Latvian independence was only achieved by the sacrifice of Latvian lives and property. The first Latvian national leaders had to overcome invasions by both German and Russian empires to gain freedom. Then, between the final expulsion of the Bolshevik Russians in 1919 and their return in overwhelming force in 1940, Latvia showed the way to economic, social, and political progress. No one can say that Latvia did not do honor to her dead during those years of independence.

Latvia was one of the first European Countries to reform the currency and financial system. The land reform law of 1920 was a model of fair, democratic dispersal of feudal estates. Happily, it ended forever the supremacy of German—or Balt—nobles over the other 97 percent of the population. Latvian foreign policy was founded on friendly relations with Soviet Russia as well as the West, and trust in the League of Nations. By 1937, there were 5,717 industrial enterprises in Latvia. Seventy thousand farmers were enrolled in 2,300 educational societies. Hydroelectric stations were numerous. The national income increased 120 percent between 1927 and 1938 despite the depression. The Latvian National Bank's assets rose from 48.2 million lats, the local currency, in 1934, to 125.6 million lats in 1939. Latvian trade was almost completely with the West, especially Great Britain, Germany, and the United States, carried in 103 Latvian ships. By 1939, Latvia was almost self-supporting, embarking on the voyage to exciting economic growth.

Soviet Russia ended all of this by invasion in 1940, in direct violation of all existing international law and morals, especially the 1920 treaties giving Latvia complete independence.

We should remember today the hopeful flowering of democracy in Latvia, and many other nations of Eastern Europe. We should remember the conviction of early Latvian leaders, and those who escaped to the West to continue the fight against oppression—many like Janis Cakste, Gustav Zemgals, Karlis Ulmanis, Janis Goldmanis, Karlis Zarins, former ambassador to Britain, and Alfred Bilmanis, former minister to the United States. We should remember the tyranny which destroyed their dreams. We extend our good wishes to their followers both in Latvia, and abroad, and share their hope for future independence for Latvia.

---

# HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

## TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 19, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. ALBERT].

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

Proverbs 3: 5: *Trust in the Lord with all thine heart; and lean not unto thine own understanding.*

O Thou infinite and eternal God, may the perplexing national and international problems, which we are daily struggling with, make us more conscious of our need of Thy divine guidance.

Help us to feel that our primary and most pressing responsibility is to lead our troubled and groping world back to Thee and the ways of righteousness.

May the Members of the Congress give clear and convincing testimony that they are men and women of integrity and inspired by a sincere desire to maintain and enhance our glorious American traditions.

Grant that the justice of God may find a voice in all their policies and plans and may they fearlessly denounce everything that is contrary to the great moral and spiritual principles.

In Christ's name we bring our petition. Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

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

## MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

On October 24, 1963:

H.R. 7195. An act to amend various sections of title 23 of the United States Code relating to the Federal-aid highway systems;

H.R. 7544. An act to amend the Social Security Act to assist States and communities in preventing and combating mental retardation through expansion and improvement of the maternal and child health and crippled children's programs, through provisions of prenatal, maternity, and infant care for individuals with conditions associated with childbearing which may lead to mental retardation, and through planning for comprehensive action to combat mental retardation, and for other purposes; and

H.J. Res. 724. Joint resolution to provide additional housing for the elderly.

On October 28, 1963:

H.R. 641. An act to approve an order of the Secretary of the Interior canceling and deferring certain irrigation charges, eliminating certain tracts of non-Indian-owned land under the Wapato Indian irrigation project, Washington, and for other purposes; and

H.J. Res. 192. Joint resolution relating to the validity of certain rice acreage allotments for 1962 and prior crop years.

On October 29, 1963:

H.R. 2268. An act for the relief of Mrs. Geneva H. Trisler;

H.R. 4588. An act to provide for the withdrawal and reservation for the Department of the Navy of certain public lands of the United States at Mojave B Aerial Gunnery Range, San Bernardino County, Calif., for defense purposes; and

H.R. 6377. An act for the relief of Sp5c Curtis Melton, Jr.

On October 30, 1963:

H.R. 75. An act to provide for exceptions to the rules of navigation in certain cases; and

H.J. Res. 782. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1964, and for other purposes.

On November 4, 1963:

H.R. 844. An act to declare that certain land of the United States is held by the United States in trust for the Oglala Sioux Indian Tribe of the Pine Ridge Reservation;

H.R. 845. An act to declare that certain land of the United States is held by the United States in trust for the Oglala Sioux Indian Tribe of the Pine Ridge Reservation;

H.R. 2635. An act to amend the act of August 9, 1955, for the purpose of including the Fort Mojave Indian Reservation among reservations excepted from the 25-year lease limitations;

H.R. 3306. An act to establish a revolving fund from which the Secretary of the Interior may make loans to finance the procurement of expert assistance by Indian tribes in cases before the Indian Claims Commission;

H.R. 6225. An act to provide for the rehabilitation of Guam, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 6481. An act to permit the government of Guam to authorize a public authority to undertake urban renewal and housing activities.

On November 7, 1963:

H.R. 6500. An act to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 8821. An act to revise the provisions of law relating to the methods by which amounts made available to the States pursuant to the Temporary Unemployment Compensation Act of 1958 and title XII of the Social Security Act are to be restored to the Treasury.

On November 13, 1963:

H.R. 1049. An act to amend sections 334, 367, and 369 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 734, 767, 769) and to add a new section 355 so as to require claims to be filed and to limit the time within which claims may be filed in chapter XI (arrangement) proceedings to the time prescribed by section 57n of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 93n);

H.R. 1311. An act for the relief of Jolan Berczeller;

H.R. 1345. An act for the relief of Peter Carson; and

H.R. 2260. An act for the relief of Mrs. Rozsi Neuman.

H.R. 2445. An act for the relief of Mrs. Barbara Ray Van Olphen;

H.R. 2754. An act for the relief of Mercedes Robinson Orr;

H.R. 2757. An act for the relief of Woo You Lyn (also known as Hom You Fong and Lyn Fong Y. Hom);

H.R. 2835. An act to clarify the status of circuit and district judges retired from regular service;

H.R. 2968. An act for the relief of Kazimierz Kurmas and Zdzislaw Kurmas;

H.R. 3384. An act for the relief of Lee Suey Jom (also known as Tommy Lee and Lee Shue Chung);

H.R. 4145. An act for the relief of certain individuals;

H.R. 6097. An act for the relief of Dr. Pedro B. Montemayor, Jr.;

H.R. 6260. An act for the relief of Wai Chan Cheng Liu; and

H.R. 7405. An act to amend the Bretton Woods Agreements Act to authorize the U.S. Governor of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development to vote for an increase in the Bank's authorized capital stock.

H.J. Res. 626. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to the establishment of an interstate school district by Hanover, N.H., and Norwich, Vt., and to an agreement between Hanover School District, N. H., and Norwich Town School District, Vt.

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 without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 2837. An act to amend further section 11 of the Federal Register Act (44 U.S.C. 311).

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendments, in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 7431. An act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. CASE, Mr. COTTON, and Mr. SALTONSTALL to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

## SELECT COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENTAL RESEARCH

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Governmental Research be permitted to sit during general debate today.

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

There was no objection.

## COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Labor Subcommittee investigating the St. Elizabeths Hospital may be permitted to sit during general debate today.

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

There was no objection.

## SUBCOMMITTEE ON HOUSING

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcomittee on Housing of the Committee on Banking and Currency be permitted to sit during general debate on November 19, 20, and 21.

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

There was no objection.

## WHITE PAPERS VIEW THAT MESS IN CUBA

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, it looks like the image makers are at it again. I hope I am wrong, but I am disturbed by an article which appeared in a Midwestern newspaper which states:

Two case histories of American foreign policy in action—one resulting in failure, the other in brilliant success—will be presented in two programs of the "NBC White Papers" series on the NBC television network Sundays, December 8 and January 5 (both 10 to 11 p.m.). Chet Huntley will narrate.

According to the image makers, both programs focus on Cuba. The first, "Cuba: The Bay of Pigs," will chronicle events from March 17, 1960, when President Eisenhower first revealed that he had decided to proceed with plans for organizing and training a military force of Cuban exiles, through April 20, 1961, marking the total failure of the force which invaded Cuba.

That is the one that is supposed to be a failure.

The second, "Cuba: The Missile Crisis," will cover developments from the "first" indications of Soviet activity in Cuba early in 1962 to October 28 of that year when Khrushchev agreed to pull out the missiles positioned there.

That is described as the brilliant success.

It is interesting to note that they terminate on October 28 after the President had made his speech, but apparently fail to follow through to give the whole picture where Kennedy backed off, capitulated and yielded. What a "brilliant success."

These apparent "snow jobs" to rewrite history and create false images are sickening.

I am referring this matter to the Republican National Committee with the request they preview these two "white papers"; and if the facts are distorted as they were in the Newburg story and the area redevelopment film, make an equal time demand to set the record straight.

## SECOND ANNUAL REPORT OF THE PEACE CORPS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

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

*To the Congress of the United States:*

Pursuant to the provisions of section 11 of the Peace Corps Act, as amended, I transmit herewith the second annual report on operations under the act covering the fiscal year ended June 30, 1963.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *November 19, 1963.*

## PRIVATE CALENDAR

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

### OUTLET STORES, INC.

The Clerk called the first bill (H.R. 2300) for the relief of Outlet Stores, Inc.

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

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

There was no objection.

### FOR THE RELIEF OF DR. AND MRS. ABEL GORFAIN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2706) for the relief of Dr. and Mrs. Abel Gorfain.

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

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

There was no objection.

### CHARLES WAVERLY WATSON, JR.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2728) for the relief of Charles Waverly Watson, Jr.

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

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

There was no objection.

### JOHN F. MACPHAIL

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5145) for the relief of John F. MacPhail, lieutenant, U.S. Navy.

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

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

There was no objection.

### HANS-DIETER SIEMONEIT

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1277) for the relief of Hans-Dieter Siemoneit.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill, H.R. 1277, be removed from the Private Calendar and recommitted to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

There was no objection.

### BRYCE A. SMITH

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6182) for the relief of Bryce A. Smith.

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

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This completes the call of bills on the Private Calendar.

## PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1964

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 9140) making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority and certain river basin commissions for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes, and pending that, Mr. Speaker, I would like to agree with my distinguished friend from Iowa on time. This subject has been so fully discussed and so clearly understood it appears to me that there is no particular object for extended debate. I wonder if it is agreeable to the gentleman from Iowa that debate be limited to 2 hours, one-half to be controlled by this side and one-half by the gentleman from Iowa?

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, this bill comes to the floor from the committee with almost unanimous approval of the Subcommittee on Public Works Appropriations as well as by the full Committee on Appropriations. I am quite sure this side of the aisle will not use a full hour. However, I concur with the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations in approving 2 hours general debate.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to 2 hours, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Iowa and myself.

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

There was no objection.

## CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Obviously a quorum is not present.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 206]

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Abbitt | Fogarty | Meader |
| Abele | Foreman | Milliken |
| Avery | Gill | O'Brien, Ill. |
| Bennett, Mich. | Goodling | Passman |
| Bromwell | Halleck | Pilcher |
| Broomfield | Harding | Powell |
| Brotzman | Harvey, Ind. | Randall |
| Broyhill, Va. | Hemphill | Rodino |
| Buckley | Holifield | St. Onge |
| Cameron | Hosmer | Schwengel |
| Carey | Jennings | Shelley |
| Celler | Kastenmeier | Shipley |
| Clawson, Del | Kelly | Shriver |
| Dague | Knox | Steed |
| Davis, Tenn. | Lloyd | Teague, Tex. |
| Dawson | Long, La. | Tollefson |
| Derwinski | Mailliard | Trimble |
| Dorn | Martin, Mass. | Wilson, Bob |
| Duncan | Mathias | |

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On this rollcall 375 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

## SUBCOMMITTEE ON LIBRARIES AND MEMORIALS

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Libraries and Memorials of the Committee on House Administration be permitted to sit during general debate today.

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

There was no objection.

## PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1964

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

The motion was agreed to.

IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 9140, with Mr. BOGGS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Appropriations presents for the consideration of the House this morning the public works appropriation bill. This bill was formerly known as the rivers and harbors bill and while it now covers many subjects it is still in the main a rivers and harbors bill.

The public works appropriation bill marshals and protects and utilizes the material resources of the Nation.

When our forefathers first settled here they found a new continent possessed of apparently inexhaustible resources of every character. It teemed with game. There were deer, elk, buffalo, bear, and every species of game—that seemed to increase more rapidly than it could be consumed. Apparently it was unlimited. For three generations, in some sections of the country for the first four generations, agriculture languished. Each family planted a small patch of corn and a few rows of tobacco but their principal subsistence was game. Today many species of game which then constituted the diet of the average family is extinct. It is gone never to return.

Also, when they first saw the countryside it was covered with vast forests of trees from 100 to 200 years old. They averaged about a yard in diameter. In my immediate neighborhood there was one tree which was so large that when a horseman rode up on the stump, there was room for him to turn the horse around. This timber was rolled up into great heaps and burned. It was for the time being merely an encumbrance upon the land. But those who make accurate estimates tell us that if those logs were available today they would exceed in commercial value the value of the entire farm from which it was cut, with all its modern farm improvements.

In the great northern forests was the Minnesota white pine, the most valuable, the most easily worked, the most durable wood known to the builder. With the coming of newly invented saws they were slaughtered and floated down the Mississippi River and sold to anyone for little more than the cost of transportation. Today you can rarely secure a single stick of Minnesota pine. It has been almost completely obliterated.

There were throughout the continent vast deposits of every mineral, from coal to gold, most of which have now been exploited and many of which have been almost completely exhausted. We wasted in irresponsible and utter profligacy vast resources of every character.

But there was one resource which it took us 200 years to appreciate. When the settlers came here there were thousands of rivulets and hundreds of rivers carrying clear, pure, water to the sea. If you had told anyone that the day would come when somebody would want a drink of pure water they would have laughed at you. But, Mr. Chairman, as incredible as it is—and the statement is corroborated by official statistics—more than one-fourth of the cities of the United States are today faced with pressing problems dealing with an adequate water supply. Many of them cannot secure sufficient water to supply the daily needs of the city, and almost all who are able to secure water find it so polluted that it has to be processed before it is potable. There are cities in the United States today using water twice. After using it once, they must process it and use it a second time.

So it is evident, Mr. Chairman, that of all these vast and boundless resources which we have been wasting and dissipating, water is perhaps the most valuable.

This bill seeks to provide for the conservation, preservation and utilization of soil and water facilities.

Not only are we in need of water for domestic consumption, but in this country the development of industry has changed concepts of transportation. In the early days, civilization came up the rivers on steamboats. Everywhere the ubiquitous steamboat steamed up the river to the most remote sections of the country ,carrying commerce and civilization with it. But there came a time when to our great pride, our railroads drove out the steamboats. Our railroads practically obliterated water traffic. Now we are beginning to realize again as Europe long ago demonstrated, that water transportation is the cheapest and most practical transportation available for heavy commodities. We are today under the necessity, under the pressure of modern industrial conditions, of again providing and utilizing water transportation.

On the Mississippi River, for example, my grandfather told me he remembered when there was no time during the day when you could not either see a boat or hear the deep mellow whistle of one boat miles away on the river.

The boats had carried all traffic. They carried both passenger and freight. But when the railroads came in the rivers were completely abandoned.

However, during the last war when large quantities of commodities had to be moved and cheap transportation was important, we tried the experiment of installing Government barges on the Mississippi. It has gradually spread to other areas and while we thought it was merely a wartime measure involving an expense that could not be justified in time of peace, we discovered that barge transportation was the most convenient, most economical, and the most commodious method of transporting heavy products—oil, coal, ore, building materials and other such bulk freight and cargo.

We are steadily increasing every year the tonnage of transportation on every river in the country. I speak of the Mississippi River particularly because I live on the banks of the Mississippi and the Mississippi and Missouri Rivers are today furnishing barge transportation at so low a cost that it is doing as much to serve the interests of modern American industry as any other single factor.

So, Mr. Chairman, in this bill we propose to solve, and we are solving this pressing industrial problem. We are preserving and conserving water, the most priceless commodity of the day—liquid gold and we are encouraging water transportation and uniting and consolidating our industrial system until today it matches the water traffic of any country in the world.

Mr. Chairman, this bill may not be and, of course, is not a perfect bill, but it is making an invaluable contribution, to our times and to our national needs.

The individual municipalities and the river and harbor projects cannot meet their needs without Federal cooperation. This bill is evidence that the American republic has not only the means of providing these essentials under modern day conditions but that it has the wisdom and will and the determination and is encouraging progress that will make the United States the most prosperous nation in the world.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, if you look above the Speaker's chair, up close to the ceiling you will see a plaque on which these words are chiseled:

> Let us develop the resources of our land, call forth its powers, build up its institutions, promote all its great interests and see whether we also in our day and generation may not perform something worthy to be remembered.
>
> Daniel Webster.

Mr. Chairman and my colleagues, it is on that basis that this Subcommittee on Public Works of the Committee on Appropriations operates year in and year out. This bill has, of course, been erroneously called the pork barrel bill. Let me say this: Every American living today should be grateful for the projects which this Congress has instituted to preserve and conserve our precious resource—Mother Earth. Were it not for the money which has been appropriated and spent for these projects, especially over the past 30 years, this Nation would be a network of gullies, as it was before the Soil Conservation Service and the Army engineers were directed by the Congress to do something about the destruction of our great natural resource—Mother Earth.

I am sure that those who have traveled in foreign lands will agree with me that had those nations that now suffer hunger, strife, and internal unrest, taken care of their lands as we have and as the Western European nations have over the past many years, then those nations today would not be suffering every kind of discomfort that one could imagine. But they forgot or the great, powerful, ruthless land barons forgot or did not care about the long range consequences if their land washed away, eroded away, or blew away, because they had a few million more acres that they could put into production. So what was the difference?

Mr. Chairman, I make no apology for the part that I have played in appropriating funds for the preservation and the conservation of our natural resources.

My friends, about 65 percent of the money which is contained in this bill for the U.S. Army Engineers is either solely for the control of floods or is for multipurpose projects that include the control of floods—floods which in the past have wreaked havoc in every section of our land and destroyed property by the billions of dollars, as well as taken many, many lives.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

So, here today, we are asking the American people to spend a part of their tax dollars—and a rather small part of their tax dollars—to continue this wonderful program of conserving our priceless natural resources.

Mr. Chairman, I shall insert along with my remarks the amounts which are included in this bill with appropriate comparisons with what the administration requested.

The statistics referred to follow:

| Activity | Budget estimate 1964 (as amended) | Recommended by the committee | Change from budget estimate |
|---|---|---|---|
| Cemeterial expenses | $10,846,000 | $10,800,000 | −$46,000 |
| Rivers and harbors and flood control | 1,086,816,000 | 1,055,782,700 | −31,033,300 |
| The Panama Canal | 33,715,000 | 31,500,000 | −2,215,000 |
| Bureau of Reclamation | 370,347,000 | 348,146,700 | −22,200,300 |
| Power agencies of the Department of Interior | 76,075,000 | 54,700,000 | −21,375,000 |
| Atomic Energy Commission | 2,849,645,000 | 2,688,169,000 | −161,476,000 |
| Tennessee Valley Authority | 48,284,000 | 46,000,000 | −2,284,000 |
| Delaware River Basin Commission | 156,000 | 155,000 | −1,000 |
| Public works acceleration | 45,000,000 | | −45,000,000 |
| Indefinite appropriations | 40,863,000 | 40,863,000 | |
| Total | 4,561,747,000 | 4,276,116,400 | −285,630,600 |

This bill carries an amount which is $1,258,586,210 below the 1963 fiscal year appropriations. However, $850 million of that amount is attributable to the fact that there is no public works acceleration money in this bill for fiscal 1964 as there was in fiscal 1963. Nonetheless, this bill comes to the floor of the House today under the 1963 appropriations even after adjusting for this nonrecurring item, and it is under the budget in an amount of $285,630,600.

Mr. Chairman, in this bill is $2,688,169,000 for the Atomic Energy Commission. I might say that it is rather difficult for the Subcommittee on Public Works Appropriations to analyze and determine just how much money should be appropriated to that great and important agency. But I say to the Members of the House that we worked diligently and we had long hearings, after which we marked up the bill, and you will find that as far as the items in the bill for the Atomic Energy Commission are concerned they are a total of $161,476,000 below the budget.

Mr. Chairman, as I said earlier, I am proud to have been a party here in Congress, along with my able colleagues on the committee, in seeing to it that our natural resources are conserved, preserved, and protected. We have many thousands of small watersheds in this great big country of ours. We have about a dozen main streams, main river valleys, and into those great rivers run thousands of tributaries. Mr. Chairman, it has been necessary, in order to stop floods, to build many dams on the upper reaches of those tributaries in order to hold the water as near as possible to the spot where the raindrops fall. That program has not only conserved our soil but it has conserved our water, which is so important.

Most every section of this country today is having a water problem. Most every city is having a water problem. Many small towns are experiencing a very serious water problem. So it is our responsibility, the responsibility of the Congress of the United States, to see to it that none of the rain that falls from heaven runs off the land and into the sea without helping to meet our many needs for water.

We cannot stop every drop, but we have in the past 30 years stopped most of the water that should have been stopped near the land on which it fell. By so doing we have raised the water table underground and we have made the water more valuable and more plentiful for human consumption, for animal consumption, for industry, and for irrigation.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, I want to leave this thought with you. As I have said on many occasions, I am sure that when God made the heavens He made them perfect in every detail. But He left the earth imperfect in most every detail. He had a reason for that. Had He not done so human beings would have perished long ago because they would have become drones with never a wish to improve their lives, like the drone in the beehive. He is finally destroyed because he is not worthy of his keep.

So, Mr. Chairman, when we talk about irrigation, small watershed projects, and

flood control we have a name for that. We call it reclamation—reclaiming land that has been destroyed or ruined and in addition we are preventing the destruction of additional land. Like the rest of man's work, the bill is not perfect but it is a good bill and it will continue to improve our programs of reclamation and conservation, and the protection of life and property from devastating floods.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the ranking majority member of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN].

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, it is only recently, after over 185 years as a nation, that we have really come to appreciate the importance of our water resources and the urgency of taking concerted action to provide an adequate water supply for domestic and industrial purposes.

An interesting sign of the times is in nearby Virginia where they are building a town which is going to house 75,000 people when finished. The first thing they are building there is a reservoir to catch the water runoff to assure an adequate supply of water. This has greatly enhanced the value of this land.

It is the first time, I repeat, in the history of this Nation that we are on the right track in our reclamation efforts. I remember as a boy on the Susquehanna River they ran steamboats between Harrisburg and Wilkes-Barre, Pa., a distance of 100 miles. Today you could not run a canoe up that river. That shows the destruction we have had over the years.

During this past year the steel plants in Youngstown have been producing at only about 52-percent capacity, yet they were nearly out of water. And this problem of water shortage faces much of our Nation.

So the committee felt fully justified in adding 30 unbudgeted studies, 17 new planning items, and 18 new construction starts. Including the budgeted items, the bill makes provision for a total of 54 new studies, 53 new planning items, and 51 new construction starts.

I regret that it was not possible, of course, to make provision for all the unbudgeted items that were requested of the committee. About 350 Members of this Congress made requests of our committee to either raise a budget item or include an unbudgeted item. I think this is the best evidence of the need that exists today for water resource development in our country. Every one of these projects will pay back far more in benefits than they cost. Yet you often hear opposition to, and criticism of, these projects from some who claim they are not needed and are a waste of the taxpayers' money.

There is $411.7 million in this bill for the Bureau of Reclamation and the power agencies. Roosevelt is considered one of the greats in conservation. In 1902 he saved the 17 Western States from the robbing and looting that had destroyed many of the great resources of the East. He saved the 17 Western States. But all the money that was spent on reclamation from 1902 to 1932 was about $300 million. He saved them, but adequate money was not provided down through the years. But we now have spent billions since 1932 reclaiming this country, and I mean reclaiming it.

I repeat, as a boy I saw them set fire to the Pocono Mountains, burning trees that it took 200 years to grow.

Let me call your attention to something. Life magazine, that has several million subscribers, calls this the "pork barrel" bill. I only wish they would publish the true facts about the value of these projects. Since 1902 we have appropriated about $4.4 billion for reclamation. Ninety-two percent of this is being repaid to the Government, and the tax revenues from farmers and businesses in reclamation areas now total $5.1 billion—more than the total cost of all the reclamation projects that have ever been built. In 1962, $1.2 billion worth of choice crops were produced and for every worker on an irrigated farm, two additional jobs are generated in the local towns. And yet a magazine like Life comes out and calls it "pork."

Public works appropriations have saved billions and billions of dollars for this Nation by the development of the waterways for low-cost transportation and flood control down through the years. If it were not for these appropriations, what we would have done to the greatest country in the world, and I mean the greatest—America.

I repeat, we invested $4.4 billion in the past 61 years in reclamation projects and the tax revenues that were generated now total $5.1 billion. Can any man or woman on this floor name a bank, business, utility, or anything in the world that has that record? Yet when the bill comes in you find many people talking about it as a waste of money.

I would like to quote from a letter written by a Yakima farmer which appeared in an editorial of a Wenatchee, Wash., paper:

> Wakened at 5 o'clock by an alarm clock from Connecticut, I take the milk pails (Pennsylvania tin) and wend my way to the barn, while the wife prepares breakfast on a range from Kalamazoo, Mich. The breakfast, likely as not, will consist of grapefruit from Florida, breakfast food from Minneapolis, bacon from Omaha or Cedar Rapids, Iowa, served on table china from Ohio or New Jersey, silverware from New York, sugar from Louisiana, etc.
>
> I go out to spray the orchard, using lead arsenate from Missouri, sulfur from Texas or Louisiana. My spray rig is made in Michigan, the tractor in Wisconsin.
>
> When I go to town it is in a car from Indiana and Detroit, with tires from Ohio, Bakelite for accessories from New Hampshire. My car insurance goes to Baltimore, life insurance to Des Moines and Omaha, fire to Hartford, Conn. Shoes for myself and family come from Boston and St. Louis, clothing from New York or Chicago, cotton goods from Georgia, South Carolina, or Mississippi.

And when he finally goes to the great beyond, he tells you, there will be a marker on his grave of Vermont granite that is sent all the way out to the West Coast.

So the whole Nation benefits from these projects, not just the locality. Yet we hear some say, "Oh, do not spend all that money—the budget just cannot stand it and the Treasury cannot stand it."

In every way that you can think of, for every dollar that is spent, it comes back 100-fold.

I spent about 10 years bumming all over this country—and I mean bumming over it and not riding the pullman cars although I might have been on top of the pullman car or under it. What I am trying to tell you now is that I have seen America like very few people have seen it, and there were times I got more education around a hobo jungle campfire at night when we got to talking about America than I have gotten on the floor of this Congress. Now I mean that sincerely. The group that I traveled with really saw and knew America.

A short time ago I said, and I say it again, that before issuing a passport to anybody to go abroad, I would question them as to how much they have seen of America and if the person had not seen a good part of it, he would have to pay a $200 penalty before he got his passport. If the people had a better understanding of our problems, we would be starting work on more of these projects that we are speaking about here today. I mean that. I have seen Europe several times since I came to the Congress and once before in 1917. But there is nothing in all of Europe put together to equal this country. If you see America, you will have no desire to go to Europe. That is why I am down in the well of the House here today. When the time comes to appropriate money for America, don't be haggling about it. Say a prayer, if you will tonight and make a fair confession that we have not been true to our country. I know that down through the years in the time that I have been in the Congress, I have been in favor of giving what they have asked for to this country. I hope on this bill, as it moves along, we will not find any Member of the Congress here trying to put in an amendment or to do this or to do that or hearing somebody say some unkind word. My only regret, as I have said many times, is that this bill, which is for the benefit of America, is not for $3 billion instead of only about $1.5 billion for rivers and harbors and reclamation. It should be $3 billion to try to make up for our abuse and the neglect of our country down through the years.

I hope when the time comes to vote on this bill for passage, that it will be passed here by the full membership of the House in the same way that it was reported out of the committee.

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WESTLAND. First of all, I would like to compliment the gentleman from Ohio, as I seem to do annually, on the speech that he has just made and compliment him and the members of his committee on this bill. I thoroughly agree that all this money that is provided in this legislation is the best kind of investment that we can make. You will find me voting for this legislation.

I am sure the gentleman from Ohio knows the great interest that we in the West have in this matter of intertie for the transmission of electrical energy

from Bonneville Power Administration down to the Southwest.

In the report this is referred to three different times, and I would like to make a record on this, if I can, with the gentleman from Ohio.

On page 54 you provide $5 million to be controlled by the Secretary of the Interior to begin construction of two extra high voltage lines—one that you say will connect with the California Power Pool and another one will be, I presume, a Federal intertie. But you restrict these funds to the passage of the bill, S. 1007, or some similar legislation.

I am sure the gentleman from Ohio is aware, and the Congress is aware, that this bill is presently in conference with some difficulties over an amendment that carries my name.

Is it the intention of the Committee on Appropriations to restrict these funds or the use of these funds until that conference is settled or until the differences are settled—or just what is the attitude?

Mr. KIRWAN. I think it is the consensus of the committee with respect to the Westland amendment that until the bill involved finally becomes law no funds are to be used for construction. That is why we put the restrictions in there. I think it would have been much better for us if legislation had been passed that way and we could have come to a clearer understanding on the subject. However, no money will be spent here on construction until S. 1007 or similar legislation becomes law.

Mr. WESTLAND. I want to thank the gentleman and his committee for having put in that language, because it certainly helps to work it out at this time.

There is one other question. On page 48 of the report you appropriate $2 million for the Bureau of Reclamation and you put the same type of restriction on that $2 million for the Bureau of Reclamation. Am I correct in that?

Mr. KIRWAN. Yes; we put the same kind of restriction on that.

Mr. WESTLAND. In the third instance you apparently have $1.5 million for preliminary engineering—a program for the interconnections to the Pacific Southwest. Is it the gentleman's opinion that the use of these funds will likewise carry the same restrictions as the $2 million for the Bureau of Reclamation and the $5 million for Bonneville?

Mr. KIRWAN. The intent of our action on this whole question was to strengthen the hand of the Secretary of the Interior in his bargaining on these tielines to see that the U.S. Government is protected. And that is what we are all interested in.

Mr. WESTLAND. We are certainly interested in protecting the U.S. Government.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. KEOGH). The time of the gentleman from Ohio has again expired.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I will yield the gentleman 2 minutes.

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. WESTLAND. Then, if I understand it correctly, this $1.5 million has no restrictions on its usage?

Mr. KIRWAN. It has no restrictions on it, as you say, except that it must be used for engineering on lines in the Bonneville area.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. EVINS. The $1.5 million is restricted to the Northwest area for preliminary studies and engineering. This is the purpose for which it was budgeted.

Mr. WESTLAND. It does not say that, and I am very much interested in it.

Mr. EVINS. It is pointed out on page 887 of volume 3 of the hearings.

Mr. WESTLAND. I am glad to get that information. Do I understand that this money could not be spent outside the Pacific Northwest?

Mr. KIRWAN. That is correct.

Mr. WESTLAND. Thank you very much.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Ohio yield to me?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ASPINALL. I wish to ask some questions following along the questions of the gentleman from Washington in order to be sure I understand what is meant by the Northwest area. Do I understand this will be confined, then, to the States of Washington, Oregon, and Idaho?

Mr. KIRWAN. Yes. The Northwest territory.

Mr. ASPINALL. I wish to thank the gentleman for that explanation, and may I commend the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN]. I think he is one of the great Americans of all time and one of the greatest Americans at least of this era in his desire to see that our own domestic natural resource values are properly conserved, developed, and harvested. His contribution to the life of America will live for a long, long time. I thank him sincerely.

Mr. KIRWAN. I thank the gentleman from Colorado for those kind remarks.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. Yes. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GUBSER. I would certainly like to join in what the gentleman from Washington and the gentleman from Colorado said about the fine, fair work that was done by the gentleman from Ohio. If he would permit me to, I would like to ask this question. Referring back to the $2 million for the California portion of the proposed intertie from the Northwest to the Southwest, should S. 1007 with the Westland amendment not become law, is it the gentleman's opinion that the $2 million could be spent for the construction of an intertie in that situation?

Mr. KIRWAN. The prohibition is that no construction be started until S. 1007 or similar legislation is enacted into law, with or without the Westland amendment. Should the Westland amendment survive in its present form, it would of course be controlling in the matter of construction outside the Bonneville area.

Mr. GUBSER. I thank the gentleman for a very clearcut answer.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Ohio yield further?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ASPINALL. I wish to commend the chairman of this great committee, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], and his counterpart, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN], and also the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] for not attempting to write legislation into an appropriation bill. It so happens that the particular matter which has been brought to the attention of this Committee at this time comes under the jurisdiction of the committee which I have the honor to chair. If we cannot get the authority, then, most certainly, this money should not be spent.

Mr. Chairman, I am very grateful for this approach to the question.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to add my commendation to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] for the constructive approach that he takes toward this type of public works and to further note the fact that the gentleman from Ohio considers this an investment in the future of America. I certainly concur with the gentleman in those expressions. In addition to that, I want to especially thank the gentleman from Ohio and the members of this committee, on behalf of the people of the congressional district which I have the honor to represent, for the consideration they have always given us with respect to the emergency problems that we have.

I want to take this opportunity publicly to thank the gentleman and the members of the committee very much for that consideration.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROUDEBUSH].

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Chairman, I certainly want to thank the gentleman from Iowa for yielding to me. I shall not long impose upon the time of this body but I want to say that I heartily endorse this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to invite the committee's attention to the report that accompanies this bill, and specifically page 5 of that report. Under those items listed for the State of Illinois, there appears $250,000 for a comprehensive survey of the Wabash River Valley. I certainly commend the committee for the attention that they have given the Wabash Valley, but likewise I must express my disappointment with this amount indicated for the comprehensive survey. It is my understanding that the Corps of Engineers has stated that they have a capability to utilize $450,000 for the purpose of this survey. However, I am aware that both the Bureau of the Budget as well as the administration asked that $250,000 be granted. Therefore, admittedly the committee has allowed the total amount requested by the Bureau. I have just returned from the

Wabash Valley, where I spent two long and difficult days, visiting nearly every project that is under consideration in that watershed. May I say to my colleagues that there is so very much to be done in the field of water conservation and flood control in this area, that I feel concerned with the speed that we are attacking this problem. The overall problem cannot be resolved unless a comprehensive survey is completed, to determine the total utilization of the water resources of this, the greatest undeveloped valley in the world. A few months ago, nearly 200 members of the Wabash Valley Association came to Washington to make their plea for $1 million for this comprehensive study. This association, which is so acutely aware of the needs of the valley, expressed concern with the progress being made in the comprehensive survey. They felt and I do, that we must survey the overall problem, before we seek a cure. The Wabash Valley has suffered for many years from tremendous floods, need of channel approvement, levee construction to protect our farm lands and cities, and this year from inadequate reserves of water in the reservoir systems, to provide an adequate low flow level in the river. Lest the members of this committee might think we are lacking in gratitude, let me make it perfectly clear that we who live in and near the Wabash Valley are most aware of the efforts being made by our Government to correct this situation that has plagued us for years. But, Mr. Chairman, we had hoped that more money could be allowed to help us get along with this most necessary work in the valley. I hope that consideration can be given to the item that I have discussed, and that increased funds be allowed for this badly needed money.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROUDEBUSH] and other members of the Wabash Valley of Illinois and Indiana concerning our interest in seeing the Wabash Valley project accelerated. We deeply appreciate the action of the committee in allowing the amount requested in the President's budget; however, we feel that the vital needs of the Wabash Valley Basin in Illinois and Indiana are so important that this comprehensive basin study should be speeded up as quickly as possible. Millions of dollars in property damage result from annual floods in the Wabash Valley; and, ironically enough, Mr. Chairman, we are experiencing a drought condition this time of year which clearly points up the need for the comprehensive study. We must find a way to harness our devastating floods and preserve this precious water at the proper locations during the low-water period. It is my intention to call this matter to the attention of the President, the Bureau of the Budget, and the other body with a hope that additional funds may be allowed in order that the millions residing in this river basin can have some assurance of protection and utilization of their natural resources. If the other body in their wisdom should allow additional funds, I am indeed hopeful my friends on the House Committee on Appropriations will see fit to agree to this item in conference. Mr. Chairman, we are urging the Army Corps of Engineers to establish a branch office somewhere in the Wabash Valley area, in order to give this great river basin the attention it requires if the above-stated objectives are met.

In closing, let me again express my appreciation to a great committee for bringing out a great bill.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRAY].

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to second the remarks of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROUDEBUSH]. We in the Wabash Valley are appreciative of the progress that is being made there and of the fact that the bill provides $250,000 for a comprehensive survey of the Wabash River Valley. At the same time we would like to point out that the Army Corps of Engineers can effectively utilize $450,000 for the survey in this fiscal year.

I am aware that the President's budget requested only $250,000, and the committee has endorsed this figure. However, the need for this survey is urgent, and I believe we would be well advised to consider the urgency of the need.

This river valley has for years been subjected to recurrent floods. This year much of the area has suffered from an extended drought, and the combination of these natural disasters points up again the tremendous opportunity for effective water control.

Mr. Chairman, delaying completion of this survey on the Wabash River would be wasteful. True economy requires that these surveys be completed as quickly as possible so that sound plans can be based on them.

We in the Wabash Valley are proud of its role in the economy, but feel some frustration in knowing that its great resources are not being fully utilized.

We are anxious to see such things as the creation of recreation areas and a reexamination of the feasibility of making barge traffic possible.

Planning in these areas will not wait. It is obvious that new projects will be better designed if the comprehensive survey of the Wabash River is accomplished beforehand.

There are three main elements in a comprehensive river basin study. First, a determination of all needs for water and related land resources, both short term and longer term. Second, a determination of availability of water and related land resources. Third, a formulation of the best plan for applying the water assets against all of the water needs.

In short this comprehensive river basin study would seek to fully consider flood control, navigation, hydropower, irrigation, water supply, water quality control, recreation, and fish and wildlife. It seeks the best regulation of the water and land affected by it.

The need is truly urgent, and we seek urgent consideration of it so that this survey may be completed at the earliest practicable date.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I do want to pay my highest compliments to every member of this committee. They are dedicated Members of Congress. They have worked long and diligently in bringing this bill to the floor of the House.

Also, Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the clerks of our committee, Mr. Culp and Mr. Wilhelm. They really represent a team that brings us the information which we need. We certainly appreciate their wonderful assistance.

Also, Mr. Chairman, I might say that our good colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MILLIKEN], a hard working member of this committee, is ill and so not present today. However, I am happy to report that he is coming along fine and will be back in the House soon.

I, as you know, have with me today on the minority side the gentleman from New York [Mr. PILLION] and the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES], who have worked side by side with me and with the other members of the committee in bringing this bill to the floor, a bill which we can support wholeheartedly.

There are a few things in this bill that I would have changed had I had my way. But, you know, I do not always have my way, and that is as it should be.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN].

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation. I, too, want to commend and thank the committee for giving the consideration to my requests in the district which I have the honor to represent.

I am certain the members of the committee recognize the many flood control problems and navigation projects that need attention in my district. The geographic location, terrain, and weather, heavy winter rains, in particular, make the area I represent somewhat unique by comparison. Approximately 40 percent of the water resources of the State of California have their origin in the north coastal counties that comprise the First District of California. I mention this to illustrate the flood control and watershed development consideration facing us now and in the future.

The members of the Appropriations Committee have been most considerate of my requests, when I have contacted you individually and particularly during my presentation before your committee. In view of the budget deficit problem facing the Congress, I believe the committee has done an outstanding job in presenting this bill to the full House.

There is one project in my district that was not included, however, that I would like to bring to the attention of the committee—the Corte Madera Creek flood control problem in Marin County. This project was not included in the President's budget and I can understand the committee's hesitancy in breaking

policy to consider individual projects. However, I think it is incumbent upon me to advise the members of changing circumstances relating to projects as they arise. The Corte Madera Creek flows near the campus of the College of Marin in Marin County. The president of the college came to my office here in Washington recently to advise of plans for expansion of facilities on their campus. At that time, he clearly defined the flood problems as they relate to his expansion plans and the restrictions placed upon them unless corrective action is taken at an early date.

Therefore, I should like to advise the committee that I plan to present my case again before the Senate subcommittee asking favorable consideration of this request and if successful, I will then ask the House conferees to sustain my request. The amount is comparatively small but the timing is of utmost importance in order to properly initiate the funding of this all-important project. I thank the gentleman from Iowa for yielding to me.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. MAY].

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask at this time that I might be permitted to direct a question to my good friend the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN]; but, first, I would like to say that I, representing the Fourth Congressional District of the State of Washington, must preface any remarks I make by joining with the gentleman in his high praise and commendation of this committee.

We have been treated very well, in a continuing and an orderly development of many important projects which are in my part of the Northwest in this bill, as usual, and I too know how hard this committee works and what a capable job it has done.

However, Mr. Chairman, I am deeply disturbed that the public works appropriations bill before us today does not contain funds with which to maintain the orderly construction schedule on the Columbia Basin project in the Fourth Congressional District of the State of Washington.

The requested funds of $3.9 million, as scheduled, would be just enough to bring construction on this half-completed project to a virtual standstill. It is the lowest appropriation in my memory.

I think my colleagues should know that when the administration's budget was prepared for submission to the Congress, the new amendatory repayment contracts with the three irrigation districts had not yet been signed. However, in ensuing weeks and months the contracts were not only signed, but were validated by the courts, thus removing the valid reasoning of the Bureau of Reclamation and the Bureau of the Budget for not recommending an additional $1.7 million for construction and operation and maintenance to keep the project going on an orderly basis.

The construction on the Columbia Basin project has been facing a slowdown for several years while the amendatory repayment contracts were being negotiated. This was only natural. The Federal Government wanted assurances from the project settlers that the Federal investment would be paid before obligating further construction. Now, however, that assurance has been given. The farmers have obligated themselves into the future and have expressed their faith in themselves and the project. The bill before us today, however, says in effect: We in the Government have no faith in you.

My good friend and colleague from Iowa, the ranking minority member of the committee, is well aware of the good faith efforts carried out by the Columbia Basin project settlers. In committee testimony my distinguished colleague has said many times, in effect, that as soon as these contracts were signed and finalized the project should go forward in an orderly manner.

I know my colleague is concerned, as I am, that the funds to do this are not in the bill.

I wondered if the distinguished gentleman from Iowa would care to comment on this situation?

Mr. JENSEN. I am pleased that the gentlewoman has brought this to the attention of the committee today. I know of her constant interest in this project and especially the part that the gentlewoman has talked about.

The fact of the matter is the homesteaders who homesteaded there in the Columbia River Basin, most of them veterans, bit off a larger chunk than they could chew at the outset. Finally the contract with the Bureau and the veterans was by necessity amended to make it possible for them to keep their land.

Last spring all contracts were negotiated and completed, but I must say it was after the budget was sent to the Congress. I do think it is quite strange that after those contracts were all negotiated, before the markup by this committee of the pending bill, the Bureau did not so inform the committee and make a request that these funds be included in this bill. But they did not see fit to do so. I think I know why. I am afraid there is a little politics mixed up in this thing. That is as far as I want to go on that. However, I am sure the Senate will include the funds that are required in order to comply with the contracts made in good faith by those people that are on that land and who have signed all of these contracts with Uncle Sam in good faith.

Mrs. MAY. I thank the gentleman. Regardless of the reason for the delay in the request of this money, I hope the Bureau of Reclamation and the Bureau of the Budget will see fit to make the request when the bill goes to the Senate and that the House Members when they understand the situation will give earnest consideration to supporting the restoration of this fund to the Columbia River development program.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY].

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. It there objection to request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, at almost this precise moment 100 years ago, President Lincoln arose from a sofa on a temporary stand erected at Gettysburg Battlefield, fixed a pair of iron-rimmed spectacles on his nose and read briefly from handwritten notes.

His words were set down carefully in advance. They reflected his somber thoughts on the conflict then drawing to a close and his high hopes that the conflict might contribute to a new birth of freedom and, to the permanence of self-government.

It is now regarded as one of the greatest speeches ever presented, certainly the greatest ever uttered by an American.

It is appropriate that the House of Representatives pause for a moment in today's deliberations, and join in spirit, fellowship, and reflection with those gathered this very moment at the same place in Gettysburg where Lincoln spoke a century ago.

Today, at this very hour, an assemblage is attending a commemorative program at which General Eisenhower is the main speaker. It dedicates anew the battlefield cemetery, and it renews our appreciation for words as well as deeds. The words Lincoln spoke at Gettysburg have become a mighty force throughout the world, serving the cause of human dignity and freedom and peace. Although totally different from the deeds performed by the brave men in blue and gray at the battlefield, they are strikingly similar in the impressive way they have influenced history.

Several of us had hoped that it would be possible to recess from legislative business today, so that all Members could have had the opportunity to be present at Gettysburg. Certainly, this would have been an appropriate gesture. Lincoln once served in this body, and to this body he looked for guidance, support and leadership during the difficult days of the Civil War.

But the legislative schedule could not be altered in time, and perhaps it is also appropriate that we stay on the job. Mr. Lincoln was a great one for wanting to get on with the work at hand. Beginning with his service in the Illinois Legislature, he believed in public improvements and worked for them. He would approve, I believe, the task we undertake today.

As the representative of part of the area once represented in this body by Mr. Lincoln, a district which also includes the Lincoln home in Springfield, Ill., I appreciate your indulgence on this significant occasion.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. DOLE].

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Chairman, page 48 of the report contains the following restrictions on the Glen Elder project in Kansas:

None of the funds provided for the Glen Elder project are to be used to purchase in fee above the normal maximum reservoir water level, for fish and wildlife purposes.

On page 431 of part 3 the hearings before the Public Works Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee there is a discussion on the Glen Elder project relative to the taking of lands in fee, in excess of those under the usual acquisition policy, such excess to be used for fish and wildlife purposes. It was indicated that the Bureau of Reclamation contemplates increasing the amount of land to be purchased in fee by 9,137 acres with this increase to be used for fish and wildlife purposes and in fact the increase is 13,527 acres over the original plan. Under unanimous consent, I include at this point the discussion on fish and wildlife costs from pages 431 and 432 of the hearings:

FISH AND WILDLIFE COSTS

Mr. EVINS. Do you know what the fish and wildlife costs will be in this project?

Mr. PALMER. The fish and wildlife costs here, the $1,696,000——

Mr. EVINS. How much land will be acquired for this purpose only? We are talking about how much land will be acquired for this purpose.

Mr. STAMM. I have some figures here, Mr. Chairman, which may answer that.

In the definite plan report prepared by the Bureau of Reclamation, under usual acquisition policy, we would have acquired 24,500 acres in fee and would have taken easements on 12,600 acres for a total of 37,000.

If we acquire additional lands for fish and wildlife purposes, we would increase the fee taking from 24,500 to 33,700 acres. That is an increase of 9,167 acres, and we would decrease the acreage on which we would have taken easement to 7,400 from 12,000-plus, a decrease of a little over 5,000.

The difference in cost by taking additional land in fee rather than easement would increase the cost by $2,125,000.

Mr. EVINS. What justification is there for acquiring this land for this purpose in this area at this time?

Mr. PALMER. Here again we look to the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife to advise us under the provisions of the Wildlife Coordination Act.

In an amendment recently signed by the Secretary to the overall acquisition policy, each individual agency is held fully accountable for defending whatever land they want bought over and above the land that is required for the normal operation of the project.

Mr. PILLION. Am I to understand now that there is practically no restriction upon these projects in acquiring 30,000 to 40,000 acres of land here for supposed fish and wildlife?

Mr. PALMER. The 30,000 or 40,000 acres you speak about, sir, are the total acreage involved. That figure includes land to be inundated by the reservoir.

Mr. DOMINY. Nine thousand, one hundred and sixty-seven acres is where fee would be taken for fish and wildlife purposes.

Mr. PILLION. Could you make that 20,000 or 30,000 and put it in here?

Mr. DOMINY. Under the authorizing legislation if the findings of fact could be certified to as to demonstrated fish and wildlife benefits; yes.

Mr. PILLION. You take 10,000 acres and decide suddenly that someone down there is interested in building up this empire. He decides you want 20,000 acres for ducks.

Would that come under fish and wildlife or recreation?

Mr. DOMINY. Fish and wildlife.

Mr. PALMER. The determination of the land which would be required for wildlife purposes would come under that agency, Fish and Wildlife, and not Reclamation.

Mr. PILLION. Not recreation?

Mr. PALMER. We have no authority there.

The only authority with this is the Congress itself.

Even this $100,000 shown here for recreation, absent some specific and substantive act of Congress, would have to be paid back by power and project users. There is no recreational authorization in this project.

Mr. PILLION. How did the $100,000 get here? Is there authority for this?

Mr. PALMER. These would be specific costs to protect the health and safety of the public and to protect the project works.

Mr. PILLION. This is recreation, $100,000. Is there authority in the legislation to put this in and to charge $100,000 for this project?

Mr. PALMER. We think so; yes, sir.

Mr. DOMINY. To allocate it.

Repayment would still have to come from the irrigation and power users, however.

Mr. PILLION. You have a right to allocate it and put it here as part of the cost?

Mr. DOMINY. To the extent that the expenditure is actually made for recreation.

We cannot allocate this to the joint cost for recreation. If we spend $100,000 for that purpose specifically we allocate it to recreation.

As I understand this restriction in the report, it will prevent the taking of any land in fee for fish and wildlife purposes on the Glen Elder project. Am I right in this interpretation of the report, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman is right.

Mr. DOLE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and let me point out, as I did before during subcommittee hearings on June 10, 1963, that consideration of fish and wildlife resource planning involves an increase in lands to be acquired in fee title by 13,527 acres; however, 7,465 acres of these lands would have been covered by flowage or construction easements. I am opposed to fee title acquisition of any additional acreage. I appreciate inclusion of the language on page 48 of the report accompanying H.R. 9140. This language will save approximately $3 million and permit the acreage to remain on the local tax rolls.

ALMENA UNIT, NORTON COUNTY, KANS.

Also, on page 48 I note a reduction of $1,597,000 made in the budget estimate of $5,580,000 in the Almena unit. The committee action deletes funds programed for irrigation features on the Missouri River Basin project, though the report indicates construction funds were provided for beginning construction of the irrigation features in the appropriation bill for fiscal 1963. Deletion of these funds comes as a surprise to those interested in the Almena irrigation unit, and while recognizing the cost per acre is high, it has been called to my attention the cost is apparently no higher now than when this phase of the project was initially programed. Information related to me today indicates many farmers in the unit have proceeded on the basis irrigation facilities would be constructed. It has also been called to my attention that the acreage involved is small, less than 6,000 acres, hence the cost per acre would not set a precedent for future irrigation projects.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ANDREWS], a member of the committee.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I regret that the committee saw fit to remove the funds from the budget request for the Walter F. George lock and dam, Alabama and Georgia. These funds have been recommended by the Corps of Engineers, the Department of the Interior, and the Bureau of the Budget for the purpose of acquiring additional lands at the project. The new lands, together with a larger acreage of project lands already acquired by the corps, would be utilized as a national wildlife refuge for the conservation and welfare of migratory waterfowl, a Federal responsibility under international treaties. There is strong local support for the purchase—for public purposes—among the people of both Alabama and Georgia. There is strong national support among the conservationists of the Nation.

This use of such project lands, acquired by the corps along with land for other project purposes, is contemplated by the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act, as amended by the Congress in 1958. Also, the acquisition of additional lands by the Corps of Engineers for this purpose was specifically authorized as an integral part of the Walter F. George project by the River and Harbor Act of 1962—Public Law 87-874.

There is ample precedent for this approval by the Congress. In the Public Works Appropriation Act for fiscal year 1962, the Congress appropriated funds to the Corps of Engineers for exactly the same purpose. This was for additional lands, and interest in lands at the Jackson lock and dam project on the Tombigbee River. Those additional lands have since been purchased, and, together with project lands previously acquired, now comprise the Choctaw National Wildlife Refuge.

Also there has been a recent and important change in the policy of the administration on this point. With letters to the Speaker and the Vice President of November 2, 1963, the Deputy Director of the Bureau of the Budget submitted proposed legislation to govern incorporation of recreation and fish and wildlife conservation in water resources projects. Among other things, the letter and the proposed legislation give approval to the expenditure of water project funds "for land acquisition to accomplish the Federal Government's obligations to conserve and protect migratory waterfowl. These expenditures are in addition to those made from the Migratory Bird

Conservation Fund for migratory waterfowl refuges."

I sincerely hope these needed funds for the Walter F. George project will be restored to the bill before congressional action on it is completed.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS], a member of the committee.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, public works have made America strong and great. They have provided the sinews of much of our national strength.

Before going into a discussion of some of the details of this bill, I think it is appropriate that we reflect upon some of the great federally sponsored projects of the past. These include:

The Panama Canal.

The Hoover Dam with its vast production of power.

Grand Coulee Dam that vibrates the walkway as you cross the Columbia River.

The St. Lawrence Seaway that was fought so bitterly for so long but which has brought commerce into the Great Lakes and into the heart of the Midwest.

Then I cite the Tennessee Valley Authority in my own country, which has brought us out of poverty and erosion into power and prosperity. Its achievements have won world recognition in the development and control of a whole watershed.

We have built massive dams in the Northwest to harness power and prevent floods.

We have built levees along the mighty Mississippi.

We have cleared river channels.

We have dredged harbors. We have developed America.

I ask, Mr. Chairman, how better could these Federal funds have been spent, for all of the projects I have enumerated? For the benefit of all the people of America?

This mighty Nation can well afford to invest in itself in the development of its vast natural resources.

The bill to which I address myself today has been carefully screened.

We have attempted to fit the foot to the boot of what we can afford in view of our overall fiscal obligations.

This bill—the public works appropriations bill for 1964—is one of the most important of the annual appropriation bills coming before the Congress. The bill provides for the continued development of our Nation's resources—for the overall growth and strengthening of the United States.

Appropriations included in this bill will provide funds for the civil works functions of the Corps of Engineers; the Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of Interior; the Atomic Energy Commission; the Tennessee Valley Authority; the Panama Canal; the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation; the several public power agencies, including the Bonneville Power Administration, the Southeastern Power Administration, the Southwestern Power Administration; and various water resources and study commissions.

Our committee has received thousands of pages of testimony—six volumes of hearings—from the various agency heads and their assistants and from State and local public officials, from Members of Congress and from interested citizens in connection with the projects included in this bill. The committee has done a monumental job of analyzing the requests for funds. I want to take advantage of this opportunity to pay tribute to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, who also serves as chairman of the Public Works Subcommittee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]. Chairman CANNON's great experience and broad knowledge in the public works field have been invaluable to the committee in analyzing and preparing this bill.

I deem it a great privilege to serve on this committee with the gentleman from Missouri and also with the other members of our committee, including the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN], the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND], the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN], the gentleman from New York [Mr. PILLION], the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES], and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MILLIKEN].

The two very able and knowledgeable members of our subcommittee staff, Carson Culp and Gene Wilhelm, also should be commended publicly for their valuable assistance throughout the hearings and in handling many of the details and much of the work on this bill.

This bill carries appropriations totaling $4,276,116,400—a reduction of $285,630,600 in the budget estimates from $4,561,747,000 and a decrease of $1,258,506,210 below appropriations for fiscal year 1963. This is a cut of 6.3 percent.

The budget request provides for 51 new construction starts by the Corps of Engineers and 8 new starts for the Bureau of Reclamation—a total of 59. Included in this our committee has added 17 additional new projects for the Corps of Engineers.

Funds are provided for 25 comprehensive river basin studies by the corps, of which 22 are continuations from last year and 3 are new starts.

In addition, the committee is recommending funds for 30 unbudgeted surveys and for the initiation of planning on 18 unbudgeted projects.

Funds are provided in this bill to continue 35 construction projects to completion and to complete 4 additional projects, having a total estimated project cost of $321 million.

The total amount of appropriations recommended in this bill is $1,457,163,000, for all programs of the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation for 1964.

Certainly the appropriations provided in this bill represent a large sum of money, but the funds also represent a capital investment in America. This is an investment which will add overall strength to our country and bring our Nation vast benefits through the prevention of floods, through the reclamation of barren wastelands, through improved waterway systems, through increased use of our water resources, benefits of electricity, the promotion of navigation, and through the development of atomic energy for peaceful purposes and for national defense.

Mr. Chairman, projects of the nature funded in this bill have recently come under heavy attack by certain national magazines and others as "pork barreling" which some insist should not be approved by the Congress.

These critics contend that these projects are a waste of money. I disagree wholeheartedly with their thesis. They are indeed investments—wise investments in America and a proper use of public funds.

This committee each year screens hundreds of projects and recommends appropriations only for the most worthwhile. As every Member knows, a great deal of screening and eliminating of projects goes on before the matter is brought before the Appropriations Committee. Legislation must be passed, authorizing each project, before we begin our consideration on the matter of funding the projects. After this is done, we give consideration to appropriations for only the most worthwhile projects and every project must have a favorable benefit-to-cost ratio. The primary purpose of this bill is to provide funds for approved great public works projects for our Nation. I repeat, these are investments in America.

Every region and every section of the Nation will share in the projects included in this bill. It is truly an all-American bill—a bill with a national purpose—one which recognizes the needs of every area of our country.

The benefits that accrue from these projects include flood control, navigation, the generation of electrical power, the prevention of erosion, and the like. However, there is an additional, very valuable benefit which will result from the projects funded in this bill—that of providing increased employment throughout the country. This is only a side effect, but an important additional benefit and one that will mean much to our country at this time and will have long-range benefit for the future.

Approved construction projects, I repeat, are in all sections and in all areas of the United States. Besides the major construction items enumerated, $18 million is carried in the bill for numerous small projects, totaling approximately 28 throughout the country.

About 71 percent of the requested appropriations will be applied to 50 major projects in amounts of $5 million or more each.

The following table gives a breakdown of the total number of projects approved by Congress over the years; the number

of projects completed; the number of projects under construction; the amounts appropriated to date; and the amount needed to complete the projects:

TABLE A.—*Number and estimated cost of active authorized projects*

[In millions of dollars]

| | Total projects authorized | Completed | Underway | Balance authorized | Total estimated cost | Balance to complete |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Activity: | | | | | | |
| Navigation | 2,511 | 2,277 | 103 | 131 | $6,165.4 | $2,764.7 |
| Flood control | 907 | 484 | 164 | 259 | 6,848.0 | 3,359.0 |
| Multiple purpose projects including power | 76 | 29 | 30 | 17 | 6,930.4 | 2,657.1 |
| Alteration of bridges | 20 | 17 | 1 | 2 | 50.5 | 14.7 |
| Beach erosion control | 91 | 33 | 14 | 44 | 44.2 | 33.3 |
| Total | 3,605 | 2,840 | 312 | 453 | 20,038.5 | 8,828.8 |

Mr. Chairman, this table shows that for navigation a total of 2,511 projects have been authorized by Congress, and of this number 2,277 have been completed, 103 are presently underway, and 131 additional projects have been authorized. The total estimated cost is $6,165,400,000 with a balance of $2,764,700,000 needed to complete.

The same situation is shown for other types of projects authorized by the Congress for the Corps of Engineers.

For instance, 76 multiple-purpose projects—large projects, including power—have been authorized, 29 have been completed, and 30 are underway, with 17 representing the balance of the number authorized.

It is interesting to note that of the total of 3,605 projects of all types authorized by Congress for the Corps of Engineers, 2,840 have been completed and only 453 remain uncompleted—and only 312 under construction.

BEACH EROSION

Regarding the participation of the Federal Government in beach erosion control projects, the existing law provides for Federal payment of 50 percent of the cost of beach erosion control works for the protection of non-Federal publicly owned or publicly used shores and up to 70 percent of the cost of protection of State and other publicly owned shores.

LOCAL PROTECTION PROJECTS

Local protection projects consist of channel improvement levees and floodwalls, emergency bank protection, snagging, and clearing work on navigable streams in the interest of flood control.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

For operation and maintenance for 1964 the bill carries appropriations of $150 million for all operation and maintenance programs of the Corps of Engineers throughout the United States.

This is a reduction of $7,368,000 from the 1964 estimates. We believe this reduction can be absorbed because of the time situation.

With these funds, operation and maintenance can be carried on on some 440 projects during next year.

IMPORTANT TENNESSEE PROJECTS

Among the great projects for which this bill provides funds to continue construction, and of particular interest in Tennessee are funds to continue construction of the Cordell Hull Dam, the Percy Priest Dam and the Barkley Dam—each named for our distinguished former colleagues.

The bill contains some $4.8 million to continue the construction which was begun this year on the Percy Priest Dam on Stones River near Murfreesboro, Tenn.

The bill also contains a total sum of $4.8 million for the continued construction of Cordell Hull Dam on Cumberland River near Carthage, Tenn. The $4.8 million total contains $3.1 million in construction funds for the dam and $1.7 million in funds for the addition of a navigation lock feature to the Cordell Hull Dam—a much-needed navigational feature for this project. The appropriations for the Percy Priest and Cordell Hull Dams will enable these projects to be carried well into the construction stage.

The bill also provides for $27 million for the continued construction of Barkley Dam near the Tennessee-Kentucky border—a valuable project which is now approximately 60 percent completed. The completion of the canal features of this project will tie the Cumberland and Tennessee Rivers together—a major engineering achievement—greatly lengthening the inland waterways of our country.

GENERAL EXPENSES OF CORPS OF ENGINEERS

For general expenses for the office of the Chief of Engineers, and offices of the division engineers; activities of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors and the work of the Beach Erosion Control Board, we are recommending $15 million.

FLOOD CONTROL—MISSISSIPPI RIVER

For flood control work on the Mississippi River and its tributaries, we are recommending $74,500,000.

These funds will provide for continuing work on the Mississippi River—for raising of 1,600 miles of existing levees along the main river, for enlarging or constructing 1,700 miles of levees on tributaries and side basins, and for channel improvement on the main river, for dredging of the main river to provide a navigation channel 12 feet deep and 300 feet wide from Baton Rouge, La. to Cairo, Ill.

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

The Bureau of Reclamation is charged by law with planning construction and operating facilities to irrigate lands, furnish domestic and industrial water supply, and develop hydroelectric power and flood control in the 17 western reclamation States, and Alaska and Hawaii.

Total appropriations recommended are $348,146,700—an increase of $5,459,100 over the appropriation for the preceding year, but a reduction of $22,200,300 from the budget estimates.

RECLAMATION FUND

Appropriations to the Bureau are made from the general fund and a special reclamation fund. The reclamation fund is largely derived from certain irrigation and power revenues; receipts from the sale, lease, and rental of public lands; and certain oil and mineral revenues.

Total receipts into the reclamation fund since the passage of the initial Reclamation Act is $1,876 million.

In other words, there have been payments into the reclamation fund from the receipts of sales, leases and rentals of approximately $2 billion.

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

For general investigation for the work of the Bureau of Reclamation for next year, we are recommending $9,894,000 of which $524,000 shall be for investigation of projects in Alaska.

The committee is recommending an appropriation of $180,190,000 for construction and rehabilitation work by the Bureau of Reclamation—of which amount $75 million shall be derived from the reclamation fund.

This appropriation will provide funding for construction of some 25 major projects throughout the 17 reclamation States. The committee is recommending $38 million for operation and maintenance of reclamation projects authorized by law. Operation and maintenance will be carried on on some 40 irrigation projects.

BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION

For the Bonneville Power Administration, the Southwestern Power Administration and the Southeastern Power Administration, the committee is recommending a total of $53,400,000 for the work of these agencies. By way of breakdown, these funds include:

Four hundred and ninety-two million dollars for Bonneville, $1 million for Southeastern; and $4,500,000 for Southwestern.

The Bonneville Power Administration, Southwestern, and Southeastern Power Administration are power marketing agencies selling the power produced on projects in their areas to rural electric cooperatives, municipalities, industrial users and others.

The profits from the sale of power by each of these agencies go into the Federal Treasury.

Revenues from Bonneville Power Administration operations are estimated at $86,900,000 for 1964; revenue from Southeastern is estimated at $23,500,000 for next year; and revenue of Southwestern is estimated at $10,800,000—or a total of $121,200,000 in revenue for the U.S. Treasury from the profitable power operations of the Government—this for 1 year only.

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

The largest appropriations item included in this bill is for the programs of the Atomic Energy Commission. The budget estimates for AEC for 1964 are $2,423,500,000. The committee has approved a total of $2,308,169,000 or a cut and reduction of $115,331,000 from the budget estimates.

A breakdown of the cuts and reductions by various programs for AEC is included in the following table:

TABLE B.—*Public works appropriations, 1964*

| Program | Budget estimate | Amount recommended | Reduction |
|---|---|---|---|
| Raw materials | $324,843,000 | $320,000,000 | −$4,843,000 |
| Special nuclear materials | 480,471,000 | 475,000,000 | −5,471,000 |
| Weapons | 782,969,000 | 782,969,000 | |
| Reactor development | 530,548,000 | 497,000,000 | −33,548,000 |
| Physical research | 219,077,000 | 192,137,000 | −26,940,000 |
| Biology and medicine | 76,973,000 | 68,645,000 | −8,328,000 |
| Training, education, and information | 17,194,000 | 14,350,000 | −2,844,000 |
| Isotopes development program | 9,260,000 | 7,860,000 | −1,400,000 |
| Civilian applications of nuclear explosives | 15,100,000 | 10,000,000 | −5,100,000 |
| Committee program | 10,081,000 | 9,331,000 | −750,000 |
| Program direction and administration | 73,415,000 | 71,560,000 | −1,855,000 |
| Security investigation program | 6,950,000 | 6,950,000 | |
| Cost of work for others | 6,240,000 | 6,240,000 | |
| Change in selected resources | 53,242,000 | 29,000,000 | −24,252,000 |
| Resources received from other sources | −32,000,000 | −32,000,000 | |
| Unobligated balance brought forward | −150,873,000 | −150,873,000 | |
| Total | 2,423,500,000 | 2,308,169,000 | −115,331,000 |

The committee has made no cuts in the weapons program for the Atomic Energy Commission. The largest reductions have been made in the reactor program and the research program for the Commission.

The Commission has been engaged in reactor development for a number of years and has by this time developed a number of feasible and workable reactors, and it is felt that the Commission should concentrate on the perfection of suitable and satisfactory reactors that have previously been developed.

The $3 million budgeted for assistance to private utilities for further work on power reactors has been denied.

It is the committee's opinion that continuation of this subsidy program is no longer necessary to stimulate utilities in entering the atomic reactor field.

Reductions have been made in other areas of the Atomic Energy Commission's activities, as the hearings developed that the Commission has been operating with large overruns in a number of their programs—particularly in selected resources and the purchase of needed raw materials.

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

The budget estimates for TVA as approved by the Bureau of the Budget for fiscal year 1964 included an appropriation request of $48 million for navigation, flood control, construction, and general administration.

There are no funds carried in the bill for TVA's power program. TVA's power operations are self-sustaining and self-liquidating; and as a profitable operation, returns are made into the Treasury.

TVA's construction request includes items other than power operations. These include construction of a lock at Guntersville Dam, Ala., rehabilitation of additional facilities at Wilson Dam, Ala., and completion of construction of the Melton Hill Dam and Reservoir near Oak Ridge, Tenn.

An amount of $4 million is included to begin construction of the Between the Lakes National Recreation Area in Kentucky and Tennessee.

Development of a new national park in the area, bounded on one side by TVA's Kentucky reservoir and on the other side by the Corps of Engineers' Barkley Lake—will mean a great new recreational area for our country and will be of particular benefit to the citizens living in the eastern section of our Nation.

This new resort area will have 300 miles of shore line and will offer outdoor recreational opportunities on a large scale. Since most of our national parks are in the West, this new development will mean much to citizens in the heavily populated eastern section of our country.

It is estimated that some 10 million Americans live within 200 miles of the new park area and that 70 million live within 500 miles of the Between the Lakes recreational development. The development is scheduled to be completed over a 5-year period with a total cost estimated to be $35 million.

TVA is the Nation's most profitable Government operation—not only from a dollars and cents point of view—of cash returns into the Treasury—but also from the point of view of strengthening our Nation. TVA is the world's greatest showcase of democracy in action.

I would like to point out at this time, Mr. Chairman, that TVA is a most beneficial and most profitable agency for the Federal Government. TVA is way ahead in its payments into the Treasury and last year returned out of power proceeds more than $48 million to the Federal Treasury. An up-to-date tabulation shows that in the 30-year TVA history this agency has paid back into the Treasury more than $438 million—almost one-half billion dollars.

Power savings cost—lower rates—to the Federal Government have amounted to an additional one-half billion dollars in power purchases by Government defense agencies over the past several years.

TVA thus represents a great service to the people of the seven-States area and also represents a great benefit to all the Nation.

CONCLUSION

In summary, Mr. Chairman, I repeat, this is a big bill, but a good bill—an all-American bill—providing for public works for all sections of the United States.

The projects have been carefully screened and projects with a satisfactory benefit-to-cost ratio have been approved.

The funds carried in this bill will build up America and help strengthen the security of our own country.

This bill should have the unanimous approval of the House and I urge its passage.

Mr. BASS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVINS. I will yield first to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS] who previously asked me to yield.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I rise not only to compliment the committee for the splendid work they have done but also to thank them for the very careful and sympathetic attention they have given to the harbor of Charleston, S.C., where the only Polaris base is on earth, and to thank each of them for the additional funds they have directed to be spent on a study to prevent the continued silting in this important waterway.

The distinguished chairman has taken note of this before as well as the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS] who was presiding over the subcommittee at the time the Army Engineers came to testify. I notice you have given $60,000 in addition to the $90,000 budgeted. Here is the reason among other things that I take the floor. The newspapers at home carried articles to the effect that the Army district engineer in Charleston said that they had sought an appropriation of $325,000. Evidently this never got past those who control the budget for the Engineers.

I notice you gave them more than was budgeted. So he is confused as to what he wanted and what his group sent to the budget. I want to ask the chairman this question. If this $150,000 does not complete and conclude the required investigation into the reasons for the silting in this waterway, would the committee give sympathetic attention to additional funds to conclude whatever study is necessary to complete this vital study?

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman is correct. I will say that we on the committee are glad to cooperate and collaborate with the distinguished chairman-designate of the great Committee on Armed Services on this as well as on all other occasions.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I do not know about being chairman, but I certainly thank you for what you have said.

Mr. BASS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BASS. I would like to take this time to pay tribute to my friend, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS] who has just addressed the Committee on this bill. We in Tennessee are fortunate to have a man of Mr. EVIN's cali-

ber and capability, and a man who is so diligent in his work, representing us on the Committee on Appropriations. I want him to know that we in Tennessee, and particularly the people in my district, appreciate the efforts he makes in our behalf.

Also, Mr. Chairman, I would like to pay tribute to the great chairman of the Committee on Appropriations who, over a period of years, has shown without any doubt his friendship and his loyalty to the people of my area. We are very proud of the gentleman from Missouri, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, and we appreciate his interest. I want to commend him and pay tribute to him, as well as to the ranking minority members of this committee. for the good bill they have brought out this year.

Mr. CANNON. I share with the gentleman his warm appreciation of the services of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS]. He is one of the most invaluable and indefatigable members of our committee. Incidentally his delightful book on Congress is a must for every congressional library.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SECREST], such time as he may consume.

Mr. SECREST. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the committee on an excellent bill, and I support it because I believe these improvements constitute wise expenditures of the taxpayers' money.

On May 23, 1963, in Crooksville, Ohio, I attended a public hearing conducted by Col. Harrington W. Cochran, district engineer for the Corps of Engineers in Huntington, W. Va. The hearing was called to determine the advisability of providing improvements of flood control and allied purposes along the Jonathan and Moxahala Creeks. I pointed out the desirability and the great need for this project.

On the 10th of June I appeared before the Public Works Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee urging the appropriation of $35,000 for a preliminary survey of this project. I am happy that the committee approved this expenditure and that it is contained in the bill before us. I am sure it will result ultimately in great benefit to many communities in my district. These communities in the past have suffered greatly from recurring floods of these two creeks.

On the same day I urged approval of the program recommended in the budget for continued improvement of navigation on the Ohio River. I am happy that the committee has allocated the full amount requested; namely, $7 million for construction of the Belleville locks and dam, $9 million for construction of the Pike Island locks and dam, $1½ million for construction work on the Racine locks and dam, and $250,000 for planning on the Hannibal locks and dam.

These projects are of the greatest importance to the future industrial development of the Ohio Valley and my congressional district, especially to Monroe and Washington Counties that border on it.

I am extremely grateful to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], the able chairman of the committee, who has done more to conserve our natural resources than perhaps any man in the history of our Nation, and to all the other members of the committee who have spent long weeks hearing testimony and preparing this appropriation bill.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. HECHLER] such time as he may require.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Chairman, I desire at this time to yield to my distinguished colleague from Florida [Mr. MATTHEWS].

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman, I wish to thank the committee for including in this bill the million dollars requested by President Kennedy for the Cross Florida Barge Canal. In my opinion, this is the most important item for Florida because it will not only help the State of Florida but the entire Nation. The project will connect the presently unconnected barge channels of the gulf and Mississippi Valley systems with those of the Atlantic Seaboard by a 12-foot by 150-foot lock barge canal across northern Florida from the St. Johns River near Palatka, to the Gulf of Mexico near Yankeetown. It will also mean there will be 2,460 miles of connected waterway uniting two great coastal areas and a bond of commerce from New Jersey to Mexico. There will be five locks with a mean summit pool elevation of 50 feet above sea level for lockage. The needed water will be supplied by pumping from lower levels, thus preventing drafts on the underground water storage. The locks will be at Inglis, Dunnellon, Silver Springs, Eureka, and St. Johns. The length of the canal will be approximately 107 miles and the time required for construction has been estimated at 6½ years. The time for construction can be greatly reduced if desirable. The total cost of the canal will be $157,900,000 with the Federal share being $145,500,000 and a non-Federal share of $12,400,000. Annual benefits from the project will be $8,256,000 and annual charges will be about $7,039,000. The project will have a benefit cost ratio of 1.17 to 1.00.

The Cross-Florida Barge Canal has been a dream since the time of Andrew Jackson. The present project for a high-level lock barge canal was authorized by the Congress in 1942. It was recognized in World War II that the Cross-Florida Barge Canal was a military necessity. During this war the loss in ships to German submarines, because there was no adequate interwaterway route through Florida, was estimated at a billion dollars. This did not include the much more precious loss of American lives and this total amount does not include the cost of cargo on the ships. For years the project has had a favorable economic justification, so it fits into the criteria for these great canal projects and by no stretch of the imagination can be considered a pork-barrel project. The principal benefits from the project will result from the saving in travel distance. For most traffic that will use the project, the saving in distance will be about 360 miles as compared to the 8-foot depth Okeechobee Waterway across south Florida and 610 miles as compared to the open-water route around Key West.

The Cross-Florida Barge Canal will be of particular benefit, Mr. Chairman, to the great district that I represent, the Eighth District of Florida. The canal will cross Levy and Putnam Counties in my district and will be of great economic help to St. Johns, Flagler, and Clay Counties, all in my congressional district. Again, let me say how grateful I am for the favorable consideration of the committee for our Cross-Florida Barge Canal and I hope now that construction can begin within the next several months and that the canal can be completed in the near future. I have requested the Corps of Engineers to make construction headquarters for the canal in Putnam County in my congressional district and I am hopeful that the initial construction work may be made at the Rodman Dam in the Putnam County area.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Chairman, on March 11 of this year, the Guyandotte River in southwestern West Virginia went on a rampage. Nearly every spring, the Guyandotte River floods. Flood stage is 20 feet, and this spring the river rose to 31.7 feet—11.7 feet over flood stage. Walls of water tore up houses from their foundations, buckling the floors, ruining bedding and furniture, turning people out into the streets. This was the worst flood that ever hit West Virginia.

On page 37 of the House committee report, is contained the following language:

> The committee has allowed $150,000 of the requested $300,000 for advance planning on the Justice Reservoir project. Within this amount such funds as may be necessary shall be used for a reevaluation of an alternate flood control plan limited to realinement and improvement of the river channel, with such minor retention structures as may be appropriate in connection with such a project. It is expected that a further public hearing will be held on the alternate project and that a report will be submitted to the committee.

Mr. Chairman, $150,000 is totally inadequate for the Corps of Engineers to proceed with advance planning on the Justice Reservoir. Under the authority of the continuing resolution, that sum has already been expended since the beginning of the 1964 fiscal year and the appropriation of only $150,000 would bring all planning to a screeching halt. There would not be a red cent to carry out the very reevaluation which the Appropriations Committee directs.

Now as far as reevaluation is concerned, and additional public hearings, there have been a great number of public hearings and evaluations conducted by the Corps of Engineers and the established committees of Congress since 1957. In 1962, the Congress after extensive public hearings authorized construction of the Justice Dam and Reservoir. The record of these public hearings is contained in the official documents of the Congress.

I cannot understand why the Congress would now reverse itself, and say "You must hold another hearing, another reevaluation" when the decision has clearly been made, and work on advance planning has started.

I have received thousands of letters from people who were driven from their homes last spring, and probably will continue to have their homes and businesses flooded. They have testified for the Justice Dam. They have seen Congress and its committees and the Corps of Engineers carefully weigh the opposition testimony. They have seen Congress and the Corps of Engineers come to a clear-cut conclusion. The people of West Virginia want to see the dirt fly; they are sick and tired of more filibustering on this subject.

Mr. Chairman, I realize that nothing would be gained by opening up this bill to amendment on the floor. I simply express the fervent hope that if and when the other body takes a different approach to this subject that the conference committee would consider voting the full $300,000 requested by the President in his budget, and then move forward with this project as the Congress has directed without any further delay. To do otherwise, Mr. Chairman, would be to imperil the lives and property of tens of thousands of West Virginians.

Mr. CANNON. In response to the remarks of the gentleman from West Virginia, Mr. Chairman, I wish to point out that we are cognizant of the serious floods which have been suffered by Logan County residents and others in West Virginia. The gentleman has been very diligent and forceful in calling to the attention of the committee the needs of West Virginia, and the value of the Justice Dam. I thank the gentleman from West Virginia for the additional light which he has thrown on the subject and why the Justice Dam is needed.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WEAVER].

PORT DREDGING AT ERIE, PA.

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Chairman, I am surprised to learn that funds have not been included in the budget for the deepening of the approach to the Duquesne marine terminal in the port at Erie, Pa.

A total of $743,000 is necessary to complete a dredging program authorized by the River and Harbor Act of 1962. The act modified the original dredging project to provide for the deepening in the terminal sector to the 27-foot depth, the necessary minimum to accommodate properly oceangoing vessels.

The estimated project cost prior to the modification was $2,571,000. The remaining deepening is the only essential project feature remaining to be done at the port.

Completion of work on the harbor depth is of concern to industries in eastern Ohio, western Pennsylvania, and western New York. They are customers or potential customers of this fast-growing port.

To encourage ocean ships to use the facility, a proper depth must be maintained.

Located in a region of heavy unemployment, Erie has hopes that its port will be a major force in restoring the economic stability of that area. A superhighway now being constructed between Erie and Pittsburgh will give western Pennsylvania industries a direct and fast route to Erie.

The development of this new ocean port has been remarkable. Some 75 acres of water lots are being reclaimed in a filling-in project to provide waterfront dock space and industrial sites. Some 750,000 cubic yards of this fill-in material was obtained from earlier dredging supervised by the U.S. Corps of Army Engineers. On May 10, 1963, a $900,000 contract was let for the construction of 1,600 feet of new steel dock space.

I hope this Congress will give serious consideration to including the $743,000 in the 1964 budget to further develop Pennsylvania's only lake port.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I want to go on record as commending this committee for an appropriation bill which I think is the first one we have had that is actually below the budget estimates of 1964 when those estimates were below the appropriations for 1963. I think this bill will meet the criteria I have established for what is necessary in aggregate spending in order to move toward a balanced budget. I have been voting against every appropriation bill that does not meet these standards, and I am very pleased that the committee in this instance has met these standards.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE].

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, may I commend the committee for bringing in a very reasonable and very fair bill. This bill seriously attempts to care for the legitimate needs of all authorized projects. At the same time it keeps the appropriations well within budgetary limitations. The committee has actually reduced the totals heretofore recommended. I think that the members are to be congratulated.

On the other hand, the committee has advisedly made provision for the appropriations needed to carry on work on the seven presently authorized watersheds where authorization authority has become exhausted. That we may all understand the situation, let me explain that it has been the practice of the legislative committee on especially large river basin projects to authorize the project but only to authorize a limited expenditure at a given time. Normally, additional authorizations are made so that these river basins never impose an undue burden on the total in any one year. This year there are seven major river basins in the United States that are running out of authorization authority. One of these is the Brazos River in Texas.

Like most of the other river basins, work has been going on for a good many years. There are presently at least four major dams under construction for the completion of which there is not adequate authorization authority. To stop work on these dams would be tremendously expensive. We all know that ultimately the work would be completed but the legislative committee of the House recognizes that in order to save money—some have estimated as much as $20 or $25 million—this work should continue without stoppage, and the committee brought in a bill earlier this year authorizing continuation of these projects. The bill actually contemplated authority to complete at least a large part if not all of the projects.

The other body sought to limit this authorization authority to the fiscal year. Of course, that enabled them to greatly reduce the total authorization, but they used this saving to authorize additional projects, some of which had been rejected in the past and none of which had been approved or even been finally heard by the House committee.

In an effort to compromise with the other body, the House again passed a bill using the Senate's identical figures as to amount and duration of authorizations but removing the new and inadequately considered projects. Of course, by limiting the authorizations to 1 year the bill gave assurance that there would be consideration of new projects next year.

I had hoped that the other body would accept this effort to compromise in the spirit in which it was made. Unfortunately, so far it has not been accepted. I am still hopeful that sound judgment will prevail and that the other body will accept this compromise.

In the meantime, the bill presently before us makes appropriations available to continue the work on these river basin projects if, as, and when authorization is secured. I believe that the committee has done well in including these appropriations. I commend the membership and I would express hope, in which I know most of the Members of this body join me, that our colleagues across the Capitol may see fit to concede on one part of their views, particularly where this body is offering to accept their figures and timing in its entirety on all of the original projects.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], a member of the subcommittee and a member of the committee, such time as he may require.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, being a new member of this subcommittee, I wish to join in the statements that have been made about my colleagues on this committee, beginning with the gentleman from Missouri, the chairman of the subcommittee, and of the full Committee on Appropriations [Mr. CANNON]. It has been my privilege to serve with him many years here, and I have never seen anyone work harder to get a dollar's value for a dollar spent. In this bill he clearly shows that a dollar spent on his own Nation is a dollar well spent.

It has been especially pleasing to me to serve this year on this subcommittee dealing with domestic public works, where all members are conscientious believers in conservation of natural resources. For many years it has been my privilege to be chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations handling agricultural appropriations, where we deal with soil conservation and watershed development and flood prevention. In fact, one of the things of which I am most proud is that

in 1952 I went before the Democratic Convention in Chicago and got them to adopt a plan to take care of watersheds for this Nation. We did not happen to win that year, but our subcommittee, without budget approval, provided $5 million to set up 56 pilot plants over this Nation. That was the beginning of the great watershed program we have today which is doing so much to reclaim and develop this Nation.

The companion part of the watershed effort is handled by our Subcommittee on Domestic Public Works. Funds for development of rivers and harbors and the major parts of the water system in which the watersheds happen to flow are in this bill. So it is doubly pleasing to me to have a chance to work with my colleagues here who have done such an outstanding job in this area throughout the years.

I am being repetitious in recalling to the Members this illustration, but it stands out to me like a ringing bell. Some years ago when I had the privilege of presiding at a hearing on an emergency appropriation bill, when we were trying to provide that the United States would have ample production facilities to meet an all-out war with Russia, as we walked back over from the hearings, the head of the office handling that matter, Joe Fowler, said, "JAMIE, if I were Joe Stalin"—and it was in Stalin's day—"I would declare 10 years of peace." He said, "Think what it would do to this country if we were to suddenly recall all of the men from the service and they were out of jobs. Think what it would mean if we closed down the factories that were manufacturing munitions. Think what it would mean if we stopped the export of agricultural products which we are exporting because of the threat of war, and you could see that it would mean economic chaos."

Yet, Mr. Chairman, you could see he apparently was right. Even though we had the greatest material prosperity in history, we could not afford to admit that you had to have war or preparation for war in order to have material prosperity. But, my friends, if you will think that statement through, and I repeat this now because we are hearing a lot about the necessity of cutting out foreign aid, calling our troops back home, and many other things because of the balance-of-payments situation, after you think through what he said, you realize that it is not war or the preparation for war that brings prosperity. It is the extra effort because of it.

Mr. Chairman, where in war you burn up your gasoline and destroy your planes, and use up other war materiel and end up a poorer nation, if we were wise enough to put forth that same effort in developing and protecting our great river basins, our harbors, replanting our forests, in building roads and schools, and the many other things so necessary for our domestic development, we could have prosperity and have a much richer country.

Mr. Chairman, I mention that because if I judge present conditions right and the statements which I see and the reports from our Treasury, we are going to have to divert our efforts from foreign aid and other things. If we will do that and spend our effort on our own country, we will end up richer for every dollar we spend.

Again, Mr. Chairman, I thank my chairman, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], for giving me the privilege of serving on this great subcommittee, whose interest is serving America first, last, and always.

With regard to the details of the bill, I quote here from the committee report, page 41, as follows:

> The reduction which the committee has made includes funds for five new positions requested and the $50,000 budgeted for the Cache River project, Arkansas. The latter amount was for an advancement to the State highway department for added costs of Highway No. 64 bridges across the project in order to meet the project dimensions should it be built. If built, the project would be of general benefit to the State and the committee sees no reason why the State should not stand this added cost, if it wants the project.
>
> Lower Mississippi operations: The operations of the Corps of Engineers at Greenwood, Greenville, and Natchez in Mississippi, have been very effective and efficient for years, and no action shall be taken to remove operations which have been carried on from these locations.
>
> Yazoo Basin project, Mississippi: The counties which suffered road damages by reason of building the Sardis Reservoir executed a full release for such damages at the time. It appears to the committee that the amount paid is unreasonably small, as compared to the value of the Teckville crossing to adjacent counties. It is the opinion of the committee that if the State should provide a first rate or primary through highway by way of the former Teckville Crossing, the Corps of Engineers should reopen the matter of prior settlement as authorized by Public Law 526, 79th Congress, and make additional contributions above the usual 50 percent for constructing a crossing in line with the value of the crossing destroyed.
>
> The committee directs the corps to keep open the streams which run into the Arkabutla, Sardis, Enid, and Grenada Reservoirs, and that Federal lands in such areas under the control of the corps shall be handled in such a manner as to enable lessors to operate in such a way as to maintain and develop such lands.

Mr. Chairman, those statements of the Appropriations Committee speak for themselves and are amply justified.

With regard to efforts of the corps to move work affecting many families from Greenville and Natchez, thereby affecting Greenwood, the work has been handled very satisfactorily at these locations for years. A concentration at Vicksburg could well lead to later efforts to handle this huge stretch of river from Memphis and New Orleans, and eliminate Vicksburg. We are opposed to taking any action toward such removal. Present officers may say they have no such intentions—but they will not be there forever.

With regard to other matters covered, these are matters where in most cases the Corps of Engineers has been very cooperative. However, the people in the areas of these reservoirs at the time of construction were led to believe that lands would be leased back at reasonable rates and under such terms as to enable the lessors to protect and develop the lands and prevent the filling of reservoirs, and that the streams entering the reservoirs would be kept open.

On the Teckville Crossing, the corps paid approximately $37,500 to Lafayette County for all road damage, for which the Government got a full release from the county.

Now the corps admits that while the construction of a crossing would cost more than its value with existing roads, the corps agrees that a crossing would be worth more than $3,500,000. After all, Mr. Chairman, other counties have an interest.

Fortunately Public Law 526, 79th Congress, does permit the corps to reopen the matter as directed by the committee in case a primary highway is built.

Whether the State will do this I do not know.

Again, Mr. Chairman, I appreciate being on this subcommittee and look forward to being on it for many years. I certainly shall give to these programs my very best efforts to protect America for its people of today and its children of tomorrow. I know if we leave to our children a nation rich in natural resources they will make it fine.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAY].

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, I think the distinguished chairman of the full Committee on Appropriations for yielding to me at this time.

Mr. Chairman, I could not allow the occasion to pass without joining today with my other colleagues in commending the very distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], and the members of his fine committee for bringing out a very, very good bill.

I have the privilege of representing a congressional district which is bounded on both sides by two of the great rivers of the Nation, the Mississippi on the west and the Ohio on the east, and four major river basins in between.

These basins are the Big Muddy River and Beaucoup Creek, the Kaskaskia, Saline River and tributaries, and the Wabash River and tributaries. These basins hold not only great economic hope for the area through navigation improvements, reservoirs and water impoundment, recreation, and many other benefits, but they also hold, Mr. Chairman, great hazards against loss of life and property if they are not harnessed properly to prevent major floods. Without the sympathetic understanding of this committee, we could not proceed with the development of our natural resources and provide the millions of people in this area with proper flood protection. I am particularly grateful to the committee for allowing funds with which to continue advanced engineering and design planning for the Rend Lake Reservoir, the funds for advanced engineering and design planning on the Kaskaskia River navigation project, the funds for a comprehensive study of the Big Muddy River and Beaucoup Creek, funds with which to make a comprehensive basin study of the Wabash Valley area, and funds with which to provide flood protection along

the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers. We are also looking forward to seeing the replacement on an accelerated basis of the High Life Dam at Mound City, Ill., on the Ohio River.

I want to publicly commend, on behalf of the more than 10 million people of Illinois, the committee for doing an outstanding job. I also want to single out the great staff of the committee, Mr. Carson Culp and Mr. Gene Wilhelm. I have never called them about any matter but what I received their sympathetic consideration. They are always available and able to be of assistance. To all of you we say "Many thanks."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WAGGONNER].

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 9140, the public works appropriation bill for 1964.

Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], and all the other committee members for their diligence in preparing and presenting this legislation to the House for consideration today. It is comprehensive and worthwhile. To be sure a great deal of money is involved but the dividends which will accrue to us and future generations will be multiplied many times over. Looking beyond today and to tomorrow, we must not fail to pass this appropriations bill today.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ULLMAN].

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I want to express my personal appreciation to the chairman and members of this important subcommittee for their diligence in bringing us this impressive legislation. I want to particularly congratulate the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] for his great speech here today on behalf of the development of our Nation's resources. No one has spoken more eloquently of the importance to every American of the conservation and utilization of the vast water and land resources of the West. He is indeed one of the greatest friends of the West this Nation has ever had. The Nation has a great stake in the future of its natural resources. This legislation is wisely considered and well presented. I congratulate the committee and urge unanimous approval by the Members.

Mr. SLACK. Mr. Chairman, I wish to commend my colleagues on the Appropriations Committee for the report it has filed on the civil works appropriations bill, and particularly that section relating to the Atomic Energy Commission.

I am particularly delighted by the statement in the committee report to the effect that nuclear power technology has advanced to the point where Government subsidies can be done away with.

There is absolutely no justification for the spending of Government funds to subsidize the construction and operation of large commercial nonexperimental nuclear powerplants. Unfortunately, this is what has been done in the past. It is my hope that the acceptance of this bill by the House, backed up as it is by this strong statement against further Government subsidy, will mark the end of this phase of our civilian nuclear power program.

Let me make it clear that I am not appearing here today in opposition to the Government research and development work on reactor concepts which show promise of being successfully adapted in the future for the production of electricity. I am sure that my fellow members of the Appropriations Committee who reported out this bill also feel that research and development work in the civilian nuclear power field must be carried forward.

But I am unalterably opposed to using the taxpayers' money to subsidize the construction and operation of large, commercial-size nonexperimental plants embodying a proven reactor concept. If I read the Appropriations Committee report correctly, the only subsidies which will be affected are those which would go to this type of plant. After all, the pressurized water and boiling water reactors are the only ones regarded as proven and, therefore, eligible for Government subsidy in the construction and operation of plants.

At least two large, commercial plants using reactors of this general type are now in operation. Yankee Atomic, at Rowe, Mass., has been operating for more than 2 years. Although it was built with Government subsidy, the combine of private utilities which own and operate it do not consider it an experimental plant. Consolidated Edison Co. of New York built a 230,000-kilowatt plant at Indian River without Government subsidy. Company officials state the plant is a part of its system, a baseload plant, and not experimental in any way.

Yet, despite the existence of these two plants, and assurances from utility executives that pressurized water or boiling water reactors can produce electricity competitive with electricity produced in fossil fuel fired plants, the Government is going to spend $42 million in direct subsidies for the construction of three new nuclear plants in the 400,000- to 500,000-kilowatt range.

The contracts for these plants are now being worked out by AEC. They will not be affected by the passage of this bill. The effect of this legislation will be to put an end to Government subsidy for the construction of any other additional plants of this type and size.

The boiling water and pressurized water reactors are now old hat. Both General Electric and Westinghouse are out trying to sell conventional reactors to private utilities, the same as they are trying to sell conventional fuel plants. These two companies are not offering experimental plants; they are trying to sell commercial plants for the production of commercial electricity.

The Atomic Energy Commission has done its job, and done it well, insofar as these water reactors are concerned. They have developed the technology. Prototype reactors have been built and operated. Private industry, on its own, has taken this AEC-developed technology and built with its own funds large plants to produce electricity that is sold to its customers in the same way as electricity produced from coal, oil, or natural gas.

Government participation in the pressurized water and boiling water reactor program should have ended right here. If private utility companies are convinced that powerplants using reactors of this type are sound, they will be built. It does not take a subsidy to induce private business to engage in sound business practices.

I do not believe the continued subsidization of these large, commercial nuclear electric plants is compatible with the spirit of the Atomic Energy Act. It was always my belief that the AEC role was confined to the development of the technology of the various reactor concepts and making that knowledge available to private business for exploitation. Surely, it is not within the province of the Commission to spend taxpayers' money to insure that the end use of Government-financed research and development work will be competitive or will be priced below products and goods already in the mainstream of American business.

Yet, I am afraid that in essence what AEC is doing is holding out the offer of sizable Government subsidies to encourage the building of large, commercial nuclear plants. It is my understanding that the president of the company which will build one of the three large plants I referred to earlier frankly stated that, without the Government subsidy—around $14 million in the case of his plant—he doubted that his company would have gone into this project.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, let me once again affirm my support of the Appropriations Committee action taken on the AEC funds for the 1964 fiscal year. The committee has acted wisely. I trust this House will give unanimous support to the provision of the bill which eliminates unjustified subsidies for proven, commercial nuclear powerplants.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the Appropriations Committee for its recommendation that $33,548,000 be cut from the reactor development program budget in the Atomic Energy Commission's budget. I particularly am pleased that this action obviously stems from the committee's awareness that nuclear power subsidies are in need of drastic curbing. In the committee's report we find this statement which I consider significant:

> It is the committee's opinion that continuation of this subsidy program is no longer necessary to stimulate the construction of power reactors since it has been demonstrated that they are now producing electric power at competitive costs, at least in those areas of high conventional fuel costs.

I understand that, in line with this opinion, $3 million for research and development and design assistance to utilities which may wish to construct power reactors has been also deleted in the committee's recommendations.

I would like, however, to ask the Appropriations Committee if there are any funds still in the reactor program budget which are available for research, develop-

ment, and design assistance on commercial-size proven reactor concepts? Specifically, is there any money included in the budget that could be used for subsidizing the design of more water-type reactors?

It is important that clear-cut answers to these questions be made a part of the RECORD. There is no doubt in my mind, from a careful reading of the committee report, that the Appropriations Committee concluded that the time has come to end subsidies for the water reactors. I would like to see a specific prohibition against further subsidies for these plants written into the bill to remove any possible doubt about the intent of the House on this matter.

But lacking such a clear-cut prohibition, I would like to have assurances that the committee's recommendations, if adopted by this House, will accomplish the same purpose—that is, ending the subsidy for large, commercial water reactors.

The continued subsidies by AEC of the building of large, commercial-size nuclear plants, it seems to me, contradicts the original intent of the Atomic Energy Act.

Take the three new plants which were recently approved by the AEC and for which $42 million in assistance will be spent by the Government. Are these plants prototypes? Are they experimental? The answer is "No." Each of them is of the same reactor concept. Some slight variation in design, but all are in the 400,000- to 500,000-kilowatt-size range. All are pressurized water reactors.

By the AEC's own words in its report to the President for 1962 on the civilian nuclear power program, pressurized water reactors are safe and of proven design.

Moreover, there are many reactors of this type in commercial operation. One, the Consolidated Edison Indian Point plant, is of 275,000-kilowatt size.

This type of plant, the AEC tells us, can compete with fossil fuel plants in high-fuel-cost areas. This should prove a sufficient inducement for private utilities to build them with their own money—without any Government subsidy.

I maintain there is no need for urgency in the Nation's program to build nuclear plants. There is no power shortage now or on the distant horizon. There is no possible shortage of low-cost domestic fuels for hundreds of years.

As a representative of an oil and gas, as well as coal producing State, I deplore the policy of the AEC which seems to be that "anything goes" in the way of subsidy so long as it gets nuclear plants built.

Spending our taxes to force an unneeded industry into competition with our vital, unsubsidized domestic fossil fuels industries is one of the greatest inequities Government can commit.

I would like to see in the future a closer adherence by the AEC to the original intent of the Atomic Energy Act. Once it gets a nuclear plant designed, researched, and developed, and possibly a small prototype built, let it turn the building of a large, commercial electric plant over to private utilities.

The AEC should set itself some specific guidelines as to when a nuclear concept has been proven. And when this point is reached, say to the utility industry, "This is a proved concept, it is safe, it is economical. You take it from there."

I do not oppose the development of nuclear power. But I do vigorously oppose "paying the way" for getting commercial-size nuclear plants into operation once they have gone beyond the experimental stage.

I hope the recommendations of the Appropriations Committee will be adopted. I hope, too, that they will accomplish what is long overdue—the curbing of subsidies to nuclear plants that have been proved safe and economically feasible.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, for a number of years I have been speaking out, like a voice in the wilderness, against what I regard as the unwise and unsound policies of the Atomic Energy Commission in regard to civilian nuclear power. I have particularly opposed the subsidization of the construction and operation of large, commercial plants—not prototypes or experimental plants but full-scale commercial operations—which are then able to compete, because of the size and scope of the Government subsidy with privately owned and nonsubsidized powerplants fired with coal and other fossil fuels.

I represent a major coal producing region. In my opinion, this whole civilian nuclear power program affects the jobs of thousands of men and women in my district. It has serious implications for the entire coal industry. Electric utilities provide the largest single market for coal. It is the growth market for coal. If the size of this market—today and in the future—is limited by nuclear power, conceived and nutured by Government funds, then the Government by its own actions will have seriously affected one of the Nation's basic industries.

What the Appropriations Committee has proposed in its report on the Atomic Energy Commission appropriations is not going to sound the death knell of the atomic program. But it is going to cause a lot of people, in and out of Congress, to take another look at this multibillion-dollar program.

The Appropriations Committee will serve the most useful purpose of focusing the attention of this House and the other body—as well as the public—upon the one aspect of the program which has been neglected for too long. I refer to the granting of subsidies from the public treasury to induce the construction of large, commercial nuclear plants. This is what I have objected to. This is what the coal industry objects to so strenuously. The proper role of Government needs to be carefully defined. The action of the Appropriations Committee is a step in that direction.

Is it the proper role of the Atomic Energy Commission to spend hundreds of millions of taxpayers' dollars developing a certain type of reactor and then spending additional millions to get these plants built and placed in commercial operation?

My answer is an emphatic "No."

Apparently, the Appropriations Committee has now taken this same position.

The Atomic Energy Commission has spent to date in excess of $1,300 million on the civilian nuclear power program. The continued annual expenditure is at a rate of about $200 million a year.

Out of all of this vast Government research have emerged reactors which can produce electric power. The Commission states they are safe to operate. Chairman Seaborg has stated that he would not mind living next door to one, so safe have they become. The Commission has had particular success with pressurized water and boiling water reactors. In its report to the President last year on civilian nuclear power, the Commission said, and I quote:

> They are reliable and safe. It is believed that large reactors of these types could now be built and operated in high-cost fuel areas with a lifetime promise of greater economy than conventional fuels. Even better economics can undoubtedly be achieved in the future from better fuel performance and other general improvements.

In view of this statement, I was puzzled as to why the Commission considered it necessary to participate in the construction of three huge plants of this type.

Recently, Chairman Seaborg, in a letter to me, stated without qualification that the pressurized water and boiling water reactors have been proven. Here are his words:

> A reactor concept is considered proven when it has been developed to the stage where engineering feasibility has been established or where reactor experiment or prototype experience has demonstrated confidence in reactor reliability for the general size contemplated. The pressurized and boiling water reactors are examples of proven concepts, although there could be design variations which might fall outside of the proven category.

You will note that once again Chairman Seaborg states these reactors are safe. The engineering feasibility and the reactor reliability have been clearly established, he assured me.

Is it not reasonable to expect that once this stage of advanced development has been achieved—and after similar plants have been successfully built and operated on a slightly smaller scale—that the Government would step out of the picture?

Unfortunately, that has not happened. A number of months after the Commission reported to the President that the water reactors "have arrived" the Commission came to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and obtained permission to build three more plants—not by any stretch of the imagination experimental plants or prototypes embodying some entirely new concept—but plants using the same proven water reactors. The total direct subsidy involved is in excess of $42 million. These plants will be built and the kilowatts they produce will be sold in competition with coal-produced kilowatts.

Where will this subsidization of commercial nuclear plants end? Would not

the public interest best be served by devoting this $42 million to further research into breeder reactors and other concepts than by using it to subsidize commercial plants? I think the AEC should be put on notice that money to finance nuclear research is not inexhaustible. We have a tremendous national debt and every few months it seems this House has to face up to the painful necessity of increasing the ceiling on that debt to avoid financial chaos.

Forty-two million dollars may not appear to be a lot of money to AEC, which deals in billions, but unfortunately, too many agencies of the Government have adopted this same attitude toward the "small" amounts and have not made any real effort to save money. If strict standards for spending Government money had been adopted by the AEC and all other agencies, the continuing financial crisis this Nation faces could at least be considerably diminished. I happen to think $42 million is worth saving, especially when not spending it will have no adverse affect on the public interest.

As I have stated, these three commercial powerplants, with proven water reactors, will be built regardless of what the House does on this appropriation bill.

The important thing is for Congress to let the Atomic Energy Commission know that it does not want any more of this type plant built with Government subsidy.

If the water reactors "have arrived," if the engineering feasibility and the reactor reliability have been clearly established, if commercial plants of the same design and size have been built and operated by private industry without subsidy, if these reactors are proven, then what reason is there for spending Government funds for the building of more of these plants?

Is it the proper role of Government to insure through a subsidy that nuclear plants will produce power cheaper than conventional plants?

I do not think it is. If nuclear powerplants of this type are technically feasible and they are needed, private industry will build them. And they will build them without the Government holding out a carrot in the form of a subsidy.

Mr. Chairman, no one that I know of is asking that the AEC be forced to get out of the business of developing and proving out the various reactor concepts for producing electricity.

What I am demanding is that the AEC stop force feeding the development of nuclear electricity through Government subsidy of commercial, nonexperimental plants. Let the AEC confine the activities to its research and development field, as Congress clearly intended.

The private utility industry is fully capable and, I am informed, perfectly willing to adapt this technical knowledge—the fruit of Government research—to the commercial production of electricity if and when the economics of the situation and the demands of the Nation for electric power so dictate.

The Appropriations Committee is to be commended for its action on the Atomic Energy Commission appropriation. Undoubtedly, the committee will be charged with scuttling the civilian nuclear power program and setting back progress. This is a lot of nonsense. All the Appropriations Committee has done was to restore a sense of balance to the program. It is forcing the AEC to get out of the subsidy business, a step which the Commission should have taken without this prodding from Congress.

The civilian nuclear power program will continue after this bill passes. But first things will be put first. This bill will force AEC out of the power business and back into the laboratory, where it belongs.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in order to bring to the attention of the House an action of the Appropriations Committee which I believe may go further than was intended. It is an action which may not only cripple a truly worthwhile scientific endeavor, but may ultimately cancel out the very savings which it is intended to achieve.

APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE ACTION

In the course of its review of the AEC appropriation—which is contained at pages 21–25 of H.R. 9140—the committee cut out the entire $15 million appropriation intended for new projects under the so-called cooperative power reactor demonstration program. Three million dollars would have been spent in fiscal year 1964 while the remaining $12 million would have been obligated in future years.

Mr. Chairman, the practical effect of the committee's action is to wipe out the possibility of future projects in the cooperative program. It is a severe blow to participation by private industry in the development of atomic power.

Why do I say "severe blow"? The cooperative power reactor demonstration program is the vehicle which makes it possible for private industry—for reactor manufacturers, for utilities, public and private—to play a role in developing atomic power. New reactor types may be risky financial propositions. They, of course, are not expected to produce economic power—this is not their function.

But if we provide some limited assistance to the utilities, they may be willing to invest the much larger sums which are necessary to get these reactors built. This is the theory of the cooperative program—it is a partnership approach to developing the atom.

REASONS FOR THE COMMITTEE ACTION—STATUS OF NUCLEAR POWER

In its report on the AEC appropriation, the committee states the reason for its action as follows:

> It is the committee's opinion that continuation of this subsidy program is no longer necessary to stimulate the construction of power reactors since it has been demonstrated that they are now producing electric power at competitive costs, at least in those areas of high conventional fuel costs.

Mr. Chairman, there is much truth in the statement of the Appropriations Committee. We have made very substantial progress in developing economic nuclear power—particularly in the field of large, so-called water reactors. But even in this field, a substantial amount of work remains to be done. The AEC recognized the fact in its November 1962 report to the President, where it stated:

> Certain classes of power reactors, notably water-cooled converters producing saturated steam, are now on the threshold of economic competitiveness with conventional power in large installations in high fossil fuel cost areas of the country.

Mr. Chairman, there is a substantial difference between the statement of the Appropriations Committee and that of the AEC. The plain fact is that despite our very impressive progress, nuclear power has not been demonstrated to be competitive with conventional sources at this point in time—it is close, but not yet "over the top."

Moreover, there are other reactors still in the very early stages of development—research must be done and prototypes must be built in order to explore the potential of these new reactor types. We must get on with the task of developing advanced concepts—particularly the breeder reactors which produce more fuel than they consume. Surely, we do not intend to "freeze" private industry out of this critically important program. Our Government laboratories are doing brilliant work, but certainly we do not want to shut out the genius and initiative of private industry.

JOINT COMMITTEE VIEWS

Mr. Chairman, I have sat as a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy for almost 20 years. As I indicated before, the joint committee this year recognized, as does the Appropriations Committee, that water reactors are nearly economic. For this reason, we indicated our strong view against permitting the AEC to go ahead with further assistance for large water reactors, in reporting out the AEC fiscal year 1964 authorization bill. In counseling the AEC not to issue a second invitation for utility design assistance proposals, we stated:

> If this invitation were to be made this year, it appears most certain that a water-type reactor would, of necessity, be the only type to qualify as proven under the Commission's criteria. In order to diversify the technology, the committee believes it would be desirable for other reactor types to have the opportunity to compete for this form of Government assistance. Several different reactor types are expected to come into operation in the near future. Although the degree of their success cannot be predicted now, it is possible that one or more could be considered at the time of a later invitation under the modified third round. This possibility indicates the wisdom of delaying the second invitation under the modified third round for at least another year.

There is no quarrel between the Appropriations Committee and the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy on this point. We are in full agreement. But, Mr. Chairman, as I said before, we have a long way to go in developing economic nuclear power, particularly in connection with the development of advanced concepts.

THE ROLE OF PRIVATE INDUSTRY

If we allow private industry to play a role in this program, we not only

save millions for the Government which would otherwise be required for Government construction of these plants; we assure that the development of atomic power will proceed in accordance with the sound principles of the free private enterprise system. We do not subsidize uneconomic power—we allow a free economy to work its will, in partnership with Government.

Mr. Chairman, if I may just cite one example. The Appropriations Committee wisely permitted an additional $3.5 million over the request of the AEC, for the so-called seed and blanket reactor—a very promising concept being developed by Admiral Rickover and his people. Someday we may wish to construct a full prototype of this reactor. Such a project would cost the Government $90 million if constructed entirely with Federal funds. But, utilizing the machinery of the cooperative power reactor demonstration program, a utility might be expected to put up a substantial portion of the cost of such a project, with corresponding savings to the Government.

IMPORTANCE OF DEVELOPING NUCLEAR POWER

Mr. Chairman, the cooperative power program is essential if we are to get on with the critically important job of developing atomic power. The importance of the task ahead was recognized as early as 1957 by the able and distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. Speaking on the floor on April 16, 1957, he stated:

> We must develop as rapidly as possible every potential source of electric and atomic power. A century from now or sooner, these potent sources of energy will be decisive in world survival.

Mr. Chairman, a few weeks ago, the House approved in excess of $5 billion for the space program. Even its most ardent supporters are hard pressed to spell out the practical advantages of this program. When we are ready to spend billions for space, we certainly do not want to deny a few million for a modest research and development program which can bring a third great source of energy to the American people.

Mr. Chairman, it can certainly not be the intention to cripple this program during a critically important stage in its development. For this reason, I am sure that there has been a misunderstanding here—one that can be remedied. I expect that the AEC will appeal this decision to the Appropriations Committee of the other body. Even if not all the money requested by the AEC is restored, I am sure that a sensible compromise can be reached which will permit the continuation of the partnership approach to the development of atomic power.

The remarks I have made in reference to this program are fully supported in a letter directed to Senator PASTORE, chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, by the Honorable Glenn T. Seaborg, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission. I ask unanimous consent to include that letter as a part of my remarks.

The letter from Dr. Seaborg follows:

U.S. ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION,
*Washington, D.C., November 19, 1963.*

Hon. JOHN O. PASTORE,
*Chairman, Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, Congress of the United States.*

DEAR SENATOR PASTORE: You have asked about the current status of the achievement of economic central station civilian nuclear power.

There are several large commercial nuclear powerplants employing light-water moderated and cooled reactors now being planned for utility construction which have projected power-generating costs competitive with conventional plants in areas of high fossil fuel costs; but there are no plants on the line today which are producing power competitive with conventional fuel costs.

It is our belief, however, that the technology of light-water reactors, such as are now being built, has reached the point of development where they can be expected to be economically competitive in large sizes in some high-cost areas. It is to be hoped that subsequent continued improvement of light-water power reactors by industry will result in their economic application to broader geographic areas than those of the highest fossil fuel costs, and that further support by the Government might be avoided. It is to be noted, however, that the economics of such plants have not yet been demonstrated, that there is a lack of long-term experience in their construction and operation, and that there is financial risk to the utilities in undertaking the projects particularly in the economics of the nuclear fuel cycle.

There is a need for the support of advanced converter reactor concepts. The development of such concepts is a logical step in the realization of "breeder" reactors, which is the ultimate objective of our long-term program. The development of "breeder" reactors will permit the addition of a virtually unlimited source of economic energy.

We should try to carry out this logical development with a minimum of direct Government construction. This can best be accomplished by entering into cooperative arrangements with manufacturers and utilities for the construction and operation of more advanced converter reactors. In this way, the goals of better fuel economy and more efficient utilization of our nuclear materials resources can be realized at a lower net cost to the Government.

Sincerely yours,

GLENN T. SEABORG.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to express my complete agreement with the remarks of the distinguished vice chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

He and I have been members of the joint committee since its inception. Over the past two decades, we have been able to witness the remarkable progress atomic energy has made, particularly in the field of civilian nuclear power. I believe we have realized some solid technical accomplishments of which we may all be proud.

For the past 10 years, I have served as chairman of the Joint Committee's Subcommittee on Research and Development. In addition, as many of you may know, I also serve as chairman of the Subcommittee on Research and Development of the House Armed Services Committee, and I am also a member of the recently created Select Committee on Government Research. And so, for the better part of 20 years, I have been closely associated with all phases of the Government's research and development program. I know of few fields of Government research which have been so successful with such a modest investment of the taxpayers' dollar. I know of few fields in which Government research can bring such solid tangible benefits to the American people. The research program in civilian nuclear power can provide the Nation with a new energy source—a source which is theoretically unlimited. It can be one of the truly worthwhile legacies that we can leave to future generations of Americans.

Mr. Chairman, the cooperative power reactor demonstration program provides a means for private industry to participate in this important development program. It allows us to brings to bear the inventiveness and creativity of private industry. It allows us to pursue the program of research and development at a fraction of the cost which would otherwise be required, for a totally Government-run program. In short, the cooperative power program makes good technical and economic sense.

I share the hope of the gentleman from California that a sensible compromise can be reached which will permit this vitally important program to continue.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to join in the remarks of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE] and the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD]. I believe that the development of atomic power is vitally important to the future growth of the Nation, and it is my sincere hope that a compromise can be worked out which will assure the continuation of a strong research and development effort in the field of civilian nuclear power.

I also note, Mr. Chairman, that the committee, in considering the AEC appropriation, deleted $750,000 which had been programed for a community building at Los Alamos. In its report, the committee stated that it "would be glad to consider funding of such a building, but it is convinced that an adequate facility can be provided at a lower cost."

Mr. Chairman, this building was authorized as part of the legislation which was enacted last year for the sale of the Government-owned community at Los Alamos, N. Mex. Although it was the purpose of that legislation to remove the Government from the so-called "community business," it was, at the same time, the intent of Congress that a healthy and viable community be maintained for the citizens of Los Alamos who are contributing so much to our national defense and security.

The physical heart of an effective community government is its city hall, around which all civic activities are centered.

The community building program for Los Alamos would provide facilities for county management, police protection, courthouse space, and all of the essential elements of good local government. No adequate facilities exist now for these functions.

I think it should be noted that when we disposed of Richland, Wash., and Oak Ridge, Tenn.—the other two atomic energy communities—we provided a community building at a cost of $650,000, in the case of Richland, and $500,000, in the case of Oak Ridge. Los Alamos is a higher-cost construction area, and in addition, it requires facilities not only for municipal functions, but for county operations as well, because the city is the seat of the county.

In summary, Mr. Chairman, I believe that the Appropriations Committee did well to point out its concern over the cost of this building. I hope, however, that an agreement can be reached under which a sufficient sum can be provided in order to build an adequate community structure, taking into consideration the unusual construction problems in a remote area like Los Alamos.

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Chairman, this bill carries appropriations for the Narraguagus River in the Second Congressional District in Maine. This is a most constructive project long needed by the community. I appreciate the consideration of the committee.

The Portland Harbor project has an appropriation of $1 million for a 40-foot channel. The Corps of Engineers has found ample economic justification for the 45-foot channel and the Congress authorized the project on that basis. I believe it important to give further consideration of this 45-foot channel and appreciate this careful consideration by the committee.

Seaport Harbor is one of the vital seaports of our State. The fund of $718,000 included in this bill will provide for vital improvements.

May I express to the committee my appreciation of their careful study of the needs in Maine.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Chairman, the State of Rhode Island has a vital interest in six important projects which are included in the public works appropriation bill, 1964.

Three million dollars of Federal funds are earmarked to assist in the completion of the Fox Point hurricane barrier in Providence. This protective facility will be of great help in guarding the State's largest commercial area from the ravages of hurricane damage.

The Lower Woonsocket flood control project is allocated $1,450,000 in the measure now before us. As a citizen of that fine city, I am well aware of the serious danger which this project is intended to help correct. I strongly recommend your approval of the appropriation specified in the bill.

Other projects necessary to the welfare of my State are the Point Judith hurricane barrier for which $50,000 has been allocated; the Point Judith harbor and breakwater calling for $470,000; the Narragansett Pier hurricane barrier for which $50,000 is set aside; and the Pawtuxet Cove project for which the committee has recommended $230,000.

It is essential to the best interests of Rhode Island and the Nation that the projects I have mentioned be undertaken or continued without delay. I ask all of my colleagues to join me in supporting the allocation of the full amounts approved by the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Chairman, it is my considered opinion that the most important waterway project before the Congress of the United States is the Cross-Florida Barge Canal. My support of this project is primarily based upon its defense value. Four Presidents of the United States have had an important part to play in the recent history of this project: Presidents Roosevelt, Truman, Eisenhower, and Kennedy, and even way back in the 19th century President Andrew Jackson vigorously supported this canal. After extended studies through many years of other various possible alternative routes the present route was selected and the project was authorized in 1942 by a bill, "to promote the national defense and to promptly facilitate and protect the transport of materials and supplies needful to the Military Establishment by authorizing the construction and operation of a pipeline and a navigable barge channel across Florida." This authorization by Congress was not on the basis of any economic justification but solely on its national defense values. The canal, however, was not built at that time because of the necessity in time of war to apply to all manpower and equipment in other directions in the emergencies involved.

As soon as I was discharged from the U.S. Army in 1947, I ran for Congress on the platform of the construction of this canal and came to Congress in January of 1949. I had the active help of President Truman in the accumulation of material necessary for a full presentation to Congress, but was not able to make such a presentation until during the administration of President Eisenhower. Under President Eisenhower's leadership it was thought that it would be well to see if the project could be justified not only for its defense values but also for its economic justifications, and President Eisenhower took the leadership in making this a budget item, and the studies were conducted and they showed economic justification for the project during the Eisenhower administration. Additional surveys were made in the beginning of President Kennedy's administration and they resulted in an even greater economic justification, 500 percent more than the original economic justification, or the final figure of 1.2 over 1.

During President Kennedy's campaign for the Presidency of the United States he had written me and allowed me to publish during that campaign the following statement over his signature:

> I know of your persistent work for the early construction of the Cross-Florida Barge Canal. If I am elected President, I will be glad to cooperate with you in making this project a reality. I regard it not only as important to Florida, but to the economy of our entire country, which must fully utilize all of our natural resources if we are to achieve necessary economic expansion.

President Kennedy has vigorously presented this matter to Congress. He actively urged the favorable action of Congress last year in its approval of his budgeted item of $205,000 for final planning. He placed in his budget this year $1 million to begin construction of the canal and he has urged our approval of the item. The House Appropriations Committee and its Subcommittee on Public Works have approved and I am deeply grateful for this wonderful support by the President and by the committee.

I would like to say something about the defense value of this project. On May 11, 1962, Chairman CARL VINSON of the Armed Services Committee wrote Chairman CLARENCE CANNON of the Appropriations Committee as follows:

> I am very hopeful that during this Congress your committee will see fit to appropriate sufficient funds to make a forward step in the construction of the Cross Florida Barge Canal which is to be a section of the Intracoastal Waterway.
>
> I am very much interested in this project because of its very important national defense aspects.

Chairman VINSON quoted the findings of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, August 30, 1946, in part, as follows:

> The Chief of Engineers has stated in his opinion (hearing before the House Appropriations Subcommittee, January 9, 1946) that the authorized canal will represent, in addition to its economic worth, a value in national security considerably greater than its cost.

On May 29, 1951, the Deputy Secretary of Defense in a letter to the President, stated as follows:

> The Corps of Engineers expressed the views that "a barge canal will afford a short, economical, protected route across Florida for the movement of a large amount of long-haul traffic by barge and small freighters between gulf and Atlantic ports. Large tonnages of raw materials as well as manufactured products are susceptible to movement between those points via protected inland waters at great saving. Completion of the canal would also permit quick, safe, and economical transfer between the east and west coasts of Florida, of floating plant and construction equipment now required to move via the circuitous and dangerous Florida Keys route.
>
> "During World War II, many cargo ships and tankers were lost off the coast of Florida due to enemy action. Many of the cargoes that were lost would and could have moved by barge or small freighter had the barge canal been in existence at that time. The saving in lives, ships, and valuable and critical cargoes would have been great. Similar and comparable savings would also accrue in future serious national emergencies if the canal is in operation."
>
> The Joint Chiefs of Staff find that either of these projects (i.e., the previously considered ship canal or the authorized barge canal) will provide an additional and shorter line of communication between the gulf coast, and the east coast, and would thus reduce exposure of shipping to submarine attack.

In the mentioned report of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, they said to the Chief of Army Engineers:

> The economic analysis of a long-lived project could not be considered complete if it covered merely the interval of peacetime years and ignored the recurrent war periods. The insurance value of the avoidance of war losses is, therefore, distributable on an an-

nual basis and can be at least roughly approximated in dollars and cents for measurement against the monetary annual charges of providing and maintaining the facilities.

The Board then goes on to compute the annual value of this wartime insurance afforded by the project as $3,600,000 based on price and replacement cost levels of 1946. In terms of today's price levels, this figure is above $10 million per year and more than doubles the total economic benefits currently reported by the Corps of Engineers in their interim report as to the peacetime economies to be yielded by the waterway.

The Office of Emergency Planning in the Executive Office of the President, in the fall of last year, reviewed a memorandum on the national defense value of the project, prepared by H. H. Buckman, engineer, and said as follows about it:

We have reviewed the Buckman memorandum and appended papers and feel that its thesis is sound and its findings still essentially valid with respect to civil as well as military defense. The desirability of a shorter line of communications between the gulf and east coasts is recognized.

Engineer Buckman further points out the tremendous cost of lost shipping in World War II due to the necessity of using the gulf-Atlantic open sealanes, and said:

Over 1 million gross tons, or 25 percent of all the shipping in these lanes, was lost. The value was $987 million, and 167 ships went to the bottom.

From what I have pointed out to you the national defense value of this canal is outstanding and there should be no further delay in going forward with it.

The lone opposition to this canal has been from railroads, which have traditionally opposed canals all over the country. It should be pointed out, however, that the Florida East Coast Railroad supports the canal and that many individuals in the railroad industry favor the canal. General Morris of the U.S. Army Engineers this year in the House hearings said with regard to railroad interests as follows:

In a short time the canal will assume its proper place in the overall transportation network. Developments along and adjacent to the canal will be accelerated, particularly by industries utilizing and processing raw materials. When this condition develops it can be anticipated that the volume of traffic transported by rail and truck will also expand due to their natural advantages in the transportation of certain classes of commodities. While this trend can be anticipated from the statistical studies made for the economic restudy of the canal, it has been clearly shown in the growth pattern of transportation in other sections of the country under similar conditions. It is believed that the provision of cheap water transportation for bulky commodities to this section of the Southeastern States will create such developments that loss of traffic to competing rail and truck transportation systems will not be of lasting importance and the resulting improvement of regional economic conditions will ultimately add materially to their traffic.

Before closing this talk, I would like to say a few things about arguments which have been raised against the canal: One is that when the canal reaches the Gulf of Mexico it reaches open waters and the route is no longer well protected until it reaches the next dug canal to the north in the shoreline of Florida some miles away. This question is answered completely by the fact that barges now safely use this partially protected area of the Apalachee Bay just as they now use partially protected routes in the Chesapeake Bay and in the Mississippi Sound. The question was answered pointblank by the Chief of Engineers in his letter to the chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors of the House under date of June 15, 1942, as follows:

With reference to the use by Intracoastal Waterway traffic of the open gulf between the eastern terminus of the present Intracoastal Waterway in the vicinity of Apalachee Bay and the gulf terminus of the above-mentioned barge canal, it may be stated that coastwise traffic now follows this route and that while some danger is connected therewith, I am informed that there is very little time lost in navigating this portion of the gulf. Accordingly, it would be possible to eliminate that section of the Intracoastal Waterway from the improvements proposed in H.R. 6999 and still move very large quantities of commerce by barge from terminals along the gulf coast to the eastern seaboard with the completion of the other improvements proposed in the bill.

Another argument that is made against this canal is that there is an existing canal running across the State of Florida in its southern portions, the Okeechobee Waterway. This southern route is 356 miles longer and is more expensive to construct and maintain even though it does exist in a very limited degree at the present time. Further, its utilization is much more limited than utilization of the Cross-Florida Barge Canal would be, according to authentic and careful studies that have been made over a period of many years. On this point there is a letter from the Office of Chief of Engineers dated May 17, 1962, which went into this question and stated as follows:

The existing Okeechobee Waterway provides a channel 8 feet deep and 80 feet wide from the Intracoastal Waterway near St. Lucie Inlet to the Gulf of Mexico near Fort Myers Beach. This waterway includes three locks, 50 feet wide and 250 feet long. In 1958, preliminary cost estimates were made for enlarging the Okeechobee Waterway to the same design criteria established for the Cross-Florida Barge Canal project. Those estimates showed that the cost of enlarging the Okeechobee Waterway would exceed $100 million. Traffic studies also showed that the volume of commerce that would use an enlarged Okeechobee Waterway, and the transportation savings therefrom, would be far from sufficient to justify the large cost of improvement of the existing waterway to the dimensions of the Cross-Florida Barge Canal.

Finally, it is said by the railroad lobby that the economic justification of the Cross-Florida Barge Canal is slight and that the benefits are primarily to Florida rather than to the Nation as a whole. As to the economic justification, I would like to point out that even on the most conservative figure presented by the Corps of Engineers, 1.2 over 1, this is an economic justification in excess of other projects which Congress has authorized, projects involving more money than this project, and we are spending money for such other developments right now in actual construction. As to the argument of the locality of the project, this is perhaps the most absurd argument which is raised against the Cross-Florida Barge Canal because it actually has more national significance than any waterway project ever undertaken by the U.S. Government. An accurate reading of the information given to the committee shows that although about 80 percent of the traffic would either start or stop in Florida, only 16 percent of it would be of the within-the-State variety even when most conservative analysis is used as to its interstate utilization.

This compares very favorably with other projects. Moreover, it should finally be observed that this project was not authorized by Congress on the basis of economic justification, but was authorized on the basis of its defense value and that the defense value is certainly the paramount value of this project. Even if all of the economic justification of this project were thrown out the window, the project still should be built because of its defense values of which I have already spoken.

In conclusion I wish to express my deepest appreciation to the House Appropriations Committee and its Subcommittee on Public Works and to the President and to the leadership on each side of the aisle in Congress for support of this project. I sincerely hope that this $1 million in construction funds will be promptly approved.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, it is my pleasure today to commend the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee for the excellent job he and the members of the committee have done on the bill appropriating funds for our public works projects.

The people of the Fourth District of Florida are indeed grateful for the favorable consideration given to the sorely needed works in Dade County, Fla. They are particularly grateful that the ranking majority member, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN], and the hard-working members of the committee recognized the need for the beginning of construction on canal C-111—which is part of the south Dade plan—and Cutler drain. The earmarking of up to $200,000 and $300,000 respectively for these projects, which are an integral part of the central and southern Florida flood control district, is the answer to hundreds of urgent pleas from officials and residents of Dade County.

The area encompassed by the south Dade plan comprises about 227 square miles of agricultural and urban subarea and contains most of the local vegetable farms and groves which make up the nontourist factor of our economy. The area is bounded on two sides by existing flood control works, but expanded urbanization and increased industrialization have rapidly forced farmers onto lands that presently have little or no flood control protection.

Subsequent to the submission of the budget for fiscal year 1964, Aerojet General Corp., which acquired about 74,000 acres of land in the south Dade area and

is now finishing work on their new plant, contracted for the development and testing of solid fuel rocket engines for the Air Force. One of the primary considerations in the selection of this site was its location with respect to the Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway as a barge transportation route to the Cape Canaveral area.

An early start on construction of canal C-111, as part of the South Dade flood control plan authorized by Congress last year, will serve the dual purpose of flood control and barge transportation for the completed solid-fuel rocket engines to the Intracoastal Waterway and thence to the launch site at Canaveral.

The population of the Cutler drain area, which comprises 38.4 square miles, has increased from 945 in 1950 to 27,300 in 1960 and is still growing rapidly. The area is subject to serious flood hazard due to the fact that local secondary drainage works are ineffective without an adequate primary channel to carry off the floodwaters.

Damaging floods have been experienced in 1947, 1948, 1949, 1952, 1953, 1954, 1958, and twice in 1960. Hurricane Donna, which poured 15 inches of rainfall from September 9 through 11, 1960, and hurricane Florence, which dropped 12 inches of rainfall from September 21 through 25, 1960, left the major portion of the area inundated from 2 to 40 days.

Dade County, because of this constant threat, has added $67,000 to next year's budget for secondary channels in this area; 13.6 miles of primary outlet channels have already been constructed. During the floods of 1960 over 13,000 acres or about 55 percent of the area, were under water. Were there to be a recurrence of this catastrophe, it is estimated that damages would exceed $480,200; average annual flood damages are estimated at $101,600.

The residents and property owners of the Cutler drain area can thank the chairman and members of the Appropriations Committee for lifting this ever-present threat to their lives and property.

In addition to the previously mentioned two projects for which funds were earmarked out of the $14 million approved for the central and southern Florida flood control district, I am pleased to say that the committee provided the full budget request on other projects vitally affecting Dade County.

The committee allocated $1,500,000 for fiscal year 1964 for the continuation of the necessary dredging operations to widen the ship channel in Miami Harbor from 300 to 400 feet. Dade County and the city of Miami are now constructing a causeway, access bridge, and related port facilities at an estimated cost of $9 million in addition to the required non-Federal contribution of $1,826,000. The port of Miami is the second largest cruise passenger port in the United States and cargo tonnage passing over the facilities has increased approximately 75 percent since October 1957.

Included in the bill is $2,085,000 for widening and deepening the Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway from Fort Lauderdale to Miami. The existing channel is 8 by 100 feet and these funds will enable construction to the dimension of 10 by 125 feet during fiscal year 1964.

Also included is $75,000 for initiation of a general investigation study of the Everglades National Park. Department of Interior representatives have concluded that the park is not receiving sufficient fresh water inflow during dry weather conditions to support the normal biological conditions within the park. This investigation will determine actual waterflow conditions and the best way of correcting the situation. The study is expected to take about 3 years at a total cost of $400,000.

Mr. Chairman, I am glad to have this opportunity to convey to the chairman of the Appropriations Committee and my colleagues who serve on this important committee, my sincere thanks and appreciation for their consideration and cooperation in approving these badly needed funds for Florida's Fourth District projects.

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Chairman, I wish to express my deep appreciation to the members of the House Committee on Appropriations for including in the public works appropriation bill on the floor today, $1,500,000 to permit continued construction of our Yaquina Bay and Harbor project in Oregon and also for approving $1,100,000 to continue major rehabilitation work on the north jetty, Tillamook Bay and Bar, Oreg. The committee is indeed to be commended for approving these funds for these most meritorious and important projects.

The Yaquina project, costing $24,400,000 when completed, is of paramount importance to the economy and employment of Lincoln County and, indeed, will benefit all of Oregon. When completed, it will make Yaquina Bay and Harbor a top ranked Oregon port. At the present time, shipment of timber products from Yaquina Bay is very seriously hampered by channel depths. Only partial loadings are now possible and delays in shipments often result. The improvements under this project will remedy this serious handicap to navigation and make Yaquina a year-round harbor and result in large savings in transportation costs and elimination of delays. This will, of course, tremendously assist the lumber industry and open up entirely new phases of commerce from expansion of exports and imports. Commercial fishing and recreation will also be greatly benefited as well as the lumber industry.

Completion of the $2,140,000 rehabilitation project on the north jetty of Tillamook Bay and Bar will also give a tremendous boost to the economy and the employment opportunities of our Tillamook area. Improvement to the north jetty will permit barging of timber products and will also be of great value to commercial fishermen and pleasure craft. The rebuilt jetty will provide a more protected and safer bay entrance and make possible a greater use of the navigation project in the bay.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I wish to take advantage of this opportunity to express my personal thanks as well as the thanks of his honor, the mayor of the city of New York, Hon. Robert F. Wagner, and of all the people of the city of New York to the members of this committee for their having included in the pending bill an appropriation in the amount of $95,000 for a study by the Corps of Army Engineers on the dangers to navigation which exist in New York Harbor due to floating debris emanating from old and unused piers and sunken and abandoned hulks and derelicts.

This study has been estimated to take approximately 1 year to complete and will include a thorough survey of the New York-New Jersey Harbor and its tributary waters for sources of debris. The study will make it possible for the Corps of Army Engineers to make a determination on the procedures necessary to carry out a project including such matters as temporary waivers of proprietary interest in or the institution of proceedings to have such hulks or derelict structures declared a menace to navigation. This project is vital to the safety of navigation in New York Harbor and the protection of both commercial and pleasure craft.

Our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. MURPHY], who represents the entire Staten Island waterfront area, the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. DWYER], and all those Members of this House who interested themselves in this worthwhile project are likewise entitled to commendation.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, the Mississippi River forms the western boundary of the congressional district I represent, and the Illinois River courses through the district's center.

Through the years the Federal Government has carried out navigation policies on these rivers which, in turn, have increased flood hazards to adjacent farmland.

It is, therefore, a proper responsibility of the Federal Government to help levee and drainage districts meet this hazard with flood control structures.

In this bill are six flood control projects within the 20th District: Planning money, Indian Grave drainage district, $100,000; McGee Creek drainage and levee district, $80,000; Sny Island levee drainage district, $166,000; Clear Lake special drainage district, $51,000; Sid Simpson flood control project at Beardstown, $695,000; the Sny Basin project, $3,500,000.

Each project has been thoroughly studied by local interests and by the Corps of Engineers. Each comes to the House with the recommendation of local interests and the corps.

I am honored to have this opportunity to urge approval of these needed improvements, and to express my appreciation to the chairman, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], and the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] for their splendid cooperation.

Mrs. HANSEN. Mr. Chairman, the Third Congressional District of Washington, of which I have the honor and privilege of representing, depends to a considerable extent upon water transportation for its economic life.

This nine-county area is bounded on the south by the great Columbia River, on the west by the Pacific Ocean, and on the north by Puget Sound, and it is apparent that good water transportation is essential to the 450,000 people residing in my district.

The public works projects carried out by the U.S. Corps of Engineers over the years have made possible an excellent system of water transportation and the bill passed by the House on November 19 will make further improvements possible.

Over the past several years a system of barge transportation has been built on the Columbia River making possible cheap and efficient water transportation from the interior of Washington to the fresh water ports of Camas-Washougal, Cathlamet, Ilwaco, Kalama, Longview, Vancouver, and Stevenson.

This bill appropriates $1 million for a start of construction on a 40-foot channel, and over the next several years construction will continue so that our ports will be able to accommodate the larger vessels which are becoming more common in today's merchant marine. There have been many instances of these large ships leaving our Columbia River ports less than full laden because of the shallowness of the channel.

This bill will make possible a start on dredging the channel, and will eliminate in time the need for vessels to leave less than fully laden.

This bill also appropriates $100,000 for start of construction on the Camas-Washougal flood control project on the Columbia River. This is an area subject to periodic flooding, and each year at flood stage Columbia River waters seep into land where industrial plants are daily trying to survive in this highly competitive world.

Included in this bill, also, are sufficient funds to maintain the Columbia River and to continue model studies at the mouth in an effort to design structures which will control the shoaling in the area.

The appropriations for the Willapa Harbor area will make it possible for this lumber port to continue to contribute to the employment stability of the area. And the money made available for the Grays Harbor and Chehalis River areas will make it possible for ships to make efficient use of the facilities.

I won't fail to mention the appropriations for the Bonneville Power Authority. The electric power provided by this agency of our Federal Government has made possible an industrial expansion which is the equal of any in the country, and the money in this bill will make it possible for BPA to continue to serve efficiently and well the hundreds of thousands of people living in the area.

In conclusion, I express my deepest appreciation of my distinguished colleagues on the Appropriations Committee and in the House of Representatives. I know full well that this money will be used wisely and well and will reflect great credit on this great body.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I want to join the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] in his expression of appreciation of the cooperation of the members of the committee. I especially want to express appreciation of the invaluable service rendered by the gentleman from Iowa, the ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations, in the long hearings and the preparation of this very intricate and difficult bill.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] is one of the most valuable members of the committee and of the House of Representatives.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

CONSTRUCTION AND REHABILITATION

For construction and rehabilitation of authorized reclamation projects or parts thereof (including power transmission facilities) and for other related activities, as authorized by law, to remain available until expended, $180,190,000, of which $75,000,000 shall be derived from the reclamation fund: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used to initiate the construction of transmission facilities within those areas covered by power wheeling service contracts which include provision for service to Federal establishments and preferred customers, except those transmission facilities for which construction funds have been heretofore appropriated, those facilities which are necessary to carry out the terms of such contracts or those facilities for which the Secretary of the Interior finds the wheeling agency is unable or unwilling to provide for the integration of Federal projects or for service to a Federal establishment or preferred customer.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I note there are some $49 or $50 million for the Department of the Interior in this bill. I also note a news story datelined Minneapolis, Minn., November 16, 1963, in which a Dr. Athelstan Spilhaus, dean of the University of Minnesota Institute of Technology, has been delegated to plan the new $10 million fish pond in Washington, otherwise known as an aquarium.

Among other things, according to the news story, Dr. Spilhaus says there is to be a pond with dead fish to show how a polluted stream harms wild life. He also apparently is going to provide a seafood restaurant, the menu of which would include such marine rarities as "Japanese hamburger." A "Japanese hamburger" is described as consisting of raw fish and seaweed.

I hope this restaurant is located at some little distance from the stream that is going to be filled with dead fish because I cannot believe "Japanese hamburger" is going to be appetizing even without the dead fish close by.

My question to somebody on the committee is whether there is any money in the Interior Department's $50 million for the fish pond that is to be located on the Potomac River? Can the gentleman tell me whether there is any money for the Japanese delicatessen in this bill?

Mr. KIRWAN. What is the gentleman's question?

Mr. GROSS. Is there any money in this bill for the fish pond to be erected on the Potomac River?

Mr. KIRWAN. When the appropriations for the National Fisheries Center and Aquarium was in here recently the gentleman said he stayed up until 2 o'clock in the morning to study the bill. If he stayed up until 2 o'clock studying this bill I am sure he knows there is nothing in this bill concerning the item.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman give me credit for staying up until 2 o'clock and trying?

Mr. KIRWAN. There is not a dime in this bill for that.

Mr. GROSS. That is all I wanted to hear, and I thank the gentleman for the information.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House, without amendment, with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. ALBERT] having resumed the chair, Mr. KEOGH, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 9140) making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority and certain river basin commissions for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House, with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 358, nays 27, not voting 48, as follows:

[Roll No. 207]

YEAS—358

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Abernethy | Battin | Broomfield |
| Adair | Beckworth | Brown, Calif. |
| Addabbo | Beermann | Brown, Ohio |
| Albert | Belcher | Broyhill, N.C. |
| Anderson | Bell | Burke |
| Andrews, Ala. | Bennett, Fla. | Burkhalter |
| Andrews, N. Dak. | Berry | Burleson |
| Arends | Betts | Byrne, Pa. |
| Ashbrook | Blatnik | Byrnes, Wis. |
| Ashley | Boggs | Cahill |
| Ashmore | Boland | Cameron |
| Aspinall | Bolling | Cannon |
| Auchincloss | Bolton, Frances P. | Casey |
| Ayres | Bolton, Oliver P. | Cederberg |
| Baker | Bonner | Chamberlain |
| Baldwin | Bow | Chelf |
| Baring | Brademas | Chenoweth |
| Barrett | Bray | Clark |
| Barry | Brock | Clausen, Don H. |
| Bass | Brooks | Cleveland |
| Bates | | Cohelan |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Colmer | Jensen | Reuss |
| Conte | Johnson, Calif. | Rhodes, Ariz. |
| Cooley | Johnson, Wis. | Rhodes, Pa. |
| Corbett | Jonas | Rich |
| Corman | Jones, Ala. | Riehlman |
| Cramer | Jones, Mo. | Rivers, Alaska |
| Cunningham | Karsten | Rivers, S.C. |
| Curtin | Karth | Roberts, Ala. |
| Curtis | Kee | Roberts, Tex. |
| Daddario | Keith | Robison |
| Daniels | Keogh | Rogers, Colo. |
| Davis, Ga. | Kilburn | Rogers, Fla. |
| Davis, Tenn. | Kilgore | Rogers, Tex. |
| Dawson | King, Calif. | Rooney, Pa. |
| Delaney | Kirwan | Rooney, N.Y. |
| Dent | Kluczynski | Roosevelt |
| Denton | Kornegay | Rosenthal |
| Derounian | Kunkel | Rostenkowski |
| Diggs | Kyl | Roudebush |
| Dingell | Landrum | Roush |
| Dole | Langen | Roybal |
| Donohue | Lankford | Ryan, Mich. |
| Dorn | Leggett | Ryan, N.Y. |
| Dowdy | Lennon | St Germain |
| Downing | Lesinski | Schadeberg |
| Dulski | Libonati | Schenck |
| Dwyer | Lindsay | Schneebeli |
| Edmondson | Lipscomb | Schweiker |
| Edwards | Long, Md. | Scott |
| Elliott | McClory | Secrest |
| Ellsworth | McCulloch | Selden |
| Everett | McDade | Senner |
| Evins | McDowell | Sheppard |
| Fallon | McFall | Short |
| Farbstein | McIntire | Sibal |
| Fascell | McLoskey | Sickles |
| Feighan | McMillan | Sikes |
| Findley | Macdonald | Siler |
| Finnegan | Madden | Sisk |
| Fino | Mahon | Skubitz |
| Fisher | Martin, Nebr. | Slack |
| Flood | Mathias | Smith, Iowa |
| Flynt | Matsunaga | Smith, Va. |
| Fogarty | Matthews | Springer |
| Ford | May | Staebler |
| Forrester | Miller, Calif. | Stafford |
| Fountain | Miller, N.Y. | Staggers |
| Fraser | Mills | Steed |
| Frelinghuysen | Minish | Stephens |
| Friedel | Minshall | Stratton |
| Fulton, Pa. | Monagan | Stubblefield |
| Fulton, Tenn. | Montoya | Sullivan |
| Fuqua | Moore | Taft |
| Gallagher | Moorhead | Talcott |
| Garmatz | Morgan | Taylor |
| Gary | Morris | Teague, Calif |
| Gathings | Morrison | Teague, Tex. |
| Giaimo | Morse | Thomas |
| Gibbons | Morton | Thompson, La. |
| Gilbert | Mosher | Thompson, N.J. |
| Glenn | Moss | Thompson, Tex. |
| Gonzalez | Murphy, Ill. | Thomson, Wis. |
| Grabowski | Murphy, N.Y. | Thornberry |
| Grant | Murray | Toll |
| Gray | Natcher | Tollefson |
| Green, Oreg. | Nedzi | Tupper |
| Green, Pa. | Nelsen | Tuten |
| Griffin | Nix | Udall |
| Griffiths | Norblad | Ullman |
| Grover | O'Brien, N.Y. | Utt |
| Gubser | O'Hara, Ill. | Van Deerlin |
| Gurney | O'Hara, Mich. | Vanik |
| Hagan, Ga. | O'Konski | Van Pelt |
| Hagen, Calif. | Olsen, Mont. | Vinson |
| Haley | Olson, Minn. | Waggonner |
| Hall | O'Neill | Wallhauser |
| Halpern | Osmers | Watson |
| Hanna | Ostertag | Watts |
| Hansen | Passman | Weaver |
| Hardy | Patman | Weltner |
| Harris | Patten | Westland |
| Harrison | Pelly | Whalley |
| Harsha | Pepper | Wharton |
| Harvey, Mich. | Perkins | White |
| Hawkins | Philbin | Whitener |
| Hays | Pike | Whitten |
| Healey | Pillion | Wickersham |
| Hechler | Pirnie | Widnall |
| Henderson | Poage | Williams |
| Herlong | Pool | Willis |
| Hoeven | Powell | Wilson, Charles H. |
| Holifield | Price | Wilson, Ind. |
| Holland | Pucinski | Winstead |
| Horan | Purcell | Wright |
| Horton | Quie | Wyman |
| Huddleston | Quillen | Young |
| Hull | Rains | Younger |
| Ichord | Reid, N.Y. | Zablocki |
| Jarman | Reifel | |

NAYS—27

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Alger | Goodell | King, N.Y. |
| Becker | Gross | Laird |
| Bruce | Hoffman | Latta |
| Clancy | Hutchinson | MacGregor |
| Collier | Joelson | Marsh |
| Devine | Johansen | Michel |
| Poff | Saylor | Stinson |
| Rumsfeld | Smith, Calif. | Tuck |
| St. George | Snyder | Wydler |

NOT VOTING—48

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Abbitt | Gill | Martin, Mass. |
| Abele | Goodling | Meader |
| Avery | Halleck | Milliken |
| Bennett, Mich. | Harding | Multer |
| Bromwell | Harvey, Ind. | O'Brien, Ill. |
| Brotzman | Hébert | Pilcher |
| Broyhill, Va. | Hemphill | Randall |
| Buckley | Hosmer | Reid, Ill. |
| Burton | Jennings | Rodino |
| Carey | Kastenmeier | St. Onge |
| Celler | Kelly | Schwengel |
| Clawson, Del | Knox | Shelley |
| Dague | Lloyd | Shipley |
| Derwinski | Long, La. | Shriver |
| Duncan | Mailliard | Trimble |
| Foreman | Martin, Calif. | Wilson, Bob |

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Milliken for, with Mr. Derwinski against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Hébert with Bob Wilson.
Mr. Shelley with Del Clawson.
Mr. Buckley with Mr. Harvey of Indiana.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Hosmer.
Mr. Multer with Mr. Goodling.
Mrs. Kelly with Mr. Burton.
Mr. Trimble with Mr. Broyhill of Virginia.
Mr. O'Brien of Illinois with Mr. Brotzman.
Mr. Gill with Mr. Lloyd.
Mr. Harding with Mr. Abele.
Mr. Hemphill with Mr. Martin of California.
Mr. Shipley with Mr. Bennett of Michigan.
Mr. Rodino with Mr. Avery.
Mr. Carey with Mr. Schwengel.
Mr. Jennings with Mrs. Reid of Illinois.
Mr. Randall with Mr. Foreman.
Mr. Duncan with Mr. Bromwell.
Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.
Mr. Abbitt with Mr. Schriver.
Mr. Pilcher with Mr. Knox.
Mr. Kastenmeier with Mr. Dague.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE and Messrs. COLLIER and JOELSON changed their vote from "yea" to "nay".

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

## PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained during the vote on the public works appropriation bill. Had I been present I would have voted "aye."

## PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. MARTIN of California. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained during the vote on the public works appropriation bill. Had I been present I would have voted "aye."

## NO NEW CIVIL RIGHTS LAW NEEDED

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, there is obtainable from the Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress, a document entitled "Provisions of the Constitution, Statutes, and Executive Orders and Regulations of the United States Relating to the Infringement of Civil Rights on the Basis of Race, Religion, Color, or National Origin."

I particularly want to invite the attention of my colleagues to this publication because I hopefuly believe that upon reviewing it they will conclude that no additional civil rights legislation is needed.

This document contains some 190 pages of excerpts and references. While I cannot personally vouch for everything it contains, and some of the items do seem rather farfetched in their application to the subject, it is on the whole a commendable job of research.

Here we find a description of the Civil Rights Commission. The various parts of the Constitution that are considered applicable are quoted. The table of contents lists general civil rights statutes, jurisdiction of district courts, statutory provisions having to do with elections, housing, education, employment, transportation, jury rights, and much more, right on down through the use of the Armed Forces to enforce Federal authority.

This interesting document illustrates an important point that ought to be given full consideration in connection with any new civil rights proposals, that is, there is a vast amount of such legislation on the statute books already. It shows that our legal establishment has available sufficient authority to guarantee the civil rights of all Americans.

Mr. Speaker, in view of this super abundance of so-called civil rights legislation, and especially in view of the nature of current proposals, any new such legislation likely to be adopted will have a whiplash effect on the American people, including the very people who now advocate the legislation and those they seek to mollify.

Under the guise of civil rights the executive branch of our Government is seeking power that would enable it to control our homes, businesses, farms, banks, schools, and the election machinery.

Under the guise of civil rights the Executive asks authority to tell you—if you own a business—whom you shall hire, fire, promote, or demote.

Under the guise of civil rights the President seeks power to blacklist individuals and business firms from Federal programs, activities, subsidies, and benefits.

The whiplash, or backlash, if current civil rights proposals are enacted, will be the regimentation of our citizens in ways, and in areas of private endeavor, hith-

erto undreamed of since first we freed ourselves from the British Crown.

Our Founding Fathers purposely and painfully drafted and ratified a written Constitution primarily to put the Government they were establishing beyond the control of impatient public officials, temporary majorities, and the vacillating moods of public opinion. The current drive for civil rights legislation is spearheaded by impatient public officials under pressure from voting blocs of citizens who, while nowise a majority, hold the balance of electoral power in certain political strongholds, namely the big cities of the North and East.

The whiplash of new civil rights laws would immediately affect and harm upward to 90 percent of our population, but in time its sting would be felt by the other 10 percent as well. The cause of freedom would suffer for all people, for all time, everywhere in this great land of ours.

Clearly, no additional civil rights legislation is advisable, and with such an abundance of such already within our statutes, covering every imaginable subject, certainly none is needed.

## ANY AMERICAN WOULD DO THE SAME

Mr. BOGGS. 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 Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as my name has been used on a personal basis recently, I am submitting the following:

[From the Valley News, El Cajon, Calif., Nov. 1, 1963]

ANY AMERICAN WOULD DO THE SAME

Two Texas Congressmen got into a fight this week.

It probably will go down in history as the most highly publicized and shortest brawl ever staged in the Halls of Congress.

The two combatants were Representative HENRY B. GONZALEZ and Representative ED FOREMAN. GONZALEZ struck the first blow. It also was the last blow. But FOREMAN must be given credit for starting the brawl. He ired GONZALEZ by indulging in some name calling.

Back in Texas recently, FOREMAN made a speech to a women's club during which he mentioned that GONZALEZ and 19 other Congressmen had voted against increasing the appropriation for the House Un-American Activities Committee.

"I am not going to call GONZALEZ a Communist," FOREMAN told the women, "but he is as extreme to the left as the other 19 and they are pinkoes."

When Texas newspapers printed stories of this speech, the headlines stated that FOREMAN had pinned a "Pinko Label on GONZALEZ."

GONZALEZ is no newcomer to the political arena. He knew the label of "pinko" was intended to impugn his loyalty and hold him up to public scorn and ridicule. So he didn't waste any time arguing semantics. He accused FOREMAN of calling him a Communist and took a swing at him.

For a Congressman to call a colleague "Communist" or "Red," except on the floor of the House where he enjoys immunity, is to commit an act of dangerous libel.

So FOREMAN used the smear word "pinko." What was he trying to say? Was he trying to say that GONZALEZ was not a Communist? Apparently this was not his intent, or he would have gone ahead and said so. Instead, he merely said he was not "going to call GONZALEZ a Communist."

Why, as long as he was telling his audience what he was not going to call GONZALEZ, didn't he go further? Why didn't FOREMAN also say that he was not going to call GONZALEZ a murderer?

The obvious answer, of course, is that FOREMAN does not think GONZALEZ is a murderer. So why bring up the subject? About his being a Communist, however, FOREMAN has some definite opinions. But he has no desire to be sued for libel. So he uses his "pinko" gimmick to do by innuendo and inference what he does not dare do directly.

Congressmen develop thick hides. They can listen unmoved while their intelligence, judgment, or generosity is attacked. They will not take violent umbrage if their colleagues describe them as lazy, uninformed, or deaf to reason.

But no Congressman worthy of his salt is going to sit on his hands while his loyalty is impugned. GONZALEZ is worthy of his salt. He is from San Antonio, born in the shadow of the Alamo. He has been in public life since 1953 when he was elected to the San Antonio City Council. His loyalty is not subject to question.

FOREMAN knows this. But he wanted to be as nasty as he could without risking libel. He was asking for trouble.

For grown men to engage in fisticuffs is not becoming. But there are times when about the only proper retort to a deliberate and provocative insult is a good punch in the nose.

The lowest order of life is the character assassin. And the lowest character assassin is he who assails a man's loyalty behind his back merely because of disagreement over a political issue.

Under the circumstances, GONZALEZ did what any self-respecting American would do.

## DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] 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 Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare was created in April 1953. At that time it was a department of rather modest size, and while its programs were varied there were not too many of them for one central office and one Cabinet officer to keep in reasonably close contact with them all.

During the 10 intervening years Congress and the executive administration have recognized that far too little attention and effort had been given to these important fields and especially the first two, health and education. The new legislation that has resulted from this recognition has vastly increased the size, complexity, and importance of the Department. In our hearings on the 1964 budget for the Department I asked for a listing and brief explanation of the legislative enactments of the last 4 Congresses having an impact on the Department's activities. This list, which totals 80 separate laws, appears on pages 1290 through 1306 of part 1 of the hearings record.

The first annual appropriation act for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare was for fiscal year 1954. It included appropriations for 49 offices and activities. It totaled $1.7 billion. The appropriation act for 1964 totals $5.5 billion. Just the part of the 1964 appropriation that would be transferred to the new Department of Health which I propose would amount to more than the entire Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for 1954 and would include approximately the same number of activities as the whole Department of Health, Education, and Welfare had in 1954.

In addition, it is quite obvious that this expansion is going to continue. There is legislation that has passed one or both Houses of Congress this year which will add to the existing responsibilities provided for in the 1964 appropriation act in the field of vocational education, aid to impacted school districts, water pollution control, assistance to certain schools of higher education, programs for the mentally retarded, and assistance in improving mental health to mention a few.

When Secretary RIBICOFF resigned in July 1962 he said:

> The man in my job wears 20 different hats a day, runs 110 separate programs and is responsible for 75 separate budget items. * * * Even the small European countries have separate departments for health, education, and welfare. Their cabinet ministers come to see me and can't believe we're trying to run them all from one office.

This was over a year ago. Since then we have added new hats, new programs, and new budget items and, as I said earlier, it is obvious we will continue to do so. This is as it should be for these are vitally important activities that benefit every person in our Nation. My only complaint is that we have gone too slowly in expanding many of them. However, I am firmly convinced that we have reached the point, in fact that we have already passed the point, where all of this multitude of diverse activities can be properly administered in a single department. To me it is the height of foolishness to put off the relatively simple action of setting up separate departments of health and education that will undoubtedly result in better, more efficient administration of these vital programs.

## LATVIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. STAEBLER] 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 Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAEBLER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, November 18, 1963, marked the 45th anniversary of the independence of the Republic of Latvia and it is fitting that

we join with Americans of Latvian descent in their observance of this momentous occasion.

The conquest of the Latvian territories in the 18th century by the Russian Empire did not change the Western orientation of the Latvian people. Even under foreign domination, they preserved their national spirit, traditions, and language.

As a result of their insurrection of 1905, Latvia was granted limited representation in the Imperial Russian Duma, which, in the persons of Janis Zalitis and Janis Goldmanis had profound influence on the history of Latvian liberation.

The Latvians were hard hit by the invasion of the German Army in 1915 with over 400,000 Latvians forced to become refugees in Russia. The brave Latvian troops held the Riga front against German forces for 2 years until the Russian revolution of 1917. Realizing that their independence was endangered by the 1917 Russian revolution, the Latvian National Council announced Latvia's separation from Bolshevik Russia on January 5, 1918.

On November 11, 1918, the British Government recognized the Latvian National Council as the Government of Latvia and 7 days later, on November 18, 1918, the first Latvian provisional parliament, the National Council, proclaimed the independence of Latvia.

On December 5, 1918, Soviet troops invaded Latvian territory and formed a Latvian Soviet government, an open breach of the declaration of the right of Latvia's self-determination. On May 22, 1919, Riga was liberated by the Latvian army and German units. After numerous German attempts to overthrow the Latvian Government, an armistice was signed and a peace treaty was negotiated with the Soviets. This Latvian freedom had been paid for by the loss of 700,000 Latvians. The recognition of Latvia by the United States on July 28, 1922, completed full international recognition as an independent and sovereign state with full representation on the League of Nations.

The subsequent occupation of Latvia by the Soviet in 1940 was a clear-cut violation of signed agreements, once again demonstrating Soviet Russia's total disregard for the pledged word.

With their background of Western culture and civilization, the people of Latvia will never recognize Soviet domination of their homeland and will carry on their fight for self-determination and their God-given right to live in freedom.

## SUPPORT FOR MEDICARE

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] 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 Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following is the text of my testimony before the Ways and Means Committee in support of the President's medicare proposal:

STATEMENT OF HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER BEFORE THE HOUSE WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE IN SUPPORT OF H.R. 3920, NOVEMBER 19, 1963

Mr. Chairman, I very much appreciate the opportunity to testify in favor of H.R. 3920, the President's proposal to provide medical care for the aged through the social security system. I have introduced an identical bill, H.R. 9095, which is also before the committee.

During the last decade the number of older people in our country has increased by 5 million. Since the end of World War II hospital charges have gone up 400 percent from $9.50 a day in 1946 to $35 a day now. Our senior citizens cannot afford to pay this kind of money very long without going completely broke and destroying whatever assets they might have saved for their old-age retirement years.

Let us examine for a moment one of the alternatives to medicare, the old-age assistance program. In 1950 there were 2.8 million people receiving old-age assistance. Today there are 2.2 million, a drop of 600,000. This has been accomplished for a very simple reason: more and more people are eligible for social security when they reach the age of 65; seven out of eight are able to meet their day-to-day needs without old-age assistance. This is the best argument I know for social security.

There is no reason why any citizen, in this the richest country in the world, should have to depend for his or her livelihood on a government dole. Social security provides the means whereby the citizen can live out his senior years with dignity and self-respect.

Medical care provided through the social security system is merely a logical extension of this principle. Parenthetically it might be noted that those who oppose medicare do so because they say that it is part of a so-called "welfare state" philosophy. If their opposition were to defeat this bill it would inevitably wipe out the decrease in the number of welfare recipients and in fact, increase it over and above the 2.8 million mark of 1950. As our aged population increases, the percentage increases of those who cannot afford the heavy medical expenses of old age.

What we want to do and what we should do is keep these people off the welfare rolls. What we need to do and what we should do is see that these people have the opportunity to provide for their own future medical needs through the social security system.

The American Medical Association has said "no" to medicare. What the AMA is further saying is "put the old people on relief."

There can be no doubt that the late distinguished Senator from Oklahoma, Mr. Kerr, and the distinguished chairman of this committee had nothing but the highest respect and regard for the needs and the well-being of those of our fellow citizens over 65 who cannot afford the high cost of being sick. Being responsive to this great concern the Congress, in 1960, adopted what is now called the Kerr-Mills program. After 3 years, however, it is all too evident that this program is not an adequate substitute for medicare. Only half of our States have joined this program and it has not worked well in those.

Frequently the range of assistance available does not include what the patient needs or else the facilities for providing the assistance are inadequate; the choice of a doctor or hospital may be nonexistent, the necessary care being available only in specific facilities or from specific doctors.

The argument has been offered that under the Kerr-Mills Act, the Federal Government's contribution is unlimited since it will match whatever the States provide. The simple fact is, however, that the States cannot match the Federal Government in this area; they just cannot provide enough funds to do the job. Of the 29 jurisdictions (including Guam, Puerto Rico, District of Columbia, and the Virgin Islands) which have adopted the Kerr-Mills approach, only four—Hawaii, Massachusetts, New York, and North Dakota—can be said to have comprehensive programs. At the other end of the scale, we find five States with minimal programs, all the rest have what the Bureau of Family Services terms intermediate plans.

An aspect of Kerr-Mills operation which is certainly just as bad as the lack of comprehensiveness in the various State plans is the denial of dignity and self-respect to the aged citizens seeking assistance, by the imposition of a means test. Why should these people have to submit themselves to this procedure in order to receive adequate medical attention that they could have helped pay for themselves through the Social Security System?

Health insurance is not socialism; medicare is not socialism. Like private health insurance, it is merely a means of paying medical bills. It is nothing more and nothing less. I am proud to be a sponsor of this legislation and I strongly urge that this committee report H.R. 3920 to the House at the earliest possible time so that our senior citizens can receive the benefits of medicare with dignity and respect.

Thank you.

## SEARSPORT, MAINE, HARBOR CONSTRUCTION

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maine [Mr. TUPPER] 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. TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, as Representative of Maine's First District, I am appreciative to the Appropriations Committee of their approval of $718,000 to Searsport, Maine, Harbor for construction, and for the appropriation of $1 million for the Portland, Maine, Harbor dredging project. I am glad that they have concluded, as I have, that it is imperative that actual dredging operations commence as soon as possible in these major Maine seaports.

However, I must in all frankness state that I view with considerable concern the change of the ultimate depth of the Portland, Maine, project from the 45 feet recommended by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, to a depth of 40 feet.

The argument has been made that many other seaports in the United States will wish to have their harbors dredged to 45 feet, and that the House should not set a precedent. I believe that every project of this type should be considered on its own respective merits and that all seaports should be adequate for their commercial needs.

I think it would be advisable to acquaint the House with some of the background relating to this port project.

It has been 17 years since Congress last authorized a dredging project for

Portland Harbor. On April 25, 1961, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, after a thorough survey of conditions, reported that Portland Harbor "is inadequate for present and prospective commerce," and recommended modifications providing for an entrance channel 1,000 feet wide and 45 feet deep, instead of the present 35 feet, and a maneuvering basin and anchorage 45 feet deep instead of the present 35 feet. The cost was estimated at $8,368,000 and they assessed the benefit-cost ratio at 6 to 1. The 87th Congress included in the Public Works Appropriations Act for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, the sum of $550,000 for preconstruction engineering and to initiate dredging. The preconstruction planning has been completed.

The State of Maine was once among the most influential of all maritime States. We have the potential, the will and the desire for this to be our lot again. Maine is currently making a determined effort to find new markets for Maine-manufactured goods as well as agricultural and fisheries products throughout the world.

The port of Portland in a very real sense is the principal artery for ocean-borne traffic in the heavily populated area of Maine. Portland is one of the most important commercial ports in the country, ranking second among New England ports. It is the second largest petroleum port in the United States, and possibilities for expansion are excellent.

Portland Harbor is an ice-free land-locked port, about 100 miles northeast of Boston. It is served by three railroads. It has 11 berths for deep-draft cargo ships, 8 available berths for deep-draft tankers, covered storage area for 75,000 tons, and ground storage for 2,272 carloads. The city of Portland is Maine's largest city, serving a retail trade area of 250,000 people.

Shipping through the port of Portland during 1962 contributed over $20 million, on a conservative estimate, to the economy of the State. Eleven million tons of crude oil from South America and the Near East was transshipped by pipeline to Montreal, Canada. Four million tons of refined oil mostly from other U.S. ports was received. Also arriving at the port was 56,745 tons of China clay, 182,721 tons of coal, and 39,849 tons of woodpulp. An average of 400,000 tons of dry cargo are moved through the port each year.

As indicated, the principal commodity is crude oil. The operation and maintenance of the pipelines and terminal is estimated to cost $4,200,000 per year and provides jobs for a great many Maine people. Federal, State, and local taxes boost this amount to $6 million per year. The value to the Portland area from servicing and supplying vessels and other incidental expenses averages between $2 and $3 million annually.

The dependence upon crude oil traffic is the major source of revenue for tugboats operating out of this port. If it were not for this assured revenue, they could not provide the vital service to other ports such as Bath—home of Bath Iron Works where many Navy destroyers are built—the Harpswell Navy Base, and Cousins Island. Most, if not all, other port services depend upon this crude oil tonnage.

A glance at a map of the northern part of this hemisphere, and a recollection of history illustrates the importance of the port of Portland in time of war. It is in the vital interest of the United States to have an ice-free, deepwater, sheltered port in the northeastern part of our country.

The expansion of commerce in Portland Harbor is restricted because of relatively shallow rock ledges in the main entrance channel. When a ship drawing 35 feet approaches the harbor 2 hours before low tide, it cannot enter. At least a 4-hour delay is necessary. If there are ocean swells, the time may be longer.

It is impossible for the larger tankers of the 60,000- to 65,000-deadweight-ton class with drafts of 42 to 44 feet to navigate this harbor.

Large tankers of the 40,000- to 47,000-deadweight-ton class—up to 750 feet in length—do presently use the harbor, but only under the most favorable conditions.

It should be borne in mind that when a ship is underway, the bow lifts and the stern sinks deeper into the water. This adds to a vessel's draft. If the vessel is loaded unevenly, this must be taken into consideration, and ocean swells are another factor when considering if a harbor channel is of sufficient depth.

With the trend rapidly developing toward larger and more efficient tankers, the requirement for a 45-foot entrance channel and anchorage is urgent.

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers has reported that these recommended improvements would result in "considerable annual benefits" from existing and prospective commerce. They pointed out that benefits to the general economy of Portland and the area it serves would be "significant."

It is my sincere hope that the Appropriations Committee will, in future deliberations, see fit to review the matter of the ultimate depth and agree with the findings of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

---

## TO PROHIBIT EXPORT-IMPORT BANK GUARANTEES ON CREDITS TO COMMUNIST COUNTRIES

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] 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. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced a bill which would prohibit the Export-Import Bank, or any other Government agency, from guaranteeing the payment of any obligation of a Communist country, or agency or national of that country. This bill is identical to S. 2310, previously introduced by Senator KARL E. MUNDT, of South Dakota, in the Senate. I am happy to join with the distinguished Senator and my Republican colleague from South Dakota in moving to check what could turn out to be a very bad beating for the American taxpayer.

During this session of the 88th Congress, as a member of the House Banking and Currency Committee, I participated as a House conferee on a bill to extend the life of the Export-Import Bank. A strong stand by the House prevented the inclusion of an unwarranted $2 billion cushion for the Bank which would have been financed through the direct Treasury borrowing method known as backdoor spending. Instead, the Senate accepted a proposal that I had originally proposed in the first conference to extend the Bank's charter for 5 years, and increase the authorization for credit insurance.

At that time, whatever our differences in approach to spending procedures, neither the House nor Senate conferees had any inkling that the new credit insurance authorization would be used to insure credit for export deals to Communist countries, as now contemplated by this administration. If I had thought this possible at the time, I would have offered this legislative proposal long ago to prevent the Export-Import Bank from ruining its otherwise excellent record of achievement.

The Kennedy administration is well aware that the law prevents the extension of direct loans to Communist countries. This congressional judgment has been based not only on the fact that the Soviet Union has declared itself an enemy of the United States and the free world, but also on the practical fact that the Communist regime has no credit rating in the eyes of Americans who have never received payments or returns on lend-lease items, to name just one factor. As any housewife knows, however, there is more than one way, and one word, to describe a loan.

In this case, credit is to be extended for 18 months on 75 percent of the purchase price for any wheat or other grain sold to Communist countries, and that credit is to be insured by the Export-Import Bank. We are told that commercial bankers are unwilling to extend the credit unless it is guaranteed in full by the Bank. At no time in the past has the Bank ever insured credit for a Communist country, and there is only one instance, with respect to a cotton shipment to Japan last July, when the Bank was supposedly not operating as you may remember, that a full credit guarantee was given. The difference between guaranteeing credit to a democratic nation, an American ally, as against the same guarantee when dealing with an unscrupulous Communist state hardly needs to be pointed out.

We are told that wheat to Russia, or grain to Hungary, is a one-shot deal, the result of their crop failures and not expected to occur again. If this is so, and no further trade is to be expected, why should we expect the Communists to honor their credit obligations? The recent blockade of American and British trucks on the autobahn in Germany, and the arrest of an American professor on

spy charges in Moscow is indicative of how deep the "thaw" is between East and West. In fact, at a recent Moscow reception, our Ambassador to Russia heard so many anti-Western toasts that he was driven to ask what had become of the spirit of Moscow. If it goes the way of the spirit of Geneva, it will be the American taxpayer who will pay for the wheat the Russian soldier eats. That is the significance of any insured credit risk for the Communist countries through the Export-Import Bank.

Mr. Speaker, the bill submitted by Senator MUNDT is scheduled for hearings before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee tomorrow. The Democratic leadership in that body has promised to bring it to the floor for a vote next Monday. Under these circumstances, I have sent a letter to the chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee, the gentleman from Texas, Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN, urging him to call similar hearings on the House side. Surely, the Members of this body deserve an equal chance to express their opinions on this legislation. My bill provides the vehicle for just such an examination by this committee and I cannot imagine any reason for delaying affirmative action on my request. I would hope that the bipartisan spirit shown by the leaders of the Senate would extend to this side of Capitol Hill as well.

A copy of the bill follows:

H.R. 9144

A bill to prohibit any guaranty by the Export-Import Bank or any other agency of the Government of payment of obligations of Communist countries

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That neither the Export-Import Bank nor any other agency of the Government shall guarantee the payment of any obligation heretofore or hereafter incurred by any Communist country (as defined in section 620(f) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961) or any agency or national thereof, or in any other way participate in the extension of credit to any such country, agency, or national, in connection with the purchase of any product by such country, agency, or national.

---

## LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. KYL] 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. KYL. Mr. Speaker, 10 days ago Dr. Edward C. Crafts, Director of the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, Department of the Interior, addressed the annual meeting of the National Audubon Society in Miami, Fla., on the subject of the need for a national land and water conservation fund. Dr. Crafts' remarks were so informative and so pertinent to a bill, H.R. 3846, just reported by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs that I commend it to all Members of the House for reading and study.

The address follows:

NEED FOR LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND

(Remarks of Edward C. Crafts, Director, Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, Department of the Interior, before the annual meeting of the National Audubon Society, Miami, Fla., November 11, 1963)

This is my first trip to southern Florida. It is also the first time I have been privileged to attend an annual meeting of the National Audubon Society. I have heard how successful your meeting was a year ago at Corpus Christi, and am honored to have been offered a chance to speak to you here today.

With its annual budget of over $1 million, membership in excess of 40,000, junior membership numbering in the millions, its several publications, its nature centers, camps, lectures, educational programs, and wildlife tours, I am well aware of your broad conservation objectives and that the National Audubon Society is the largest of the national conservation organizations. Further, the unusually large membership of women in the Audubon Society contributes to its uniqueness and effectiveness.

Earlier in this program, you were addressed by my friend and boss, the Secretary of the Interior. I have no intention of trying to match his eloquence. But we are approaching the moment of truth on some of the hard-rock issues of the day, and there are certain things that I want to say to you. I say these in the hope that I am speaking not only to those of you here today in person, but also to your membership at large and to other conservationists throughout the country.

In recent years, particularly in the last two decades, there has been a great rush to the outdoors. I could quote you statistics as to the dollars spent, investments made, numbers of people participating, activities that are favored, and so on. You may not know these figures, but you are part of this rush. All you have to do is look around on all sides to see it happening.

The cultural and sociological implications have been analyzed by professionals and by foundations, and in such books as the 20th Century publication, "Of Time, Work, and Leisure," Walter Kerr's "The Decline of Pleasure," and Charles Brightbill's "The Challenge of Leisure." The reasons are generally well known. There are more people, more free time, more money, more automobiles and better roads.

In recognition of these changes, the Congress a few years ago established an Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission. In due time there was issued an impressive series of reports with numerous recommendations. The report of this bipartisan Commission, headed by Laurance Rockefeller, has been widely heralded and applauded.

One of its recommendations was the creation of a small, new Federal agency to promote coordination among Federal agencies; to serve as a focal point of contact between the Federal Government and State and local governments, and the private sector; to develop an overall, long-range outdoor recreation plan; and to assist in research and education.

The Bureau of Outdoor Recreation was thus established by the Secretary of the Interior and within the past few months has been given a charter by the Congress in the passage of an Organic Act, which recognizes the functions of coordination, planning, research, education, technical assistance, and cooperation with State and local governments and private parties.

The Congress in the initial section of that act:

"Declares it to be desirable that all American people of present and future generations be assured adequate outdoor recreation resources, and that it is desirable for all levels of government and private interests to take prompt and coordinated action to the extent practicable without diminishing or affecting their respective powers and functions to conserve, develop, and utilize such resources for the benefit and enjoyment of the American people."

I think few would disagree with this congressional statement of policy. It is the one that controls the fundamental philosophies of this Bureau. It is in harmony with the numerous statements about programs and objectives made before other groups in the past year and a half.

May I underscore particularly that we believe the States should play the key role in intergovernmental relations. We also recognize that the greatest contribution to outdoor recreation now is supplied, and probably in the future will continue to be supplied, by the private sector.

There are certain things we have done, as well as certain knowledge we have gained from experience, during the last year and a half that may be of interest to you.

There is a major problem of effective communication between professionals and laymen consumers of outdoor recreation. It is hard for the professionals to get across to the laymen the scope of their frustrations when their programs or requests for funds are being cut to ribbons, or when they are being knifed by competitors for limited land or water resources. Too many laymen naively think that everyone is for the outdoors, just as they are for motherhood and against sin.

Along the same line, until recent years, most State governments were indifferent toward the burgeoning needs for outdoor recreation. Those who sought recognition of public responsibility in this field were at the bottom of the totem pole; and general quality of workers in this field and salaries paid were both too low.

I have learned that both the recreation worker and the recreation enthusiast are not effectively organized to make their views known where policy is made. Frequently, they are in disagreement or in competition with each other and, thus, often their efforts are ineffectual. A classic example is competition between winter sports enthusiasts and wilderness lovers for the same area. Also where a man's pocketbook and business are concerned, he will fight harder than where his free time or vacation is involved.

It is a fact of life that public agencies must compete for dollars and that recreation is competing against funds needed for defense, for education, for space exploration, for foreign aid, and other activities that are established responsibilities of Government and generally considered of higher priority.

One of the most basic problems is that a proper proportion—whatever that may be—of land and water resources should be devoted to outdoor recreation. This puts the recreationist in direct competition with others who utilize the same resources for commercial or economic purposes. Problems of balance, of multiple use, primary use, and of the allocation of resources close to centers of population as well as problems of public versus private responsibilities and opportunities are among the most difficult ones that we face.

Admittedly, I am not impartial. But, I think the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation has done reasonably well under the circumstances confronting it in the first 18 months of its existence. We were not fortunate enough to light running with money already available, with a statute enacted recognizing the Bureau, or with hiring preference to enable us to attract superior personnel.

We had to pick ourselves up by the bootstraps so to speak and get the money, persuade the Congress to enact legislation, and to hire competitively with old-line established agencies. Fortunately, the challenge of the first new conservation organization in

the Federal Government since the 1930's helped us obtain competent personnel with a variety of disciplines and experience backgrounds.

It has been our good fortune to have a policy role in numerous studies that are being made of special situations or areas. Almost without exception, these are controversial. They include proposals for Fire Island, Assateague, and Oregon Dunes National Seashores; an Allagash National Riverway in Maine; a nationwide study of wild rivers, which must consider questions of the utilization or control of water for irrigation, power, or flood control; the study of the North Cascade Mountains in Washington; a nationwide review of a possible system of scenic roads; and numerous others.

I have also learned that recreationists are sometimes their own worst enemy. I am for a wilderness bill, probably as much as anyone here. I helped prepare some of the earlier drafts, and have testified three times on behalf of wilderness legislation when I was in the Forest Service. But I say to you that the frustrations of the proponents should not lead to personal attacks upon Members of the Congress. The most recent example is the reference to the chairman of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in the November 1963 issue of Field and Stream. The derogatory remarks in that article are completely out of order, and I do not wish to repeat them.

The chairman is a proud and sensitive man. He is a good legislator and like most of us, he does what is right as he sees it. He has done much for conservation and is seeking to do much more. Attacks of this sort serve no good. If they have any result, it is only to lessen and delay chances of enactment of a wilderness bill. As far as I am concerned, they are both unwarranted and sheer folly.

But despite the progress that has been made, the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation can be only half an arm until the land and water conservation fund bill is enacted. Until that time, we cannot give the service to the States and local governments that was contemplated in the grants-in-aid recommendations of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission.

Enactment of this bill is absolutely essential to effective progress by State and local governments and the Federal Government in outdoor recreation.

The bill, because it is long and complex, has not been widely understood. Opposition has sprung up to it, misstatements are being made about it, and it is approaching the hour of decision.

It was introduced by 16 Senators and 11 Congressmen, including 2 from Florida. It is listed in the box score of the New York Times as one of 12 major bills in the Congress; it is similarly listed in the box scores of major bills in the Congressional Quarterly.

The bill was developed after extensive discussion with key State officials from about one-half the States; with conservation, fish, and wildlife, recreation and industrial groups; and with numerous Federal agencies. It is pioneering conservation legislation.

There are three basic premises behind the bill:

1. The first is that States must occupy the key role in developing a balanced national outdoor recreation program.

2. The second is that (a) a substantial acreage of land needs to be acquired by public agencies in order to make it possible to meet future recreation needs, and (b) this acquisition needs to occur promptly before such lands become either unavailable for recreation because of commitments to other uses or prohibitively expensive.

3. The third is that acquisition should be financed with as little impact as possible on the Federal budget and, as a corollary, that recreationists—the direct beneficiaries—should pay a reasonable portion of these costs.

The bill sets up a conservation fund which will be used mostly by the States, partly by the Federal Government. The States will use their share on a 50–50 matching basis for planning, development, and acquisition of outdoor recreation facilities and areas. There is also a provision that Federal aid may be available to counties and local governments if their proposals are included in a statewide outdoor recreation plan.

The Federal agencies—Park Service, Forest Service, Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, and the water development agencies—will use their share mainly for acquisition of outdoor recreation areas, and as a partial offset to capital costs allocated to recreation at reservoir projects.

The moneys going into the fund will come from user, entrance or admission fees to Federal areas under certain conditions, from a fuel tax now paid on gasoline used in motorboats which currently goes into the highway fund, income from the sale of surplus Federal real property, and advance appropriations, which are to be paid back from the fund over a period of time.

Of particular interest to this group is a provision of the bill that a portion of the Federal funds may be used for areas authorized for preservation of fish and wildlife species threatened with extinction. We know that since the settlement of this country, over 20 species of birds and 17 species of mammals have became extinct.

You can see from what I have said how essential this bill is to State programs. Many States are gearing up in the expectation of its enactment and availability of Federal funding through the grant-in-aid program. Just this week, Florida, Pennsylvania, and Ohio voted on bond issues to help finance State recreation programs. Washington and California will vote a year hence. Eleven States now have voted bond issues. Four others have them under consideration.

The Governors of several States, including Florida, Washington, New Mexico, Illinois, California, and so on, recognize the furtherance of tourism and the development of adequate outdoor recreation facilities as a key element in their administration.

Both the House and Senate committees have completed hearings. The House committee has ordered the bill reported, but only after much discussion and considerable division of opinion. Some 46 States, either through their Governors or other key officials, are on record as favoring the bill, as are 11 major recreation organizations, 16 labor organizations, and an equal number of other groups. A representative of the National Audubon Society testified at the Senate hearings, but your organization did not go on record before the House committee. Frankly, I would have expected the Audubon Society to be in the forefront of organizations supporting this legislation.

Within the past week, the President, Secretary of the Army Vance, and Secretary of Agriculture Freeman have all written the chairman reiterating their support of the bill and endorsing it in the form in which it was ordered reported by the House committee. This should clear up any question as to position of the administration, possible opposition of the Corps of Engineers or agencies of the Department of Agriculture.

Yet, the bill is running into trouble. Why? Because of misunderstandings, misstatements, half truths, and untruths that are being circulated about it. Most of these revolve about the question of fees to be charged, and the use of income from the sale of surplus Federal real property.

Let me state categorically that contrary to statements that have been made, this is not a proposal to levy any new taxes, to make moneys automatically available without going through normal appropriations processes, nor to authorize large-scale Federal acquisition. The bill does not levy any new taxes. It simply switches a present tax from the highway trust fund to the proposed conservation fund. The bill makes no moneys available except as recommended by the Appropriations Committees and enacted by the Congress in the annual appropriations act, and it contains no new authorization for acquisition of any Federal property.

What it does do is establish a fund, the availability of which is subject to appropriation. As such moneys are made available, the Federal portion may be used for certain acquisitions that may be authorized by other acts of Congress.

Most of the fee questions that are being raised relate to general entrance or admission charges and particularly their applicability to water areas.

In contrast, there apparently is very little objection and general acceptance of the proposal in the bill to authorize specific recreation user fees for particular facilities or services provided by the United States.

With respect to entrance and admission fees, there are numerous limitations and restrictions in the House reported bill, including the following:

1. Such fees may be charged only at land or water areas administered primarily for scenic, scientific, historic, cultural, recreational, or wilderness purposes. This would appear to prohibit entrance or admission fees at water reservoirs administered primarily for flood control, power, or irrigation. Thus, the numerous questions that are raised with respect to Corps of Engineers reservoirs in Oklahoma or other States, appear to have little basis.

2. Entrance or admission fees may not be charged except where (a) the area is administered by a Federal agency, and (b) where recreation facilities or services are provided at Federal expense. This limitation takes care of situations where Federal areas are under lease to States, local public agencies, or private concessionaires, and are administered not by the Federal Government, but by State or county governments or private parties.

3. No fee of any kind (entrance or user) shall be charged for nonrecreational use of water reservoirs, canals, or waterways that are units in a Federal navigation system. This is double protection for those who are concerned about fees being charged on Federal reservoirs or waterways.

4. Nothing in the section on fees shall authorize Federal hunting or fishing licenses, or fees or charges for commercial or other activities not related to recreation. This takes care of sportsmen who have been concerned that the bill would in effect impose a Federal fishing and hunting license over and above present State licenses.

5. No fee (entrance or user) shall be charged for travel by private-noncommercial vehicle over any national parkway or road that is part of the Federal aid system and is commonly used by the public as a means of travel between two places, any or both of which are outside of the area involved. This takes care of most families which wish to take a Sunday drive to view the scenery as well as parties wishing to travel from town A to town B through a national forest or a large tract of public-domain land.

6. No fee (entrance or user) shall be charged for travel by private-noncommercial vehicle to land to which a person has a property right if the land is located within the designated charge area. This takes care of the situation where a person owns private land inside a national forest or a national park and needs to travel over a road to obtain access to and from such private property.

7. Where more than half of the lands in a designated charge area have been acquired by donation from the State, no special

entrance fees may become effective until there has been consultation with the Governor of such State and consideration of his views.

Despite these very clear limitations, questions are being raised about the king's forest and about a czar to regulate travel. There have been headlines about a "New tax to levy fee to sniff flowers, listen to birds."

A letter of October 29 issued by the president of the National Waterways Conference makes numerous unfounded charges and says the bill should be killed.

Because of the numerous limitations on fees, the very natural question arises as to under what circumstances could entrance and admission fees apply. The great bulk of Federal lands would not be subjected to entrance or admission fees, nor would they be charged for most of the Federal reservoirs or riverways.

Within the restrictions described, an annual entrance or admission fee per private noncommercial automobile could be assessed which would be good for a year and to all areas designated by the President as being within the coverage of the fee. This would mean that entrance fees could be levied for the national parks, as has been done for years, and for certain specific areas within the national forest system, wildlife refuges, and other Federal lands and waters where three conditions occur concurrently: (1) special facilities are provided at Federal expense for recreation, (2) the administration is directed by a Federal agency, and (3) the primary purpose of administration is for recreation, scenic, wilderness or related purposes. There is a further requirement that designated areas subject to a fee or charge shall be clearly posted.

Through the use of a single admission fee good for all designated areas, many individuals and families would save considerable money in the course of a year as compared to the present system of a series of individual entrance or admission fees for many of our national parks and recreation areas.

In view of all the questions that have been raised about fees for recreational use of Federal resources it is worth noting that at least 17 States now make an entrance charge to their State parks and at least 42 States impose user fees for services and facilities at such parks and other recreation areas. Several Canadian Provinces make similar recreation charges.

There is also a provision in the bill that proceeds from the sale of surplus Federal real property shall be credited to the Land and Water Conservation Fund. This provision likewise is being criticized as unwise.

The proposal here is in effect an exchange of real property no longer needed by the Federal Government for other lands to meet a rapidly growing public need. This is not taking a capital investment and dissipating it to another use. On the contrary, it is a conversion and reinvestment of funds received from the sale of real estate no longer needed to an appreciating capital asset; namely, lands needed for outdoor recreation.

There is nothing in the bill that changes the procedures for disposal of surplus property in any way. There is nothing in it that would affect existing laws and regulations regarding disposal of surplus property to schools, churches, hospitals, States or their political subdivisions. The bill does not deal with procedures for disposal, but only with the use of income from disposals that are made.

I could go on and give you additional details, but I think this is not needed. There is strong support for this bill. The conservation organizations are well organized behind it. The Citizens Committee for Natural Resources, with Ira Gabrielson as its chairman, is waging an all-out effort in support of the legislation. So are numerous other conservation and recreation groups. The Citizens Committee for the ORRRC Report is doing what it can within the limitations of its charter.

I have brought with me and there is available to you a summary of the bill, a statement of the fee provisions, and some key questions and answers. I hope that I have interested you sufficiently to take the time to look at these materials which were prepared to answer numerous inquiries.

I am sure you know that within the last few weeks, Secretary Udall's new book, "The Quiet Crisis," has come off the press. In it he says:

"The land and water conservation fund proposed by President Kennedy may mark a turning point in conservation history. If the States are to provide leadership before it is too late, if the few remaining spacious seashores are to be preserved for all of the people, if wildlife values are to be permanently protected and our national park, forest, and wildlife refuge systems are to be rounded out by the addition of the remaining suitable lands, the task must begin immediately and be completed within the next three decades."

In the introduction to "The Quiet Crisis" President Kennedy has stated that:

"The race between education and erosion * * * has not run its course * * * that each generation must deal anew with the * * * tendency to prefer short-run profits to long-run necessities. The Nation's battle to preserve the common estate is far from won. * * * The crisis may be quiet, but it is urgent. We must do in our own day what Theodore Roosevelt did 60 years ago and Franklin Roosevelt 30 years ago: we must expand the concept of conservation to meet the imperious problems of the new age."

The moment of truth is upon us. I invite the members of the National Audubon Society and all conservationists everywhere to stand up and be counted.

---

## BALANCE-OF-PAYMENTS DEFICIT

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ELLSWORTH] 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. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, one of the most dangerous threats to free world security and stability lies in the deficit condition of our balance of payments. It is difficult to dramatize this situation, to bring home its meaning to the man in the street in ways that arrest his attention.

Clarence K. Streit, distinguished author and now editor of Freedom & Union, has done a brilliant, compelling article on "The Danger to the Dollar—and How To End It," which I want to share with my colleagues.

Basically, Mr. Streit's dramatic point is that a devaluation of the dollar could lead to a world depression, that France and Germany together have the power virtually to force devaluation, and that international politics being what it is today, this is well within the realm of possibility.

Streit's analysis of the situation is all the more authoritative because of his close observation of the currency debacle in 1931, which turned depression into great depression. At that time he was New York Times correspondent covering the Basel World Bank and the League of Nations in Geneva. His trenchant analysis of the current situation follows:

THE DANGER TO THE DOLLAR—
AND HOW TO END IT
(By Clarence Streit)

A foreign run on the dollar is, in my carefully considered judgment, the most dangerous threat the free face now. Though it would not kill as would atomic war, it is worse than that threat in several ways—in public unawareness of the danger, in scope of direct, immediate, ruinous effects, and in its advantages to communism. Such a run would wreck the gold exchange standard, which is tied to the dollar and on which the monetary stability and economy of the non-Communist world is based.

Current conditions are ominously similar in some basic respects to those that resulted in 1931 in the crash of the gold exchange standard and the British pound to which it was then related, though less than it is to the dollar now. The resulting devaluation of the pound turned the depression of 1929 into the great depression, in which Hitler came to power 15 months later. Most ominous in the similarities between the present situation and the one in early 1931—before the run began that May which toppled the pound in September—are these four:

SIMILARITIES WITH 1931 CRASH

1. The dollar is dangerously vulnerable as was the pound in 1931—and much more depends on it.

2. The remedies on which attention centers now, as then, are technical ones that miss the heart of the trouble.

3. Like those of 1931, political leaders now, ranging from President Kennedy to Governor Rockefeller, seem dominated by monetary experts and forget to apply to this problem and its technicians Clemenceau's dictum: "War is too important to be left to generals."

4. Worst of all, the political factor which precipitated the 1931 crash is ignored now as then and is fundamentally the same; the power politics situation is indeed startlingly similar now to the one which led certain governments to wreck, unwittingly, in 1931 the gold exchange standard in their maneuvering as regards armaments, disarmament, and the political future of Germany.

The danger that this will recur lies in the fact that the power politics situation remains the same in this basic respect: The great bulk of the gold reserves on which monetary stability in the non-Communist world depends—and which is still concentrated in the Atlantic community as in 1931—is still divided there among a few governments by national sovereignty. The figures given in the August Federal Reserve Bulletin show that 76 percent of these gold reserves are divided among the NATO governments—74 percent among eight of them. Here are the figures:

TABLE 1.—*Non-Communist world, June 1963*

[Millions of dollars]

| | |
|---|---|
| Total gold reserves | 41,565 |
| Total NATO gold reserves | 31,598 |
| United States | 15,830 |
| German Federal Republic | 3,753 |
| France | 2,814 |
| United Kingdom | 2,447 |
| Italy | 2,289 |
| Netherlands | 1,581 |
| Belgium | 1,373 |
| Canada | 755 |
| Total, above 8 NATO nations | 30,842 |

The Communist nations keep the amount of their gold reserves secret, but their total is, at best, too small a fraction of those held by Atlantica to endanger an Atlantic union

currency. The present danger to world monetary stability is—unlike the atomic danger—plainly due not to the Communists but solely to national sovereignty's division of freedom's gold reserves among the NATO allies. Practically speaking, the only foreign nations that can threaten the dollar's supremacy are seven of these allies.

The dollar's vulnerability is worsened by the fact that, under the gold exchange standard, the paper dollar is rated as being "as good as gold." The central bank reserves of practically every non-Communist nation—except of course, the United States—are composed partly of gold and partly of dollars—mostly in short-term obligations of the United States.

Among the major monetary powers of Western Europe these reserves are more in gold than in dollars. In Canada, Latin America, Asia, and Africa the national currency is most often backed more by dollars than gold.

The United States has guaranteed to convert these foreign-held dollars into gold on demand by the central bank holding them. This presented no problem in the first postwar decade. By 1958, however, these liabilities had grown to $16,159 million, while U.S. gold reserves sank to $20,582 million.

At this point another important fact must be noted, and kept in mind: U.S. law requires that $12,000 million of its gold reserve remain set aside to guarantee the domestic circulation of the dollar. Consequently, only $8,582 million of its gold stock was really available in 1958 to meet the $16,159 million liabilities abroad. Since 1958 this situation has steadily worsened. How vulnerable the dollar now is may be seen from these June 1963 figures in the August Federal Reserve Bulletin:

TABLE 2.—*June 1963 figures*

[Millions of dollars]

| | |
|---|---|
| Total foreign-held dollar liabilities of United States | 25,042 |
| Total gold held by United States | 15,830 |
| Earmarked for U.S. circulation | 12,000 |
| Available to meet foreign dollar liabilities of the United States | 3,830 |

There is no legal requirement in the United States to maintain a 25-percent reserve of gold to meet its dollar obligations to foreigners. The law does require this ratio to guarantee the dollar's domestic circulation—even though U.S. citizens cannot demand that their dollars be converted into gold. It would therefore seem prudent for the United States to maintain at least this 25-percent ratio of gold behind the dollar's external circulation, especially since foreign central banks do have the right to demand gold for their dollars. The Federal Reserve Bulletin does not report what the ratio of U.S. gold available to meet foreign demand is each year, but these ratios can be computed from the absolute figures it gave in August. Here they are for 1958 and 1963:

*Table 3*

| | *Percent* |
|---|---|
| Percentage of U.S. gold available to guarantee its foreign dollar liabilities: | |
| In 1958 | 54 |
| In 1963 | 11 |
| Percentage of gold to dollars legally required to guarantee U.S. circulation | 25 |

Despite the fact that confidence in the dollar abroad is now assured by less than half the ratio of gold reserves legally required to guarantee the domestic dollar, monetary experts—and the statesmen who share their view that this is a purely monetary problem—profess confidence that this will precipitate no run on the dollar. They point out that the central banks which could theoretically start such a run are too aware of the ultimately disastrous consequences for their own economy and currency to start anything so suicidal.

I agree that this is no doubt true—insofar as purely monetary considerations and authorities are concerned. But to me the danger lies in the political factor, which they ignore—at least in practically all public discussion. Since this factor precipitated the run that wrecked the gold exchange standard in 1931, let us turn now to it.

The October Freedom & Union reprinted a play-by-play account, published in the original unabridged edition of Union Now in 1939, of how power politics among the Atlantic nations led to that disaster then. To sum it up briefly:

The Atlantic powers, especially Germany and France, were then in a diplomatic struggle to increase or maintain their ratio of armed power—the key factor for national sovereignty. The Versailles Treaty had disarmed Germany, but the League Covenant had pledged that the victors would reduce their own arms "to the lowest point consistent with national safety." When 1931 began Germany had vainly sought for 12 years to get this commitment carried out—and thus improve its power position. On January 23, 1931, I reported in the New York Times from Geneva that the League Council had finally convoked the World Disarmament Conference to meet February 2, 1932. In February 1931 the British succeeded in bringing the French and Italians into the armaments limitation treaty it had signed with the United States and Japan in London in 1930. Berlin suspected with some reason, that one purpose behind this was to isolate Germany in the coming world conference, and that "the hope of real land disarmament [had been] sacrificed to France by Britain and Italy in order to safeguard their naval interests," and keep Germany down.

A little before the Franco-Italian accord was ready to be signed, Germany struck back with an economic arm; it announced on March 22 that it had formed a customs union with Austria. This was in defiance of the Versailles Treaty, with political implications which the French and Little Entente could not accept—the less so after Berlin thereby succeeded in killing the naval agreement. They sought in turn to kill the customs union with their monetary arm; they exploited the financial difficulties of the Vienna Creditanstalt Bank in order to force Austria to desist. They did not intend to wreck the gold exchange standard, but this diplomatic maneuver got out of hand. Thus began in mid-May the run on the Austrian schilling that led to the pound's devaluation 4 months later, and that of the dollar in 1933.

Now, 32 years later, it is President de Gaulle who feels that the United States seeks to keep France in an inferior role by excluding it from atomic armaments, and also by getting Washington's special ally, Britain, included in the Common Market so that it can advance Anglo-American purposes within today's custom union. Now France is determined to achieve parity with Britain in atomic arms—as Germany was in 1931 to achieve it with France in land armaments—while the United States and the United Kingdom seek to block France now as France sought to block Germany in 1931 * * * all four still move by the same national sovereignty motives.

Result: France has blocked all the efforts of the United States to prevent (from its standpoint) any proliferation of nuclear weapons. From the standpoint of Gen. de Gaulle and many Europeans, these efforts really aim at assuring that the United States will continue to monopolize atomic power in the West and keep its European allies from having any effective voice in its use of this power.

PARIS FEARS RUSSO-UNITED STATES DEAL

In the maneuvering for the diplomatic power which a nation gets from arms and allies, President de Gaulle has also defied the Anglo-Saxons—as he calls the Anglo-Americans—by vetoing British entry in the Common Market, and by negotiating the political pact which has made Bonn the uneasy special ally of Paris. To this pact several other factors contributed, notably (1) mutual comprehension, after two World Wars, of the necessity of Franco-German reconciliation; (2) mutual desire by two governments, proud of their country's important past role in history, to reassert themselves; (3) mutual confidence born of the strength gained through the Common Market; and (4) longstanding mutual fear that the United States and Soviet Russia might one day make a deal to the detriment of Franco-German policy as regards Berlin and other of their national interests.

These fears have been strengthened by a series of events since August 1962. The United States would not risk its cities then in atomic war to stop the building of the wall in Berlin, as Paris and Bonn were willing to gamble theirs—but it ran this risk in October over Cuba. There Washington decided its national interest required this—without giving its European allies any real voice, though their cities and lives were endangered by its decision.

The direct communications between Washington and Moscow that occurred during the Cuban crisis left the allies (as well as the U.S. public) in the dark. They were followed by evidence—to the already suspicious, at least—of a secret deal, balancing the uninspected removal of Russian missiles with a U.S. wink at the continuance of Russian troops in Cuba and removal of its own missile bases in Turkey. Thereafter came the establishment of the "hot line" between Washington and Moscow—permanent, direct, secret communication between the Kremlin dictator and the American President—with no equivalent speeding of U.S. communications with our major European allies, as the Republican House Committee on NATO Unity pointed out.

In this atmosphere came the negotiations of the test ban treaty by the "Anglo-Saxon" atomic powers with Moscow. President de Gaulle promptly attacked it. To him it aimed at preserving the American-British-Soviet atomic monopoly by leaving France the choice of either abandoning its atomic effort, or continuing it under the handicap of being morally isolated (with Red China) from the hundred or so nations that have signed the treaty. He chose the latter course.

Inextricably mixed with these political and armaments factors are the economic and monetary sides of national sovereignty. They played an important if secondary role in precipitating the 1931 run—but a major role in speeding the debacle thereafter. What is the situation now?

The chronic U.S. gold drain, resulting from the continued U.S. balance-of-payments deficit, and the relative stagnancy of the U.S. economy, have added urgency to Washington's need to expand its agricultural and other exports in Europe. Meanwhile the economic strength the Common Market has brought its six nations has made it harder for Washington to deal with them. The hopes Washington placed in its Trade Expansion Act were chilling even before the De Gaulle veto of British entry in the Common Market left them icebound.

The "chicken war" that followed concerns an export of less economic than political importance to the United States.

On the European side, France is the most important agricultural member of the Common Market. Its farmers are unhappy, as

are those in the United States. It has powerful incentives to make the most of the Common Market and reduce imports there from the United States and others.

Moreover, all the major Common Market nations are facing serious inflationary pressures. Between 1959 and the end of the first quarter of 1963, the Washington Post reports, consumer prices rose in France 16.3 percent, in Italy 13.7 percent, in Germany 11.1 percent, but only 4.6 percent in the United States. This has now led the French and Italian Governments to take countermeasures, which the Post hopefully concludes "may ultimately rebound to the benefit" of U.S. exports. I fear the inflationary danger will hurt the dollar.

Jacques Rueff, the leading French monetary authority, has long maintained that the current European inflation is the inevitable result of the gold exchange standard. A veteran of its 1931 debacle, he drew a parallel, in an important article 2 years ago, between the inflationary situation preceding it and the current one in Europe. He has warned of the danger of that standard crashing again from economic and monetary causes.

Mr. Rueff has long advised that the way for a country to avoid the inflationary effects of the gold exchange standard is to convert to gold all the dollar portion of its central bank reserves. He would have the gold exchange standard replaced by the old gold standard. The U.S. Treasury strongly opposes this, as do other experts. Mr. Rueff is keenly aware of the danger to the dollar, and hence to Western monetary stability, in any substantial conversion of foreign dollar assets into gold. He urged in 1961 that an international conference be called to solve the problem in a safe and sane way, to avoid the danger of a panic destroying the gold exchange standard again.

Having known Mr. Rueff many years, I feel sure that he can be counted on to throw his great influence in Paris against any move that would risk plunging Atlantica into another great depression. Since he masterminded the successful restoration of the franc after President De Gaulle returned to power in 1958, he should have particular weight with the general, even though he is no longer in the Government.

There is this difficulty, however. The general does not have Mr. Rueff's deep understanding of economics and finance, nor does he attach to them as high importance as Mr. Rueff does. To me, President De Gaulle is one of the truly great statesmen of our time, but his greatness—apart from his character and writing—lies in his work in the fields he knows best and to which he attaches the most importance, the political and military arms of national sovereignty. Too much concentration on these, combined with not enough respect for economic matters or enough understanding of the causes and consequences of a world monetary crash, could be dangerous to the dollar in present conditions.

Perception of this danger grows when one considers the psychological effects of the recent conflicts and maneuvers in the interlocking political, military and economic factors of Atlantic power politics. Suspicion and bitterness have mounted in both camps, most of all between Paris and Washington. Each seems to have lost its sense of fairness and objectivity. Pride and prejudice help keep either from taking the first step toward understanding the opposing point of view—putting one's self honestly in the other's shoes. Franco-American distrust seems to me as bad now as was the mutual distrust between Berlin and Paris in 1931, which I saw contribute so heavily to the crash then.

In these circumstances, it would seem wise to turn to another phase of the situation which is strangely neglected in current public discussions of the dollar's vulnerability. How strong are the monetary arms that Paris and Bonn hold in the diplomatic maneuvering over atomic arms and East Germany?

The danger to the dollar lies in the U.S. short-term obligations to foreigners which it must convert into gold on demand. How much of these are held by our NATO allies as a whole, and by Paris and Bonn in particular?

The August Federal Reserve Bulletin reported that in June the total of these short-term dollar obligations held by all foreign countries—after deducting those held by the International Monetary Fund and other international organizations—was $20,983 million. The Bulletin does not give the total for the NATO nations, but by adding the individual figures, one finds that in June they held $11,749 million, or 56 percent of the total. As for the present power of the Paris-Bonn axis in relation to the dollar, here are the Bulletin figures:

TABLE 4.—*Dollar obligations, convertible into U.S. gold—June 1963*

| | *Million* |
|---|---|
| Held by France | $1,718 |
| Held by German Republic | 2,709 |
| Total, Paris-Bonn | 4,427 |
| U.S. gold available to meet such demand [1] | 3,830 |
| U.S. deficit | 597 |

[1] After deduction of $12 billion earmarked for U.S. internal currency.

Paris and Bonn thus together now hold the power to force the dollar to devaluate (a power they have held for some time). To imperil thus the U.S. economy, and the world's, they need only exercise their right to turn their dollars into gold—if they are willing to risk the consequences.

As an American, who not so long ago was a monetary policymaker, said to me recently when I discussed this with him: "They could ruin us, either of them." He did not believe either would take so "suicidal" a step, but the fact remains that either is in position to do this. For if either began to convert even a substantial amount of their dollars into gold, other governments would infer that Atlantic power politics had reached the tough stage where they had better convert their dollars into gold before the United States devalued, or declared an embargo. And the run would be on.

The financial and economic effects of even an incipient run on the dollar could be accelerated and magnified by another factor to which too little attention is being paid—the amount of U.S. corporate securities owned abroad. By the latest official estimate, the total at the end of 1962 was $10.3 billion, of which $7.7 billion was held in Europe and $1.1 billion in Canada. Fear of a run on the dollar would give the owners of these securities strong incentive to try to sell them before any U.S. devaluation, or embargo. This would accelerate a fall in Wall Street.

It should be noted, however, that the source of the above figures, the Department of Commerce Survey of Current Business, August 1963, also puts the total of foreign corporate securities held in the United States at the end of 1962 at $5.4 billion. These figures do not include a much greater offsetting factor, direct investments; the total at the end of 1962 given for those of the United States abroad was $37 billion, with $7.6 billion of foreign direct investments in the United States. The fact that the United States holds these powerful arms helps deter a run. But once a run began and the United States fought back with them, the nations thus endangered would not lack means of reprisal. Such a fight would profit only communism in the end.

Let us note another reassuring fact: not only is it highly unlikely that any non-Communist government would deliberately aim to wreck the dollar, but the area where Franco-American cooperation has remained best is the monetary one. As late as July 10 Edwin L. Dale, Jr., the very able correspondent of the New York Times, cabled from Paris:

"The French Government decided today to repay in advance more than $200 million of its foreign debt, the great bulk of it to the United States. The repayment * * * will help the U.S. balance of payments and cut American gold losses. Today's decision is further evidence that France, despite her sharp differences with the United States on political and defense matters, intends to continue her role in the many-sided international cooperative effort on the monetary front.

"France for several years has had the world's largest surplus in her balance of payments, which is reflected in a rapid build-up of her holdings in dollars. These dollars can be used to buy gold in the United States and some have been. To the extent that they are used to repay debt in advance, they are not converted into gold. Thus the U.S. gold loss is reduced." [1]

Even so, the belief that the dollar will remain safe because its fall would bring disaster to all is as open to doubt as similar reasoning that "the balance of terror" will preserve peace. I recall reading in editorials of 1914 that the destructiveness of the new "high explosive shells" would prevent war then. I also read editorials in the late 1930's that the poison gas "balance of terror" would prevent World War II. The belief that this balance will prevent atomic war now is even more widespread, but it did not keep the world from that brink only a year ago in Cuba.

There remains the fact that catastrophe can occur on the monetary as well as the atomic front of power politics, without its being intended. In 1931 both Germany and France had painful recent memories of the miseries of postwar depreciation of the mark and franc—very powerful incentive to preserve the gold standard which had restored them to financial health. Had either government dreamed that their disarmament maneuvering in early 1931 would wreck that standard, I am convinced neither would have made even the relatively minor moves they actually made in Austria.[2] But Paris and Berlin believed they were playing with cards, not with monetary fire. It was the old story of the little campfire the hunters started only to warm themselves, and which set the dry forest ablaze while they slept and destroyed them along with the woods.

In present conditions the temptation for President de Gaulle to play with monetary fire is—despite the strong misgivings of his German partner—already great, and will very probably grow. For one thing, the contrast between the situation in the United States and in France before he came to power in 1958, and the situation now has served to give him a confidence in his own judgment in the monetary-economic area he lacked before. In 1957 the French economy and franc were in a sad state, while the dollar was riding high. Now, after 5½ years of his regime, his franc is back to the pre-World

[1] In 1962 France had already helped the dollar in this way by repaying in advance $470 million of its debt to the United States. Further such help is, however, limited, since only $600 million of the French foreign debt remain outstanding.

[2] After the consequences caused even the United States to abandon gold in early 1933, France ardently led the vain fight at the London Monetary Conference later that year for restoration of the gold exchange standard.

War I ratio of roughly five to the dollar and is riding high while the dollar has become vulnerable. In those few years the reserves behind the franc have more than quadrupled, despite the Algerian war burden, while the gold behind the dollar has sunk from $22,-857 to $15,830 million—almost a third. It is France that is now annually leading the world in balance-of-payments surplus, and the United States that is in chronic deficit. After only 4 years as President, General de Gaulle was helping—at Washington's request—to keep the dollar stable by repaying in advance money his predecessors had borrowed from the United States to check the franc's decline.

All this will be news to most Americans, but President de Gaulle would have been more than human had he not stressed this contrast as he did in his press conference on July 29:

"To my mind, these present differences politically with the United States are purely and simply the result of the intrinsic changes which took place in the last few years and which are continuing with regard to the absolute and relative situation of the United States and France. France had been materially and morally destroyed by the collapse of 1940. * * *

"It was from America that it received the weapons for its soldiers. France's security was dependent entirely on its protection. * * * But it happens that, since then, France's position has considerably changed. Its new institutions put it in position to wish, and to act. Its internal development brings it prosperity and gives it access to the means of power. It has restored its currency, its finances, its balance of trade, to such an extent that, from this standpoint, it no longer needs anyone. * * * And so, far from borrowing from others, particularly the Americans, it is paying back its debts to them and even on occasion is granting them certain facilities. * * *

"Furthermore, the burden for the United States of its financial support to many states and the military forces it maintains abroad cannot but weigh heavily on it. * * * For these reasons the balance of payments and the dollar problem of the United States are becoming essential concerns."

General de Gaulle would also be more than human if, now that domestic inflation threatens the impressive financial record of his regime, he were not tempted to follow the experts who would correct this by converting France's dollar holdings into gold. And he might not do this as cautiously as they recommend.

The general would be far more than human if he were not also tempted to use this monetary arm—his most effective one in the power politics game—for the further purpose of preventing the United States from making the deal he fears Russia is enticing it to make at the expense of France and Germany. In his press conference July 29 he noted that "the United States sees tempting prospects opening" now for agreement with Moscow, and added:

"Hence all the separate negotiations between the Anglo-Saxons and the Soviets which, starting with the limited agreement on nuclear testing, seem likely to be extended to other questions, notably European ones, until now in the absence of the Europeans, which clearly goes against the views of France."

What a temptation for General de Gaulle to seek to check both the inflationary and Russian dangers to France by giving the "brash young man" in the White House at least a little rap on the dollar knuckles to remind him that, however powerful he is in atomic weapons, the France he snubbed in 1961 now has the monetary whiphand and might wreck the dollar—even during a presidential campaign—if he persisted in his atomic and Russian policies.

I have a very high opinion of the general, and some reason to think that he would accept the kind of Atlantic federation I advocate, if it were offered by Washington. And so I have some hope that he will wait at least until after the next U.S. presidential election before giving the White House too risky a monetary rap. But the administration and the vast majority of the U.S. press and public seem convinced that General de Gaulle is obsessed with nationalistic grandeur, and excessively human in such traits as pride. How they can still expect him, as they implicitly do, to be wise and saintly enough not to use his monetary arm no matter what Washington says and does is quite beyond my understanding.

My own fears, and their dim view of General de Gaulle, rather than their paradoxical hopes, were strengthened by this report in the Washington Post, September 24:

"Indignation over Prime Minister Georges Pompidou's charge yesterday that Americans are involved in an internal and external conspiracy against the De Gaulle regime seems to have distracted attention from a possibly more ominous passage contained in the same speech. This was a hint that France is considering tossing some sort of brick into the international monetary pool. * * *

" 'We have been reproached for not attacking the deepest cause of inflation,' Pompidou said, 'that is to say, the present form of the international monetary system. This is an aspect of the situation that we have by no means neglected.'

"This recalls a campaign in the economic daily, Les Echos, a few weeks ago which went so far as to suggest that a healthful devaluation of the dollar might be forced on the United States by a demand for the conversion of France's dollar holdings into gold."

There are, of course, differences between the present danger to the gold exchange and the situation that wrecked it in 1931, as well as the similarities I have dwelt on. The hopeful differences include these: The Western World is not already in a depression now as it was in 1931. There is better protection within the United States against the 1929 type of Wall Street crash, and against unemployment. Much more is known, at least by experts, of the short-term debt factor. The central banks and treasuries of the Atlantic democracies, including notably those of the United States, cooperate internationally much better now. The reparations-war-debts tangle no longer enters the picture.

At least one difference, however, is ominous: Communist Russia, which was not strong enough in any arm of power politics to play an important role in 1931, now is a major player. Only Communist dictatorship can hope to gain from the wrecking of the gold exchange standard now—as Nazi dictatorship did in 1931—and it can hope to gain immensely.

DEPRESSION WOULD BENEFIT SOVIETS

Whereas Russia would suffer fearfully if it sought to win the world by the atomic arm, it would suffer relatively little from a crash of the dollar. The resulting depression would create instead the most favorable conditions for communism to take over much of the non-Communist world intact, by subversion within.

Moscow's best way to achieve this is to push ahead on the course it is now following: By fostering the hope in Washington that such things as Russia's ideological row with Red China, its crop shortage, its ability to help the dollar by paying in gold for U.S. wheat, its signing of the test ban treaty and other straws indicating a general mellowing in Moscow, have opened the door now to agreement on more and more important matters.

This lures Washington away from the task of uniting Atlantica effectively and into direct negotiations with Moscow. It disunites Atlantica particularly by the hope the latter rouse in London and the fear they inspire in Paris and Bonn—thus tightening the existing tension between not merely the United States and France but between London and Paris-Bonn while drawing the latter two together. It adds to Atlantic disunion generally by lessening the fear of Russia that brought NATO into being and has remained its major cementing force.

Present Kremlin policy develops, in short, the conditions in which power politics among the Atlantic democracies could again, as in 1931, wreck the gold exchange standard, spread depression, and divide them ruinously. For whereas military danger tends to unite them, economic-monetary danger is divisive.

By pushing its current policy, the Kremlin can hope to achieve these results before it has had to reward Washington's hopes with anything more than illusory concessions. At the same time it thus adds world-ranging wingpower to the image of Russia as the dove of peace. Success should also bring Red China to heel, by proving how much craftier and safer is Mr. K.'s way of "burying" us than Mr. Mao's. Even Machiavelli could not have devised a better policy for advancing communism and destroying free enterprise, and all the other freedoms, than the lead Moscow now gives and Washington follows.

In my balance, this ominous difference between the situation in 1931 and 1963 outweighs the hopeful differences.

---

## MORE MANAGED NEWS?

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BARRY] 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. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, the process of managing the news apparently means that newsmen must be managed to achieve the necessary results.

Those who hold great power in public or private life have the capacity to influence the working press. They do so by giving or withholding news. They do so by "other" favors which produce a desire to cooperate on the part of the newsmen.

Thus, the newsman is to some extent subject to pressures from the very powerful people in public life. This, of course, is no reflection on the newsmen, rather it is a reflection upon those who use improper methods to secure their ends. The following article from the Los Angeles Times entitled "Press Sees Two Sides of White House," by Robert S. Allen and Paul Scott, is illustrative of the problem. I quote:

PRESS SEES TWO SIDES OF WHITE HOUSE

(By Robert S. Allen and Paul Scott)

The Kennedy administration, always extremely publicity conscious, has come up with a new status symbol.

It is a White House "master list" of newsmen.

For those enshrined on this select roll there is an extensive assortment of social and professional benefits and favors.

Socially, there are invitations to the numerous White House functions and parties, including intimate dinners, dances, and other events; trips on the President's planes, yachts, and other conveyances; visits to his various weekend and vacation domiciles; and other personal treats and pleasures.

Professionally, newsmen on the "master list" enjoy so-called "background briefings" by the President, members of his staff and other "authorities"; news tips; interviews and other special tidbits, and the privilege of launching "trial balloons" in the guise of exclusive stories.

Existence of this unique "master list" was revealed by its principal keeper—White House press secretary Pierre Salinger (a newspaperman himself once).

An influential Democrat, during a call at the White House, dropped in on Salinger and introduced a reporter, stressing their warm friendship. Salinger responded cordially.

"Haven't I seen you around here recently?" he asked.

"You probably have," said the correspondent, "I've attended some of the press conferences."

"Glad to have you with us," beamed Salinger. "We try to take care of our friends. From now on your name will be on the 'master list.' You will be in on everything; background briefings, news tips, and all the rest. I'm sure you will find it worthwhile."

Newsmen trying to keep track of President Kennedy's backstage manipulations on the embattled civil rights bill in its tortuous course through the House Judiciary Committee had a quite different experience with Salinger.

On the basis of the record, he apparently deliberately tried to mislead them, as follows:

On Capitol Hill they were told by House Democratic leaders they had a conference slated with the President at 4 p.m. Salinger flatly denied it. He emphatically asserted, "No such meeting is scheduled."

Newsman: "But the press wires say the Democratic leaders told them they do have such a meeting with the President."

Salinger: "I am not responsible for what the wires put out. There is no meeting scheduled."

Newsman: "Do you think it is likely to be scheduled later?"

Salinger: "I talked to the President just about 5 minutes ago, and he has no plans to meet anyone. The inference in your question is that we do have a meeting for 4 o'clock that will be discovered later. That is not true. We have no meeting scheduled for 4 o'clock."

At 3:58 p.m., Salinger notified the newsmen that the President was about to meet with Speaker JOHN MCCORMACK, Democrat, of Massachusetts, and other House leaders on the civil rights legislation.

Later, when asked about this contradiction, Salinger claimed the 4 o'clock meeting had not been scheduled until 3:30 p.m.

Senator JOSEPH CLARK, dour Pennsylvania Democrat, is a millionaire several times over, but he balked like a mule when it came to forking over $250 for a ticket to a party fund-raising affair.

When the President went to Philadelphia last week to put in a campaign plug for Democratic Mayor Tate, the local party organization, at national committee spurring, gave a reception for the President with a $250 admittance charge. Purpose of the affair was to raise some $50,000 for the national committee.

Several hundred local and State Democratic leaders were invited, among them CLARK, the party's lone Pennsylvania Senator.

The day before the reception, CLARK's office telephoned the local organization and complained he hadn't received his ticket. This drew the immediate reply, "We haven't got his check yet. No check, no ticket."

"Do you mean that the Senator has to pay?" was the astonished exclamation.

To those newsmen who are not fortunate enough to be on the "master list," my condolences. Any system of favoritism or nepotism is going to produce the privileged few at the expense of the many.

## THE LATE CONGRESSMAN HJALMAR NYGAARD

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. ANDREWS] 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. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, it is a great privilege to have been elected to represent the First District of North Dakota which had been served so ably and well by my longtime friend, the late Hjalmar Nygaard.

Hjalmar was a man who deeply enjoyed serving the people, whether it was his local townspeople in Enderlin, the State of North Dakota which he served with such distinction during his 12 years in the legislature, or all the people of America whom he represented here in Congress. His life was dedicated to service.

Here was a man who was very proud to be an American, and he was very concerned with the rights and feelings of the individual. Although he was a quiet man, when he spoke out he was firm in behalf of those principles in which he believed and by which he lived.

Hjalmar Nygaard has left an indelible mark on the history of North Dakota and the United States. The Nation has lost a Congressman, true, but North Dakota has lost one of the finest men she has ever produced.

## DEPRESSED ECONOMIC CONDITIONS STILL STYMIE VITAL DRILLING ACTIVITY

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. Speaker, despite continuing advances in scientific techniques, new oil and gas reserves are found only by the actual drilling of test wells. Less drilling means less oil and gas discovered.

Declines in drilling activity are not due to any lack of locations to drill but are largely the result of depressed economic conditions in the producing industry caused by rising costs, declining oil prices and severe oversupply conditions both in the United States and every major producing area of the world.

Experience provides increasing evidence that an effective program for controlling foreign oil imports is essential in the interest of national security. The Government's mandatory oil import program has now been in effect for almost 5 years.

However, the continuing decline in U.S. exploration and drilling ever since 1956 constitutes ample evidence that the level of imports under the mandatory program have been set too high to have any corrective influence. Exploratory crew activity in the United States has been reduced by more than 50 percent. Total wells drilled are down 24 percent. Wildcat wells show a decrease of 35 percent. The number of rotary rigs in operation has decreased by more than 40 percent and trained, hard-to-replace, drilling personnel are leaving the drilling business which is experiencing almost depression conditions.

The most serious threat to the program at this time appears to be increased imports from Canada. It is understood that strong efforts are now being made to further substantially increase imports from Canada. During the past year, imports from Canada have been fairly well stabilized as a result of an understanding reached between our Government and that of Canada. Since that time, however, there has been a change in the Canadian Government and the position of the present government is uncertain. This becomes a vital matter since any increase in Canadian imports, without a commensurate decrease from other sources, would present a serious threat to the effectiveness of the entire present program.

As shown in the following table overland imports from Canada have increased substantially since 1959:

[In barrels daily]

| | Districts I–IV (east of Rockies) | District V (west coast) | Total |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1959 | 56,000 | 36,000 | 92,000 |
| 1960 | 66,000 | 49,000 | 115,000 |
| 1961 | 98,000 | 91,000 | 189,000 |
| 1962 | 115,000 | 124,000 | 239,000 |
| 1963 (1st 6 months) | 126,000 | 137,000 | 263,000 |

In addition to the threat of increased Canadian imports, the program should be tightened up in several other respects, for example:

RE DISTRICTS I-IV (EAST OF ROCKIES)

In several respects the present program involves estimates rather than being based on actual past experience. For example, the level of imports in districts I–IV is based upon estimates of domestic production for the period under consideration rather than actual production during a prior period. This injects uncertainty which casts doubts on the integrity of the program even though the margin of error in the estimates may be quite small.

Another source of uncertainty involves imports from Canada. Actual overland imports of oil from Canada during the first half of 1963 exceeded the Department of Interior estimate by 6,000 barrels per day in district I–IV and by 6,500 barrels daily in district V—west coast—or a total of 12,500 barrels daily. Further, under the present program no provision exists for correcting differences between estimated overland imports and actual volumes received.

DISTRICT V (WEST COAST)

The level of imports into district V is determined as the amount necessary to supplement domestic availability. The determination of domestic availability, therefore, becomes important.

Calculation of availability in district V—west coast—should be based on the full availability of supplies from all U.S. areas, including the maximum capacity of pipelines into the area. At present, for example, the pipeline from the Four Corners area has a capacity of 80,000 barrels daily and is capable of being substantially expanded. Yet, the Department of Interior in determining the level of imports estimates the availability through this line as only 70,000 barrels daily. The program should serve to: First, encourage the exploration for and development of oil in district V; and second, encourage the movement of oil from other domestic areas of oversupply into the deficit area. The program should provide incentives that would serve these two objectives.

## WORLD'S GREATEST SHOWMAN

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, it has been my privilege, since coming to Congress, to represent a part of the great motion picture industry of California. No one will deny that in the 20th century it has contributed to the swift development of California as well as to our Nation in many recorded and unrecorded ways.

This phenomenon runs a close parallel to the birth and growth of its motion picture industry which has nurtured and helped build radio and television as supplementary mass media of entertainment and information. Amongst the companies in my district which have been outstanding in leadership in this area is Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer, whose roaring lion has become a national symbol. There is no single person to whom this achievement owes more than to the man known around the globe as "The World's Greatest Showman"—Cecil B. DeMille. Although he was born in 1881 near Ashfield, Mass., California is proud to claim him as its son—even if by adoption, for without his pioneering efforts one doubts whether Hollywood and its environs, such as Culver City, ever would have become the world's entertainment capitol.

I deem it a privilege to bring to the attention of my colleagues in Congress the fact that we are approaching the 50th anniversary of the first full-length motion picture, "The Squaw Man," produced by DeMille at a cost of $15,000 from a barn which he had rented in a little-known suburb of Los Angeles called Hollywood.

History designates DeMille as the world's most successful producer-director whose films have grossed over $1 billion. In 1923, he produced his first big silent movie spectacular, "The Ten Commandments," and in 1956, DeMille brought out its second version—this time in color and with sound. The evangelist, Billy Graham, has referred to him as "a prophet in celluloid who had the privilege in bringing some of the word of God to more people than any other man." DeMille also will be remembered as the owner and developer of the first commercial airline in the United States—the man who took complete charge of the Hollywood bond drive in World War II—the man who designed the regulation uniforms in use today at the Air Force Academy in Colorado Springs. Whether he was filming a Bible drama, the story of the Union Pacific, Cleopatra or "The Plainsman," whatever DeMille did, he did profitably with distinction and honor. His career of 45 years in turning out movie spectaculars may well serve as an example of what a citizen's enterprise and dedication to work can accomplish in a democracy such as ours.

That is why I believe the Nation is indebted to Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer Television for its distinguished production of "The World's Greatest Showman," the legend of Cecil B. DeMille, which will be presented as a 90-minute color spectacular on the NBC–TV network, Sunday, December 1, with many of movieland's past brightest stars contributing their services in tribute to a truly great American.

## PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, during the vote on the public works bill I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present and voting, I would have voted "yea."

## LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM ON WEDNESDAY

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to address a question to the acting majority leader, the gentleman from Louisiana. There have been reports on the floor this afternoon that the legislation scheduled for tomorrow would not be taken up. Can the gentleman tell us whether the legislation previously scheduled for tomorrow will be considered?

Mr. BOGGS. The legislation previously scheduled for tomorrow will be taken up as scheduled.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

## THE 45TH ANNIVERSARY OF LATVIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Mr. speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] 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. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, yesterday was the 45th anniversary of Latvian Independence Day. Unfortunately, this event was commemorated in the free world areas with a necessary feeling of sadness, as Latvian refugees keeping alive the historic nature of the occasion, could not truly celebrate.

The people of Latvia itself are not permitted to celebrate their true Independence Day which, incidentally, was achieved at the expense of the original Russian Communist government.

At the present time the Soviet Union, in its deliberate policy of suppressing the nationalistic spirit, is implementing plans to eliminate the structure of the fictitious independence of the Soviet Socialist Republics, and create regional governmental structures rather than the historic nationality lines. The purpose is to scatter nationalistic opposition.

I earnestly appeal to all American of Latvian origin and to Latvian emigree groups throughout the free world to maintain their spirit and determination to work for the restoration of freedom to their homeland. The most important point to emphasize is that freedom will not be achieved for Latvia or any other captive nation of communism if the administration follows its policy of coexistence with the Soviet Union. We must defy those who would surrender all of Eastern Europe to permanent Communist domination.

The brave people of Latvia suffered under centuries of czarist tyranny and were rapidly developing their little land when treacherously engulfed by the Reds in 1940.

Certainly justice will triumph. In commemorating the 45th anniversary of Latvian independence, we look forward to the ultimate restoration of freedom to that brave little nation, when its people will once again control their own democratic form of government and gain freedom from the oppressive dogmas of communism.

## LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. HARDING (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for today through November 30, on account of official business.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio and to include a tribute to the memory of Charles R. Hook, of Ohio.

Mr. POAGE and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BOLAND and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HOLIFIELD to include a letter in his remarks today.

Mr. DOLE to include extraneous matter in his remarks today.

Mr. PHILBIN and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ROOSEVELT and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HANNA.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida.

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

Mr. DEROUNIAN.

Mr. LINDSAY.

Mr. COLLIER.

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

Mr. COHELAN.

Mr. MATSUNAGA.

## SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER pro tempore announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 912. An act approving a compromise and settlement agreement of the Navajo Tribe of Indians and authorizing the tribe to execute and the Secretary of the Interior to approve any oil and gas leases entered into pursuant to the agreement.

## ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 50 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, November 20, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

1379. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting reports concerning visa petitions which this Service has approved according the beneficiaries of such petitions first preference classification, pursuant to the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended, was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

Mr. MORRIS: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 3071. A bill to provide for the establishment of Fort Larned as a national historic site, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 907). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WILLIAMS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H.R. 8462. A bill to authorize the conveyance of certain real property of the United States heretofore granted to the city of Grand Prairie, Tex., for public airport purposes, contingent upon approval by the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency, and to provide for the conveyance to the United States of certain real property now used by such city for public airport purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 908). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HARRIS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H.R. 6199. A bill granting the consent of Congress to a supplemental compact of agreement between the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey concerning the Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Commission, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 909). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WATTS: Committee on Ways and Means. Senate Concurrent Resolution 19. Concurrent resolution to designate "Bourbon whiskey" as a distinctive product of the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 910). Referred to the House Calendar.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BONNER:

H.R. 9153. A bill to amend the provisions of section 15 of the Shipping Act, 1916, to provide for the exemption of certain terminal leases from penalties; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.R. 9154. A bill to authorize the Weather Bureau to make appropriate reimbursement between the respective appropriations available to the Bureau, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 9155. A bill to amend section 4(b) of the Communications Act of 1934 to exempt from the provisions thereof special Government employees; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JONES of Missouri:

H.R. 9156. A bill to repeal certain provisions of law relating to the printing as House documents of certain proceedings; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. McFALL:

H.R. 9157. A bill to amend the provisions of section 15 of the Shipping Act, 1916, to provide for the exemption of certain terminal leases from penalties; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. YOUNGER:

H.R. 9158. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to establish a statutory policy governing the broadcasting of views on controversial issues; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H.R. 9159. A bill to amend section 1(14)(a) of the Interstate Commerce Act to insure the adequacy of the national railroad freight car supply, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H.R. 9160. A bill to establish the Department of Education; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 9161. A bill to establish the Department of Health; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 9162. A bill to establish a National Wilderness Preservation System for the permanent good of the whole people, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. REUSS:

H.R. 9163. A bill to establish a National Wilderness Preservation System for the permanent good of the whole people, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H.R. 9164. A bill to establish a National Wilderness Preservation System for the permanent good of the whole people, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H.R. 9165. A bill to establish a National Wilderness Preservation System for the permanent good of the whole people, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WATTS:

H.R. 9166. A bill to provide tax equity by the taxation of cooperative corporations with respect to earnings derived from business done for the United States or any of its agencies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Texas:

H.R. 9167. A bill to provide tax equity by the taxation of cooperative corporations with respect to earnings derived from business done for the United States or any of its agencies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STINSON:

H.J. Res. 805. Joint resolution regarding Indian fishing rights; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

## PRIVATE BILLS

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

By Mr. BARRY:

H.R. 9168. A bill for the relief of Mary F. Thomas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H.R. 9169. A bill for the relief of Garabed Najarian (Nadjarian); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McFALL:

H.R. 9170. A bill for the relief of Ramiro Velasquez Huerta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOSS:

H.R. 9171. A bill to amend the act of May 25, 1920, relating to conveyance of certain parts of rights-of-way by railroad companies; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H.R. 9172. A bill for the relief of George, Danae, and Maria Kerassoglou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

# SENATE

## TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 19, 1963

*(Legislative day of Tuesday, October 22, 1963)*

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

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

O Thou Eternal God, quest of the ages, whom by searching we cannot find, we are sure of Thee, not just because Thou didst speak through the lips of prophets in days of old. We are sure of Thee because, for those who have hearts to feel and ears to hear, Thy voice today is calling.

Thou dost speak to us wherever truth is uttered. We see Thee in all life's loveliness. We touch Thy garment in the sacrament of human love. We sense Thy presence in all brave and generous deeds.

But give us to know that the deepest revelation of Thyself is hidden in our

own hearts and in the hearts of our fellows on this strange, earthly pilgrimage. Enlarge our thoughts to make room in our sympathy for the vast multitudes of the disinherited who, in these days, have been stirred by a radiant hope, and who, as sheep without a shepherd, are turning from despair to promise. So may we find our true selves in the need of others, and thus, beyond ourselves, find Thee.

We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, November 18, 1963, was dispensed with.

## MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on November 13, 1963, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

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

S. 876. An act to authorize the Administrator of General Services to convey certain land in Prince Georges County, Md., to the American National Red Cross.

## REPORT ON OPERATIONS UNDER THE PEACE CORPS ACT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

Pursuant to the provisions of section 11 of the Peace Corps Act, as amended, I transmit herewith the second annual report on operations under the act covering the fiscal year ended June 30, 1963.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *November 19, 1963.*

## 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 and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 2512. An act to clarify the status of members of the National Guard while attending or instructing at National Guard schools established under the authority of the Secretary of the Army or Secretary of the Air Force, as the case may be, and for other purposes;

H.R. 2988. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for participation by members of the Armed Forces in international sports activities;

H.R. 3005. An act to amend sections 510 and 591 of title 10, United States Code, to remove the requirement that an alien must make a declaration of intention to become a citizen of the United States before he may be enlisted or appointed in a Reserve component;

H.R. 8135. An act to provide for the establishment and administration of public recreational facilities at the Sanford Reservoir area, Canadian River project, Texas, and for other purposes;

H.R. 9139. An act making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes; and

H.J. Res. 779. Joint resolution to amend the joint resolution of January 28, 1948, relating to membership and participation by the United States in the South Pacific Commission, so as to authorize certain appropriations thereunder for the fiscal years 1964 and 1965.

## ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker pro tempore had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 912) approving a compromise and settlement agreement of the Navajo Tribe of Indians and authorizing the tribe to execute and the Secretary of the Interior to approve any oil and gas leases entered into pursuant to the agreement, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

## HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The following bills and joint resolution were severally read twice by their titles and referred, as indicated:

H.R. 2512. An act to clarify the status of members of the National Guard while attending or instructing at National Guard schools established under the authority of the Secretary of the Army or Secretary of the Air Force, as the case may be, and for other purposes;

H.R. 2988. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for participation by members of the Armed Forces in international sports activities; and

H.R. 3005. An act to amend section 510 and 591 of title 10, United States Code, to remove the requirement that an alien must make a declaration of intention to become a citizen of the United States before he may be enlisted or appointed in a Reserve component; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 8135. An act to provide for the establishment and administration of public recreational facilities at the Sanford Reservoir area, Canadian River project, Texas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 9139. An act making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H.J. Res. 779. Joint resolution to amend the joint resolution of January 28, 1948, relating to membership and participation by the United States in the South Pacific Commission, so as to authorize certain appropriations thereunder for the fiscal years 1964 and 1965; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

## TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

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

## COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the following subcommittees were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today:

The Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, of the Committee on Government Operations.

The Internal Security Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary.

## EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, to consider the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

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

## U.S. ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT AGENCY

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Dr. Herbert Scoville, Jr., of Connecticut, to be an Assistant Director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

## DEPARTMENT OF STATE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Benson E. L. Timmons III, of Florida, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Haiti.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

## LEGISLATIVE SESSION

On motion of Mr. MANSFIELD, the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

## REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, without amendment:

S.J. Res. 103. Joint resolution to increase the amount authorized to be appropriated for the work of the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped (Rept. No. 645).

## BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. BEALL:

S. 2314. A bill to amend section 5414 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 2315. A bill to authorize the Weather Bureau to make appropriate reimbursement between the respective appropriations available to the Bureau, and for other purposes;

S. 2316. A bill to require the inspection of certain towing vessels;

S. 2317. A bill to amend the provisions of section 15 of the Shipping Act, 1916, to provide for the exemption of certain terminal leases from penalties;

S. 2318. A bill to amend the Joint Resolution approved August 20, 1958, granting the consent of Congress to the several States to negotiate and enter into compacts for the purpose of promoting highway traffic safety; and

S. 2319. A bill to amend section 4(b) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, to exempt therefrom "special Government employees" as defined in section 202(a), title 18, United States Code, 76 Stat. 1121; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAGNUSON when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. CURTIS:

S. 2320. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Anna Soos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## APPROPRIATE REIMBURSEMENT BETWEEN THE RESPECTIVE APPROPRIATIONS AVAILABLE TO THE WEATHER BUREAU

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the Weather Bureau to make appropriate reimbursement between the respective appropriations available to the Bureau, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the Secretary of Commerce, requesting the proposed legislation, be printed in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 2315) to authorize the Weather Bureau to make appropriate reimbursement between the respective appropriations available to the Bureau, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The letter presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
*Washington, D.C., November 7, 1963.*

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

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There are enclosed four copies of a draft bill to authorize the Weather Bureau to make appropriate reimbursement between the respective appropriations available to the Bureau, and for other purposes, and four copies of a statement of purpose and need in support thereof.

We are advised by the Bureau of the Budget that, from the standpoint of the administration's program, there would be no objection to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

LUTHER H. HODGES.

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE AND NEED

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to give the Weather Bureau more effective control and better accountability of services and administrative operations and expenses conducted jointly for two or more appropriations when the costs are not susceptible of immediate distribution directly to those appropriations. Specific examples of such operations and expenses are: the maintenance of inventories of stores used by several appropriations; utilization of personal services of technicians paid from one appropriation but whose services are partially utilized on programs financed by other appropriations; and the charging of administrative and technical overhead to one appropriation with subsequent distribution and charge to the proper appropriation or fund.

The proposed legislation would permit the Bureau to realize the benefits of cost accounting and administer its programs on a cost basis. It would facilitate the distribution of overhead charges and permit the recapture of costs for technical services now given to various programs without reimbursement. The legislation would simplify payrolling by having a technician's salary charged to one appropriation with later distribution of charges to the benefiting appropriations. The legislation would simplify the stores program by continuing purchases of stores from one appropriation and charging the using appropriations upon issuance of such stores from inventory.

Identical authority was provided for the Bureau of the Census in the 87th Congress (Public Law 87-489).

## INSPECTION OF CERTAIN TOWING VESSELS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to require the inspection of certain towing vessels. I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, requesting the proposed legislation, be printed in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 2316) to require the inspection of certain towing vessels, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The letter presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
*Washington, D.C., November 6, 1963.*

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

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is submitted herewith a draft of a proposed bill to require the inspection of certain towing vessels.

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to bring towing vessels propelled by means other than steam under inspection by the Coast Guard.

Section 4427 of the Revised Statutes (46 U.S.C. 405) presently requires the inspection of every tugboat, towing boat, and freight boat. This section is part of an extensive statutory pattern to insure high standards of safety on merchant vessels through regulation and inspection by the Coast Guard. Although phrased in broad terms, section 4427 has been interpreted by the courts as applying only to vessels propelled by steam. As a result, motor propelled towing vessels are not presently subject to inspection unless they are seagoing vessels of over 300 gross tons.

The anomaly, whereby steam towing vessels are subject to inspection and motor towing vessels performing practically identical services are not, has long been recognized. This anomaly has become increasingly apparent with the increasing dominance of the diesel towing vessel as compared to the steam towing vessel. At the present time, steam tugs have been almost completely superseded by diesel towboats; figures show that in 1962 there were 5,016 diesel tugs in operation compared to 84 propelled by steam.

The present interpretation of section 4427 of the Revised Statutes results in another inconsistency in that barges or self-propelled tank vessels carrying hazardous liquid cargoes on inland waters must be inspected and meet Coast Guard safety standards while motor propelled tugs towing such barges are not required to be inspected. Considering the ever-increasing traffic in dangerous liquid cargoes and the fact that collision is a major source of marine casualties, an obvious potential hazard is involved in permitting such cargoes to be towed by vessels which at present are neither subject to the requirements for safety inspection nor subject to the licensing and certificating of their personnel.

During 1962 the Coast Guard made a comprehensive study of towing vessel operations. The study showed that of 5,100 vessels documented for towing service only 103 were inspected and certificated by the Coast Guard. The remaining vessels were not subject to inspection under existing law.

The data obtained during the study also shows that while the number of towing vessels has increased 20 percent in the past 10 years, the number of casualties has increased by 120 percent to an average of 559 casualties per year for the period from 1960 through 1962. During 1962, for example, 530 towing vessels were involved in casualties serious enough to be reported, which is an average of 1 out of every 10 towing vessels in service. Detailed casualty figures for that year reveal that while no lives were lost due to casualties on inspected towing vessels, 15 lives were lost in casualties involving uninspected towing vessels. The figures further reveal that less than 3 percent of the inspected vessels were involved in reportable casualties compared to 10 percent of the uninspected vessels. During fiscal year 1962 estimated monetary damages due to casualties involving towing vessels were over $9 million.

Analysis of the casualty figures for towing vessels for the past several years leads to the conclusion that operation of diesel towing vessels involves as great a hazard as operation of those propelled by steam, and that this hazard could be reduced by requiring these vessels to comply with Coast Guard safety standards. In brief, the Department has concluded that motor-propelled towing vessels should be brought under the statutory inspection scheme. The proposed bill would, therefore, amend section 4427 of the Revised Statutes to provide for the inspection of towing vessels regardless of the manner of propulsion.

The Department believes that the smaller towing vessels are not a sufficient safety hazard to warrant the increased administrative difficulties and costs which would result if they were subject to inspection. Therefore, the bill would exclude those towing vessels which are less than 15 gross tons and 26 feet in length. This would eliminate from inspection the smaller vessels which engage in limited operations.

The casualty statistics also show that a large percentage of the casualties which have occurred on uninspected towing vessels are

of a type which could be avoided or minimized if well-qualified personnel were aboard. For example, during fiscal year 1962 almost 60 percent of the reported casualties involved collisions while another 12 percent involved groundings of the tug or tow. To minimize the hazard to life and property from operation of towing vessels by unqualified personnel, the proposed bill would contain authority to prescribe regulations regarding the meaning of towing vessels and the licensing and certificating of their personnel.

The Department, of course, realizes that there are large numbers of vessels to which the strict application of the inspection and manning requirements would not be appropriate for one reason or another. In some cases it is not possible or practicable to bring the vessel into strict compliance; in other cases to do so would result in severe economic hardship or loss of employment. Therefore, the proposed bill would require the Secretary to take into account the various factors which might appropriately require a lessening of the inspection or manning requirements as to certain vessels. It would also give him authority to exempt additional vessels from the inspection requirement if necessary in the public interest. These provisions are intended to provide sufficient flexibility in administration to enable the Secretary to tailor the inspection requirements more closely to the circumstances of individual vessels. With this authority it should be possible to achieve the maximum safety on towing vessels consistent with the least economic hardship and disruption to the industry. This authority would also permit the gradual application of the requirements to existing vessels to insure an orderly transition period with minimum interference to towing vessel operations.

The proposed legislation would require increased expenditures for inspection and clerical personnel since an additional 4,300 vessels would become subject to inspection. The Department estimates that an increase of 55 officers and 20 civilians would be required. This would result in additional costs of approximately $650,000 per year.

There is enclosed a memorandum which contains in summary form the results of the study made by the Coast Guard of the operation of towing vessels. There is also enclosed for your convenient reference a comparative type showing the changes in existing law that would be made by the proposed bill.

It would be appreciated if you would lay the proposed bill before the Senate. A similar proposed bill has been transmitted to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The Department has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection from the standpoint of the administration's program to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

DOUGLAS DILLON.

## EXEMPTIONS OF CERTAIN TERMINAL LEASES FROM PENALTIES

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the provisions of section 15 of the Shipping Act, 1916, to provide for the exemption of certain terminal leases from penalties. I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the Chairman of the Federal Maritime Commission, requesting the proposed legislation, be printed in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 2317) to amend the provisions of section 15 of the Shipping Act, 1916, to provide for the exemption of certain terminal leases from penalties, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The letter presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION,
*Washington, D.C., November 13, 1963.*

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
*President of the Senate,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There are submitted herewith four copies of a proposed bill, together with a statement of purpose and need for the draft bill, to amend the provisions of section 15 of the Shipping Act, 1916, to provide for the exemption of certain terminal leases from penalties.

The need for and purpose of the proposed bill are set forth in the accompanying statement.

The Federal Maritime Commission urges enactment of the bill at the 1st session of the 88th Congress for the reasons set forth in the accompanying statement.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that, from the standpoint of the administration's program, there is no objection to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN HARLLEE,
*Rear Admiral, U.S. Navy (Retired),*
*Chairman.*

JUSTIFICATION FOR BILL TO AMEND SECTION 15, SHIPPING ACT, 1916

The bill would amend section 15 of the Shipping Act, 1916, so as to exempt from the penalty provisions of that section currently existing leases of terminals provided they are filed with the Federal Maritime Commission within 90 days from the date the bill is enacted into law. The need for the bill stems from the fact that until the former Federal Maritime Board's decision in Agreements Nos. 8225 and 8225–1, 5 F.M.B. 648 (1959) and the subsequent affirmation of the Board's decision by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit in *Baton Rouge Port Commission* v. *United States*, 287 F. 2d 86, cert. den. 368 U.S. 985, neither the agency nor the industry were clear as to the full circumstances under which leases of terminal facilities fall within the coverage of section 15 of the Shipping Act.

Section 15 provides that all agreements between two persons subject to the Shipping Act which provides for "fixing or regulating transportation rates or fares; giving or receiving special rates, accommodations, or other special privileges or advantages; controlling, regulating, preventing, or destroying competition * * * or in any manner providing for an exclusive, preferential, or cooperative working arrangement," must be filed with and approved by the Commission in order to be lawful. The penalty for carrying out such an agreement prior to Commission approval is up to $1,000 per day.

Leases of terminal facilities quite customarily contain, in addition to the usual grants of estates in land, covenants requiring that the lessee operate the terminal facility according to specified standards and in some instances grant future rights to the lessee. For example, the lease in the Baton Rouge case, above, required that the lessee charge rates "competitive with, and not greater than, rates for similar services and privileges charged at other gulf ports," and gave to the lessee the right of first refusal to lease any similar additional facility which the lessor might construct. The Maritime Board found that these and other covenants brought the lease within the purview of section 15 and the fifth circuit affirmed.

In due course the Maritime Board informed the Department of Justice of its findings in the Baton Rouge case and the Department brought suit against the lessee for civil penalties due under section 15. As other unapproved leases have been determined to be subject to section 15, the Maritime Board and now the Maritime Commission have informed the Attorney General in order that his Department might take such action as it thought warranted. Several additional suits for civil penalties have been filed.

Thus, lessees and lessors of terminal facilities have found themselves in the position of having entered into long-term leases some years ago which they believed not to be subject to section 15 of the Shipping Act, 1916, but which under the holding of the Baton Rouge case may be subject to that section. The practical choices open to such persons are to submit their leases to the Commission and seek approval, knowing that they may be subject to a suit for fairly enormous penalties or not to file their agreements with the hope that they would not be discovered or that they could successfully distinguish between their lease and the Baton Rouge lease.

It is the Commission's position in suggesting the instant bill that, while a sound regulatory purpose is served in requiring that terminal leases which in any fashion limit or control competition be first submitted to the agency for approval, the needs of justice are not served by exacting penalties for past behavior under what amounts to a new or different construction of the law. In short, it is the consensus of the Commission that a new construction of a statute should be given prospective effect and should not result in penalties for past behavior innocently engaged in.

Because of the variety of legal instruments which are used in granting rights to operate terminal facilities, the language of the bill is not limited to leases but includes licenses and assignments.

The bill would require prompt filing of all existing leases and would eliminate any excuse for not filing future agreements. In short, the bill forgives past violations of the Shipping Act and puts future regulation on a sounder footing.

## COMPACTS BETWEEN STATES FOR PROMOTION OF HIGHWAY TRAFFIC SAFETY

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Joint Resolution approved August 20, 1958, granting the consent of Congress to the several States to negotiate and enter into compacts for the purpose of promoting highway traffic safety. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, requesting the proposed legislation.

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

The bill (S. 2318) to amend the Joint Resolution approved August 20, 1958, granting the consent of Congress to the several States to negotiate and enter into compacts for the purpose of promoting highway traffic safety, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The letter presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

OCTOBER 22, 1963.

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

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The Commissioners of the District of Columbia have the honor to submit herewith a draft bill to amend the joint resolution approved August 20, 1958, granting the consent of Congress to the several States to negotiate and enter into compacts for the purpose of promoting highway traffic safety.

The purpose of the proposed bill is to amend the joint resolution approved August 20, 1958 (72 Stat. 635), so as to include within its provisions the consent of Congress with regard to agreements and compacts established for the promotion of highway traffic safety that may be entered into by any State and the District of Columbia.

Under the existing language of the resolution the Congress expressly gives its consent "to any two or more of the several States to enter agreements or compacts" for the purpose of cooperative efforts and mutual assistance respecting, among other things, traffic safety and enforcement programs. However, the language has the effect of excluding the participation of the District of Columbia with any State in undertaking such cooperative efforts through a compact or agreement. Since only the Congress, acting as the legislative authority for the District of Columbia, may authorize the District of Columbia to enter into any agreement or compact with a State, the Commissioners urge that the proposed bill be adopted to permit such participation.

An agreement is being considered at the present time by officials of the District of Columbia and the State of Maryland with respect to the mutual adoption of certain procedures which would permit law enforcement officers of both jurisdictions to issue citations to residents of the neighboring jurisdiction for violation of such traffic regulations as may be covered by the agreement rather than, as is now the case, to require such nonresidents to post collateral.

In order that such agreement or any other agreement or compact that may come within the purpose of the aforementioned resolution may be entered into by the District of Columbia, the Commissioners most strongly urge that the proposed bill be approved.

The Commissioners have been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that, from the standpoint of the administration's program, there is no objection to the submission of this legislation to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

WALTER N. TOBRINER,
*President, Board of Commissioners,*
*District of Columbia.*

## AMENDMENT OF COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934, TO EXEMPT CERTAIN GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend section 4(b) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, to exempt therefrom "special Government employees" as defined in section 202(a), title 18, United States Code, 76 Stat. 1121. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from the Acting Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, requesting the proposed legislation, together with an explanation thereof.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter and explanation will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2319) to amend section 4(b) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, to exempt therefrom "special Government employees" as defined in section 202(a), title 18, United States Code, 76 Stat. 1121, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The letter and explanation presented by Mr. MAGNUSON are as follows:

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION,
*Washington, D.C., October 22, 1963.*

The VICE PRESIDENT,
*U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: The Commission has adopted as part of its legislative program for the 88th Congress a proposal to amend section 4(b) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, to exempt therefrom "special Government employees" as defined in section 202(a), title 18, United States Code, 76 Stat. 1121.

The Commission's explanation and draft bill to accomplish the foregoing objective were submitted to the Bureau of the Budget for its consideration. We are now advised by that Bureau that from the standpoint of the administration's program there would be no objection to the presentation of the draft bill to the Congress for its consideration. Accordingly, there are enclosed six copies of our draft bill on this subject and six copies of an explanatory statement with reference thereto.

The consideration by the Senate of the proposed amendment would be greatly appreciated. The Commission would be happy to furnish any additional information that may be desired by the committee to which this proposal is referred.

Sincerely yours,

ROSEL H. HYDE,
*Acting Chairman.*

EXPLANATION

The Federal Communications Commission recommends that Congress amend section 4(b) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, so as to except therefrom "special Government employees," as that term is defined in Public Law 87-849, 76 Stat. 1119, approved October 23, 1962. Until section 4(b) is conformed to the new conflict-of-interest standards set out in Public Law 87-849, the benefits contemplated by the statute will remain largely unavailable to the Commission.

Insofar as it is pertinent here, section 4(b) prohibits, inter alia, any "person in (the Commission's) employ" from directly or indirectly having a financial interest in a company engaged in the manufacture or sale of communications equipment, or in broadcasting, or in rendering communications services. These prohibitions apply categorically to any person in the Commission's employ, since section 4(b) draws no distinction between those working for the Commission on a full-time basis, as against special consultants who work on a part-time basis only. Of course, when these restrictions were enacted, it was not a common practice for the Government to use the services of part-time consultants. Nevertheless, the sweeping interdictions of section 4(b) now stand as an obstacle to the use of part-time consultants contemplated by Public Law 87-849, which has liberalized the conflict-of-interest standards as they apply to special Government employees. Thus, for all practical purposes, the benefits of Public Law 87-849 are academic, insofar as the Commission's functions are concerned.

To remedy this situation, it is proposed that the second sentence of section 4(b) of the Communications Act be amended to make it clear that the provisions thereof are inapplicable to "special Government employees." As amended, that second sentence would provide (the new language being indicated by italic) as follows:

"No member of the Commission or person in its employ shall be financially interested in the manufacture or sale of radio apparatus or apparatus for wire or radio communication; in communication by wire or radio or in radio transmission of energy; in any company furnishing services or such apparatus to any company engaged in communication by wire or radio or to any company manufacturing or selling apparatus used for communication by wire or radio; or in any company owning stocks, bonds, or other securities of any such company; nor be in the employ of or hold any official relation to any person subject to any of the provisions of this act; nor own stocks, bonds, or other securities of any corporation subject to any of the provisions of this act: *Provided, however, That the foregoing provisions shall not apply to a 'special Government employee,' as defined in section 202(a) of title 18, United States Code, Seventy-sixth Statutes at Large, page 1121.*"

The sole purpose of this amendment is to relieve "special Government employees" of the restrictions of section 4(b) of the Communications Act. In so doing, it will, to use the words of the Attorney General in his "Memorandum Regarding Conflict-of-Interest Provisions of Public Law 87-849," dated January 28, 1963 (28 F.R. 985), "help the Government obtain the temporary or intermittent services of persons with special knowledge and skills whose principal employment is outside the Government."

It should be further pointed out that the only effect of our amendment would be to permit a "special Government employee" to own stock or business interests in the communications industry while he is employed on a part-time basis by the Commission. Such an employee would continue to remain fully subject to all the conflict-of-interest standards now contained in Public Law 87-849. And in the event a "special Government employee" should become a regular employee of the Commission, or a member thereof, he would then become subject to section 4(b) of the Communications Act. In short, it is not intended to confer on "special Government employees" any rights beyond those now set out in Public Law 87-849.

## INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1964—AMENDMENTS (AMENDMENT NO. 328)

Mr. TOWER submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H.R. 8747) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

## ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, November 19, 1963, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 912) approving a compromise and settlement agreement of the Navajo Tribe of Indians and authorizing the tribe to execute and the Secretary of the Interior to approve any oil and gas leases entered into pursuant to the agreement.

## REJUVENATION OF THE WHITEFISH PILOT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, this is the age of bigness. Although we deplore the trend, the growth of giant commercial enterprises and the subsequent demise of their smaller competitors is fast becoming the rule today. Nowhere is this more evident than in the newspaper industry. Improvements in technology, better means of distribution, and increased costs have combined to force hundreds of smaller newspapers out of business or into mergers.

While we are generally aware that this fast-paced competition has reduced most metropolitan cities to a single newspaper, we are much less aware of the effects of this trend on the small community weeklies. They, too, feel the pinch, and their mortality rate is high.

It is therefore refreshing, Mr. President, to witness the exception to the rule. I am referring to the efforts of Mr. and Mrs. Dick Adams to breathe new spirit into the Whitefish Pilot, the weekly paper of the small community of Whitefish, Mont. When Mr. Adams took control of the Pilot 4 years ago, he found a shop full of antiquated equipment and a languishing circulation. After modernization of equipment and an overhauling of selling and circulation procedures, the paper's circulation has doubled in the face of competition from four dailies and several weeklies which sell in the area. In recognition of their fine work, the success story of Mr. and Mrs. Adams was recently featured in the November issue of the American Press magazine.

Mr. President, it is true that the infusion of new capital was necessary to rejuvenate the Whitefish paper. But money alone was not enough. It took imagination and enterprise on the part of Mr. and Mrs. Adams to make the venture a success. Their efforts should be an example to others who are faced with the discouraging prospect of declining business and possible failure. We Montanans are proud that they chose the Treasure State for the site of their operation.

I ask unanimous consent that the article from the American Press describing their example be printed in the RECORD.

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

YOUNG MAN-AND-WIFE TEAM REBUILDS THE WHITEFISH PILOT

Constructive change is the single most important factor in the process of revitalizing a rural newspaper which had grown stodgy during 40 years of continuous ownership. This is the conclusion of Dick Adams, looking back on his first 4 years as publisher-owner of the Whitefish Pilot in Whitefish, Mont.

More significant among the changes by the Adams husband-wife team in Whitefish have been (1) a switch from carrier to mail distribution, (2) a change from Friday to Thursday publication, (3) a comprehensive reequipping of the back shop, (4) change from 7 column, 12 pica to 8 column, 11 pica pages and, most important of all, (5) aggressive local advertising selling plus intensive local news-feature coverage.

Approximately 4 years ago, Mr. Adams was a publicist for a large corporation in St. Paul, Minn. Along with so many of his journalistic contemporaries, he nourished the dream of weekly newspaper ownership * * * some day. Mrs. Adams not only shared this dream * * * she was well qualified to contribute a full measure of performance from her background as a reporter on the Minneapolis Star-Tribune.

Casual inquiry by the young couple about "* * * the local newspaper * * *" while on a ski vacation at the Big Mountain ski area near Whitefish stimulated an almost alarmingly quick response. Within a few hours of the original inquiry, members of the Whitefish Chamber of Commerce were at Big Mountain to "talk turkey with the Adamses." The wholehearted cooperation from Whitefish business leaders resulted in Adams' ownership of the Pilot late that same winter.

(Mr. Adams ruefully comments that the proximity of an outstanding ski area provided much "built-in desirability" to the Pilot; and in the 4 years the Adamses have been in the area, they've been on skis twice.)

At the time of takeover, Pilot circulation was about 800—almost entirely in the form of Friday morning carrier distribution. Records were most inadequate and the delivery boys were doing little to solicit new subscribers. Within the first 2 months under new management, Pilot distribution was switched to mail. In several issues preceding this change, the Pilot ran house ads announcing the pending switch and requesting area residents to drop in at the office to help the new publishers bring their circulation records up to date. Mr. Adams recalls that many of the residents who did drop in were vague as to when they last paid for their subscription; in all such instances, the subscriber was given the benefit of the doubt but all records were set up on a businesslike basis.

Circulation is now up to 1,690; the Whitefish post office has a total of 1,820 patrons. With such a ratio, Mr. Adams feels they've about reached the saturation point on numbers. He has no plans for going further afield in circulation effort because Flatland County is intensively covered by four dailies—out of Kalispell, Missoula, and Great Falls, Mont., and Spokane, Wash.—plus several strong weeklies. Under such circumstances, the Adamses feel they will do better to continue to concentrate coverage, selling and circulation efforts within the immediate Whitefish community.

A joint promotional effort with the Big Mountain ski area is finding good advertiser reaction. This involves free distribution each week of about 200 copies through the summer resorts in the area (just west of the Glacier Park western entrance). Each such copy is labeled with a special Big Mountain sticker explaining that the newspaper is being given to the tourist on a complimentary basis and, of course, selling the joys of a return visit next winter for the skiing. This inexpensive program has been helpful in building more summer tourist traffic for Whitefish merchants.

The shift in publication date from Friday to Thursday gives the advertiser a better break for weekend shopping, Mr. Adams has found. This shift also opens up the week by adding another day which the Adamses are able to devote to feature writing and advertising work. The move from seven to eight columns was almost as beneficial as a rate increase because it permits more ads per page. The narrower column actually is a rate increase, Mr. Adams points out.

A good measure of community hunger for a good local newspaper is shown by the fact that the first Pilot published by the Adams team contained 12 pages—the largest single edition in 10 years, at the time. Further testimonial to this hunger lies in the fact that most of the circulation jump from 800 to almost 1,700 came during the first year under Adams direction.

In his advertising work, Mr. Adams does everything possible to gain the confidence of his customers to the point that many of them consider him their individual "promotion manager." In carrying out this responsibility, he strives first for consistency; of course he remains alert for ideas and sound reasons to recommend increased space. Because he is so personally sold on the advantages of consistency, Mr. Adams eschews special editions with the exception of the traditional preholiday shopping number, the back-to-school edition, Easter shopping, and each February a special for the Whitefish Winter Carnival.

Feature subject material is limitless in the Whitefish area. The Adamses strive for action pictures to go with each feature. They are both proficient with a Speed Graphic, do their own developing and send all engraving to a commercial firm in nearby Kalispell. Rarely do they run a cut in less than three-column width, believing that if a photo doesn't warrant good display, it probably isn't good enough to use.

Type selection has been completely modernized now. A more recent change was to down-style headlines indented one em to improve readability. The present flag was adopted last spring. It shows a local summer scene with "The Whitefish Pilot" overprinted in Bodoni italics; last fall the flag was changed to show a winter scene as background for the logo.

Though much progress has been made in revamping the equipment to make the Pilot a modern mechanical shop, more investment is still called for. The greatest forward step was made with installation of a web-fed Duplex press complete with automatic folder as a replacement for the wornout flatbed. This has cut press time for the newspaper from almost 8 hours to less than 1 hour. The two Mergenthaler linotypes have been completely rebuilt and modernized. The only original equipment still in service are two job presses which Mr. Adams hopes to replace soon.

Equipment replacement thus far amounts to about 25 percent of the original purchase price. Mr. Adams is currently leaning toward installation of a Multilith press for job work * * * not only for the flexibility this will give him but also to begin to acquaint himself and his staff with offset procedures. Though he knew little about printing production prior to taking over the Pilot, Mr. Adams says he has learned enough now to become convinced that complete conversion to offset for the Pilot as well as most weeklies is a matter of when rather than if.

Despite the back shop improvements in the past 4 years, labor costs still amount to more than 40 percent of the Pilot's gross. In addition to Mr. and Mrs. Adams, the Pilot employs about three-and-one-half persons, including two full-time men. The ability to use unskilled help for major offset production in effect is "automation in reverse," as Mr. Adams sees it. His closest estimates indicate, however, that he could operate with one full-time man to handle offset plate production and printing plus part-time help and cut his present labor costs by 40 percent in dollars.

---

## THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF LINCOLN'S GETTYSBURG ADDRESS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 10 minutes in the morning hour.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, 2 years ago it was my privilege to stand at Gettysburg and deliver the address on the 98th anniversary of the great address by Abraham Lincoln.

I should like, for the RECORD, to repeat some of the observations I made on that occasion:

One hundred years ago, a man from Illinois stood at Gettysburg, the destiny of a nation upon his shoulders and the cares of conflict graven upon his face.

From thousands of patriot graves, men who had fallen beneath a July sun were speaking to him. From his anguished soul he was trying to speak to and for them.

He was uneasy. In ink and pencil he drafted and redrafted the remarks which he was invited to make. His mind struggled to embody in few words a message suited to the occasion, setting forth the reason for the conflict, the duty still at hand, and the hope for the future. Yet, out of deep humility, he was impelled to say it was not the words of the living which would be noted and remembered but only the deeds of heroes who had fallen there for the Union.

THE NEW NATION

Consider then his words. He spoke of our forefathers—those who were there before him and brought forth a new nation. They were but one of many generations who had gone before, a part of the endless stream which flows through time and history and gives continuity to our national life.

Each generation added to the inheritance which it received from those who had gone before, enriched it, and transmitted it to those who were to follow.

The new Nation which they wrought was conceived in liberty and dedicated to equality.

How freely those words come to the tongue in all parts of the earth—liberty and equality. And what strange meanings are read into them.

Men speak of liberty even as it is being extinguished before their eyes. They speak of liberty, even as it is being transformed into a strange gospel. Men speak of liberty, even as her domain shrinks and she struggles for survival. Men speak of liberty even as such heresies as "better Red than dead" rise up to be embraced by those who have forgotten freedom's price. But the man from Illinois spoke only of that liberty which ennobles and dignifies the individual and preserves his godly image.

IMMORTAL PROSE

Then came the deathless question which continues to roll down time's corridor with each generation. Can a nation so conceived and so dedicated long endure?

What strange doubts assail this timid generation of today as it beholds the challenges to both liberty and equality.

We seem beset with fear not faith, with doubt not confidence, with compromise not conviction, with dismay not dedication.

We are drenched with the literature of fear and doubt. Survival has become the main theme. The fallout shelter from which the stars of hope and courage cannot be seen has become the symbol of our fears and misgivings.

Are we to become fearful, unworthy legatees in a blessed, united land where the earth is fertile to our every need, where the skills and ingenuity of men are boundless, where the burdens are bearable, where decent living is within the reach of all, and where the genius to produce is unlimited?

Perhaps we have lost our sense of continuity. Perhaps we have forgotten that we move in that same endless stream which began with our forefathers and which will flow on and on to embrace our children and our children's children. If we have, there will have gone with it that sense of individual responsibility which is the last best hope that a nation conceived in liberty and dedicated to equality can long endure.

Comes then the reminder from the man from Illinois. Men died and are sleeping who fought under a July Gettysburg sun that the Nation might endure, united, free, tolerant, and devoted to equality.

The task was unfinished. It is never quite finished.

Freedom is never fully won at any given time or place.

From Runnymede and the Magna Carta until now is 7½ centuries.

Has there been a generation in which liberty has not been challenged in one form or another?

In the day of our forefathers, the challenge was from a king and his ministers to a people.

When our Capital was burned by the British in 1814 it was an imperious sovereign against an infant land.

When the man from Illinois stood at Gettysburg 100 years ago, it was the challenge flowing from one of the unsolved problems in the Constitution.

Three score years ago, it was a helpless island people against a foreign tyrant.

Twice in our own time, it was the challenge of autocracy and dictatorship versus freedom and self-determination.

And today, it is the challenge of cold war born strangely enough in the crucible of hot war. It is the challenge of a despotic, deceitful system with its own prophets, its own holy book, its own specious promises of salvation, its own image of man as a creature without dignity or the everlasting hope of another more glorious life.

But the challenge to freedom is not limited to forces from without. It embraces also those individuals and groups who are unceasing in their efforts to expand the powers and functions of the Central Government and have it intrude more deeply into the affairs of the people.

These—all these—are the continuing challenges to freedom and the task of the defenders is never finished.

Comes now the shining hope and the duty with which the man from Illinois charged his countrymen.

The hope—a new birth of freedom. But can there be a birth without labor and pain?

Dare we in this soft age believe when men shrink from pain and sacrifice that a new birth of freedom and a new sense of mission can come without pain?

And then the further hope that self-government shall not perish. He did not mean government of the few but of all. He did not say government by the few but by all. He did not say government for the few but for all.

But the key to all is government by the people for the certain way to lose the precious power of self-government is failure to use it.

So spoke the man from Illinois 100 years ago.

His imperishable words are as fresh today as when they were uttered.

NEED STILL HERE

The problem today is the same as in his day—whether in this uneasy, fevered world, this or any nation founded on liberty and equality can long endure.

The duty is the same—the duty imposed upon us as a part of that endless procession of men and women to build and ennoble this good land and carry on the unfinished work.

The bonds are the same, for the living cannot separate themselves from their obligation to the dead.

The need is the same—for a new birth of freedom as the lamps of liberty go out in many places, either by force and brutality or by default.

The challenge is the same—for this generation to come out of the gloomy shelters of defeatism and despair and assert freedom's cause under God to all the world with the same vigor and purpose which marked the course of the man from Illinois.

His name you know—Abraham Lincoln.

## SENATOR NELSON'S REVIEW OF SECRETARY UDALL'S "THE QUIET CRISIS"

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, Secretary of the Interior Udall has written a book entitled "The Quiet Crisis," in which he informs the conscience of America of the great need to preserve our natural resources.

The Washington Post has persuaded my junior colleague, Senator GAYLORD NELSON, who is a former Governor of Wisconsin, to review "The Quiet Crisis." My colleague is himself not only an ardent conservationist, but an expert one. As Governor of Wisconsin, he was responsible for the finest conservation program of any State in the Union. The Senator is extraordinarily well informed on the subject. When he came to the Senate my colleague made his first choice of a committee the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and I am sure he is a most useful and expert member of that committee.

I should like to read the last two paragraphs of the review, by my colleague from Wisconsin, of Secretary of the Interior Udall's book:

Udall's story of tragic waste of priceless assets, mixed with half victories along the way, ends with the grim challenge of the future: The specter of a population twice as large as today's, empowered by new technology to consume resources at an even greater pace, making a new assault on our battered environment.

The message of "The Quiet Crisis" is obvious. We have only a precious few years left to make a massive effort at the State, local, and National level to preserve our fresh water, our soil, our forests and streams, our minerals, and even the air we breathe. If we fail to act, these priceless resources may be destroyed forever.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have this brief review of "The Quiet Crisis," as reviewed by the Senator from Wisconsin, printed in the RECORD.

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

UDALL WRITES A PRIMER FOR WONDERS OF AMERICA

(Reviewed by GAYLORD NELSON)

"The Quiet Crisis," by Stewart L. Udall, introduction by President John F. Kennedy, Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 209 pages, $5.

If you want your children to grow up and get rich some day by exploiting the things and the people around them, I wouldn't recommend this book. But if you want them to acquire a reverence for the land and the forests and the wild animals, and to be inspired by the great figures of American history who have expressed this spirit in our public life, then I don't know of a better primer.

Interior Secretary Udall, in this terse little book, manages to see and express conservation as a wide-sweeping, all-encompassing part of American history. It is the story of a political, economic, and philosophical struggle involving cowboys, Indians, transcendentalists, empire builders, robber barons, bureaucrats, and Presidents.

For the most part, it is a sad story of an inevitable tragedy, of how the great American dream of a new empire stretching from ocean to ocean conflicted with many of the scientific principles of conservation. Secretary Udall tells how the new Nation flourished—but only at the expense of the Indian,

the buffalo, the virgin timber, the clean water, and the precious topsoil.

The heroes of this story are the few strong figures in our history who have had the soul to appreciate the precious things in our environment, and the backbone to fight to save them.

Udall describes what a masterpiece of creation the American continent was when the Pilgrims arrived. Yet it looked hideous to them, and they set about changing it. The conflict has continued ever since. The American Indian's concept of the land as something that existed for the enjoyment and sustenance of all had to be eliminated—and so did the Indian. The forests had to be cut down to build houses and make way for farms. The beavers had to be trapped to earn cash from Europe. The thin layer of grass on the great plains had to be plowed under to plant corn. The rivers had to be dammed. The western lands had to be given to the railroads. The gold-rich hills had to be washed away with high pressure water hoses to bring out the nuggets of wealth.

Almost from the beginning, a few voices cried out in the wilderness. The result was blazing controversy and, in some cases, great victories for the public's stake in its environment.

"Where can I go now, and visit nature undisturbed?" demanded John James Audubon in the 1820's. His book, "Birds of America," was credited with arousing the national conscience and saving many species, and ultimately the founding of the Smithsonian Institution.

Udall's story of tragic waste of priceless assets, mixed with half victories along the way, ends with the grim challenge of the future: The specter of a population twice as large as today's, empowered by new technology to consume resources at an even greater pace, making a new assault on our battered environment.

The message of "The Quiet Crisis" is obvious. We have only a precious few years left to make a massive effort at the State, local, and national level to preserve our fresh water, our soil, our forests and streams, our minerals, and even the air we breathe. If we fail to act, these priceless resources may be destroyed forever.

## McNAMARA'S REPORT TO THE NATION ON AMERICA'S DEFENSE

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, Secretary of Defense McNamara delivered one of the most significant addresses on the national defense in a long time before the Economic Club in New York City on Monday.

This address not only indicates our substantial superiority over the Soviet Union in nuclear power and versatility. It also indicates how important it is that we keep our guard up.

Secretary McNamara is the top authority on defense. Our defensive power must be a prime ingredient in our international policy as determined in important part by the Congress. For this reason I think it essential that the Members of Congress have the complete text of Secretary McNamara's address available in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that this outstanding and significant speech may be printed in the RECORD, and that a thoughtful editorial on the speech, published in the Washington Post and entitled "Strength-for-Peace Policy," may also be printed in the RECORD.

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

REMARKS OF SECRETARY OF DEFENSE ROBERT S. McNAMARA BEFORE THE ECONOMIC CLUB OF NEW YORK, WALDORF ASTORIA HOTEL, NEW YORK, N.Y., MONDAY, NOVEMBER 18, 1963

Before long this administration will be presenting, once again, the details of a proposed national defense budget for the consideration of the Congress and the public. Given the importance of these matters, their complexities and uncertainties, and the existence of real differences of opinion, a degree of controversy is inevitable, and even desirable.

Some controversies, however, reveal underlying differences in perspective that scarcely suggest the participants are living in the same world. Within the past few weeks, some critics have suggested that we have literally hundreds of times more strength than we need; others have accused us of risking the whole future of the Nation by engaging in unilateral disarmament. I would like to believe that criticisms bracketing our policy in that fashion prove it to be rational and sound. But a discrepancy of that order cannot be reassuring. Rather, it indicates that we have failed to convey to some part of our audience even the broadest outlines, as we see them, of the problems that our military strategy and force structure are meant to address. I believe we should be able to move from controversy on that scale toward consensus in military affairs, not always on details or components of our policies, but at least on an appreciation of the major national security problems confronting us, on the broad alternative paths to their solution and on the dominant goals, obstacles, costs and risks affecting choice. My purpose in speaking to you this evening is to help move in this direction.

As a prelude, then, to the coming season of debate, I should like to identify and discuss some basic matters on which a considerable degree of consensus seems to me both possible and desirable, although by no means assured.

These include those overall comparative strengths and weaknesses of the opposing military alliances that form the bold relief in the strategic environment. In short, they are the considerations that seem to have relatively long-term significance compared to the annual budget cycle.

Matters of that degree of permanence tend to be stamped on our minds as being unchanging and unchangeable, the unquestioned framework of daily and yearly policymaking. Yet these factors of which I shall speak do change: more swiftly and more profoundly than our picture of them tends to change. Indeed, I believe it is just the fact that over the last decade this topography has changed—while many maps have not—that accounts for some apparently irreconcilable controversies.

Let me recall the earlier period briefly, for comparison The strategic landscape at the outset of the fifties was dominated by two outstanding features. One was the practical U.S. monopoly of deliverable, strategic nuclear weapons. The other was the Soviet Union and Communist China's virtual monopoly of ground force on the continents of Europe and Asia.

Both of these determinants of Western military policy had changed considerably by the end of the Korean war. The Soviets had produced atomic explosions and had created a sizable nuclear delivery capability against Europe, while NATO ground forces had expanded rapidly, and military operations in Korea had greatly tarnished the significance of Chinese Communist superiority in numbers. But the old notions of monopoly persisted as short-cut aids to thinking on policy matters. And they were not so misleading as they came later to be. Soviet armed forces approaching 5 million men still heavily outweighed the NATO forces in Europe; and Soviet delivery capability against the United States was dwarfed by that of SAC. Moreover, tactical nuclear weapons were being heralded as a new nuclear monopoly for the West.

Even as these earlier notions of monopolies grew obsolete, ideas about the feasibility of alternative policies continued to reflect them. So did ideas about how wars might be fought. Nuclear operations, both strategic and tactical, by the United States in response to Soviet aggression against our allies were considered to be virtually unilateral. Hence it was supposed the problem of credibility of the U.S. response would scarcely arise, even in the case of relatively limited Soviet aggressions. Western reliance upon nuclear weapons, in particular strategic systems, both to deter and to oppose nonnuclear attack of any size seemed not only adequate but also unique in its adequacy.

That sort of situation is convenient for policymakers. It makes policy easy to choose and easy to explain. Perhaps that is why throughout most of the fifties, while the Soviets under various pressures decreased their ground forces and the NATO allies built theirs up, and while the Soviets acquired a massive nuclear threat against Europe and laid the groundwork for a sizable threat against the United States, the picture underlying most policy debate remained that appropriate to 1949. It was a picture of Communist Goliath in conventional strength facing a Western David, almost naked of conventional arms but alone possessed of a nuclear sling. Then toward the end of that decade, the prospect that the Soviets would acquire intercontinental ballistic missiles at a time when our strategic forces consisted almost entirely of bombers focused our attention and our budget even more sharply than before upon our strategic forces. The urgency of the problem of deterring the most massive of attacks was a new reason for thinking that the West could spare neither resources nor thought to deal more specifically with lesser threats. The most urgent task was to provide for deterrence of massive aggression by assuring the survival under any attack of forces at least adequate, in the calculations of a potential attacker, to destroy his society in retaliation. It was now not the assurance of continued nuclear superiority that preempted the attention of policymakers but, on the contrary, the struggle to maintain it.

But it is time for the maps to change by which policy is charted and justified. The old ones, which assumed a U.S. nuclear monopoly, both strategic and tactical, and a Communist monopoly of ground combat strength, are too far removed from reality to serve as even rough guides. Neither we nor our allies can afford the crudities of maps that tell us the old policies are still forced upon us, when a true picture would show important new avenues of necessity and choice.

What most needs changing is a picture of ourselves and of the Western Alliance as essentially at bay, outmanned and outgunned except for nuclear arms no longer exclusively ours. We should not think of ourselves as forced by limitations of resources to rely upon strategies of desperation and threats of vast mutual destruction, compelled to deal only with the most massive and immediate challenges, letting lesser ones go by default. It would be a striking historical phenomenon if that self-image should be justified. We are the largest member of an alliance with a population of almost 450 million people, an aggregate annual product which is fast approaching a trillion dollars. and a modern and diverse technological base without parallel, facing the Soviet Union and its European satellites with their hundred million fewer

people and an aggregate output no more than half that of the West.

And quite apart from ignoring the underlying strengths of the West, the outdated picture I have described takes no account of the military capabilities in being that our investment over the last decade, and specifically in the last few years, have bought for us. If new problems put strong claims on our attention and our resources today, it is very largely because we have come a large part of the way that is feasible toward solving some old ones.

Let me summarize the current status of the balance of strategic nuclear forces, that part of the military environment that has preoccupied our attention for so long. In strictly relative numerical terms, the situation is the familiar one. The U.S. force now contains more than 500 operational long-range ballistic missiles—Atlas, Titan, Minuteman, Polaris—and is planned to increase to over 1,700 by 1966. There is no doubt in our minds and none in the minds of the Soviets that these missiles can penetrate to their targets. In addition, the United States has Strategic Air Command bombers on air alert and over 500 bombers on quick reaction ground alert. By comparison, the consensus is that today the Soviets could place about half as many bombers over North America on a first strike. The Soviets are estimated to have today only a fraction as many intercontinental missiles as we do. Furthermore, their submarine-launched ballistic missiles are short range, and generally are not comparable to our Polaris force. The Soviets pose a very large threat against Europe, including hundreds of intermediate and medium-range ballistic missiles. This threat is today and will continue to be covered by the clear superiority of our strategic forces.

The most wishful of Soviet planners would have to calculate as a certainty that the most effective surprise attack they could launch would still leave us with the capability to destroy the attacker's society. What is equally pertinent is that the relative numbers and survivability of U.S. strategic forces would permit us to retaliate against all the urgent Soviet military targets that are subject to attack, thus contributing to the limitation of damage to ourselves and our allies.

Deterrence of deliberate, calculated attack seems as well assured as it can be, and the damage-limiting capability of our numerically superior forces is, I believe, well worth its incremental cost. It is a capability to which the smaller forces of the Soviet Union could not realistically aspire. That is one reason, among others, why I would not trade our strategic posture for that of the Soviets at any point during the coming decade.

But given the kind of force that the Soviets are building, including submarine-launched missiles beyond the reach of our offensive forces, the damage which the Soviets could inflict on us and our allies, no matter what we do to limit it, remains extremely high.

That has been true for our allies ever since the middle and late fifties. Soviet acquisition of a sizable delivery capability against the United States, and more significantly their acquisition of relatively protected forces, submarine launched or hardened, has been long and often prematurely heralded. Its arrival at last merely dramatizes the need to recognize that strategic nuclear war would under all foreseeable circumstances be bilateral—and highly destructive to both sides.

Larger budgets for U.S. strategic forces would not change that fact. They could have only a decreasing incremental effect in limiting somewhat the damage that the United States and its allies could suffer in a general nuclear war. In short, we cannot buy the capability to make a strategic bombing campaign once again a unilateral prospect.

That must, I suggest, be accepted as one of the determinants affecting policy. Another is that the same situation confronts the Soviet leaders, in a way that is even more intensely confining. In fact, enormous increases in Soviet budgets would be required for them to achieve any significant degree of damage-limiting capability. The present Soviet leaders show no tendency to challenge the basis of the U.S. strategic deterrent posture by such expenditures.

In the last 2 years alone, we have increased the number of nuclear warheads in the strategic alert forces by 100 percent. During that period we have more than doubled the megatonnage of the strategic alert forces. The fact that further increases in strategic forces size will at last encounter rapidly diminishing returns—which is largely an effect of the very large investments the United States has made in this area—should be reflected in future budgets. The funding for the initial introduction of missiles into our forces is nearing completion. We can anticipate that the annual expenditure on strategic forces will drop substantially, and level off well below the present rate of spending. This is not to rule out the possibility that research now in progress on possible new technological developments, including the possibility of useful ballistic missile defenses, will require major new expenditures. In any event, there will be recurring costs of modernization.

In the field of tactical nuclear weapons, the picture is in important respects similar. The United States at present has in stockpile or planned for stockpile tens of thousands of nuclear explosives for tactical use on the battlefield, in antisubmarine warfare and against aircraft. They include warheads for artillery, battlefield missiles, demolition munitions, bombs, depth charges, air-to-air missiles and surface-to-air missiles. The consensus is that the United States is presently substantially superior in design, diversity and numbers in this class of weapons.

This is an indispensable superiority, as we can readily understand if we consider how our problems of strategic choice would be altered if the tables were reversed and it were the Soviet Union which held a commanding lead in this field. Nevertheless, what we have is superiority, not monopoly, and even if tactical nuclear warfare can be limited, below some ill-defined threshold of strategic exchange, the key fact is that if the West initiates such warfare in the future it must be expected to be bilateral, in any theater which engaged the Soviet Union. Again, we cannot buy back a monopoly, or the assurance of unilateral use.

Finally, there is the area of what we call our general purpose forces. Within the last 2 years, we have increased the number of our combat-ready Army divisions by about 45 percent, from 11 to 16. There has been a 30-percent increase in the number of tactical air squadrons; a 75-percent increase in airlift capabilities; and a 100-percent increase in ship construction and conversion to modernize the fleet.

But it is not only force size that matters. The key to the effective utilization of these forces is combat readiness and mobility.

The most recent demonstration of our ability to reinforce our troops presently stationed in Europe occurred last month in Operation Big Lift, the first of a series of planned large-scale, worldwide exercises. For the first time in military history, an entire division was airlifted from one continent to another. That movement could never have been accomplished without a massive increase in our airlift capability, which is still being expanded. (It will have risen 400 percent between 1961 and 1967.) It required the development of new techniques to pre-position combat equipment, of which we have two extra division sets now in Europe. It called for new techniques in military training and administration to make sure that units are really ready to move out on a moment's notice. This exercise, in which some 16,000 airmen and soldiers and more than 350 planes took part, is directly relevant to the needs of Europe, where it brought a seventh division to join the six that are to remain in place. It is also relevant to the ability of the United States to fulfill its policy commitments worldwide, swiftly and in effective strength.

But, it might be asked, what is the significance of all this for the realistic security problems of the United States and its allies? To what contingencies are these forces expected to contribute, and how effective might they be, measured against the strength of opposing forces? How meaningful is it to talk of 16 or 20 or 30 divisions in opposing the ground armies of the Soviet Union and Communist China?

Such questions are often meant to be merely rhetorical, in view of the supposed masses of Communist troops. The fact is that they are serious, difficult questions, to which I shall suggest some tentative answers. But it is difficult to encourage realistic discussions of specific contingencies so long as the shadow of the Communist horde hangs unchallenged over the debate. The actual contingencies that seem to be to me most likely and most significant are not those which would involve all, or even a major part, of the Soviet bloc or Chinese Communist armed forces, nor do they all involve Europe. Hence, aggregate figures of armed strength of NATO and the Warsaw Pact nations are not immediately relevant to them. But it is useful to make these overall comparisons precisely because misleading or obsolete notions of these very aggregates often produce an attitude of hopelessness toward any attempt to prepare to meet Communist forces in ground combat, however limited in scope.

The announced total of Soviet armed forces for 1955 was indeed a formidable 5.75 million men. Today that figure has been cut to about 3.3 million; the Warsaw Pact total including the Soviets is only about 4.5 million. Against that, it is today the members of NATO whose active armed forces number over 5 million. The ground forces of NATO nations total 3.2 million, of which 2.2 million men are in Europe, as against the Soviet ground combat forces total of about 2 million men, and a Warsaw Pact total of about 3 million. Both the Soviet Union and the U.S. forces of course include units stationed in the Far East. In central Europe, NATO has more men, and more combat troops, on the ground than does the bloc. It has more men on the ground in West Germany than the bloc does in East Germany. It has more and better tactical aircraft, and these planes on the average can carry twice the payload twice as far as the Soviet counterparts.

These facts are hard to reconcile with the familiar picture of the Russian Army as incomparably massive. The usual index cited to support that picture is numbers of total active divisions, and the specific number familiar from the past is 175 divisions in the Soviet Army.

This total, if true, would indeed present a paradox. The Soviet ground forces are reliably estimated to be very close to 2 million men, compared to about 1 million for the United States. How is it that the Soviets can muster 10 times the number of active, combat-ready, fully manned divisions that the United States has manned, with only twice as many men on active duty? The answer is simply that they do not. Recent intensive investigation has shown that the number of active Soviet divisions that are maintained at manning levels anywhere close to combat readiness is less than half of the 160 to 175 figure.

What remains is a large number, but even that is misleading. For one thing, U.S. divi-

sions have about twice as many men in the division unit and its immediate combat supporting units as comparable Soviet divisions. A U.S. mechanized division has far more personnel in maneuvering units, far more in armored cavalry, far more engineers, far more signals, far more light armored personnel carriers, and far more aircraft available in support than Soviet divisions. In addition to longer staying power, much of the U.S. manpower and equipment margin is muscle that would make itself felt on D-day. If, on the other hand, we were to reorganize along Soviet lines, we could display far greater numbers of divisions comparable to those of the Soviets.

The Soviet combat-ready force remains a formidable one. Moreover, the Russians do have a powerful mobilization capability; in particular, they have a large number of lightly manned or cadre divisions to be filled out on mobilization. Still, this reality remains strikingly different from our accustomed maps of it.

I do not wish to suggest that such aggregate comparisons are by themselves a valid index to military capabilities. But they are enough to suggest the absurdity, as a picture of the prevailing military strengths on which new efforts might build, of David and Goliath notions borrowed from 1949.

None of this is to say that NATO strength on the ground in Europe is adequate to turn back without nuclear weapons an all-out surprise nonnuclear attack.

But that is not in any case the contingency toward which the recent and future improvements in the mobility and capabilities of U.S. general purpose forces are primarily oriented. Aggression on that scale would mean a war about the future of Europe and, as a consequence, the future of the United States and the U.S.S.R. In the face of threats of that magnitude, our nuclear superiority remains highly relevant to deterrence. The Soviets know that even nonnuclear aggression at that high end of the spectrum of conflict so threatens our most vital interests that we and our allies are prepared to make whatever response may be required to defeat it, no matter how terrible the consequences for our own society.

The probability that the Soviet leaders would choose to invoke that exchange seems to me very low indeed. They know well what even the Chinese Communist leaders must recognize upon further reflection, that a nuclear war would mean destruction of everything they have built up for themselves during the last 50 years.

If we were to consider a spectrum of the possible cases of Communist aggression, then, ranging from harassment, covert aggression, and indirect challenge at one end of the scale to the massive invasion of Western Europe or a full-scale nuclear strike against the West at the other end, it is clear that our nuclear superiority has been and should continue to be an effective deterrent to aggression at the high end of the spectrum. It is equally clear, on the other hand, that at the very low end of the spectrum a nuclear response may not be fully credible, and that nuclear power alone cannot be an effective deterrent at this level in the future any more than it has been in the past.

The fact is that at every level of force, the Alliance in general, and the U.S. Armed Forces in particular, have greater and more effective strength than we are in the habit of thinking we have—and with reasonable continued effort we can have whatever strength we need. I have spoken already of strategic weapons, where the great superiority of the United States is the superiority also of the Alliance. In tactical nuclear weapons a parallel superiority exists—and while many of our Allies share with us in manning the systems which would use these tactical warheads in the hour of need, it is not unfair to point out that, even more than in the strategic field, the tactical nuclear strength of the Alliance is a contribution of the United States. That strength has been increased, on the ground in Europe, by more than 60 percent in the last 2 years. Today the thousands of U.S. warheads deployed on the continent for the immediate defense of Europe have a combined explosive strength more than 10,000 times the force of the nuclear weapons used to end the Second World War. Tactical nuclear strength the Alliance has today, and we have provided it.

But neither we nor our Allies can find the detonation of such weapons—and their inevitable bilateral exchange—an easy first choice. At the lower end of the spectrum, therefore, we also need strong and ready conventional forces. We have done our part here and we continue to believe it just—and practicable—for our partners to do theirs.

The most difficult questions arise over the best means for meeting a variety of dangerous intermediate challenges in many parts of the world: those which threaten the possibility of sizable conflict while still not raising the immediate issue of the national survival of ourselves or of any member of our alliances. Conflicts might arise out of Soviet subversion and political aggression backed up by military measure in non-NATO areas in Europe, Latin America, the Middle East and Africa. There is a range of challenges that could arise from Communist China and its satellites in the Far East and in southeast Asia. Most dangerously, approaching the upper end of the spectrum, there is the possibility of limited Soviet pressures on NATO territory itself, along the vast front running from Norway to Greece and Turkey. Both the flanks and the center contain potential targets. And always, of course, there are the contingencies that could arise in relation to Berlin.

It is difficult to say just how probable any of these circumstances might be, although they must be regarded as more likely than still larger aggressions. What one can say is that if any of these more likely contingencies should arise, they would be highly dangerous. Inaction, or weak action, could result in a serious setback, missed opportunity, or even disaster. In fact, if either a nuclear exchange or a major Soviet attack should occur, it would most likely arise from a conflict on a lesser scale, which Western capabilities had failed to deter and which an inadequate Western response had failed to curb in time.

Since World War II, the expansionist impulse of the Communist bloc is clear, but equally clear is its desire to avoid direct confrontation with the military forces of the free world. In Greece, in Berlin, and in Cuba, Communists have probed for military and political weakness but when they have encountered resistance, they have held back. Not only Communist doctrine has counseled this caution, but respect for the danger that any sizable, overt conflict would lead to nuclear war. It would follow that no deterrent would be more effective against these lesser and intermediate levels of challenge than the assurance that such moves would certainly meet prompt, effective military response by the West. That response could confront the Soviets with frustration of their purposes unless they chose themselves to escalate the conflict to a nuclear exchange, or to levels that made nuclear war highly probable—a choice they are unlikely to make in the face of our destructive power.

The basis for that particular assurance cannot be systems in development, or weapons in storage depots, or reserves that must be mobilized, trained, and equipped, or troops without transport. We need the right combination of forward deployment and highly mobile combat-ready ground, sea, and air units, capable of prompt and effective commitment to actual combat, in short, the sort of capability we are increasingly building in our forces.

This capability requires of us—as of our allies—a Military Establishment that is, in the President's words, lean and fit. We must stop and ask ourselves before deciding whether to add a new and complex weapon system to our inventory, whether it is really the most effective way to do the job under the rigorous conditions of combat. We must examine constantly the possibilities for combining functions, particularly in weapons that could be used by two or more services. Given this tough-minded sense of reality about the requirements of combat readiness, it should be possible for the United States not only to maintain but to expand this increased strength without overall increases in our defense budget. As our national productivity and our gross national product expand, the defense budget therefore need not keep pace. Indeed, it appears likely that measured in relative—and perhaps even absolute—terms, the defense budget will level off and perhaps decline a little. At the same time, we are continuing the essential effort to reduce the impact of defense spending our our balance of payments. We have already brought this figure down from $2.7 billion in fiscal year 1961 to $1.7 billion for fiscal year 1963, and we shall continue to reduce it, without reducing the combat ground forces deployed in Europe, and while strengthening our overall combat effectiveness.

And it must be our policy to continue to strengthen our combat effectiveness. I do not regard the present Communist leaders as wholly reckless in action. But recent experience, in Cuba and, on a lesser scale, in Berlin, has not persuaded me that I can predict with confidence the sorts of challenges that Communist leaders will come to think prudent and profitable. If they were again to miscalculate as dangerously as they did a year ago, it would be essential to confront them, wherever that might be, with the full consequences of their action: the certainty of meeting immediate, appropriate, and fully effective military action.

All of our strengths, including our strategic and tactical nuclear forces, contributed last year, and they would contribute in similar future situations to the effectiveness of our response, by providing a basis for assurance that the Soviets would not dangerously escalate or shift the locale of the conflict. But above all, in order to fashion that response, and to promise the Soviets local defeat in case of actual ground conflict, we had to use every element of the improvements in combat readiness and mobility that had been building over the preceding year and a half, including combat divisions, air transport, and tactical air. And the last ingredient was also there: the will to use those forces against Soviet troops and equipment.

Let us not delude ourselves with obsolete images into believing that our nuclear strength, great as it is, solves all of our problems of national security, or that we lack the strengths to meet those problems that it does not solve. In the contingencies that really threaten—the sort that have occurred and will occur again—we and our allies need no longer choose to live with the sense or the reality of inferiority to the Soviet bloc in relevant, effective force. Let us be fully aware of the wide range of our military resources, and the freedom they can give us to pursue the peaceful objectives of the free world without fear of military aggression.

---

STRENGTH-FOR-PEACE POLICY

Secretary McNamara's fact-packed speech to the Economic Club in New York came at a timely moment. Undoubtedly it was designed for close reading in Moscow and the capitals of Europe as well as in American homes. In a brilliant analysis of the U.S. defense problem and the world's security problem, the Secretary has strengthened hope for a peaceful future while dwelling

upon the terrible destructiveness that our arms have attained.

For the benefit of the pessimists who persistently overestimate the strength of the Soviet Union, Mr. McNamara offered concrete comparisons. The U.S. strategic nuclear forces now have more than 500 operational long-range ballistic missiles and will have more than 1,700 by 1966. The Soviet Union, he said, has only a fraction of this missile strength and about half as many bombers capable of first-strike action as are available in our Strategic Air Command. The United States has similar superiority in tactical nuclear weapons.

One of the hopeful notes in the Secretary's speech is his statement that our strategic forces have reached a stage of development where further increases will yield only diminishing returns. Nothing this country can do will restore its nuclear monopoly, and in the absence of a monopoly neither the United States nor the Soviet Union can get much mileage out of piling up more and more nuclear capacity, when each already has enough bombs and delivery vehicles to inflict unthinkable damage, if not total destruction, on the other.

For this reason Mr. McNamara anticipates a substantial drop in the annual expenditures on strategic forces. But there was no hint whatever in the Secretary's words of letting down our guard. He pointed to continued heavy obligations in developing the antimissile and in the maintenance of conventional forces to meet possible smaller aggressive thrusts against which nuclear power is not an effective deterrent.

To our European allies, Mr. McNamara seemed to be saying that there is still much to do to build up the strength of NATO despite the massive nuclear power behind it. To Moscow he seemed to be saying that the United States has not the slightest intention of yielding to pressure or of growing weary under the kind of harassment that the Kremlin has indulged in at Berlin and elsewhere. To the American people he was offering reassurance that this country does have the strength to stand firm through every crisis, that we can maintain an adequate defense without bankruptcy, and that there is no occasion to be jittery when the Kremlin blows hot and cold for the purpose of sowing confusion.

It was not a sword-rattling speech. The Secretary was candid in laying facts on the line, but underlying his exposition of American armed might is the administration's policy of using this strength to discourage aggression, avoid provocation and actively pursue better understanding and peace. "Let us be fully aware of the wide range of our military resources," the Secretary of Defense concluded, "and the freedom they can give us to pursue the peaceful objectives of the world without fear of military aggression."

---

## THE BERLIN PROBLEM

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, at this time, we are seeing almost weekly evidence of the ability of the Communists to harass us and put us on the defensive on the access routes to Berlin.

Our long-term objective remains the unification of Germany; but all of us, West and East, free world and Communists alike, know that as long as the world is in its present divided state of strain between the West and the East, neither side is going to permit the loss to the other of the portion of Germany that is currently pledged to it.

We all know that West Germany, with its 11 divisions, is the very bulwark of the West's land forces in Europe today. And, East Germany is not only powerful militarily, but it is now the second largest industrial Soviet satellite nation.

The only way that unification and freedom can come to Germany as a whole is as a result of a reduction in tensions that will lead to an increased porosity of the cruel Berlin wall and of the Iron Curtain itself; a reduction in tensions that will create a climate permitting the establishment of a fully democratic, unified Germany, as envisaged in the Potsdam Conference of 1945; and a reduction in tensions that will mean that both West and East will abide by the results of freely-held German elections.

That is the positive reason for a reduction in tensions.

The negative reason is to avoid the series of incidents that are now frequently occurring on the Berlin-Helmstedt autobahn. A hostile incident, starting by accident, can rapidly escalate to the blow-up point. This danger becomes all the more real as we come to depend on medium-size nuclear weapons for tactical defense, in place of conventional infantry and artillery. Without exaggerating, such an escalation could easily lead to the immolation of all of us. We are very lucky not to have started presently on such a course.

Twice before on the floor of this Chamber I made specific suggestions for lowering of tensions in central Europe and for the development of some constructive solution, some break from the status quo, some effort toward diplomatic actions on our part, rather than perpetual reactions.

In essence, my proposal calls for an internationally guaranteed corridor along the Berlin-Helmstedt autobahn with consequent loss of sovereignty over it by the Communists, in exchange for our recognition of the Oder-Neisse frontier and our recognition of the existence of the East German Government. There are various additions to this idea that I have developed and advanced in the past, including the location in Berlin of the European Headquarters of the United Nations, presently in Geneva, or of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, now in Paris.

I cannot help but point out at this time that if these ideas had been accepted—instead of our being involved in a series of crises in Berlin, we would have started along the path toward a reduction in tensions in central Europe. We could have embarked already on a course of action leading through increasing porosity of the Iron Curtain to eventual unification of Germany.

My own contacts, personally and by mail, with German citizens—as contrasted with their political leaders in government—convince me that such a solution is acceptable to these citizens. I am equally confident that such a solution is privately acceptable to both the West and the East. But, for political reasons and for reasons of barter and the maintenance of good trading positions, the governments on neither side wish to come forth and break the present impasse in which we find ourselves. I would not be so concerned about this matter if it were not for the fact that because of our own unwillingness to try to break this impasse, we are endangering the world itself.

I call, once again, on our administration to seek to rectify the sterility of our policy vis-a-vis Berlin and Germany.

In this connection, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Washington Post of November 14, 1963, that illustrates the facet of our problem deriving from our lack of a concrete, specified corridor of access.

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

### ACCESS TO BERLIN

Twice in 2 months, paralyzing incidents have taken place on the autobahn between West Germany and West Berlin. Either could have eventuated in war. Motives aside, in both cases the trouble arose from differing Soviet and American views of the Allied "right" of access to Berlin.

There is no formal document or international agreement specifically giving the Allies the right of access. In respect to Germany, it springs from the Allied conquest in World War II; there is no worry here. In respect to the Soviet Union, the right springs from various agreements on the occupation and division of Germany and Berlin; none of them explicitly mentions access. The only relevant piece of paper is a memorandum of June 29, 1945, by General Clay in which he recorded his understanding of an oral conversation about access with General Zhukov. There is no question but that in legal and abstract terms the Allies have the right of access. But due to the vague circumstances of its origins, it has been almost continually disputed in theory and contested in practice by the Russians.

The result has been not a clear simple "right" but, as the United States stated in its November 6 note to Moscow, a "right (exercised) in accordance with procedures." This is the key. These "procedures" are actually conditions or limitations established and enforced by the Russians. Typically, in the two recent incidents, the question was not whether the United States had a right to travel but the conditions under which the Soviet Union would allow it to travel.

Three elements have led the United States to accept these "procedures." One is the American recognition that the access territory is occupied in a military sense by the Soviets and thereby is a legitimate matter of interest to them. The second is the simple fact of physical Soviet control: Moscow has the men and the weapons on the spot and, up to a point, it is physically capable of enforcing its will.

The third element can only be called inept American and Allied diplomacy. Time after time since the war, although not invariably, the Soviets have made demands and the Allies have merely acquiesced. Junior military personnel, acting without instructions in new situations hatched by the Russians, have given way without clearing with their political superiors; so it was with the first Soviet demands that convoy troops dismount. Sometimes, as with the 1,500 American troops rushed to Berlin after the wall was erected—they all dismounted, other factors were allowed to override the issue of procedures. Sometimes, it is reported, low-level personnel who acquiesced in new procedures did not even report it to higher authorities; to this day the patchwork of procedures is such that no one will swear he knows what they all are.

Furthermore, the three Western Allies have often failed to coordinate their access prac-

tices, thus allowing the Russians to employ invidiously divisive tactics. When the Allies finally did get together in their parallel October 29 notes to Moscow, for the first time they explicitly stated a procedure. The consequence of this was to hand the Russians the effective right to demand that troops in convoys of a certain size dismount.

Access to Berlin is going to remain treacherous as long as the Soviets keep trying to force the Allies out of Berlin. The West must hope that the Soviets will not misunderstand the depth of its commitment there and not push the West too far. But meanwhile the United States must take urgent steps to shore up its position. It must record for its own use the procedures governing access so that there will be no confusion and unnecessary concession. It must insure the closest policy supervision of every American move between West Berlin and West Germany. It must coordinate its access practices with its Allies. And it must recognize that erosion is as sure a way to lose a right as outright abrogation.

## BUSINESS LEADER COMMENTS ON TAX BILL

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, early this year Mr. Milton J. Shapp, a respected businessman and civic leader in Philadelphia, Pa., wrote a letter to the President discussing the conditions essential for economic growth and offering suggestions based on his years of experience and study.

This letter has been made public but I want it to be included in official proceedings as we consider the tax bill. I believe we can profit from this thoughtful analysis of the tax cut approach to vigorous economic development.

Mr. Shapp makes several important points which deserve careful consideration. In particular, he points out that:

Tax savings enjoyed by low income groups or small companies will be spent quickly, creating consumer and industrial demand for many products * * *. Normally, industry will invest in new plants and facilities only when it has sufficient demand for its products and though financing is of course required, the decision to invest is not made just because funds happen to be available.

Further—

Private investments must be balanced by public investments in wealth-producing physical assets.

He illustrates the dependence of business prosperity on public investments in education, transportation, and resources.

In this context, Mr. Shapp says:

I do not advocate a program of government spending, but rather one of investment to stimulate the economy.

To preserve this distinction between operating expenses and capital investment, Mr. Shapp suggests adopting a capital budget. This is a practice, he explains, that is employed by every growing, successful business firm in the country.

The letter makes some astute observations and it merits our study. The factors it cites should not be ignored or slighted during Senate deliberation on the tax reduction.

I ask unanimous consent that the full text of Mr. Shapp's letter be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE JERROLD CORP.,
*Philadelphia, Pa., March 27, 1963.*

THE PRESIDENT,
*The White House,*
*Washington, D.C.*

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: In your recent speech before the American Bankers Association you asked those who have thoughts in regard to your tax program to submit suggestions and criticisms. This letter is written with the hope that some of the ideas I express may help your administration achieve a program for true economic growth.

I believe that two aspects of your tax proposals will prove particularly beneficial. These deal with the cuts that you have recommended for low-income families and those to assist small businesses. I support, too, but to a lesser degree, your proposals to reduce tax rates for large corporations and individuals in higher income brackets, as I do not believe these will result in any material boost to our economy. I make this statement as one who personally is in a high tax bracket and who is the head of a corporation that might save $100,000 a year in taxes if your proposals should be accepted by Congress. However, at issue here is not what I would gain personally, nor what my company would gain immediately through tax savings. We must look at the benefits that would accrue to the national economy by cutting taxes in top brackets. Unless tax reductions help the national economy, they will prove to be illusory in the long run.

Tax savings enjoyed by low-income groups or small companies will be spent quickly, creating consumer and industrial demand for many products. Often the profits of small companies are tied up in accounts receivable, inventory and fixed assets. They find it difficult to convert 52 percent of their profits into cash to meet taxes, and this factor has thwarted the growth of many young companies and slowed down employment increases they could have attained.

However, savings on taxes for large corporations will not necessarily increase investments in a substantive manner. Since 1957, industry's cash flow has been much greater than capital reinvestment in new plant and equipment. In larger perspective, statistics show that since 1922 there has been absolutely no trend relationship between the amount of money in the hands of industry or private investors and the total sums that have been invested in plant expansion or modernization.

Normally, industry will invest in new plant and facilities only when it has sufficient demand for its products, and though financing is of course required, the decision to invest is not made just because funds happen to be available. If substantial tax cuts are granted to individuals in the higher income brackets and for larger corporations, it is predictable that a large portion of the savings will not be used for individual investment but will merely serve to inflate stock market values. Since 1957 there has been a close correlation between the amount of private savings (business and personal) and the rise of stock prices. As you know, however, there is a big difference between sustained economic growth for the Nation and inflated stock values. The latter only gives the illusion of success.

However, if you feel that all individuals and business firms should be permitted to participate in tax savings, I concur. I merely point out that there is little growth benefit to be derived from high level cuts.

I should now like to call your attention to other aspects of the problem. For America to achieve a growth rate sufficient to reduce unemployment to manageable levels, we must increase those types of public sector investments that stimulate and sustain the economy. In previous decades, entrepreneurs furnished all or almost all of the capital that private companies needed. There was no real need a century ago, for example, for mills, mines, or factories to hire educated people. Business owners didn't need clean water, sewage disposal plants, airports, highways, etc., to make substantial profits on their invested capital.

This has all changed. Private investments must be balanced by public investments in wealth-producing physical assets. Business firms today do need educated people at all levels—in production, sales, research, and executive capacities. Highways and airports are essential to transport people and goods. Public investments to purify streams, build sewage disposal plants, etc., are required. In essence, taxes collected from industry, if reinvested in these types of public facilities, are part of the capital required to maximize business profits. These public investments are indeed as important to the operation of modern industry as the factories and office buildings they build for themselves. Yet, since 1946, on a per capita basis private investments have virtually tripled and public investments (Federal, State, and local) have dropped some 4 percent.

In my own business, if I were to invest in research and new production facilities and not balance these investments by training sales and field engineering personnel, etc., I would not obtain optimum profits. In fact, I might very well sustain high losses due to this unbalance in programing.

Ironically, most businessmen oppose public investments. Yet, business profits and the economic growth rate of the country have been retarded specifically because we have failed to maintain balance in our private and public investment programs.

My great fear is that any advantages that might be developed by a tax cutting program will be negated if this is accompanied by a program that reduces investments in needed public facilities. Please note the distinction. I do not advocate a program of Government spending, but rather one of investment to stimulate the economy. I believe that proper public investment will in fact reduce the operating cost of Government.

As to military expenditures, necessary as they may be, with the exception of defense and space funds that are allocated for research and education purposes, there is no long-term growth stimulation provided by these expenditures. Once the hardware is made, it is either abandoned as obsolete (as in the case of military bases in Turkey, England, and with many existing types of naval ships and aircraft), or destroyed in experimental tests.

Studies that Dr. Ernest Jurkat and I have made indicate clearly that public investments to develop people (via education and health programs), resources (for material and energy) and transportation systems, are the only types of public investments that stimulate private investment and spur true economic growth. For example, as shown on pages 58 and 59 of my recent study, "New Growth—New Jobs for Pennsylvania," each increase of $1 in these types of public investments stimulates an immediate (within 1 to 3 years) increase of private investment of $2.40. Together, this $3.40 investment increases GNP by $10.

During the American Bankers Association meeting, you indicated that each dollar of tax cut would stimulate $3 of added growth. This may not occur if public investment programs in these needed domestic facilities are reduced to balance the tax cuts. Even so, the $3 estimate is far below the $10 that could be achieved if a proper level of public investment in selected fields was maintained.

I believe that a more positive answer to increasing growth while maintaining a balanced budget is found in the proposals you suggested in your Yale speech last year. Adopt a capital budget. Segregate operating expenditures from capital investments in budget presentations.

Every successful business firm in this country does just this. No growth company could possibly show a profit if each year all of its capital expenditures were lumped together with secretarial salaries and office supply expenditures. Surely no business could grow if, because it kept "an administrative budget," it failed to make the necessary capital improvements to insure continued expansion and profitability of operations.

I submit the following specific proposals that I believe would help achieve sustained economic growth:

1. The Federal Government should separate capital and operating expenditures in budget presentations. The following items should be considered capital investment items: highways, bridges, health, development of natural resources, sewerage and water systems, housing, community development, airports, local utilities, parks, recreation, education, and research.

It can be shown statistically that investments for each of the above items either increase the economic growth potential of this country by stimulating the development of people, resources, and transportation systems, or they cut operating costs of government. Either case qualifies these expenditures to be listed as investments.

2. We should resort to the businesslike procedure of borrowing to meet capital needs. Tax revenues should be used to meet operating needs of the Government. Amortization repayments and interest charges should be included in the annual operating budget.

3. The Government should immediately institute a study to determine the impact that various investment programs (mentioned in item 1 above) have upon the rate of growth. (I have considerable material available on this subject.) It should be noted specifically that even in such an important field as transportation, the Chairman of the ICC stated last June that there were no studies being conducted to determine the impact that transportation has upon the growth of a community or the Nation. The Department of Commerce has little data that bears on this essential factor. It seems that before we place too much emphasis on the triggering effect of tax cuts, we should know more about the positive factors that stimulate growth.

4. Tax cut proposals should be directed to those phases of the economy where money not collected by the Government would definitely and quickly be put into the mainstream of commerce. This would mean emphasis on tax cuts for all people earning less than $10,000 or $15,000 a year and for businesses earning less than $100,000. I would propose that the 52-percent surtax apply only when a company has reached a $100,000 level of income, with lower taxes applying below that figure.

5. To really stimulate private investments, I suggest that you offer business the option of depreciating any type of capital investment in any length period it chooses. This might cost the Government $5 or $6 billion in taxes the first year or so, but over a brief span, even if industry chose to write off capital investments rapidly, the money would start to flow back into the Treasury as higher profits would not then be cushioned by depreciation reserves unless investment programs were maintained.

Mr. President, as you know, I have supported and continue to support most of the programs that you have advocated. I believe that history will record your efforts to reshape America's position in the world as a major turning point in the affairs of this Nation. The suggestions I have made in regard to your economic program are not meant to be critical for the sake of criticizing.

However, from the private studies I have made of the national economy, I feel that your tax program may not obtain the results you anticipate. On the other hand, this program plays into the hands of those who criticize vitally needed public investment programs. Congress may well alter your tax program, reduce taxes and create deficits without making balanced investments in the fields that generate maximum economic growth.

I shall be very happy to meet with you or any of your economic advisers to explore in greater detail the suggestions and thoughts contained in this letter.

Sincerely yours,

MILTON J. SHAPP.

---

## WHAT HAPPENED TO KING COTTON?

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, Robert T. Davis, Jr., the former mayor of Columbus, Ga., and vice president of Swift Spinning Mills, recently addressed the Columbus Kiwanis Club on the cotton and textile problem.

In his splendid speech, Mr. Davis concluded that King Cotton is not dead yet, but that it does suffer from an illness which only positive governmental action can cure.

Most of cotton's problems are directly related to Government actions; therefore, the solutions to most of these problems rest with the Government—

Mr. Davis said.

And this of course is true. Moreover, anyone who is cognizant of the cotton and textile situation knows full well that until there is remedial legislation, particularly with reference to the iniquitous two-price cotton system, the situation will not get any better. It will in fact continue to worsen, and more and more mills will either shut down or convert to synthetic fibers.

I consider Mr. Davis' address worthy of wide distribution, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

WHAT HAPPENED TO KING COTTON?

In 1930, a professor of economics at the University of North Carolina, Claudius T. Murchison, published a treatise entitled "King Cotton Is Sick." Recently in Macon, a civic club talk was entitled "Is King Cotton Dead?" Over 30 years of sickness is a rough ordeal for anyone to go through. Cotton is still alive, but the illness has caused him to give up his throne and assume a lesser role. Why has this happened? What is the future for cotton? What is the outlook for cotton textiles? Or more important, What is going to happen to the domestic textile industry? These are important questions, not only for these United States, but the South, the State of Georgia, and even closer to home, this community. The textile industry is by far the largest employer in the State of Georgia with over 90,000 persons earning about $375 million annually in approximately 350 plants. With an annual payroll of approximately $33 million, the seven local textile mills have a tremendous influence on our economy. As a matter of current interest, these seven mills make up approximately 22 percent of the total funds raised for United Givers.

To paraphrase a controversial comment of a few years ago, you might say "What's good for the textile industry is good for Columbus." If you are sympathetic with this feeling, I hope for a few minutes you will examine with me this tremendous industry which has a reputation for poor-mouthing, but still forges on somehow, making enough money to provide the American consumer with the least inflated industrial commodity. It is a complex story, with many interesting chapters. It is an old story because the industry began several thousand years before Christ. It is also an industry that began in this country out of necessity—the need for clothing which heretofore had been supplied by the British Empire, whom we had just defeated in gaining our independence. The necessity was so great that the manufacturing equipment had to be designed and put together from memory by the few who had this knowledge. By 1815, the industry employed some 100,000 men, women, and children and consumed about 90,000 bales annually.

Later in the same century, when Eli Whitney invented the cotton gin, the development and growth of the textile industry and the raw cotton industry became one and the same. The production of raw cotton and the spindlage of the textile industry both advanced rapidly until just after World War I, when a period of change began. The sharp rise in cotton consumption began to level off and the productivity of textile mills started a marked increase. These conditions left a growing surplus of raw materials and an excess of productive capacity.

Naturally, under the influence of the New Deal, this surplus of cotton created the necessity for legislative action. The results of these temporary measures of price support and acreage controls are well known. When started in the early 1930's, U.S. production of cotton was over 50 percent of the total world production, however today it approaches only 30 percent. Since then, the growth of cotton outside of the United States has been encouraged to increase about 300 percent, while our production has remained relatively stable.

The Government did nothing to relieve the excess of manufacturing capacity, but the mills have reduced their spindles to a level of only about 53 percent of the 1920 total. Of course, I hope none of you think the Government should have done anything about this, but the fact remains that this improvement in productivity and efficiency still provides the opportunity for the consumer to obtain a better buy in textiles today than they can with any other commodity. For example, the wholesale price index based on 1947–49, indicates textiles at less than the base, when all industrial commodities (including textiles) are about 130. Textile prices have actually gone down while the average prices of all industrial commodities have advanced 30 percent.

Let's go back to King Cotton to see the results of this Government assistance to assure the farmer of his fair share of economic growth. In the first place, it is very evident that the Government's help prevented him from enjoying his historical share of the world market. The price support caused the foreign production of cotton to increase from approximately 12 million bales in 1930 to over 33 million bales now. With our know-how, our efficiency, and our marketing ability, this loss of business was not necessary, except for the simple reason, we priced ourselves out of the market and encouraged others to grow their own requirements. It has also encouraged synthetic fiber producers, especially rayon, to take advantage of this artificially higher cotton price. It also encouraged paper, plastics, and other products to take over cotton textile markets—for example: bagging—for fruit, fertilizers,

etc., napkins, towels, tire cord, furniture stuffing, and many others.

Legislative help actually started the downfall of King Cotton's reign. During all this time, you and I were wearing lighter and lighter weight clothes which offset to a large extent the population growth. The same quantity of cotton just went further and we didn't need to grow more for domestic use. The fertilizer manufacturers and the county agents were working all this time and they stayed ahead of the Department of Agriculture by enabling about the same amount of cotton to be grown on a fraction of the acreage required in 1930. Actually, the raw cotton production is increasing so fast, I doubt if the Department of Agriculture can reduce the acreage fast enough to record any significant decrease in bales produced. In fact, last week's report indicated an estimated cotton crop of 15,322,000 bales—almost 2 million more than the domestic and export markets are expected to require. This is 457,000 bales larger than last year's crop on 9 percent less acreage.

In 1955, because of the high price supports, our raw cotton exports fell to the lowest peacetime level since 1871. Thus, to counter the twin problems of American surpluses and increased foreign movement into traditional American export markets, the United States in 1956 set up a special export subsidy program. The subsidy represents the difference between the price of U.S. cotton and the so-called world price for cotton. It may vary from year to year, but since August 1, 1961, it has remained at 8½ cents per pound, or $42.50 for a 500-pound bale. Also, earlier this year, this Commodity Credit Corporation offered for sale on a bid basis cotton for export which in some instances actually amounted to more than a $42.50 discount.

At inception it was recognized that such an export subsidy would create two disastrous impacts on the domestic textile producing industry, both of which would require immediate corrective action: (1) It would kill off the textile export market, and (2) it would invite unfair priced textile imports.

To prevent the first of these, provision was made for the payment of an equalization fee on cotton textile exports on the same per pound basis as the raw cotton subsidy. However, efforts made at the time, and repeated since, have failed to provide an offset for the far more important element of the problem—imports.

U.S. cotton textile imports made from lower priced cotton have increased spectacularly since 1956 while the export subsidy has lowered the price of American cotton to foreign textile mills.

In 1955, immediately prior to the inception of the cotton export subsidy, imports of cotton products amounted to a 363,487,000 square yard equivalent. By 1962, such imports amounted to a 1,165,878,000 square yard equivalent, more than triple the imports of 1955.

Most of these increases in cotton textile imports have been in categories of products in which the raw cotton cost is the predominant one in manufacturing costs, such as in yarns and gray goods. For example, imports of carded and combed yarn, in direct competition with Swift Spinning Mills, have increased from 142,000 pounds in 1955 to 28,453,000 pounds in 1962.

Cotton textile imports have taken over markets that otherwise would have been supplied by American-grown cotton processed by the American industry.

The industry's position was made very clear recently by J. Craig Smith, president of Avondale Mills, when he spoke to an international cotton meeting in Athens, Greece. He said, and I quote, "We have no objections to imports which come in because the quality is better than the quality of products made by American mills. Few textile imports into the United States are in this category.

"We have no objections to imports which can be sold in our country because they are a new style or pattern, or are otherwise different from what we make. Actually, most of our imports, being made for the American market, copy our styles and patterns and participate without cost in the substantial sums that we spend on promotion.

"We have no objections to imports based on more efficient operation in the exporting country. Many of you who have visited American mills have told us that our mills are as efficient as, if not more efficient than, any in the world. You are not able to ship goods into our country because we are inefficient.

"We have no objections to imports where anything resembling a monopoly situation exists. If there is a monopoly industry in the United States, it should have competition from whatever the source. Our American textile industry is the most competitive industry in the world. This competition is reflected currently in earnings of 2 percent to 3 percent on our sales and in a comparative price structure lower than that of any other major industry. Most of you gentlemen would be ashamed to report earnings as low as ours.

"What imports, then, do we object to? We have a law in the United States requiring that we pay a minimum wage of $1.25 an hour or the president of the mill goes to jail. We have another law fixing the support price of our cotton at 32.47 cents per pound. The fine cotton grown here in Greece and in 30 other countries around the world is not available to us except for a negligible quota. Most of our textile imports come in only because they are cheap, and they are cheap only because they are made with cheap labor and out of cheap cotton. Their production in the United States would be completely illegal. These are the imports we are trying to control." End of quotation. This is a good summary and I believe a fair position to take.

At this stage, we can't say "King" cotton, we simply must say "Mister" cotton.

This year, three of the largest cotton textile mill chains in the country announced that they were no longer consumers of only cotton. Springs, Greenwood, and Graniteville made known that they were starting in the synthetic field in a big way. Others have entered into this because of the price and promotional values of synthetics as compared to cotton. The movement is not over and unless something is done and done quickly, cotton will be relegated to a minor role in a few years.

Most of cotton's problems are directly related to Government actions; therefore, the solutions to most of these problems rest with the Government. So far, cotton and the textile industry have received sympathy and promises, but no real positive action. The Tariff Commission has turned us down twice, the Office of Emergency Planning has refused to act and Congress has not been able to get together on any legislation. The President even recognized our plight because on September 6, 1962, after the Tariff Commission had rejected our second case, he said, I quote, "Thus the inequity of the two-price system of cotton cost remains as a unique burden upon the American textile industry for which a solution must be found in the near future. I am therefore requesting the Department of Agriculture to give immediate attention to the formulation of a domestic program that would eliminate this inequity. Such a program would undoubtedly require enabling legislation. Early in the next session of Congress, I shall recommend legislation designed to remove the inequity created by the present two-price cotton system." End of quote and almost end of concern by administration. Unless something is done soon, the patient is going to die.

The Cooley bill, which should come before the House in a few weeks, would eliminate inequities of two-price cotton by providing still another subsidy. The bill doesn't offer the best solution, but it will enable domestic mills to buy their cotton at competitive prices, provide the consumers with better values, and to some extent, stem the tide of imports. The Talmadge bill, now in the Senate Agriculture Committee, seems to be the best approach, but unfortunately, it does not have sufficient support. Ultimately, the Government must get out of the business of buying, storing, transporting, selling, and giving away cotton, as well as all farm commodities. These farm programs cost over $1 billion a year. It also means any American wheat or cotton we sell to Russia or any other Communist country must be subsidized by 60 cents a bushel and $42.50 a bale respectively.

The only way cotton can become king again is for the fiber to be planted, grown, harvested, and merchandised on a free enterprise basis. In addition, his best customer, the domestic textile industry, should be provided with some permanent assurance that imports will be controlled with reasonable quotas. This is not wishing for a handout, or something for nothing, or anything unreasonable. Since these aspirations are reasonable and sound, I have confidence or am optimistic enough to feel that the solutions are forthcoming.

It is on this basis that Swift Spinning Mills announced several months ago a modernization program and expansion program which will involve the expenditure of approximately $3 million in 1964. By the middle of December, we expect to award contracts for the building, the air conditioning, and the electrical work required for a modern and efficient combed yarn mill which will increase our production by 5 million pounds of yarn annually. We will increase our cotton requirements from 35,000 to 50,000 bales annually, or to approximately 10 percent of the cotton grown in Georgia each year. It is interesting to note if nothing is done to eliminate two-price cotton, we will pay $2,125,000 more for this cotton than a foreign mill would pay for the same cotton. We will, of course, be able to run synthetics or blends of cotton and synthetics.

At the present time, we make in every hour and 15 minutes, enough yarn to go all the way around the world, and late next year, the trip could be made about every 53 minutes. Our present electrical power requirements are equivalent to over 3,400 average homes and within the next few years, this could very easily be doubled. The vast majority of new machinery will be purchased from Saco-Lowell Shops, a subsidiary of Maremount Corp. This will be manufactured in Easley, S.C., and Sanford, N.C. Foreign equipment is being considered for the winding operation; however, this is still undecided.

During September, I had the opportunity, along with about 1,000 other Americans, of visiting the International Textile Machinery Show in Hannover, Germany. Practically every textile machinery manufacturer in the world was represented and it was evident that the next few years will see accelerated advancement in this industry. Another encouraging factor is the rapidly increasing capital outlay by both the machinery manufacturers and the textile mills for research and development. For example, textile research and development in 1962 was up 162 percent from 1957, while all industry research and development was up only 50 percent during the same period. We are mighty proud of the DuoCard, which was invented by our superintendent, Otis B. Alston. Our

entire production is processed through Duo-Cards and many others have also changed but most important is the fact that this development caused a revolution in the carding phase of textile manufacture. Several of the mills built in the last few years contain only about one-third as many cards as they would have a few years ago and much credit is due to Otis Alston for this progress.

The textile industry has been taking giant strides toward modernization and improved efficiency in recent years. Textile industry outlays for new plant and equipment have been greater than net profits, after taxes, in every year since 1950, wth the exception of 1959. In 1962, textile industry outlays exceeded profits by 73 percent. In contrast to the textile industry performance, profits for all manufacturing industries have been running above plant and equipment expenditures since 1954. Last year, all manufacturing industry profits exceeded plant and equipment expenditures by 21 percent. Estimates of expenditures for new plant and equipment in 1963 indicates $720 million for textiles—up 18 percent over 1962, as compared to an expected 5-percent gain for all industries.

So, in spite of King Cotton's sickness, the textile industry is showing remarkable progress and this could be made more evident if the correct medicine is prescribed for the patient. King Cotton's future simply boils down to a matter of economics, because the textile industry will consume whatever fiber or fibers are most economical and those in greatest demand by the public. It's as simple as that.

## ILLUSIONS ABOUT THE TAX CUT

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, so far during the Senate discussions on the tax cut bill we have heard the administration line from almost every conceivable direction—"If we don't have a tax cut, we'll have a recession; if we don't have a tax cut we'll rob the American public; if we don't have a tax cut we'll do this or we'll do that"—is how it has been going.

My colleague, the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], has carefully analyzed the proposed tax cut and recently presented his views to an annual meeting of the American Life Convention in Chicago. The convention is an association which includes more than 300 life insurance companies having approximately 95 percent of the life insurance business in the United States. It also includes 13 of the leading life insurance companies in Canada.

Senator BENNETT said in his speech the proposed tax cut bill simply could not produce all of the economic benefits promised by its supporters.

So that my colleagues can see Senator BENNETT's views on this important legislation I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the speech by Senator Bennett.

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

### ILLUSIONS ABOUT THE TAX CUT

(Speech by Senator WALLACE F. BENNETT, American Life Convention, Chicago, Ill., Oct. 17, 1963)

I am grateful for the privilege of spending 24 hours with you here in Chicago and for the challenge to try to share with you the latest from Washington.

Because I am a member of the Senate Finance Committee, which began hearings on the tax bill just 2 days ago, this bill suggests itself as my most obvious subject. Ordinarily such a topic does not lend itself to the colorful development expected of an after dinner speaker. This time, however, things have been different. My story, like most serious discussions of economic problems, may bog down in statistics before it reaches the end; but at the beginning, it shows all the elements of a good TV melodrama.

The hurricane of emotional pressure is being swept up for the tax bill. Many businessmen, as well as politicians, are being swept along by it. Those who are crying up the storm say that the decision of our committee will either bring a serious recession immediately or guarantee bright skies forever after. Impetuous youth, that has dawdled along with the problem for more than 30 months, is trying in this way to blow down an "old and mighty oak" represented by our great chairman, Senator HARRY BYRD—an oak which has withstood all such storms for more than 30 years.

For special sound effects we have already had the anguished cry of a faithful New Frontiersman who feels that he has been betrayed. The end of the story may be predictable—its author has the votes. But, for the time being, the show is an exciting one.

The earlier episodes of the tax cut spectacle have built up a great sense of anticipation. People have been grumbling for years under the highest tax levels in our history—greater even than those that existed during the height of World War II. But these grumblings never broke out into open revolt because in only 6 out of the past 31 years has the Federal budget been balanced; and our people have had instinctive opposition to tax cuts in the face of deficits. Now the New Frontier has raised up prophets who preach that deficits are good and that they should be encouraged and increased. The way to do that, they say, is both to increase expenditures and cut taxes simultaneously. They claim this exciting combination can provide immediate blessings, as any fool can plainly see (to quote the immortal Little Abner). Of course, there are a few, like me, who may be blind, who insist, still, in the name of the old Puritanic ethic, that reduced rather than increased expenses should accompany tax cuts.

The prophets hope that the doubters can be reassured with words. At least to them it seems worth a try. And so the words are pouring forth. Here are some of them.

If taxes are cut right now, Christmas can begin a new era of prosperity such as we have never seen before. There will be no more dips in the business cycle—only a steady climb. The cut of $7 billion in 1964, rising to an annual rate of $11 billion in 1965 and thereafter, will really create $30 to $40 billion of new spending money for consumers each year and, at the same time, provide all the funds needed to catch up with the lag in capital investment, to solve the unemployment problem, to solve the balance-of-payments difficulties—and will do all this without creating a new inflation.

On the other hand, they warn darkly, if the bill is not passed, there is a real risk of a severe new recession by New Year's Day.

What a sure fire pitch. What a slogan—"Get some money for yourself and save the country." No wonder they don't want the Finance Committee to probe too deeply—1964 is just around the corner. How can anyone resist this glittering opportunity? How can anyone be so tedious and stuffy as to look this gift horse in the mouth? At the risk of becoming tedious, I am going to try today to do just that.

In developing my thesis today, I shall discuss four assumptions being made by the prophets of tax cut prosperity. The first is general, the other three specific. To me, all are fallacious.

The first and general assumption is that a tax cut can occur in an economic vacuum and that its benefits can be delivered to us directly, setting in motion only those economic forces which will enhance those benefits, and not disturbing any other forces which might offset them.

The measurements and comparisons made by economists are never exact because the many forces in our economy are in constant motion. They never stand still. Therefore, when an attempt is made to measure the effects resulting from one change (in this case the tax cut), the technique is to assume that most, if not all, of the other dynamic components of our economic mix are standing still. Only in this way can they get their basis of comparison. But while this assumption may be useful for analytical purposes, it is not true in fact. All other related factors and forces will adjust themselves to the change, often unpredictably. And so it is with the changes which the tax bill, if passed, may produce, many of which the advocates of the bill prefer to ignore.

This then, is the general assumption against which we should look now at three specific effects claimed for the bill. The first has to do with the income available for consumer spending, the second with income available for investment to create more jobs, and the third with the impact of this bill on the already awakening inflationary forces.

We are told that the reduction in the personal income tax will release about $6 billion in new consumer purchasing power in 1964 which will grow into $9 billion in 1965 and thereafter. We are also told that this will respond to the multiplier theory so that when combined with the effect of corporate rate changes, the output of goods and services in the economy can be increased as much as $30 to $40 billion. Increased spending at these levels, they say, will result in increased business profits which will also turn into increased investment and help provide jobs for the unemployed.

All this is nothing but a new version of the pump-priming theory which was both proposed and discredited in the 1930's. This version is attractive, however, because it promises to put more money in the pockets of each of us. Unfortunately, there are other factors affecting our disposable income which will not remain constant. If we look carefully we can see at least two elements which could reduce and may eliminate the total effect of the Federal income tax cut on personal income.

First, Federal income taxes are not the only ones we pay. State and local taxes are not only heavy, but they are continuing to rise both in rate and in total dollars. The 1962 increase amounted to $4.1 billion. Any increase in State and local taxes, of course, will counteract purchasing power increases made possible through a cut in Federal taxes as far as the net effect is concerned.

A second offsetting factor is the prospect for increase in social security taxes. In 1963, social security taxes increased by $2.3 billion. The net rate increase, due in 1966, will add another equal amount. In the meantime, there are bills before Congress which would increase the base on which social security taxes are computed. If the base is increased to $5,400, this will add another billion dollars.

The point I am making is that the prophets of tax-cut prosperity assume that these two factors will remain constant and will not eat up any of the individual tax-cut benefits. As a matter of fact, they will be offsetting factors.

So much for the first specific assumption. The second is equally suspicious. It is that

whatever net increase in personal disposable income may remain after these offsets, there will still be enough to do all of these four things:

1. Increase consumer spending.

2. Provide enough capital for investment in industry and commerce to substantially reduce the existing obsolescence and solve the problem of needed modernization.

3. Finance enough new jobs to break the back of the unemployment problem and,

4. Provide enough for individual investment in government securities so as to keep the financing of the new deficit out of the banking system.

If there is actually an increase of disposable income it is quite likely that most of it will be spent for consumption and the rate of savings will be little larger than that which is already occurring. Savings, during the past several years, have been between 6 and 8 percent of personal disposable income. If this relationship holds for the future, about $5.5 billion would be consumed and about $1½ billion of the reduction would be saved and invested. Even as we say this we must remember that interest rates are pushing upward both under the pressure of our balance-of-payments problem and because of some domestic policy. If interest rates continue to rise, individuals will be induced to increase their investment percentage by paying off some of their present debt. A decline in consumer debt could greatly reduce the amount of consumption being attributed to the tax decrease. This is another reason why the claim for consumption spending is highly suspect and has, at best, a very shaky foundation.

Let's turn now to the assurances being given that investment will increase and many new jobs will be created. Considering this we must add in the effects of the proposed decrease in the corporate rates also.

The prophets estimate that corporate tax cut will make $1.5 billion available for investment. If we add the $0.5 billion saved from personal income tax reduction, we have a possible investment total of $2 billion. Against that we have the McGraw-Hill estimate that 22 percent of the $250 billion investment in manufacturing plant and equipment is technologically outmoded. This means that there is immediate need for $55 billion new capital just to bring our present rated capacity up to date. In addition, we will need to provide another $50 billion each year to offset further depreciation and obsolescence. This, of course, does not include capital needs of the economy outside of manufacturing, which is difficult if not impossible to estimate. It already appears obvious, however, that a $2 billion increment would have little effect to correct the situation which would require in excess of $100 billion.

Of course, it does not seem fair to assume that all this money must come only from a tax reduction. Sums used for this purpose now normally come from retained earnings which in turn come from corporate profits. Though the proposed changes in corporate tax rate are supposed to give a boost to corporate profits, they will not be fully effective until 1970; and during the first 2 years, 1964 and 1965, there may be corporations which will actually have a greater tax burden than under the present rate system. This is another condition which will blunt the claimed stimulation of this tax bill.

Even the fact that $2 billion is made available for investment does not assure that it will be invested unless business confidence in the future is improved.

Now, will the tax cut with its increase in the Federal deficit improve business outlook and environment? The very fact that the administration is planning a deficit and at the same time a tax cut is a disturbing factor in the minds of many individuals. Mail which I am receiving has been overwhelmingly in favor of a tax cut only if expenditures are also controlled. Whether we like it or not, growth and prosperity which are the result of spending actions of individuals are greatly determined by the attitudes of these individuals toward the future. If confidence is undermined by New Frontier economic policies, the result will not be increased investment and spending. Even if one should grant that the economic theories used to justify planned deficits at the top of the business cycle were correct, if those who make the spending decisions do not agree, whether through lack of understanding or disagreement with the theory, the result will be the same.

If we expect investment to return to its previous levels in relation to our gross national product, profits which result in investment capital must also rise to previous levels. In 1950, corporate profits after taxes were 8 percent of GNP. Last year they were only 4.7 percent. Since these profits are the prime source of retained investment funds, if they could be restored even to the 1955 rate, an additional $16 billion would be made available; and, at the 1950 rate, the figure would be $20 billion.

Before we leave this discussion of the effect of the tax cut on investments, let's turn to look at the claim that it will provide jobs for a substantial number of our unemployed. First, it is necessary to consider the amount of investment required for each new job. The best estimate I can get is a figure of $16,000 for each new job. Looking first at the modernization of our present equipment, it is obvious that much of this, on an automation basis, will create new production without substantially increasing the number of jobs.

At the same time, to reduce the current unemployment even to 4 percent, we must create 1,315,000 new jobs; and to provide for our expanding labor force, we will need an additional 1 million jobs in 1964 and a rising number every year thereafter. At the rate of $16,000 required to fund a job, this would require a new investment of $37 billion in 1964, increasing annually thereafter.

To try and spread the $2 billion per year which this new tax bill would make available among the many needs which I have already mentioned convinces us that the assumption that the tax cut can be a source of dominant investment income just won't stand up.

There is another area of investment need for the funds to be released. This is the demand to finance increasing private credit and increasing public deficits. The demand for Federal, State, and local public credit expanded last year by about $16 billion, which is higher than all the claimed benefits from the tax cut even without any offsets. The Secretary of the Treasury told the bankers of America at their convention in Washington on October 8 that since 1961 all increases in the public debt had been financed outside of the banking system. If this policy is to continue, then obviously all of the new tax savings must flow into this channel.

To draw a subbalance at this point, I think it is obvious that a tax cut cannot do all of the jobs promised for it.

We are ready now to face the third assumption, which I think cannot be substantiated. The spokesmen for the administration tell us that we need not worry about inflation because this problem has been licked since January 1961 and cannot raise its ugly head again so long as we have idle productive capacity and unemployment. As I have already pointed out, this so-called idle productive capacity is not being used because 22 percent of it is inefficient, technologically obsolete, and undoubtedly high cost. The administration's position, therefore, becomes an anomalous one. It relies upon the evils of underproduction to cure the evil of inflation. It cannot have it both ways.

Of course, we know from experience that inflation has not been stopped even though we have theoretical excess capacity and no Government program has been able to make a substantial dent in unemployment. In the United States, consumer prices have risen 15 percent in 10 years, robbing all fixed incomes and investments, including the more than 112 million outstanding life insurance policies, of approximately one-sixth of their value. Almost every month the consumer price index inches up. Since January 1961, it has risen 2.8 index points, including a rise of nearly one point in the 60-day period of June and July of this year. Since every rise of one index point represents a loss of approximately $4.5 billion in purchasing power, we can see how real a threat this is to the survival of tax cut benefits.

Those who claim there is no inflation, point with pride to the fact that wholesale prices for commodities have been fairly steady. This is true, but it has served to conceal a significant change of pattern in the consumer index where the costs of retail distribution and of services have been increasing both in their comparative proportion to the total consumer spending and in their absolute price levels. Now wholesale prices for manufactured products are beginning to rise on a broad front. Even steel is breaking through the psychological barrier raised by the President's attack on the industry in 1962, and experts see this as the beginning of a new general price rise and therefore a new pressure for inflation.

That we have probably only dammed up the effects of inflation and not eliminated them is more readily seen when we look at our performance in comparison with that of our international trading partners. In the past 10 years, including 1962, U.S. export prices increased about 10 percent. Export prices in Western Europe increased only 1 percent and those of all other major areas in the world went down. No wonder our share of world trade dropped in this period, from 21 percent to 17 percent. This, of course, contributes to today's balance-of-payments problems. Now how can policies which would add to inflationary pressures and raise prices possibly put us in a better position to compete with other countries? Obviously they cannot. Not only that, but if incomes increase, this will result in increased imports rather than increased exports and thus contribute to the problem.

The administration is partially counting on inflationary trends in foreign countries to offset our trade disadvantage. It is true that recently cost-of-living indexes in our trading partners have gone up more than those in the United States. From January 1962 until May of this year (the latest figures available for foreign countries), our cost-of-living index rose only 1 percent while costs in other countries increased from 2½ percent in European countries to 10 percent in Japan. The astronomical price rises that have occurred in some Latin American countries have created Government crises and hastened military takeovers. Some economists say that now we can relax and let foreign inflation close the price gap. I cannot agree with that conclusion. Foreign countries are not going to stand idly by without doing something to control the rapid rise in prices. On the other hand, the policies that are being followed by our administration are definitely inflationary.

Some of us who face special responsibility for shaping, then finally approving or rejecting any tax cut are especially concerned about the long trend of rising Government expenditures and deficits. We are assured that if we vote this cut, it will release new activity which will increase the absolute tax take so that the economy will grow up to the problem and its deficits will be swallowed up—again the pump-priming theory. We had a tax cut in 1948, but our deficits increased by $22 billion between then and 1954.

Some theorists blamed it on the Korean war. Then we had another tax cut in 1954; and since then, without war, the deficits have increased this time by a total of $26 billion.

If the present tax cut is adopted, I think that we must expect deficits to continue to pile up. The present spending pattern with its deficit effects, is to me an inescapable force for further inflation.

Let me return briefly to mention another factor, outside of my original outline, also erroneous.

The Secretary of the Treasury, Douglas Dillon, claimed just last Tuesday in tax hearings that are being held in the Senate Finance Committee that "without the basic reduction in tax burdens proposed in H.R. 8363 (the tax bill), we increase the likelihood of repeating the disappointing record of recent business cycles. On the other hand, a substantial across-the-board reduction in taxes should give our economy the impetus it needs to put an end to this pattern of recession." This is too much to expect of a tax cut. It is not reasonable to claim that it will do away with business cycles. They are an important part of our system and help correct excesses that naturally develop in a free economy. When business cycles are completely stopped, we will have a controlled economy.

One of the things that bothers me most about the impossible claims that the administration is making for the tax cut is that if the tax bill becomes law and if, thereafter, these offsetting factors operate as I think they will, and if, therefore, the rate of production is not greatly stimulated, and unemployment is not greatly reduced, and our balance-of-payments position is not greatly improved, and if inflation keeps climbing up, the New Frontier economists and politicians will not agree that their policies have failed but will attempt to put the blame on the private sector of our economy and herald the failure as proof that the Federal deficits are not big enough. In other words, the administration is attempting to put itself in a "heads I win—tails you lose" position. If there is improvement they will take the credit. If improvement is inadequate, private industry will take the blame.

Now as I close let me summarize again my impressions of what will still happen even if these tax proposals are adopted and in 1964 and 1965 they do reduce total Federal taxes by some $7 and $11 billion respectively.

First, I am afraid this amount will be largely wiped out by increases in State and local taxes plus actual and potential increases in social security taxes and, finally, any new purchasing power remaining will be wiped out by inflation even at its present creeping pace.

Second, like the boxer who, accustomed to reading baseball averages, sold 500 percent of his future earnings and thought he still had 500 percent left, even if there were some real spendable money left, it would not be enough to make any dent in the promises that have been made for it. It cannot carry the load of creating $30 to $40 billion in new multiplier generated consumer income. It cannot supply the funds necessary to modernize plant capacity. It cannot solve our unemployment problems, it cannot finance the new debt that will be created through deficit spending. It cannot do away with business cycles which are the result of private spending decisions. It cannot solve our balance of payments problems.

I can understand why every American wants his taxes cut. The current rates are not only a heavy burden to carry, but a drag on the growth of the economy. But I cannot for the life of me, understand how we can be persuaded that this proposed tax cut, standing alone, is the key to all of our economic problems.

On the other hand, all of us who question the present tax cut proposals could enthusiastically support them if they were matched by a definite and specific program for the control and reduction of Federal expenditures supported by the administration with equal vigor. Instead the official position is that the President cannot control expenditures and in this field he is captive of the Congress. Poppycock. There are several very simple things the President can do:

1. He can reject all proposed new programs which create new spending.

2. He can hold down the expansion of existing bureaus.

3. He can trim the fat and waste out of the sprawling Federal empire instead of adding thousands of new Federal jobs (164,000 since January 1961).

It would take a speech much longer than this one to detail even the obvious expense-saving possibilities that exist but we cannot expect anyone in the administration to make it. Pious generalities can be more easily proclaimed and more easily either forgotten or politically interpreted in the coming 1964 campaign. Unfortunately, too, there is tragic historical evidence that in an election year many American voters, including many businessmen, are either economically illiterate or selfishly myopic and for whatever reason willing to be seduced politically with their own money.

To me this is the unspoken and maybe the major motivation behind the present storm being built up to sweep the tax bill through the Senate and behind the rationalized assumptions being used to defend it.

I do not agree that this cynical appraisal is accurate today for the majority of American voters. I think they still cling to an old-fashioned faith in fiscal responsibility, both for themselves and for their Government. I share that faith and look forward confidently to that day when it will be translated into a sound Federal tax program matched by expenditure control and Federal surpluses instead of deficits.

---

## JAMES MADISON MEMORIAL LIBRARY ON SQUARE 732

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, it is high time that the Congress act with decency, reasonability and economy to settle the future of its building program on Capitol Hill.

The present dawdling and uncertainty, mixed with preposterous plans for the misuse and arrogant taking of Capitol Hill properties, is unfair to the residents of the area, wasteful of tax funds paid from throughout the country, and ignorant of rational planning.

Residents and property owners in the area close in to the Capitol are compelled to live in uncertainty about the future of their homes, not knowing from one day to the next what wild and grasping announcements of possible takings will be irresponsibly put out by various officials. The uncertainty eliminates or slows down the restoration and upkeep of these areas when congressional policy should be to encourage the beautification of the Capitol area.

Taxpayers across the Nation hear daily of wasteful and absurd expenditures of public funds to haphazardly build monstrous and costly public buildings or cold and lifeless memorials.

Competent architects and engineers, as well as the responsible cultural and architectural planning agencies in Washington, throw up their hands in despair at the refusal of the Congress to rationally consider appropriate development of the seat of the Government.

Mr. President, this is no exaggeration. The Congress should take full note of the growing concern expressed in the press and by public groups.

### COMMITTEE OF ONE HUNDRED URGES LOCATION OF THIRD LIBRARY BUILDING ON SQUARE 732

The immediate focus of this growing dissatisfaction with congressional failure to establish sound policies is the proposal for a third Library of Congress Building. It is very encouraging that the Committee of One Hundred on the Federal City of the American Planning and Civic Association has urged Congress to locate this third Library Building on square 732, directly across Independence Avenue from the main Library Building. On November 14, the Committee of One Hundred passed a resolution urging that the parts of the companion bills H.R. 7391 and S. 1920 designating square 732 as the site for the future additional library facility be supported and enacted into law, that the designers of this edifice be most carefully selected to insure a clean-cut, artistic, and harmonious building, that they be required to work closely with the Commission of Fine Arts and the National Capital Planning Commission during the development of this design.

H.R. 7391 is sponsored in the House by Representative WILLIAM B. WIDNALL, of New Jersey, and S. 1920 is sponsored in the Senate by Senators LAUSCHE, MCCARTHY, CLARK, and I.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the Committee of One Hundred resolution be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

Whereas there is need for additional facilities for the Library of Congress; and

Whereas H.R. 7391 has been introduced by Congressman WILLIAM B. WIDNALL, and in the Senate S. 1920 has been introduced by Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS supported by Senator FRANK LAUSCHE, Senator EUGENE MCCARTHY, and Senator JOSEPH CLARK, to locate these additional facilities on square 732, being that square lying immediately south of the present Library of Congress: Now, be it therefore

*Resolved at this regular meeting of the Committee of One Hundred on the Federal City of the American Planning and Civic Association on November 14, 1963*, That passage be urged of that part of H.R. 7391 and S. 1920 designating square 732 as the site for the future additional library facility be supported and enacted into law, that the designers of this edifice be most carefully selected to insure a clean-cut, artistic and harmonious building, that they be required to work closely with the Commission of Fine Arts and the National Capital Planning Commission during the development of this design; and also be it

*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be sent to Congressman WIDNALL, Senator DOUGLAS, Senator LAUSCHE, Senator MCCARTHY, Senator CLARK, the Librarian of Congress, chairmen of the Committee on Public Works of the House of Representatives, and the Senate, and to the Fine Arts Commission.

### PRESS LABELS HILL PROGRAM "SHOCKING" AND AN "INVITATION TO BLIGHT"

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, a number of recent articles in Washington newspapers deserve serious consideration by Members of Congress. In the No-

vember 10 issue of the Washington Post, Mr. Wolf Von Eckardt writes in an article that "nothing is as utterly dismaying as the bungling megalomania of Congress which threatens" the spirited effort now being made to rehabilitate the residential area on Capitol Hill.

His language is strong, but I think we deserve it. He notes that there are "many more horrors" like the new House Office Building to come "if the Architect of the Capitol, J. George Stewart, who is no architect, continues to have his way." "Stewart wants both a James Madison Memorial Library and a third Library of Congress Building," he goes on, but urges that the two be combined and comments, correctly, that "the issue is laboriously confused by Stewart."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in full in the RECORD at the close of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD. (See exhibit 1.)

Mr. DOUGLAS. In another recent newspaper article, which appeared in the Washington Sunday Star of November 17, Mr. Robert J. Lewis recalls his article of 3 years ago in which he urged careful planning by independent and qualified architects, reports that no progress has been made as far as Capitol Hill is concerned, and states that "it is clearer today than ever that the central question the article raised is in even greater need of attention than it was at the time the article first appeared."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the RECORD at the close of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD. (See exhibit 2.)

CAPITOL ARCHITECT INCORRECTLY INFORMS CONGRESS ON LIBRARY BILL

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the Congress should act quickly, both to establish independent and competent planning of proposed additional construction on Capitol Hill and to approve the proposal for a third Library of Congress Building located on square 732.

I want to be very clear on one point, Mr. President. I fully support the request of the Librarian of Congress for additional space and I regret the delay in congressional action on his request. The Library of Congress is one of the great library institutions of the world, as well as an essential and competent adjunct of the Congress. It should have facilities adequate to do its job and I accept in good faith the request of the distinguished Librarian of Congress, Dr. L. Quincy Mumford.

I must add, however, that I think the Library's needs must be met with proper regard for the taxpayers. Other Members of Congress, and I, have urged that the property south of Independence Avenue across from the main Library building, square 732, which was acquired and cleared at a cost, I believe, of more than $5 million, be used for the third Library building. This building could be known as the James Madison Memorial Library to honor that famous Founding Father.

The Architect of the Capitol urges, however, that this large tract of expensive land be used as a park with a small memorial to James Madison and that additional residential property east of the Library Annex be acquired and razed to provide a site for the third Library building. These blocks east of the Annex largely contain restored residences of fine quality. To acquire and destroy them would be very costly and would be a fatal blow to the long efforts of Capitol Hill property owners to privately rehabilitate their property.

But the extravagance and arrogance of the Architect's proposal has seeped through to him, apparently, for he would agree to subgrade vaults in square 732 to supplement the Library's needs.

Mr. President, my study of the facts in this matter has led me to conclude that Mr. Von Eckardt is correct when he says that Mr. George Stewart has "laboriously confused" the issue.

Apparently the Architect opposes the proposal for a James Madison Memorial because, he alleges, it would first, provide only 70 to 75 percent of the Library's space requirements while the lots east of the annex would be adequate; second, a library on this site would be more costly because "a more classic design would be necessary" than on the lots east of the annex; third, a library on this site would bottle up the House of Representatives if additional facilities were included on the lots just south of the House Office Buildings; fourth, this would spread the library facilities and make operation costly; and fifth, a library on this site would be contrary to the wishes and intent of the former Speaker of the House, the late Sam Rayburn.

FACTS SHOW SQUARE 732 LARGE ENOUGH BY ITSELF

Mr. President, even a cursory examination of the facts shows that the Architect is, as he is so often, dead wrong.

In the first place, the fact is that square 732, by itself, is fully large enough to provide all the space requirements of the Library. The Librarian has officially reported to the Congress that the Library needs "nearly 2 million square feet of space, net."

A library building could be constructed on square 732 with three stories fully underground, a fourth story located below grade at Independence Avenue but above grade on C Street, and six additional stories above ground so laid out that they occupy only 60 percent of the total surface area leaving 40 percent for courtyards. Such a building would permit a courtyard memorial, if necessary, to James Madison and supply all the space needed by the library.

I repeat, Mr. President, this would supply all of the 2 million square feet of space needed by the library. Within the building lines square 732 contains 258,038 square feet. Four stories covering 100 percent of the building area would yield 1,032,155 square feet; 6 stories covering 60 percent of the building area would yield 923,939 square feet, and a penthouse at the top could add another 31,906 square feet for a total of 1,993,000 square feet.

This is very close to the Librarian's stated needs. But may I point out that this is a very conservative proposal. Additional floors could be added both above and below ground. The memorial to James Madison could simply be the library itself and since modern library buildings use air conditioning and do not need a courtyard, elimination of the courtyard would add at least 300,000 more square feet.

Mr. President, square 732 is fully large enough to meet the Librarian's needs without additional facilities above the lots just south of the House Office Buildings which was an alternative we earlier proposed.

These estimates of footage available by using square 732 are illustrations only, but in my opinion they show that the Architect's contention is mere propaganda. An independent authority should check this out.

SQUARE 732 LARGER THAN ARCHITECT'S ALTERNATIVE

Moreover, Mr. President, a check of the size of the lots involved in this issue discloses that Mr. Stewart's objections are nonsense because the alternative site he proposes, namely the lots east of the annex, is smaller—I repeat, smaller—than square 732. Square 732 is larger than squares 787 and 788, including the 90-foot width of A street between them, by at least 15 percent.

The figures must be juggled to claim that only the squares east of the annex can provide enough space. Square 732 contains an estimated 258,038 square feet of building space; squares 787 and 788 plus A Street contain only 217,940 square feet.

Mr. President, the Architect's allegation that a library on square 732 would be more costly because it would require a more classic design is preposterous. Actually, judging from his works, I doubt very much that the Architect can recognize a classic design when he sees one. I think the building should be of classic design and it may well be that this would be more costly than the type of monstrosity Mr. Stewart is fond of building, but I think we should have some facts. How much more costly would a classic exterior be than the medieval fortress exterior Mr. Stewart approved for the third House Office Building?

Mr. Stewart's argument that a library on square 732 would "bottle up" the House buildings is laid to rest by the fact that under our proposal all three House Office Buildings will have an unobstructed access to the south. And if Mr. Stewart is worried about further expansion on the lots south of the office buildings, as he claims, then why did he oppose my proposal to the Senate Subcommittee on Legislative Appropriations that the underground parking garages to be constructed under those lots contain foundations for above ground building in case that proves necessary?

CONGRESS LED TO BELIEVE SQUARE 732 WAS ACQUIRED FOR LIBRARY

Now, Mr. President, we come to the most interesting argument offered in opposition to the Madison Memorial Library proposal; namely, that the late Speaker Sam Rayburn and other House leaders opposed using square 732 for a

library when they secured congressional approval for its acquisition.

A brief examination of the legislative history of the acquisition of square 732 shows this contention to be incorrect. While the library building was not said to be the only purpose to which square 732 would be put, such use was the only specific purpose stated by the sponsors of the provision adopted in the 1960 legislative branch appropriations bill.

Consider the floor debate in the House on this provision to acquire square 732. Several Members raised the question of purpose. Mr. Rayburn, in part, said this—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 106, part 11, page 14090:

I know this, we need this property for expansion. The Library of Congress—I will not say they will be located here—say they need more space, and big space. They may go there, but, if not the Library of Congress, something else.

Does this sound like an intent to use the property for grass and a small memorial?

Or consider the remarks of Congressman THOMAS, the subcommittee chairman—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 106, part 11, page 14091:

I feel compelled to make this statement. We appropriated this year $265,000 for rental of urgently needed space for the Library of Congress. You know you have to have an addition to the Library of Congress. Do you want to put it here on the Capitol grounds or do you want to put it 4 or 5 miles away from the other buildings of the Library of Congress? If I could guess with any degree of accuracy where it will be put, I would say it would be right here.

Or, Mr. President, go back to the hearings before the Thomas subcommittee on June 17, 1960. Congressman THOMAS asked the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, Mr. CANNON, what he thought about the proposal to take square 732. Said Mr. CANNON—page 434 of the hearings:

Mr. Chairman, when I first came to Washington, the Library of Congress was the fourth largest library in the world. It is today and has long been the first library in the world.

Formerly people visiting the United States from abroad would say, "Oh well, America is a money-loving country. Americans are interested only in business; only in piling up dollars. When it comes to the matter of culture, of intellectual attainment, libraries, and historic associations, you have to come to Europe."

So when it comes to the support and expansion of the greatest library and all it implies, an institution which marks us as a people of advanced culture, we should at least provide for inevitable growth and development. A carload of accessions reach the Library every day of the year. When they built the Congressional Library, as always, they underestimated the future need for space. That has been true of every public building we have built, including the Senate and the House Office Buildings.

The construction of a building of this character takes many years as Speaker Rayburn very well knows. It will take at best 4 or 5 years before the building is completed, so the earlier we begin, Mr. Chairman, the quicker we will reach the point when this building will become available.

In the meantime we must pay each year increasing rent for space to accomodate the vast influx of books and manuscripts which flow in every working hour. Our rent for space in the Library will go up with each succeeding year and the quicker we can get this building ready the greater the saving.

Mr. President, I am quoting from the committee hearings on the question of acquiring square 732 and that was the issue. I repeat it was square 732.

And now, Mr. President, let us quote the testimony in this hearing of the Architect himself, Mr. Stewart, who now says in 1963 that square 732 is completely unsuitable for the third library building. Mr. Thomas asked Mr. Stewart if he could give a definite answer at this time whether it is the intention to place the Library on this property.

Mr. Stewart replied:

That would be a decision of the Joint Committee on the Library, and it probably would be handled in such a way they would certainly consult with the House Office Building Commission if this ground were available.

I might say this: It would be an ideal location for the Library.

Mr. THOMAS. That is the next question that I was going to ask you. Would this land accommodate the building? Have you proceeded far enough with your plans and thinking to know that there is enough ground in these two blocks, should it be the decision of the proper committees in the future to locate there?

Mr. STEWART. Yes; and it would take all the ground there if it was decided to put it there.

Mr. President, the Congress has put up long enough with the proposals of the incumbent Architect. The legislative history of the proposal to acquire square 732 shows that he is again up to his old tricks. In 1960 he testified that square 732 was an "ideal location" and contained enough ground for the third library building. Today he claims that the site was never intended for this purpose and is too small.

Mr. President, I urge the members of the Public Works Committee, the Library Committee, and the House Office Building Committee to reexamine the record and to approve location of the third library building on square 732. I urge them to act without further delay which harms the program of our fine Library of Congress.

And I also urge immediate action on the proposals to provide for preparation by qualified authorities of a long-range plan for the development of Capitol Hill. Senators LAUSCHE, MCCARTHY, CLARK, and myself have proposed this in S. 1920. I am encouraged to see the introduction yesterday by Senator RANDOLPH of Senate Joint Resolution 133 which makes a similar proposal. There are others, and I hope that the Committee on Public Works will act promptly on them.

EXHIBIT 1

ERRING CONGRESS THREATENS HILL HOMES

(By Wolf Von Eckart)

Nothing on the current Washington cityscape is as encouraging as the steady private rehabilitation of the charming residential area on Capitol Hill and nothing is as utterly dismaying as the bungling megalomania of Congress which threatens this spirited effort and our national pride.

Yes, our national pride.

Any morning Capitol Hill residents might wake up to read in the papers that some sneaky rider to an appropriations bill will unleash the bulldozers on property which their own sweat and money has rescued from blight. That this can happen—and it happened only 2 years ago—is shocking enough.

What is worse is that Congress continues to waste millions upon millions to heap pompous blocks of marble upon marble wtihout plan, reason, or design. That is a national scandal.

Just look at that pseudo-Roman fortification, the Sam Rayburn Building. As someone has said about another structure, it can be defended only from the military point of view.

But there are more, many more horrors like this to come if the Architect of the Capitol, J. George Stewart, who is no architect, continues to have his way. He usually does.

Stewart wants both a James Madison Memorial Library and a third Library of Congress building. The two should be combined. But the issue is laboriously confused by Stewart. And while it's all being threshed out in the committees, Representative HOWARD W. SMITH, Democrat, of Virginia might well be drafting one of those riders.

It need only be pinned to an urgent bill at a hectic time and brrrr—there go the bulldozers and another four blocks of that unique, neatly arranged, tree-shaded array of turn-of-the-century architectural charm.

And Representative SMITH, Stewart and their friends will have another mammoth "classic" temple just where they want it.

They want it on the neatly fenced, 2-block weed patch south of Independence Avenue and just east of the Old House Office Building. Congress appropriated this site 2 years ago and razed the restored buildings and shops.

Just why Stewart and the Madison men insist on having it there has never been explained. It's not an appropriate site for a memorial, which should be at some focal point. Why must poor Madison be lined up in phalanx of massive office buildings?

This already cleared site, many people feel, would be ideal for the third Library of Congress building which Librarian L. Quincy Mumford says he needs desperately. He wants nearly 2 million square feet of space in which to grow during the next quarter century.

In the absence of an independent study of space needs and such new library methods as the New York Public Library now employs, we must take his word for it. There are experts who believe Mumford's requirements are exaggerated. At any rate, he needs a third building.

To make room for it, Stewart and his friends want to clear four blocks of restored houses and the nice old St. Mark's Church between East Capitol Street and Independence Avenue and between Third and Fifth Streets SE., directly east of the Library of Congress Annex and the Folger Library.

This vandalism is completely unnecessary. In the interest of commonsense and the taxpayer, Representative WILLIAM B. WIDNALL, Republican, of New Jersey, and Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois, and other Senators, propose that the third library building and the Madison Memorial be combined and put on the already cleared site.

Let's call it the Madison Memorial Library, they say, and put a nice statue of James Madison in the court. Stewart and the proponents of the Madison boondoggle, however, don't like this idea. They seem to concede that a hollow temple would be silly. So they'll put some reading rooms into it and some of Mumford's books into a very deep basement. That helps justify the expense a little. Upstairs temple: a mere $15 million. Basement book stacks: a $24 million bargain.

But to take care of all of Mumford's books in the Madison temple, they say, is impos-

sible. It would spoil that classic temple effect. Besides they want that third library building. They want to expand their domain.

Senator DOUGLAS and others, always willing to be helpful, then suggested that buildings for additional books might be put on top of the parking garages Stewart proposes along the south side of the three House Office Buildings.

But Stewart wants greenery on those garages. He wants a view. Even if it is only a view over the Pennsylvania Railroad tracks and the Southeast Freeway.

He hasn't explained how the tunneled garages will fit in with the existing railroad tunnel, the utility tunnels of the Capitol powerplants, the tunnels connecting the various Capitol buildings and the proposed new subway tunnel.

Congress has, of course, not yet acted on the Madison Memorial Library. It may not even get around to it this session. But Stewart has his sketch all ready. And architects DeWitt, Poor & Shelton, who helped him extend the East Front, have already been tentatively commissioned to design that third library.

"If ever there was an example of a misuse of Government power and a concurrent lack of Government responsibility, J. George Stewart in his influential and official position embodies it," observed Representative FRANK THOMPSON, Jr., Democrat, of New Jersey, recently.

The American Institute of Architects has now urged a long-range, comprehensive master plan of the Capitol Hill area, which envisions future needs of the legislative branch, the Library of Congress, the Supreme Court, and other needs.

This is imperative.

But it is disappointing that the AIA did not also urge continued preservation of the Hill's residential area. And it seems contradictory and a sad mistake that AIA hastily dived into the Madison Memorial Library hassle and came up on the wrong side.

AIA wants nothing done until there is a master plan. Then why prejudge this plan by recommending that the expansion of the library would be better served in an easterly direction, particularly since AIA does not consider the Madison site appropriate for a memorial.

This is a serious matter. It's not just a question of saving four charmingly livable city blocks. Nor is it only a matter of another pompous DeWitt stone heap. The issue is whether Congress and the people are really in agreement with Stewart's grandiose ambitions for which the third library is merely another bridgehead.

These ambitions have been repeatedly spelled out by Stewart's assistant, Mario E. Campioli. They call for proliferating ever more massive marble House, Senate, and Supreme Court offices and libraries along an East Mall clear to the Anacostia River. In the end, it has been hinted, the Capitol itself might be turned into a museum and a bigger and better one built farther east.

Rome's decline and fall began with such megalomania.

---

EXHIBIT 2

[From the Washington Star, Nov. 17, 1963]

A PATTERN FOR THE HILL

(By Robert J. Lewis)

Inside and outside of Congress interest has been growing for the past several years in the future setting for the Capitol.

Introduction of a number of bills in both the House and Senate directed to this question followed closely after the appearance in the Star on June 25, 1960, of an article entitled "Mr. Rayburn's Proposal." General objectives of one such bill currently before Congress have received widespread support.

"Some discussion of this matter is appropriate now," the 1960 article stated, "because the House voted, unexpectedly, to approve expenditure of $5 million to buy two blocks of land and private buildings adjacent to the Capitol so that they can be cleared for Government use. The chief aim appears to be, as explained by Speaker Rayburn, to improve 'the looks of things around here.' "

So far, it is a moot question whether there has been any progress towards meeting the late Mr. Rayburn's objective.

But it is clearer today than ever that the central question the article raised is in even greater need of attention than it was at the time the article first appeared.

"The most obvious reason for unsightly deterioration around the Capitol appears to be a lack of understanding of how to achieve the kind of surroundings the Capitol deserves to have," the article said.

"It is entirely clear that policies in the past have invited the blight and abounding lack of good taste that Congress, in its present move, appears to be striking against.

"But will this move mean anything?

"Will the same old invitation to blight on the periphery of the Capitol and its auxiliary buildings be allowed to exist—as it always has existed—because Congress has not seemed to realize that uncertainty over its own intentions in the foreseeable future—and inattention to what the limits, setting and physical characteristics of the congressional enclave should be—is the very thing that largely induces the blight in the first place?"

In the article 3½ years ago, the writer of this column advanced a proposal which later provided the framework for the solution of another major problem affecting the quality of the Washington scene.

Recognizing that an imaginative improvement of Pennsylvania Avenue as the Nation's most important ceremonial way deserved attention of a higher level of talent than normally would be available in a single planning agency, President Kennedy last year entrusted that task to some of the most distinguished designers in the land.

A program of this general nature was suggested to Congress in 1960 as a means of dealing with the Capitol environment.

"The whole job of creating a charming and appropriate setting for the Capitol does not appear to be just a job for planners and engineers," the 1960 proposal noted.

"It probably could best be done in control of Congress, working with a statesmanlike artist, as coordinator, in whom Members could place trust and confidence.

"Thomas Jefferson, with his far-ranging interest in good design and convictions about its essential simplicity, could never have resisted a challenge like this.

"Were Congress to consider this matter of creating an appropriate setting for the Capitol as a project in the large sense, it certainly could count on challenging the interest and services of the country's best qualified and most talented artists and architects of the present day."

Unless a good design is developed which has the support of Congress, the Capitol surroundings will continue to erode. A glimmer of the administrative pattern to achieve such a design is implicit in the supraplanning arrangement now existing for Pennsylvania Avenue.

---

## THE AFFLUENT RAILROADS

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the November 16, 1963, issue of the Nation contained a very interesting article which I wish to bring to the attention of the Senate. The article is entitled "The Affluent Railroads," by Desmond Smith, and it points out many of the tactics and bookkeeping efforts on the part of certain large railroad companies who wish to show a loss in their operations. Once they can show this loss, these railroads petition the Interstate Commerce Commission to reduce their commuter service and devote their equipment to the more profitable freight service. In many cases, even freight service has been reduced.

Mr. President, the railroad industry is at a low ebb in the United States, and I believe the major cause for this has been a lack of desire on the part of the railroad management to serve the transportation needs of our citizens. Many railroads are controlled by people who are more interested in depleting the liquid assets of their company, and these people could not care less about how the public is served. I believe the time may be approaching when legislation involving either the Interstate Commerce Act or the Internal Revenue Code will be necessary to remove the financial incentive railroad management now has to show a monetary loss from its operations in order to create a tax shelter for a parent holding company.

I urge that this article "The Affluent Railroads" be read, and, in fact, studied by Congress and the country. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to insert the article in the RECORD.

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

THE AFFLUENT RAILROADS

(By Desmond Smith)

In 1963 the railroad industry is in deep financial trouble (Readers Digest)—as it was in 1950 (Business Week); 1940 (Time); 1920 (the Wall Street Journal) and 1910 (Saturday Evening Post).

In all these magazines during all these years it has been possible to read of the impending bankruptcy of our national railroad system. No doubt about it, the American railroads are a basket case. Little wonder that they have been described by one jaded onlooker as "the most amazing financial-health paradox in our economy—robust on Wall Street, at death's door in the public prints and in the halls of Congress." Politicians, journalists, even financial analysts get tied in knots when they come to examine the looking glass economics of railroading. Critics, including some major accounting firms, have severely attacked the Interstate Commerce Commission (ICC) for its present do-nothing attitude toward railroad accounting practice. It is difficult for an analyst of railroad accounts to establish a railroad's degree of profitability when it is not immediately clear how general overhead is being allocated between the operating division and the subsidiaries. Another complaint (unanswered by the railroads) is that depreciation is constantly overstated. And when leaseholders turn out to be subsidiaries, the critical observer will ask, is this another method of hiding income? These are some of the more obvious examples of "Chinese bookkeeping" that have been commented on by others. Sad to say, there are many more.

The railroads have created for all but the stout of heart a Sisyphean task of lifting up the grains of probability from under the weight of possibility, confusion, and doubt. Still, a start has to be made somewhere.

There are some 215,000 miles of railroad lines in the United States, divided between the 105 class 1 carriers and the 22 class I

switching and terminal companies. However, although the railroads (according to the public prints) stood eyeball to eyeball with bankruptcy last year, their top officers took no pay cuts. As a matter of fact, according to the Interstate Commerce Commission's annual report, they gave themselves a slight raise of about 8 percent. Salaries vary a good deal, as might be expected. The president of the Union Pacific, a railway whose net railway operating income expanded 19.1 percent last year, received $146,600 in 1962. But the president of the bankrupt New Haven Railroad had to get by with a paltry $40,000.

It is worth examining cash dividends (as a percentage of net income) for the class 1 railroads. During the booming war years of 1941–46 the average was 35.2 percent. By 1960 (latest figures), it had climbed to 86.5 percent. Moreover, bankruptcies have declined tremendously since World War II. In 1940, railroads representing 31 percent of total trackage were being operated by receivers or trustees, but by 1960 this had dropped to about 1 percent. Additionally, by 1960 (a recession year), class 1 railroads as a whole showed a splendid assets-to-liabilities ratio of 1.62 (compared with 0.66 in 1939). But bankrupt railroads are to railway presidents on the public-speaking circuit what burnt-out restaurants are to arson-minded restaurateurs. They elicit both sympathy and money.

By coincidence or otherwise, previously well-run railroads, notably in the northeast and mid-Atlantic regions, began to run their passenger services downhill in the late fifties. In Pennsylvania, World War I coaches were brought out from dusty train sheds to give the commuter second thoughts about the joys of train travel. In Connecticut, wealthy commuters found themselves traveling in boxcars. In New Jersey, commuters refused to accept cash payments after a disgraceful campaign of harassment, initiated by a railroad, had failed to move them off the trains. Across the Nation, a design of harassment was built up, planned in the short run to squeeze more money for commuter services and in the long run to drive the last traveler from the tracks to make way for the high-profit item—freight. The strategy included every discomfort imaginable, from broken plumbing and dirty depots and way stations to neglected tracks (that caused delays) and filthy passenger cars. By 1963, a pig could travel across the United States in air-conditioned comfort, but you couldn't.

Curiously enough, the public in the main took the punishment. The railroads blamed the entire mess variously upon finances, the railroad unions, and the weather. Yet the railroad industry's Draconian measures produced results. The commuters put pressure on the politicians, and the politicians applied relief. New Jersey reduced State taxes on passenger facilities and made treasury contributions to the affected communities to offset commuter deficits. Philadelphia created an authority to subsidize the commuter services operated by the Pennsylvania and the Reading Railroads. New York State, itself hard pressed for cash, took the remarkable step of persuading most of the important cities to reduce valuations on railroad properties. Thus the annual taxes payable to New York City by the New York Central were steadily reduced beginning in 1959; by 1962, this carrier paid some $7.5 million less in taxes annually than in 1959. The difference in tax payments obtained by the city was made up by the State.

But such actions as these will not satisfy the railroad companies. "There is much surplus railroad mileage in this country today," says Stuart T. Saundrs, president of the Norfolk & Western Railway, and this is especially true in the East. Of the approximately 225,000 mainline miles now in service, 23,000 miles, or less than 10 percent, carry 50 percent of our total freight ton-miles, and at the other extreme, 67,000 miles, or about 30 percent, carry only 2 percent of the total freight business." As railroad presidents see the situation, they would like to shrink railroad mileage still further to concentrate on the profitable freight business. On the one hand, they claim a special relationship (with attendant privileges) to the economy, since the railroad companies are a vital part of our national defense; on the other hand, they want the right to close down unprofitable routes at their own time and choosing.

Meanwhile the railroads benefit in numerous ways from abandoning track. Savings are realized that amount to $2,500 a mile in taxes, plus $3,000 a mile in maintenance costs. Cash is generated by selling off salvaged materials (at $5,000 a mile). The land is available for real estate purposes—the Boston & Albany Railroad sold 11 miles of its roadbed and right-of-way to the Massachusetts Turnpike Authority for $8 million.

It is precisely because of the railroads' central importance to any national defense plan that such requests to reduce railway mileage can have the central place in a national transportation policy. A policy (or absence of one) that allows railroads to abandon track as they please needs closer scrutiny.

When a railway president begins an article in a national magazine with the statement that "U.S. transportation is highballing to a crisis," and when the financial editor of one of America's great newspapers begins his story, "The country's railroads are highballing toward their best earnings year since 1957," the reader is left in sime confusion. The key to this semantic boggle is simple enough. What the railroad president is speaking about is net railway operating income (freight and passenger revenues), whereas the financial editor is referring to total earnings. This includes other income, an item that is almost always cheerfully black in the railroad ledger. To paraphrase Father Flanagan: There is no "railroad problem," there are only "problem railroads."

The financial picture is similar to that of American industry as a whole. There are blue-chip companies and there are others that are not doing so well. But even such celebrated examples of how not to run a railroad as the New Haven are doing exceptionally well under the other income heading. Last year the New Haven earned $4.3 million on rentals in the Grand Central area of New York City. In recent years, as downtown city areas have been redeveloped, property values have soared, directly benefiting on the other income side of the ledger those companies with poor performance in terms of net railway operating income.

Just how much this can mean can be gathered from a company such as the Chicago & North Western, which estimated last year that surplus real estate no longer included in its railway operations is valued at $40 million. In the western United States the railroad companies are among the biggest landowners. Northern Pacific, for example, controls more than 8 million acres of land; so does the Union Pacific. A close runner-up is the Southern Pacific with some 5.2 million acres. And even more valuable are the mineral and timber rights. The Union Pacific in 1962 showed other income totaling $39.26 million, which nearly matched its net railway operating income of $46.78 million. The Santa Fe's subsidiary, the Chanslor-Western Oil & Development Co., earned $10.29 million before taxes in 1962. In addition, the Santa Fe owns a controlling interest in Kirby Lumber Co., which has lumber, oil, and gas interests in Louisiana and Texas.

Few people who have ever looked at railroad balance sheets objectively doubt that for many class 1 railroads, the return on investment is high. For the 10-year period from 1951 to 1961, the class 1 railroads had an average net-income-to-revenue of 7.19 percent. During this same period, General Motors averaged 7.62 percent; General Electric, 5.62 percent and United States Steel, 7.34 percent. Certainly, when compared to these bellwhether corporations, it is clear that the railroad industry's financial health is sound.

Over the last half-century, the railroads haven't had a bad run for their money. Much of the strength inherent in the railroad establishment is derived from the fact that many of the same financial interests that controlled the railroads at the turn of the centuary are still involved today. Now that the railroad industry has left the monopoly era it is finding the age of competition rough going. In the past, railroads set their own tariffs on the basis of "what the traffic can bear"; unlike the business competitors they were exempt from antitrust laws that prevented other industries from price-fixing. Today, however, the railroads have to meet competition from an aggressive trucking industry, from pipe lines, from barge traffic and from the airlines. To earn the kind of profits they have become accustomed to in the second half of the 20th century they will have to squeeze all the water they can out of their overhead. "First and foremost," says Milton J. Sharp, a Pennsylvania industrialist, "the attitude of railroad management must change. Every business has competition. The difference is that the railroads complain about it instead of doing something to counteract it. They complain that their competition is unfair because of Government subsidies to improve highways, airports, harbors, etc. They forget that they, too, were heavily subsidized at the outset. They received all kinds of benefits, including land at low prices."

Recently, pressed by competition, the industry has belatedly recognized that the bulk of its plant is obsolete and needs replacement. The current investment in new equipment is running at the rate of about $1 billion a year. Technology is, in turn, taking away jobs at an astounding rate. Since the end of World War II, every second railwayman has lost his job. Railroad employment in 1963 has fallen to the bottom of the depression levels. The railway workers have lost 700,000 jobs since 1945, for there is almost no job on the railroads that cannot be automated, from "crewless" trains and remote-control locomotives to electronic classification yards. Although automation has brought economic security to the few, it is bringing devastating unemployment for many. The Railroad Brotherhoods, their memberships in a militant mood, have thus brought the automation question to a showdown over the right of management to change work rules. The changes in question would eliminate 65,000 jobs—mostly those of firemen who presently ride diesel locomotives in freight and yard service.

Obviously, to survive, the railroad industry has no alternative but to drag itself into the 20th century. And it must modernize its antiquated plant and track. The railway unions, too, must drop mental attitudes that match the railroad managements' "cuspidor age" thinking processes. Yet, until recently the unions did not oppose mechanization, nor do they oppose automation now. What they seek is the kind of approach that has already been worked out in the steel and aluminum industries for solving the serious problems that automation brings. They contend that in the second half of the 20th century the kind of social Darwinism currently in favor with much of railroad management is inhumane. "We pledge the fullest cooperation to management in accepting the new technology and making it work as it should," says W. P. Kennedy, president of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen. "We ask in return that

management pledge us an equitable share in the fruits of increased productivity * * * and that it accept some of the social costs of technological displacement."

In the notorious featherbedding public relations campaign, railroad management gave the Brotherhoods their answer. The public was told in words and pictures that the featherbedding railwayman was the root of all the railroad's troubles. Yet—and this is the real irony—by sticking to this sham issue, the railroad industry has weakened its long-range objective, which is surely to see a strong and viable railroad system that is capable of retaining its place in the Nation's transportation complex.

Meanwhile, with troubles ahead on the labor issue, the railroads are cutting away at passenger schedules, automating at a rapidly rising rate, shrinking railroad mileage, examining merger deals—and making money. In the first half of this year, net income rose to $270 million (compared with $181 million in the 1962 period). In part this favorable position was due to new liberalized depreciation guidelines and a 7-percent investment credit allowed late last year. It came just in time, for the special Korean war tax credits were running out. In a way the public ought to be sorry over the Internal Revenue Department's action, for it might have been fun to watch the railroad industry's awesome public relations battalions go to work on that assignment.

## A FAIR TEST FOR KREBIOZEN

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, on October 23, 1963, the Denver Post printed an editorial entitled "Tests Needed To End Krebiozen Fight." This is a fine, objective piece of writing and it makes the same point that I have always made: namely, that only a fair and impartial test can judge the effectiveness of krebiozen. As the Denver Post makes very clear, they are not in a position to judge or pass on this question, and this is precisely the stand I have always taken. Only a fair and impartial test can settle this controversy. I should like to draw attention to a quotation in this editorial of the words of the great Alexander Fleming, discoverer of penicillin, who once said:

Penicillin sat on the shelf for 12 years while I was called a quack. I can only think of the thousands who died needlessly because my peers would not use my discovery.

The Denver Post then makes this most sober comment that "man should never make such a tragic mistake again." I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the RECORD.

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

TESTS NEEDED TO END KREBIOZEN FIGHT

A committee of 24 physicians assembled by the National Cancer Institute, after reviewing 504 case histories of krebiozen-treated patients, has concluded that a clinical test of the drug is not justified.

But the committee's conclusion that the drug is worthless in the treatment of cancer will not end the amazing krebiozen dispute.

For more than 12 years, opponents and backers of krebiozen have engaged in a bitter tug of war. Scientifically, neither side has gained an inch.

Opponents of the drug have charged quackery and fraud. Backers have charged conspiracy and persecution.

Opponents have shown conclusively first that krebiozen doesn't exist, then that it exists but it is merely mineral oil, and now that it is really creatine, a common amino acid derivative found in large quantities in the human body and ineffective against cancer.

Backers have shown conclusively that krebiozen causes regression of certain types of tumors and eases pain in many cases of terminal cancer.

In truth, neither side has shown a thing.

Dr. Stevan Durovic, discoverer of krebiozen, and Dr. Andrew C. Ivy, chief scientific sponsor of the drug, are not likely to let up now. Neither are the dozens of doctors who say they have used it, and that it works.

And neither, judging from the intensity of feeling shown to date, are the 400 cancer victims in the United States who believe they need krebiozen to stay alive—or the relatives of many cancer victims who have been given the drug in the late stages of the disease.

The American Medical Association, on the other hand, will surely continue opposing the efforts of the drug's backers. Along with the influential American Medical Association will be most of the medical profession.

But who is right? Ordinarily, we would be inclined to accept the edict of the American Medical Association without question on a medical issue. And yet, it seems to us that enough evidence has been presented in the past 12 years at least to justify a clinical test of krebiozen.

The physicians who back the drug are not quacks. They are scientists who believe the drug krebiozen is effective in the treatment of cancer and warrants further investigation. They have never made fantastic claims.

Perhaps they are wrong. But if there is just one chance in a million that krebiozen is the beginning of a solution in the dreadful cancer problem, it should be given the fairest and fullest possible test.

Even if the tests showed that use of the drug results only in relief of pain without the toxic effects of narcotics, the finding would be worthwhile.

Even though the American Medical Association leaders are opposed to a National Cancer Institute test for krebiozen, we have been told by individual physicians and researchers that at least the scientific theory behind the drug is sound and that they think it should be tested.

The Food and Drug Administration banned interstate shipment of krebiozen on July 12. Thereafter, many patients who had been using it moved to Illinois where it is manufactured.

Emphatically, we wish to make the point that we do not, and cannot, pass judgment on the effectiveness of the drug. We do, however, suggest that the reading and interviewing we have done indicate that there is enough here to warrant krebiozen being given a fair clinical test.

We cannot laugh off the conviction of hundreds of cancer victims who believe it is sustaining them.

And a reading of history indicates that it is foolish to cast aside any drug that shows even an inkling of promise against a disease that strikes one in every four Americans.

Alexander Fleming, discoverer of penicillin, once said:

"Penincillin sat on the shelf for 12 years while I was called a quack. I can only think of the thousands who died needlessly because my peers would not use my discovery."

Man should never make such a tragic mistake again.

## THE AIRPLANE: ALASKA'S LIFELINE

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, an article published in this month's Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association publication, Pilot, is a most interesting and valuable one. Written by Steve McCutcheon, "The Airplane: Alaska's Lifeline," describes the very great importance of the airplane to my State's economy and society. Alaska is a State which has jumped from the dogsled to the airplane overnight. Alaska is a State over a large part of which there are no roads whatever. In many communities the only way to travel is to fly.

Steve McCutcheon, a pilot himself, and a good friend of mine over many years, sets this forth clearly.

I ask unanimous concent that his article be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE AIRPLANE: ALASKA'S LIFELINE

(By Steve McCutcheon)

The importance of air transportation in Alaska is virtually unparalleled. The airplane is a way of life. The extremely high degree of aviation activity in the 49th State has been brought about by deficiencies in surface transport.

For example, with a land area equal to one-fifth of the Continental United States, Alaska only has approximately 1 mile of road per 100 square miles of land. In contrast, road density in the rest of the United States is about 1 mile of highway per square mile. The seasonality of access to many communities in Alaska by surface methods makes the urgency of air transport even greater.

On a per capita basis, there is at least 1 pilot's license for every 55 persons and 1 aircraft for each 156 residents in Alaska. One of the true pioneers of Alaska generally thought to be the trapper and gold miner actually is the hard-working bush pilot. The annals of aviation in this north country are well documented with stories of personal sacrifice of these unsung heroes.

Only recently Alaska's Gov. William A. Egan—himself an old pilot—appointed the widow of a member of the State legislature to her husband's vacant seat. Her husband had lost his life in a crash attempting to bring a sick person of a remote village to the hospital at Nome in a snowstorm. He had flown into the ground in the terrible whiteout.

Airline pilots, too, many former bush pilots, have had a firm hand in the development of modern aviation in Alaska. Their record of safety is amazing, particularly when it is realized that one of the toughest, most hazardous airline routes in the world is flown at least once each day by Reeves Aleutian Airlines. This routes lies down the long Aleutian Peninsula—the birthplace of wind and fog.

That general commercial aviation has had a strong hand in the development of Alaska is apparent from the fact that only 10 percent of all the food consumed is locally grown.

Tourism in the northernmost State continues to expand, as more and more each year head for the 49th State for recreation among its scenic splendors and abundant big game. Current tour business in Alaska is worth about $40 million. Present forecasts indicate the 1964 season will run at least 20 percent ahead of this year. The airlines certainly will come in for a handsome share of this increase. All airline traffic to Alaska is now jet, while Northwest Orient is running fanjet ships.

New hotels and lodges have been built, some largely predicated upon the constantly increasing air traffic. More are under construction and planned for the future by State authorities. During the last 10 years individual tourist-supported businesses have reported from 10 to 100 percent average annual increases. A good deal of this obviously is due to more frequent air service to many points within the State as well as the increase

in direct service from New York City, Chicago, and Seattle-Portland.

A startling figure or two lend firm support to the allegation of Alaska's burgeoning air industry. In 1960 there were 63.2 civil aircraft per 10,000 persons. Montana was second with 14.3, while the average of the whole United States was 4 planes per 10,000 of population.

It is an amazing fact that many Alaskan children have never seeen an automobile. Yet, in remote spots of this northern State these same children will spot the distant silhouette of an aircraft, immediately call it by name, probably announce the horsepower, cruising speed, and load capacity, and like as not name the pilot.

Metropolitan Anchorage, with a population of roughly 88,000, is the hub of air commerce for Alaska as well as the international transpolar routes. A brief comparison of historical records reveals some substantial expansion of the utilization of aircraft.

In 1954, according to FAA reports, there were seven scheduled airlines operating out of the huge Cook's Inlet City. In that same year there were 6,885 departures, carrying 61,564 persons, 1,678.7 tons of mail and 2,666.3 tons of general cargo. (A general cargo in Alaska can mean a load of freshly caught king salmon, a herd of dairy cattle, a cargo of live chickens, several beluga whales or some walruses, bales upon bales of furs, strong boxes of gold bricks, oil drilling bits, a tractor, a small river boat, a load of king crabs, crates of fresh lettuce from the Matanuska Valley, fresh milk, dry goods or cement.)

In that same year 1954, Alaska was still a Territory but it reported 67 communities serviced by air. Total operations for the whole 586,000 square miles was 53,057 departures carrying 227,987, more than the whole population of Alaska. In addition that year, 4,500 tons of mail and 8,200 tons of cargo were also airlifted.

While 1957 saw 67 communities serviced by air the 1960 figure had risen to 156. By 1963 there were over 250 publicly owned air facilities in the State of which at least 150 have scheduled flights by one or more commercial carriers.

Alaska's biggest city, Anchorage, has the largest State-owned civil air facility. Anchorage International currently handles the largest transpolar intercontinental jets as well as turbine and piston-powered craft, besides the interstate and intrastate skeds and nonskeds.

Anchorage International provides terminal facilities for both national and international travelers, space for airline ticket counters, baggage facilities, weather bureau, customs and immigration as well as Department of Agriculture, restaurant, bar and the internationally famous dining room. A new ultramodern, high-speed mail-handling facility has recently been put into operation by the U.S. Government only a stone's throw from the airport terminal building.

A portion of this huge aviation complex is novel. That portion is the integral floatplane facility of Lake Hood. Here is one of the very few civil seaplane bases that may boast its own control tower. Currently there are more than 375 aircraft based at this marine terminal. Operations are limited as there is no more tiedown space available and a waiting list of several hundred presently exists. FAA reports that nearly 25 percent of all U.S. registered floatplanes tie down at Anchorage's Lake Hood facility.

All manner of airframe and engine service is available at the water's edge. Runways lead to International for amphibious craft. More are under construction. Lake Hood has a wheel field also which is several thousand feet long, paralleling the canal that connects Lake Hood with Lake Spenard. Several miles south of Anchorage International, there is a private floatplane facility with an east-west runway of more than 6,000 feet. Here homeowners park their aircraft right at the front door.

Last year there were 49,236 operations off Lake Hood. The forecast is that by 1980, assuming some improvement can be made in the tiedown problem, there will be 100,500 annual operations.

Recently Alaska's Governor Egan initiated an all-out campaign for removal of Federal restrictions that handicap the Sourdough State in tapping the rich international tourist business.

Target of the drive is a CAB ruling which prevents extension of stopover privilege to through passengers on foreign-flag carriers, while they are at Anchorage or Fairbanks International Airports.

In a letter to CAB Chairman Alan Boyd and Director Gilmore of the U.S. Travel Service, Governor Egan said that an estimated 42,000 persons per year—passengers on the intercontinental transpolar flights are restricted from extending their contact with the United States beyond the confines of the Alaskan air terminals. The Governor stated that if only 5 percent of these people could be successfully encouraged to spend 10 days in Alaska, it would add more than a million dollars per year to the Alaskan economy.

Under present CAB regulations, should a passenger of Air France or SAS stop over in Anchorage or Fairbanks they would be required to continue their journey to the orient via an American carrier. JAL, KLM, and Canadian Pacific do not have passenger rights so that their passengers could under no circumstances remain in Alaska for any length of time. With Lufthansa of West Germany about to enter the transpolar route stopping at Anchorage, sizable numbers of touring foreigners are prevented from seeing our northern State.

A decision has been promised shortly; meanwhile, the State of Alaska is going ahead with the expansion of all facilities including $620,000 which is being spent at Anchorage International for phase 1 of the multimillion-dollar terminal expansion and runway updating. Fairbanks International is scheduled for $498,000, for development of their general aviation area, including apron, taxiway, and access road, noise abatement and an inbond incinerator.

Largest single expenditure of the year will be $2,300,000 when the airport gets underway at scenic Sitka, former Russian capital of Alaska, located in southeastern Alaska. Other major projects include $850,000 for landing strip extension at the Bristol Bay metropolis of Dillingham. Homer, an agricultural and fishing community on the big game-rich Kenai Peninsula, will get $85,000 for apron expansion and taxiway extension. McCarthy will get $136,000 for an airport to serve east-central Alaska. Noatak, a village of several hundred Eskimos situated on the Noatak River not far from the Chukchi Sea, will get $60,000 to level up a strip built on permafrost.

The Prince William Sound city of Seward, the ice-free southern terminal of the Alaska Railroad, famous for its mid-August Silver Salmon Derby each year, is to get a quarter of a million to extend its runway, and to relocate the highway which passes near the end of the current strip.

Under construction is a million-dollar field at Point Barrow, another million-dollar field at the small Eskimo village of Savoonga on St. Lawrence Island, while a substantial airport is near completion on the lower Yukon River between the settlements of Mountain Village and Andreafsky.

Recently the Federal Government has turned over to the small towns of Nenana (famous for the Alaskan ice breakup lottery) and Kenai the fields formerly operated by the FAA.

Kenai, oil capital of Alaska, also has a sound economic backbone, supported by a thriving commercial catching and canning of Cook's Inlet salmon as well as a substantial business in airborne big game guides and outfitters.

With wise foresight the Kenai city fathers have retained former Alaska Director of Aviation, Eugene Roguszka, as a consultant in the planned expansion and improvement of facilities at the airport. The updating of the facility will be a combination of city, State, and Federal aid moneys. The Kenai project will require about $700,000 to complete.

Of major importance to Alaska's two big internationals is the construction and equipping of ultramodern fire and rescue stations. Outside of jets hitting a few moose there have been no accidents on either of the big airports; but the State is not relaxing. They are providing the highest quality of machines and trained men to maintain the enviable safety records.

James E. Moody, Alaskan-born chief engineer of the State department of aviation, stated that the construction of some fields in the permafrost regions posed tough problems not encountered in general aviation in the southern 48 States.

The sites of Barrow, Savoonga, Noatak, Shungnak lie in the permanently frozen ground area. They require careful and extensive analysis of permafrost condition prior to field construction. In such places, overlay embankment type runways were the first application, so far as Moody knew, of A. H. Lachenbruch's theories on design for permafrost construction. The design is unique and progressive, for the engineers calculate the thickness of embankment needed to maintain thermal balance according to scientific formulae instead of rule of thumb. When thermal balances get out of adjustment the underlying permafrost thaws unevenly so that the fill material undulates until finally the field is useless.

Most bush fields in Alaska are officially secondary airports with a runway length not less than 2,500 feet. They serve villages or settlements of from 30 to several hundred persons.

Trunk airports have a minimum runway length of 4,000 feet. They serve larger communities or may serve a whole section of this vast State.

In southeastern Alaska, the bulk of operations are of a marine nature, utilizing both floatplanes and amphibious types such as the Grummans.

In 1963, at least 14 units will have been constructed or rehabilitated through enlargement.

Activity in the field of air transport and establishment of facilities is nothing short of phenomenal. For instance, new construction of trunk airports, which cost from a quarter of a million to a million dollars with runways over 4,000 feet, is underway at Point Barrow, America's northernmost community on this continent; at Savoonga, close in the shadow of Soviet Siberia; and at Andreafsky on the lower Yukon River.

Enlargement programs running as high as $6 million per airport are underway at the international airports in Anchorage and Fairbanks, as well as at Seward, Kotzebue, Homer, Fort Yukon, and Dillingham.

Reconstruction of bush and trunk airports is being carried out at Gambell, only 40 miles from Soviet territory, Sand Point, Noatak, Central, Koyukuk, and Karluk.

New construction of secondary (bush) airports with runways at least 2,500 feet in length is underway at: Buckland, Shungnak, Ambler, Togiak, Emmonak, Tunaunak, Kotlik, Wainwright, Nulato, Russian Mission, Nitemute, Clarks Point, Pilot Point, Teller Mission, Goodnews Bay, Stebbins, Shageluk and the village of St. Michael, once famous as headquarters for Klondike gold stampede riverboats.

Stateside persons interested in aviation seldom think in terms of marine terminals for aircraft. But this aspect of flying in Alaska is important. This certainly is pointed up in Alaskan expenditures for floats and facilities for water borne aircraft.

Substantial seaplane facility construction is going on at Anchorage's Lake Hood. The rest of these communities are in the southeastern panhandle section of the State; Funter Bay, Angoon, Hawk Inlet, Kake, Kasaan, Hoonah, Wrangell, Metlakatla, Tongass Harbor, Craig, Pelican, Baranof, and Petersburg, all are receiving either new or additional float aircraft facilities.

Larry Johnson, director of aviation for the State, is a former war pilot as well as civil pilot. Upon query, he stated shortly—"There's a boom on in aviation in Alaska. Our department is doing its share to keep it booming."

---

## "THE QUIET CRISIS"

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, our distinguished Secretary of Interior, Stewart L. Udall, has given the Nation a literary masterpiece entitled "The Quiet Crisis." I have just completed reading it and I recommend without hesitation that every Member of the Congress read this important book.

In his foreword, Mr. Udall raises the question, "What does material abundance avail if we create an environment in which man's highest and most specifically human attributes cannot be fulfilled?"

Secretary Udall, with whom I was privileged to serve as a Member of the House of Representatives, is uniquely qualified to answer this question. He does so in beautiful, highly informed prose in "The Quiet Crisis."

Each generation—

Writes the Secretary—

has its own rendezvous with the land, for despite our fee titles and claims of ownership, we are all brief tenants on this planet. By choice, or by default, we will carve out a land legacy for our heirs. We can misuse the land and diminish the usefulness of resources, or we can create a world in which physical affluence and affluence of the spirit go hand in hand.

In an introduction to Secretary Udall's book, President Kennedy writes:

We must develop new instruments of foresight and protection and nurture in order to recover the relationship between man and nature and to make sure that the national estate we pass on to our multiplying descendants is green and flourishing. I hope that all Americans understand the importance of this effort, because it cannot be won until each American makes the preservation of "the beauty and the bounty of the American earth" his personal commitment. To this effort, Secretary Udall has given courageous leadership, and, to this understanding "The Quiet Crisis" makes a stirring and illuminating contribution.

Mr. President, today's Washington Post carries a notable review of "The Quiet Crisis," by our colleague from Wisconsin, Senator GAYLORD NELSON. Senator NELSON is admirably qualified to review this work. As Governor of Wisconsin, he became known nationwide as an effective and farsighted champion of conservation. What he has to say about the subject of resources development and the building of a better life for Americans is always significant.

In reviewing "The Quiet Crisis," Senator NELSON says:

If you want your children to grow up and get rich some day by exploiting the things and the people around them, I wouldn't recommend this book. But if you want them to acquire a reverence for the land and the forests and the wild animals, and to be inspired by the great figures of American history who have expressed this spirit in our public life, then I don't know of a better primer.

The Senator from Wisconsin adds:

The message of "The Quiet Crisis" is obvious. We have only a precious few years left to make a massive effort at the State, local, and national level to preserve our fresh water, our soil, our forests and streams, our minerals and even the air we breathe. If we fail to act, these priceless resources may be destroyed forever.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the review by Senator NELSON be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 19, 1963]

"THE QUIET CRISIS" BY STEWART L. UDALL

(Reviewed by Senator GAYLORD NELSON)

If you want your children to grow up and get rich some day by exploiting the things and the people around them, I wouldn't recommend this book.

But if you want them to acquire a reverence for the land and the forests and the wild animals, and to be inspired by the great figures of American history who have expressed this spirit in our public life, then I don't know of a better primer.

Interior Secretary Udall, in this terse little book, manages to see and express conservation as a wide sweeping, all encompassing part of American history. It is the story of a political, economic and philosophical struggle involving cowboys and Indians, transcendentalists, empire builders, robber barons, bureaucrats and Presidents.

For the most part, it is a sad story of an inevitable tragedy, of how the great American dream of a new empire stretching from ocean to ocean conflicted with many of the scientific principles of conservation. Secretary Udall tells how the new Nation flourished—but only at the expense of the Indian, the buffalo, the virgin timber, the clean water, and the precious topsoil.

The heroes of this story are the few strong figures in our history who have had the soul to appreciate the precious things in our environment, and the backbone to fight to save them.

Udall describes what a masterpiece of creation the American Continent was when the Pilgrims arrived. Yet it looked "hideous" to them, and they set about changing it. The conflict has continued ever since. The American Indian's concept of the land as something that existed for the enjoyment and sustenance of all had to be eliminated—and so did the Indian. The forests had to be cut down to build houses, and make way for farms. The beaver had to be trapped to earn cash from Europe. The thin layer of grass on the great plains had to be plowed under to plant corn. The rivers had to be dammed. The western lands had to be given to the railroads. The gold-rich hills had to be washed away with high-pressure water hoses to bring out the nuggets of wealth.

Almost from the beginning, a few voices cried out in the wilderness. The result was blazing controversy and, in some cases, great victories for the public's stake in its environment.

"Where can I go now, and visit nature undisturbed?" demanded John James Audubon in the 1820's. His book, "Birds of America," was credited with arousing the national conscience and saving many species, and ultimately to the founding of the Smithsonian Institution.

Francis Parkman, a proper Bostonian, lived with the Sioux Indians and wrote "The Oregon Trail." Udall comments, "To him, the saga of American settlement had all the overtones and grandeur of classic tragedy." Ralph Waldo Emerson and Henry David Thoreau developed a philosophy of conservation "when the raid on resources was gathering momentum in the forests of Wisconsin, the mountains of Colorado and the valleys of California." George Perkins Marsh warned that America could become as desolate as the moon if her resources were squandered.

Carl Schurz, a crusading Senator from Wisconsin, was called un-American for supporting the plan of John Wesley Powell to plan irrigation projects, share water equitably and make settlement programs work with nature. Gifford Pinchot, partly by winning the confidence of outdoorsman Theodore Roosevelt, helped set aside hundreds of millions of acres of land in public reservations, and open the door to a national park system. John Muir fought to save the purity of the wilderness, even from the likes of Pinchot. Franklin D. Roosevelt seized upon a depression as a time to make a great advance for conservation.

This story of tragic waste of priceless assets, mixed with half victories along the way, ends with the grim challenge of the future: The spector of a population twice as large as today's, empowered by new technology to consume resources at an even greater pace, making a new assault on our battered environment.

The message of "The Quiet Crisis" is obvious. We have only a precious few years left to make a massive effort at the State, local and National level to preserve our fresh water, our soil, our forests and streams, our minerals and even the air we breathe. If we fail to act, these priceless resources may be destroyed forever.

Mr. McGOVERN. In the Book Week Review section of last Sunday's Washington Post, the distinguished critic and noted naturalist, Mr. Joseph Wood Krutch, offers a stimulating review of Secretary Udall's volume. He describes it as a work of outstanding importance. Mr. Krutch credits Secretary Udall with having a better understanding of the nature and importance of conservation issues than any other Government official of this generation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the review by Mr. Krutch be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 17, 1963]

THERE'S A BOTTOM TO THE WELL

(NOTE.—"The Quiet Crisis," by Stewart L. Udall, illustrated, Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 209 pages.)

(By Joseph Wood Krutch)

Conservation is a livelier subject now than it has been at any other time since the days of Theodore Roosevelt. Like virtue it has no declared opponents but like virtue again it is defined in so many different ways that it needs no enemies.

To some, conservation means no more than efficient exploitation with a more or less genuine regard for the material needs of the future. To others it includes the preservation of the natural scene for its own sake. And even among the latter there is no substantial agreement. Why preserve nature? For health? For recreation? Or (most

importantly of all so some say) for the sake of the wonder and beauty whose disappearance would leave the human spirit deprived of one of its greatest sources of strength—an awareness of the world which man, in his pride, did not make but to which he nevertheless belongs?

Every concrete proposal becomes immediately a battleground. Should the national parks be developed in a way which makes *them less* and less nature preserves, more and more recreation centers for all the outdoor but artificial amusements of urbanized man—hunting, motorboating, motorcycling, portable TV sets, etc.? If the answer to this question is "Yes,"then should wilderness areas be set aside to serve the purposes for which the parks were originally established? Are areas of extraordinary and unique beauty, of so little value, comparatively speaking, that their destruction is of no importance if they happen to offer a convenient site for a dam, a missile range, or an atomic installation?

All these questions are being answered in individual cases—usually in the affirmative, occasionally in the other. The wilderness bill is kept languishing in committee despite the fact that it would probably pass both Houses of Congress. Glen Canyon, one of the most magnificent spectacles on the continent, has just been flooded by a dam which many contend serves no important purpose, and Congress has refused to appropriate funds for the protection of Rainbow Bridge despite the fact that such protection was promised when the dam was authorized.

Nothing is more badly needed than a definition and a clarification of the meaning, aims, and methods of the conservation which no one is openly against. This is precisely what Secretary of Interior Udall's book undertakes to do, and though much has, of course, been written on the subject, "The Quiet Crisis" is of outstanding importance for several reasons. The first is simply the fact that the author's position makes his opinions certain to carry weight. The second reason is that he is amazingly well informed and far more alive to both the nature and importance of the issues than, in my opinion, any other Government official of this generation has been. A third reason is that his short book is concise, clear, vivid, factual, extremely readable and, when the occasion calls for it, eloquent. Even those who cry "sentimental" at my suggestion that money and power are not the only real values can hardly accuse Udall of sentimentalizing. What is perhaps more important; his writing is miraculously free of any trace of that gobbledegook which few men in public life seem able to avoid.

Instead of presenting the issues as either abstract or new, he has chosen a historical approach and traced the whole story of the dominant attitudes toward the American earth from the time of the pre-Columbian Indians, to the present day. He has shown how the crucial issues of the present have repeatedly arisen and how they were settled.

The Indian lived with nature in a way impossible for a large population, and there is truth, of course, in President Monroe's statement, "The hunter or savage state requires a greater extent of territory to sustain him than is compatible with the progress and just claims of civilized life—and must yield to it." But that was taken to mean, first, that the Indian should be exterminated, and second, that it was our pleasant duty to recklessly exploit and destroy the natural world. First, the pioneers like Daniel Boone and later the mountain men of the West lived as hunters. Then, after their individual and minor depredations, came the systematic exhaustion of wildlife resources by the Astors et al., the reckless transfer of large public areas to railroad builders and others, and the quick destruction of the forests. Thomas Jefferson had had other ideas but reckless waste was encouraged by what Secretary Udall calls the myth of superabundance.

And it was not until thinkers like Emerson and Thoreau and scientist-reformers like George Perkins Marsh raised their voices that other attitudes received a hearing.

It is impossible even to summarize the long and frequently dreadful history which Secretary Udall so brilliantly sketches, but two horrible examples may be given. Maine and Pennsylvania sold off enormous tracts of virgin forest at 12½ cents an acre. As for the preservation of wildlife, President Grant vetoed the first bill ever introduced into our Congress for the preservation of wildlife because, presumably, he agreed with Gen. Phil Sheridan, who had boasted that the buffalo hunters were doing more to subjugate the Indians by depriving them of their food supply than the Army had been able to do in 20 years. "Let them kill, skin, and sell until the buffalo is exterminated, as it is the only way to bring about lasting peace and allow civilization to advance."

The myth of superabundance of the natural as opposed to the superabundance of the manufactured is concerned. But the questions how, what, and why our resources should be protected, are still very much an issue and, despite minority protests, it is by no means sure that those to whom conservation means merely efficient exploitation will not carry the day. Too few agree with or even understand what Secretary Udall says in his foreword:

"Each generation has its own rendezvous with the land, for despite our fee titles and claims of ownership, we are all brief tenants of the land. * * * We can misuse the land and diminish the usefulness of its resources; or we can create a world in which physical affluence and affluence of the spirit go hand in hand. * * * What does material abundance avail if we create an environment in which man's highest and most specifically human attributes cannot be fulfilled?"

Anyone who wishes to consider the question of the relation of conservation to such fulfillment cannot do better than to read "The Quiet Crisis."

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, while I hope that my colleagues will take the time to read the entire volume, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the foreword to Mr. Udall's book and the introduction by President Kennedy, as well as the closing chapter entitled "Notes for a Land Ethic for Tomorrow."

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

FOREWORD TO "THE QUIET CRISIS," BY STEWART UDALL

One week last fall two events came to my attention which seemed to sum up the plight of modern man: the first was a press report which indicated that T. S. Eliot, the poet, was a victim of London's latest "killer fog" and lay gravely ill; the second was a call from a preservation-minded citizen of New Hampshire who informed me that Robert Frost's old farm—fixed for all time in memory by the poem "West-running Brook"—was now an auto junkyard.

The coincidence of these two events raised questions in my mind: Is a society a success if it creates conditions that impair its finest minds and makes a wasteland of its finest landscapes? What does material abundance avail if we create an environment in which man's highest and most specifically human attributes cannot be fulfilled?

Each generation has its own rendezvous with the land, for despite our fee titles and claims of ownership, we are all brief tenants on this planet. By choice, or by default, we will carve out a land legacy for our heirs. We can misuse the land and diminish the usefulness of resources, or we can create a world in which physical affluence and affluence of the spirit go hand in hand.

History tells us that earlier civilizations have declined because they did not learn to live in harmony with land. Our successes in space and our triumphs of technology hold a hidden danger: as modern man increasingly arrogates to himself dominion over the physical environment, there is the risk that his false pride will cause him to take the resources of the earth for granted—and to lose all reverence for the land.

America today stands poised on a pinnacle of wealth and power, yet we live in a land of vanishing beauty, of increasing ugliness, of shrinking open space, and of an overall environment that is diminished daily by pollution and noise and blight.

This, in brief, is the quiet conservation crisis of the 1960's.

It is not too late to repair some of the mistakes of the past, and to make America a green and pleasant—and productive—land. We can do it if we understand the history of our husbandry, and develop fresh insight concerning the men and the forces that have shaped our land attitudes and determined the pattern of land use in the United States.

This book is an attempt to outline the land-and-people story of our continent. It is dedicated to the proposition that men must grasp completely the relationship between human stewardship and the fullness of the American earth.

STEWART L. UDALL.

WASHINGTON, D.C., *July 1963*.

---

INTRODUCTION BY JOHN F. KENNEDY

The history of America is, more than that of most nations, the history of man confronted by nature. Our story has been peculiarly the story of man and the land, man and the forests, man and the plains, man and water, man and resources. It has been the story of a rich and varied natural heritage shaping American institutions and American values, and it has been equally the story of Americans seizing, using, squandering, and belatedly, protecting and developing that heritage. In telling this story and giving this central theme of American history its proper emphasis and dignity, Secretary Udall puts us all in his debt.

From the beginning, Americans had a lively awareness of the land and the wilderness. The Jeffersonian faith in the independent farmer laid the foundation for American democracy; and the ever-beckoning, ever-receding frontier left an indelible imprint on American society and the American character. And Americans pioneered in more than the usual way. We hear much about land reform today in other parts of the world, but we do not perhaps reflect enough on the extent to which land reform, from the Northwest Ordinance through the Homestead Act of the Farm Security Administration and beyond, was an American custom and an American innovation.

Yet, at the same time that Americans saluted the noble bounty of nature, they also abused and abandoned it. For the first century after independence, we regarded the natural environment as indestructible—and proceeded vigorously to destroy it. Not till the time of Marsh and Schurz and Powell did we begin to understand that our resources were not inexhaustible. Only in the 20th century have we acted in a systematic way to defend and enrich our natural heritage.

The modern American record in conservation has been brilliant and distinguished. It has inspired comparable efforts all around the earth, but it came just in time in our own land, and, as Mr. Udall's vivid narrative makes clear, the race between education

and erosion, between wisdom and waste, has not run its course. George Perkins Marsh pointed out a century ago that greed and shortsightedness were the natural enemies of a prudent resources policy. Each generation must deal anew with the "raiders," with the scramble to use public resources for private profit, and with the tendency to prefer short-run profits to longrun necessities. The Nation's battle to preserve the common estate is far from won.

Mr. Udall understands this—and he understands too that new times give this battle new forms. I read with particular interest his chapter on "Conservation and the Future," in which he sets forth the implications for the conservation effort of the new science and technology. On the one hand, he notes, science has opened up great new sources of energy and great new means of control. On the other hand, new technical processes and devices litter the countryside with waste and refuse, contaminate water and air, imperil wildlife and man, and endanger the balance of nature itself. Our economic standard of living rises, but our environmental standard of living—our access to nature and respect for it—deteriorates. A once-beautiful nation, as Mr. Udall suggests, is in danger of turning into an "ugly America." And the long-run effect will be not only to degrade the quality of the national life but to weaken the foundations of national power.

The crisis may be quiet, but it is urgent. We must do in our own day what Theodore Roosevelt did 60 years ago and Franklin Roosevelt 30 years ago: we must expand the concept of conservation to meet the imperious problems of the new age. We must develop new instruments of foresight and protection and nurture in order to recover the relationship between man and nature and to make sure that the national estate we pass on to our multiplying descendants is green and flourishing.

I hope that all Americans understand the importance of this effort, because it cannot be won until each American makes the preservation of "the beauty and the bounty of the American earth" his personal commitment. To this effort, Secretary Udall has given courageous leadership, and, to this understanding, "The Quiet Crisis" makes a stirring and illuminating contribution.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

---

NOTES ON A LAND ETHIC FOR TOMORROW—CHAPTER XIV OF "THE QUIET CRISIS," BY STEWART UDALL

"We abuse land because we regard it as a commodity belonging to us. When we see land as a community to which we belong, we may begin to use it with love and respect."—Aldo Leopold, "A Sand County Almanac."

Beyond all plans and programs, true conservation is ultimately something of the mind—an ideal of men who cherish their past and believe in their future. Our civilization will be measured by its fidelity to this ideal as surely as by its art and poetry and system of justice. In our perpetual search for abundance, beauty, and order we manifest both our love for the land and our sense of responsibility toward future generations.

Most Americans find it difficult to conceive a land ethic for tomorrow. The pastoral American of a century ago, whose conservation insights were undeveloped, has been succeeded by the asphalt American of the 1960's, who is shortsighted in other ways. Our sense of stewardship is uncertain partly because too many of us lack roots in the soil and the respect for resources that goes with such roots. Too many of us have mistaken material ease and comfort for the good life. Our growing dependence on machines has tended to mechanize our response to the world around us and has blunted our appreciation of the higher values.

There are many uprooting forces at work in our society. We are now a nomadic people, and our new-found mobility has deprived us of a sense of belonging to a particular place. Millions of Americans have no tie to the "natural habitat" that is their home. Yet the understanding of the grandeur and simplicity of the good earth is the umbilical cord that should never be cut. If the slow swing of the seasons has lost its magic for some of us, we are all diminished. If others have lost the path to the wellsprings of self-renewal, we are all the losers.

Modern life is confused by the growing imbalance between the works of man and the works of nature. Yesterday a neighbor was someone who lived next door; today technology has obliterated old boundaries and our lives overlap and impinge in myriad ways. Thousands of men who affect the way we live will always remain strangers. An aircraft overhead or an act of air or water pollution miles away, can impair an environment that thousands must share. If we are to formulate an appropriate land conscience, we must redefine the meaning of "neighbor" and find new bonds of loyalty to the land.

One of the paradoxes of American society is that while our economic standard of living has become the envy of the world, our environmental standard has steadily declined. We are better housed, better nourished, and better entertained, but we are not better prepared to inherit the earth or to carry on the pursuit of happiness.

A century ago we were a land-conscious, outdoor people: the American face was weather-beaten, our skills were muscular, and each family drew sustenance directly from the land. Now marvelous machines make our lives easier, but we are falling prey to the weaknesses of an indoor nation and the flabbiness of a sedentary society.

A land ethic for tomorrow should be as honest as Thoreau's "Walden," and as comprehensive as the sensitive science of ecology. It should stress the oneness of our resources and the live-and-help-live logic of the great chain of life. If, in our haste to "progress," the economics of ecology are disregarded by citizens and policymakers alike, the result will be an ugly America. We cannot afford an America where expedience tramples upon esthetics and development decisions are made with an eye only on the present.

Henry Thoreau would scoff at the notion that the gross national product should be the chief index to the state of the Nation, or that automobile sales or figures on consumer consumption reveal anything significant about the authentic art of living. He would surely assert that a clean landscape is as important as a freeway, he would deplore every planless conquest of the countryside, and he would remind his countrymen that a glimpse of grouse can be more inspiring than a Hollywood spectacular or color television. To those who complain of the complexity of modern life, he might reply, "if you want inner peace find it in solitude, not speed, and if you would find yourself, look to the land from which you came and to which you go."

We can have abundance and an unspoiled environment if we are willing to pay the price. We must develop a land conscience that will inspire those daily acts of stewardship which will make America a more pleasant and more productive land. If enough people care enough about their continent to join in the fight for a balanced conservation program, this generation can proudly put its signature on the land. But this signature will not be meaningful unless we develop a land ethic. Only an ever-widening concept and higher ideal of conservation will enlist our finest impulses and move us to make the earth a better home both for ourselves and for those as yet unborn.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RIBICOFF in the chair). Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

---

## FEDERAL AIR POLLUTION CONTROL PROGRAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 615.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 423) to accelerate, extend and strengthen the Federal air pollution control program.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Works, with amendments, on page 2, line 8, after the word "welfare," to insert "including"; on page 3, at the beginning of line 13, to insert "the making of"; on page 4, line 13, after "(1)", to insert "conduct, and"; in line 14, after the word "acceleration", to strike out "of" and insert "of,"; in line 19, after the word "and", to insert "provide"; at the beginning of line 25, to strike out "confronting" and insert "in cooperation with"; on page 5, line 3, after the word "affect", to strike out "or be of concern to communities in various parts of the Nation or may affect"; after line 7, to insert:

(4) initiate and conduct a program of research directed toward the development of improved, low-cost techniques for extracting sulfur from fuels.

In line 16, after the word "recommendations", to insert "by him"; on page 6, line 6, after the word "individuals", to strike out "upon such terms and conditions as he may determine;" and insert "for purposes stated in paragraph (a) (1) of this section;"; in line 11, after the word "to", to strike out "section" and insert "sections"; in the same line, after "3648", to insert "and 3709"; in line 24, after the word "biological", to insert "effects of varying"; on page 7, line 2, after the word "thereof", to insert "and"; in line 5, after the word "air", to strike out "pollution;" and insert "pollution."; after line 5, to insert:

(c) (1) In carrying out the provisions of subsection (a) of this section the Secretary shall conduct research on, and survey the results of other scientific studies on, the harmful effects on the health or welfare of persons by the various known air pollution agents (or combinations of agents).

(2) Whenever he determines that there is a particular air pollution agent (or combination of agents), present in the air in certain quantities, producing effects harmful to the health or welfare of persons, the Secretary shall compile and publish criteria reflecting accurately the latest scientific knowledge useful in indicating the kind and extent of such effects which may be expected from the presence of such air pollution agent (or combination of agents) in the air in varying quantities. Any such criteria shall be published for informational purposes only and

made available to municipal, State, and interstate air pollution control agencies. He shall revise and add to such criteria whenever necessary to reflect accurately developing scientific knowledge.

After line 23, to strike out:

(9) recommend to air pollution control agencies and to other appropriate organizations, after such research as he determines to be necessary, such criteria of air quality as in his judgment may be necessary to protect the public health and welfare; and

(1) establish, equip, and maintain regional field laboratory and research facilities for the conduct of research investigations, experiments, field demonstrations and studies, and training relating to the prevention and control of air pollution, and insofar as practicable, each such facility shall be located near institutions of higher learning in which graduate training in such research might be carried out.

On page 8, after line 14, to strike out:

SEC. 4. (a) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated $5,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, $6,000,000 for each succeeding fiscal year to and including the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, $7,000,000 for each succeeding fiscal year to and including the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and $10,000,000 for each succeeding year to and including the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, for grants to air pollution control agencies to assist them in meeting the costs of establishing and maintaining programs for the prevention and control of air pollution. Sums so appropriated shall remain available for making grants as provided in this section during the fiscal year for which appropriated and the succeeding fiscal year.

(b) From the sums available therefor for any fiscal year the Secretary shall from time to time make allotments to the several States, in accordance with regulations, on the basis of (1) the population, (2) the extent of the air pollution problem and (3) the financial need of the respective States. For purposes of this section, population shall be determined on the basis of the latest figures furnished by the Department of Commerce, and per capita income for each State and for the United States shall be determined on the basis of the average of the per capita incomes of the States and of the continental United States for the three most recent consecutive years for which satisfactory data are available from the Department of Commerce.

(c) From each State's allotment under paragraph (b) for any fiscal year, the Secretary is authorized to make grants to air pollution control agencies in such State in an amount equal to two-thirds of the cost of establishing and maintaining programs for the prevention and control of air pollution: *Provided*, That in the case of grants to an interstate air pollution control agency (as defined in section 10(b)(2)) the grant shall be made from the allotments of the several States which are members of such agency on such basis as the Secretary finds reasonable and equitable.

(d) Such grants shall be made, in accordance with regulations, upon such terms and conditions as the Secretary may find necessary to carry out the purposes of this section. Such regulations shall include provision for special financial incentives for regional air pollution control programs which meet criteria established by the Secretary as necessary for the effective control of air pollution in the area.

(e) Sums allotted to a State under subsection (b) of this section which have not been obligated by the end of the fiscal year for which they were allotted because of a lack of approvable applications shall be reallotted by the Secretary, on such basis as he determines to be reasonable and equitable and in accordance with regulations promulgated by him, to States from which approvable applications have been made but which have not been approved for grants because of a lack of funds in the allotment of such State. Any sum made available to a State by reallotment under the preceding sentence shall be in addition to any funds otherwise allotted to such State under this Act and shall be available for grants to air pollution control agencies in such State.

(f) Payments of grants under this section shall be made through the disbursing facilities of the Treasury Department

And, in lieu thereof, to insert:

SEC. 4. (a) From the sums authorized for the purposes of this Act but not to exceed 20 per centum of the total authorization, the Secretary is authorized to make grants to air pollution control agencies in an amount up to two-thirds of the cost of developing, establishing, or improving programs for the prevention and control of air pollution: *Provided*, That the Secretary is authorized to make grants to intermunicipal or interstate air pollution control agencies (described in section 9(b) (2) and (4)) in an amount up to three-fourths of the cost of developing, establishing, or improving, regional air pollution programs. As used in this subsection, the term "regional air pollution control program" means a program for the prevention and control of air pollution in an area that includes the areas of two or more municipalities, whether in the same or different States.

(b) From the sums available therefor for any fiscal year, the Secretary shall from time to time make grants to air pollution control agencies upon such terms and conditions as the Secretary may find necessary to carry out the purpose of this section. In establishing regulations for the granting of such funds the Secretary shall, so far as practicable, give due consideration to (1) the population, (2) the extent of the actual or potential air pollution problem, and (3) the financial need of the respective agencies: *Provided*, That any agency receiving such grant shall not have reduced its non-Federal funds from the preceding fiscal year during the fiscal year in which it receives such grant.

(c) Not more than 12½ per centum of the grant funds appropriated for purposes of this Act shall be expended in any one State.

On page 12, after line 8, to strike out:

AIR POLLUTION CONTROL ADVISORY BOARD

SEC. 5. (a)(1) There is hereby established in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare an Air Pollution Control Advisory Board, composed of the Secretary or his designee, who shall be chairman, and nine members appointed by the President none of whom shall be Federal officers or employees. The appointed members, having due regard for the purposes of this Act shall be selected from among representatives of various State, interstate, and local governmental agencies, of public or private interests contributing to, affected by, or concerned with air pollution, and of other public and private agencies, organizations, or groups demonstrating an active interest in the field of air pollution prevention and control, as well as other individuals who are expert in this field.

(2)(A) Each member appointed by the President shall hold office for a term of three years, except that (i) any member apointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term and (ii) the terms of office of the members first taking office after July 1, 1964, shall expire as follows: Three at the end of one year after such date, three at the end of two years after such date, and three at the end of three years after such date, as designated by the President at the time of appointment. None of the members appointed by the President shall be eligible for reappointment within one year after the end of his preceding term.

(B) The members of the Board who are not regular fulltime officers or employees of the United States, while attending conferences or meetings of the Board or while otherwise serving at the request of the Secretary, shall be entitled to receive compensation at a rate to be fixed by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, but not exceeding $100 per diem, including travel time, and while away from their homes or regular places of business they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 73b–2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

(b) The Board shall advise, consult with, and make recommendations to the Secretary on matters of policy relating to the activities and functions of the Secretary under this Act.

(c) Such clerical and technical assistance as may be necessary to discharge the duties of the Board shall be provided from the personnel of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

And, in lieu thereof, to insert:

ABATEMENT OF AIR POLLUTION

SEC. 5. (a) The pollution of the air in any State or States which endangers the health or welfare of any persons, shall be subject to abatement as provided in this section.

(b) Consistent with the policy declaration of this Act, municipal, State, and interstate action to abate air pollution shall be encouraged and shall not be displaced by Federal enforcement action except as otherwise provided by or pursuant to a court order under subsection (g).

(c)(1)(A) Whenever requested by the Governor of any State, a State air pollution control agency, or (with the concurrence of the Governor and the State air pollution control agency for the State in which the municipality is situated) the governing body of any municipality, the Secretary shall, if such request refers to air pollution which is alleged to endanger the health or welfare of persons in a State other than that in which the discharge or discharges (causing or contributing to such pollution) originate, give formal notification thereof to the air pollution control agency of the municipality where such discharge or discharges originate, to the air pollution control agency of the State in which such municipality is located, and to the interstate air pollution control agency, if any, in whose jurisdictional area such municipality is located, and shall call promptly a conference of such agency or agencies and of the air pollution control agencies of the municipalities which may be adversely affected by such pollution, and the air pollution control agency, if any, of each State, or for each area, in which any such municipality is located.

(B) Whenever requested by the Governor of any State, a State air pollution control agency, or (with the concurrence of the Governor and the State air pollution control agency for the State in which the municipality is situated) the governing body of any municipality, the Secretary shall, if such request refers to alleged air pollution which is endangering the health or welfare of persons only in the State in which the discharge or discharges (causing or contributing to such pollution) originate and if a municipality affected by such air pollution, or the municipality in which such pollution originates, has either made or concurred in such request, give formal notification thereof to the State air pollution control agency, to the air pollution control agencies of the municipality where such discharge or discharges originate and of the municipality or municipalities alleged to be adversely affected thereby, and to any interstate air pollution control agency, whose jurisdic-

tional area includes any such municipality and shall promptly call a conference of such agency or agencies, unless in the judgment of the Secretary, the effect of such pollution is not of such significance as to warrant exercise of Federal jurisdiction under this section.

(C) The Secretary may, after consultation with State officials, also call such a conference whenever, on the basis of reports, surveys, or studies, he has reason to believe that any pollution referred to in subsection (a) is occurring and is endangering the health and welfare of persons in a State other than that in which the discharge or discharges originate. The Secretary shall invite the cooperation of any municipal, State, or interstate air pollution control agencies having jurisdiction in the affected area on any surveys or studies forming the basis of conference action.

(2) The agencies called to attend such conference may bring such persons as they desire to the conference. Not less than three weeks' prior notice of the conference date shall be given to such agencies.

(3) Following this conference, the Secretary shall prepare and forward to all air pollution control agencies attending the conference a summary of conference discussions including (A) occurrence of air pollution subject to abatement under this Act; (B) adequacy of measures taken toward abatement of the pollution; and (C) nature of delays, if any, being encountered in abating the pollution.

(d) If the Secretary believes, upon the conclusion of the conference or thereafter, that effective progress toward abatement of such pollution is not being made and that the health or welfare of any persons is being endangered, he shall recommend to the appropriate State, interstate, or municipal air pollution control agency (or to all such agencies) that they take necessary remedial action. The Secretary shall allow at least six months from the date he makes such recommendations for the taking of such recommended action.

(e)(1) If, at the conclusion of the period so allowed, such remedial action or other action which in the judgment of the Secretary is reasonably calculated to secure abatement of such pollution has not been taken, the Secretary shall call a public hearing, to be held in or near one or more of the places where the discharge or discharges causing or contributing to such pollution originated, before a hearing board of five or more persons appointed by the Secretary. Each State in which any discharge causing or contributing to such pollution originates and each State claiming to be adversely affected by such pollution shall be given an opportunity to select one member of such hearing board and each Federal Agency having a substantial interest in the subject matter as determined by the Secretary shall be given an opportunity to select one member of such hearing board, and one member shall be a representative of the appropriate interstate air pollution agency if one exists, and not less than a majority of such hearing board shall be persons other than officers or employees of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. At least three weeks' prior notice of such hearing shall be given to the State, interstate, and municipal air pollution control agencies called to attend such hearing and to the alleged polluter or polluters.

(2) On the basis of evidence presented at such hearing, the hearing board shall make findings as to whether pollution referred to in subsection (a) is occurring and whether effective progress toward abatement thereof is being made. If the hearing board finds such pollution is occurring and effective progress toward abatement thereof is not being made it shall make recomemndations to the Secretary concerning the measures, if any, which it finds to be reasonable and suitable to secure abatement of such pollution.

(3) The Secretary shall send such findings and recommendations to the person or persons discharging any matter causing or contributing to such pollution; to air pollution control agencies of the State or States and of the municipality or municipalities where such discharge or discharges originate; and to any interstate air pollution control agency whose jurisdictional area includes any such municipality, together with a notice specifying a reasonable time (not less than six months) to secure abatement of such pollution.

(f) If action reasonably calculated to secure abatement of the pollution within the time specified in the notice following the public hearing is not taken, the Secretary—

(1) in the case of pollution of air which is endangering the health or welfare of persons in a State other than that in which the discharge or discharges (causing or contributing to such pollution) originate, may request the Attorney General to bring a suit on behalf of the United States to secure abatement of pollution, and

(2) in the case of pollution of air which is endangering the health or welfare of persons only in the State in which the discharge or discharges (causing or contributing to such pollution) originate, may, with the written consent of the Governor of such State, request the Attorney General to bring a suit on behalf of the United States to secure abatement of the pollution.

(g) The court shall receive in evidence in any such suit a transcript of the proceedings before the Board and a copy of the Board's recommendations and shall receive such further evidence as the court in its discretion deems proper. The court, giving due consideration to the practicability of complying with such standards as may be applicable and to the physical and economic feasibility of securing abatement of any pollution proved, shall have jurisdiction to enter such judgment, and orders enforcing such judgment, as the public interest and the equities of the case may require.

(h) Members of any hearing board appointed pursuant to subsection (e) who are not regular full-time officers or employees of the United States shall, while participating in the hearing conducted by such board or otherwise engaged on the work of such board, be entitled to receive compensation at a rate fixed by the Secretary, but not exceeding $100 per diem, including travel time, and while away from their homes or regular places of business they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 73b-2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

(i)(1) In connection with any conference called under this section, the Secretary is authorized to require any person whose activities result in the emission of air pollutants causing or contributing to air pollution to file with him, in such form as he may prescribe, a report, based on existing data, furnishing to the Secretary such information as may reasonably be required as to the character, kind, and quantity of pollutants discharged and the use of devices or other means to prevent or reduce the emission of pollutants by the person filing such a report. After a conference has been held with respect to any such pollution the Secretary shall require such reports from the person whose activities result in such pollution only to the extent recommended by such conference. Such report shall be made under oath or otherwise, as the Secretary may prescribe, and shall be filed with the Secretary within such reasonable period as the Secretary may prescribe, unless additional time be granted by the Secretary. No person shall be required in such report to divulge trade secrets or secret processes and all information reported shall be considered confidential for the purposes of section 1905 of title 18 of the United States Code.

(2) If any person required to file any report under this subsection shall fail to do so within the time fixed by the Secretary for filing the same, and such failure shall continue for thirty days after notice of such default, such person shall forfeit to the United States the sum of $100 for each and every day of the continuance of such failure, which forfeiture shall be payable into the Treasury of the United States, and shall be recoverable in a civil suit in the name of the United States brought in the district where such person has his principal office or in any district in which he does business: *Provided*, That the Secretary may upon application therefor remit or mitigate any forfeiture provided for under this subsection and he shall have authority to determine the facts upon all such applications.

(3) It shall be the duty of the various United States attorneys, under the direction of the Attorney General of the United States, to prosecute for the recovery of such forfeitures.

On page 22, after line 7, to strike out:

ENFORCEMENT MEASURES AGAINST AIR POLLUTION

SEC. 6. (a) The pollution of the air in any State or States which endangers the health or welfare of any persons, shall be subject to abatement as provided in this section.

(b) Consistent with the policy declaration of this Act, municipal, State, and interstate action to abate air pollution shall be encouraged and shall not be displaced by Federal enforcement action except as otherwise provided by or pursuant to a court order under subsection (g).

(c)(1) Whenever requested by the Governor of any State, a State air pollution control agency, or (with the concurrence of the State air pollution control agency for the State in which the municipality is situated) the governing body of any municipality, the Secretary shall, if such request refers to air pollution which is endangering the health or welfare of persons in a State other than that in which the discharge or discharges (causing or contributing to such pollution) originate, give formal notification thereof to the air pollution control agency of the municipality where such discharge or discharges originate, to the air pollution control agency of the State in which such municipality is located and to the interstate air pollution control agency, if any, of such State, and shall call promptly a conference of such agency or agencies and of the air pollution control agencies of the municipalities which may be adversely affected by such pollution, and the air pollution control agency and interstate agency, if any, of the State or States in which such municipalities are located. Whenever requested by the Governor of any State, a State air pollution control agency, or (with the concurrence of the State air pollution control agency for the State in which the municipality is situated) the governing body of any municipality, the Secretary shall, if such request refers to air pollution which is endangering the health or welfare of persons only in the requesting State in which the discharge or discharges (causing or contributing to such pollution) originate, give formal notification thereof to the air pollution control agency and interstate agency, if any, of the requesting State, to the air pollution control agencies of the municipality where such discharge or discharges originate, and of the municipality or municipalities alleged to be adversely affected thereby, and shall promptly call a conference of such agency or agencies, unless in the judgment of the Secretary, the effect of such pollution is not of such significance as to warrant exercise of Federal jurisdiction

under this section. The Secretary shall also call such a conference whenever, on the basis of reports, surveys, or studies, he has reason to believe that any pollution referred to in subsection (a) and endangering the health or welfare of persons in a State other than that in which the discharge or discharges originate is occurring.

(2) The agencies called to attend such conference may bring such persons as they desire to the conference. Not less than three weeks' prior notice of the conference date shall be given to such agencies.

(3) Following this conference, the Secretary shall prepare and forward to all the air pollution control agencies attending the conference a summary of conference discussions including (A) occurrence of air pollution subject to abatement under this Act; (B) adequacy of measures taken toward abatement of the pollution; and (C) nature of delays, if any, being encountered in abating the pollution.

(d) If the Secretary believes, upon the conclusion of the conference or thereafter, that effective progress toward abatement of such pollution is not being made and that the health or welfare of any persons is being endangered, he shall recommend to the appropriate State or municipal air pollution control agency (or to both such agencies) that it take necessary remedial action. The Secretary shall allow at least six months from the date he makes such recommendations for the taking of such recommended action.

(e) If, at the conclusion of the period so allowed, such remedial action has not been taken or action which in the judgment of the Secretary is reasonably calculated to secure abatement of such pollution has not been taken, the Secretary shall call a public hearing, to be held in or near one or more of the places where the discharge or discharges causing or contributing to such pollution originated, before a hearing board of five or more persons appointed by the Secretary. Each State and each municipality in which any discharge causing or contributing to such pollution originates and each State and each municipality claiming to be adversely affected by such pollution shall be given an opportunity to select one member of such hearing board and at least one member shall be a representative of the Department of Commerce, and not less than a majority of such hearing board shall be persons other than officers or employees of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. At least three weeks' prior notice of such hearing shall be given to the State, interstate, and municipal air pollution control agencies called to attend the aforesaid hearing and the alleged polluter or polluters. On the basis of evidence presented at such hearing, the hearing board shall make findings as to whether pollution referred to in subsection (a) is occurring and whether effective progress toward abatement thereof is being made. If the hearing board finds such pollution is occurring and effective progress toward abatement thereof is not being made it shall make recommendations to the Secretary concerning the measures, if any, which it finds to be reasonable and suitable to secure abatement of such pollution. The Secretary shall send such findings and recommendations to the person or persons discharging any matter causing or contributing to such pollution, together with a notice specifying a reasonable time (not less than six months) to secure abatement of such pollution, and shall also send such findings and recommendations and such notice to the State, interstate, and municipal air pollution control agencies of the State or States, and of the municipality, where such discharge or discharges originate.

(f) If action reasonably calculated to secure abatement of the pollution within the time specified in the notice following the public hearing is not taken, the Secretary—

(1) in the case of air pollution which is endangering the health or welfare of persons in a State other than that in which the discharge or discharges (causing or contributing to such pollution) originate, may request the Attorney General to bring a suit on behalf of the United States to secure abatement of the pollution.

(2) in the case of air pollution which is endangering the health or welfare of persons only in the State in which the discharge or discharges (causing or contributing to such pollution) originate, may, with the written consent of the Governor of such State, request the Attorney General to bring a suit on behalf of the United States to secure abatement of the pollution.

(g) The court shall receive in evidence in any such suit a transcript of the proceedings before the hearing board in such case and a copy of such board's recommendations and shall receive such further evidence as the court in its discretion deems proper. The court, giving due consideration to the practicability and to the physical and economic feasibility of securing abatement of any pollution proved, shall have jurisdiction to enter such judgment, and orders enforcing such judgment, as the public interest and the equities of the case may require.

(h) Members of any hearing board appointed pursuant to subsection (e) who are not regular full-time officers or employees of the United States shall, while participating in the hearing conducted by such board or otherwise engaged on the work of such board, be entitled to receive compensation at a rate fixed by the Secretary, but not exceeding $100 per diem, including travel time, and while away from their homes or regular places of business they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 73b–2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

(i) In his summary of any conference pursuant to this section, the Secretary shall include references to any discharges allegedly contributing to pollution from any Federal property. Notice of any hearing pursuant to this section involving any pollution alleged to be affected by any such discharges shall also be given to the Federal agency having jurisdiction over the property involved and the findings and recommendations of the hearing board conducting such hearing shall also include references to any such discharges which are contributing to the pollution found by such hearing board.

And, in lieu thereof, to insert:

AUTOMOTIVE VEHICLE AND FUEL POLLUTION

SEC. 6. (a) The Secretary shall encourage the continued efforts on the part of the automotive and fuel industries to develop devices and fuels to prevent pollutants from being discharged from the exhaust of automotive vehicles, and to this end shall maintain liaison with the manufacturers of automotive vehicles and fuel producers. For this purpose, he shall appoint a technical committee, whose membership shall consist of an equal number of representatives of the Department and of the automotive and fuel manufacturing industries. The committee shall meet from time to time at the call of the Secretary to evaluate progress in the development of such devices and fuels and to develop and recommend research programs which could lead to the development of such devices and fuels.

(b) One year after enactment of this section, and semiannually thereafter, the Secretary shall report to the Congress on measures taken toward the resolution of the vehicle exhaust pollution problem and efforts to improve fuels including (A) occurrence of pollution as a result of discharge of pollutants from automotive exhaust; (B) progress of research into development of devices and fuels to reduce pollution from exhaust of automotive vehicles; (C) criteria on degree of pollutant matter discharged from automotive exhausts; (D) efforts to improve fuels so as to reduce emission of exhaust pollutants; and (E) his recommendations for additional legislation, if necessary, to regulate the discharge of pollutants from automotive exhausts.

On page 29, after line 17, to strike out:

REQUIREMENT OF REPORTS

SEC. 7. (a) The Secretary is authorized to require any person whose activities result in the emission of air pollutants causing or contributing to air pollution which has been the subject of a conference under section 6 to file with him, in such form as he may prescribe, a report, furnishing to the Secretary such information as may reasonably be required as to the character, kind and quantity of pollutants discharged and the use of devices or other means to prevent or reduce the emission of pollutants by the person filing such reports. Such reports shall be made under oath or otherwise, as the Secretary may prescribe and shall be filed with the Secretary within such reasonable period as the Secretary may prescribe, unless additional time be granted by the Secretary. All information in such report shall be considered confidential for the purposes of section 1905 of title 18 of the United States Code.

(b) If any person required to file any report under this section shall fail so to do within the time fixed by the Secretary for filing the same, and such failure shall continue for thirty days after notice of such default, such person shall forfeit to the United States the sum of $100 for each and every day of the continuance of such failure, which forfeiture shall be payable into the Treasury of the United States, and shall be recoverable in a civil suit in the name of the United States brought in the district where such person has his principal office or in any district in which he does business: *Provided*, That the Secretary may upon application therefor, remit or mitigate any forfeiture provided for under this subsection and he shall have authority to determine the facts upon all such applications.

(c) It shall be the duty of the various United States Attorneys, under the direction of the Attorney General of the United States, to prosecute for the recovery of such forfeitures. The costs and expenses of such prosecution shall be paid out of the appropriation for the expenses of the courts of the United States.

On page 31, in the heading in line 6, after the word "Federal", to strike out "Faciliries" and insert "Facilities"; in line 7, after "Sec.", to strike out "8." and insert "7. (a)"; after line 17, to insert:

(b) In order to control air pollution which may endanger the health or welfare of any persons, the Secretary may establish classes of potential pollution sources for which any Federal department or agency having jurisdiction over any building, installation, or other property shall, before discharging any matter into the air of the United States, obtain a permit from the Secretary for such discharge, such permits to be issued for a specified period of time to be determined by the Secretary and subject to revocation if the Secretary finds pollution is endangering the health and welfare of any persons. In connection with the issuance of such permits, there shall be submitted to the Secretary such plans, specifications, and other information as he deems relevant thereto and under such conditions as he may prescribe. The Secretary shall report each January to the Congress the status of such permits and compliance therewith.

On page 32, at the beginning of line 10, to change the section number from "9" to "8"; in line 12, after the word "any", to strike out "office" and insert "officer"; in line 22, after the word "detailed", to insert "to the same extent as if such personnel had been detailed under section 214(b) of that Act"; on page 33, at the beginning of line 5, to change the section number from "10" to "9"; in line 23, after the word "more", to strike out "cities, counties, or other local governments" and insert "municipalities"; on page 34, after line 3, to insert:

(c) The term "interstate air pollution control agency" means—

(1) an air pollution control agency established by two or more States, or

(2) an air pollution control agency of two or more municipalities located in different States.

At the beginning of line 10, to strike out "(c)" and insert "(d)"; in line 12, after the word "Islands", to strike out "and Guam." and insert "Guam, and American Samoa."; at the beginning of line 13, to strike out "(d)" and insert "(e)"; at the beginning of line 16, to strike out "(e)" and insert "(f)"; after line 18, to insert:

(g) All language referring to adverse effects on welfare shall include but not be limited to injury to agricultural crops and livestock, damage to and the deterioration of property, and hazards to transportation.

In line 24, after "Sec.", to strike out "11." and insert "10. (a)"; in the same line, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out "This" and insert "Except as provided in subsection (b) of this section, this"; on page 35, after line 3, to insert:

(b) No appropriation shall be authorized or made under section 301, 311, or 314(c) of the Public Health Service Act for any fiscal year after the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, for any purpose for which appropriations may be made under authority of this Act.

After line 8, to insert:

RECORDS AND AUDIT

SEC. 11. (a) Each recipient of assistance under this Act shall keep such records as the Secretary shall prescribe, including records which fully disclose the amount and disposition by such recipient of the proceeds of such assistance, the total cost of the project or undertaking in connection with which such assistance is given or used, and the amount of that portion of the cost of the project or undertaking supplied by other sources, and such other records as will facilitate an effective audit.

(b) The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Comptroller General of the United States, or any of their duly authorized representatives, shall have access for the purpose of audit and examinations to any books, documents, papers, and records of the recipients that are pertinent to the grants received under this Act.

On page 36, after line 6, to insert:

APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 13. (a) Funds appropriated by Public Law 88-136 under "air pollution" shall be available to carry out the purposes of this Act.

(b) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to carry out this Act not to exceed $25,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, not to exceed $30,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, not to exceed $35,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, not to exceed $42,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and not to exceed $50,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969.

At the beginning of line 20 to change the section number from "13" to "14", and at the beginning of line 21, to strike out "Act of 1963" and insert "Act"; 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,* That the Act of July 14, 1955, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1857–1857g), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"FINDINGS AND PURPOSE

"SECTION 1. (a) The Congress finds—

"(1) that the predominant part of the Nation's population is located in its rapidly expanding metropolitan and other urban areas, which generally cross the boundary lines of local jurisdictions and often extend into two or more States;

"(2) that the growth in the amount and complexity of air pollution brought about by urbanization, industrial development, and the increasing use of motor vehicles, has resulted in mounting dangers to the public health and welfare, including injury to agricultural crops and livestock, damage to and the deterioration of property, and hazards to air and ground transportation;

"(3) that the prevention and control of air pollution at its source is the primary responsibility of States and local governments; and

"(4) that Federal financial assistance and leadership is essential for the development of cooperative Federal, State, regional, and local programs to prevent and control air pollution.

"(b) The purposes of this Act are—

"(1) to protect the Nation's air resources so as to promote the public health and welfare and the productive capacity of its population;

"(2) to initiate and accelerate a national research and development program to achieve the prevention and control of air pollution;

"(3) to provide technical and financial assistance to State and local governments in connection with the development and execution of their air pollution prevention and control programs; and

"(4) to encourage and assist the development and operation of regional air pollution control programs.

"COOPERATIVE ACTIVITIES AND UNIFORM LAWS

"SEC. 2. (a) The Secretary shall encourage cooperative activities by the States and local governments for the prevention and control of air pollution; encourage the enactment of improved and, so far as practicable in the light of varying conditions and needs, uniform State and local laws relating to the prevention and control of air pollution; and encourage the making of agreements and compacts between States for the prevention and control of air pollution.

"(b) The Secretary shall cooperate with and encourage cooperative activities by all Federal departments and agencies having functions relating to the prevention and control of air pollution, so as to assure the utilization in the Federal air pollution control program of all appropriate and available facilities and resources within the Federal Government.

"(c) The consent of the Congress is hereby given to two or more States to negotiate and enter into agreements or compacts, not in conflict with any law or treaty of the United States, for (1) cooperative effort and mutual assistance for the prevention and control of air pollution and the enforcement of their respective laws relating thereto, and (2) the establishment of such agencies, joint or otherwise, as they may deem desirable for making effective such agreements or compacts. No such agreement or compact shall be binding or obligatory upon any State a party thereto unless and until it has been approved by Congress.

"RESEARCH, INVESTIGATIONS, TRAINING, AND OTHER ACTIVITIES

"SEC. 3. (a) The Secretary shall establish a national research and development program for the prevention and control of air pollution and as part of such program shall—

"(1) conduct, and promote the coordination and acceleration of, research, investigations, eperiments, training, demonstrations, surveys, and studies relating to the causes, effects, extent, prevention, and control of air pollution; and

"(2) encourage, cooperate with, and render technical services and provide financial assistance to air pollution control agencies and other appropriate public or private agencies, institutions, and organizations, and individuals in the conduct of such activities; and

"(3) conduct investigations and research and make surveys concerning any specific problem of air pollution in cooperation with any air pollution control agency with a view to recommending a solution of such problem, if he is requested to do so by such agency or if, in his judgment, such problem may affect any community or communities in a State other than that in which the source of the matter causing or contributing to the pollution is located.

"(4) initiate and conduct a program of research directed toward the development of improved, low-cost techniques for extracting sulfur from fuels.

"(b) In carrying out the provisions of the preceding subsection the Secretary is authorized to—

"(1) collect and make available, through publications and other appropriate means, the results of and other information, including appropriate recommendations by him in connection therewith, pertaining to such research and other activities;

"(2) cooperate with other Federal departments and agencies, with air pollution control agencies, with other public and private agencies, institutions, and organizations, and with any industries involved, in the preparation and conduct of such research and other activities;

"(3) make grants to air pollution control agencies, to other public or nonprofit private agencies, institutions, and organizations, and to individuals, for purposes stated in paragraph (a)(1) of this section;

"(4) contract with public or private agencies, institutions, and organizations, and with individuals, without regard to sections 3648 and 3709 of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 529; 41 U.S.C. 5);

"(5) provide training for, and make training grants to, personnel of air pollution control agencies and other persons with suitable qualifications;

"(6) establish and maintain research fellowships in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and at public or nonprofit private educational institutions or research organizations;

"(7) collect and disseminate, in cooperation with other Federal departments and agencies, and with other public or private agencies, institutions, and organizations having related responsibilities, basic data on chemical, physical, and biological effects of varying air quality and other information pertaining to air pollution and the prevention and control thereof; and

"(8) develop effective and practical processes, methods, and prototype devices for the prevention or control of air pollution.

"(c)(1) In carrying out the provisions of subsection (a) of this section the Secretary shall conduct research on, and survey the results of other scientific studies on, the

harmful effects on the health or welfare of persons by the various known air pollution agents (or combinations of agents).

"(2) Whenever he determines that there is a particular air pollution agent (or combination of agents), present in the air in certain quantities, producing effects harmful to the health or welfare of persons, the Secretary shall compile and publish criteria reflecting accurately the latest scientific knowledge useful in indicating the kind and extent of such effects which may be expected from the presence of such air pollution agent (*or combination* of agents) in the air in varying quantities. Any such criteria shall be published for informational purposes only and made available to municipal, State, and interstate air pollution control agencies. He shall revise and add to such criteria whenever necessary to reflect accurately developing scientific knowledge.

"GRANTS FOR SUPPORT OF AIR POLLUTION CONTROL PROGRAMS

"SEC. 4. (a) From the sums authorized for the purposes of this Act but not to exceed 20 per centum of the total authorization, the Secretary is authorized to make grants to air pollution control agencies in an amount up to two-thirds of the cost of developing, establishing, or improving programs for the prevention and control of air pollution: *Provided,* That the Secretary is authorized to make grants to intermunicipal or interstate air pollution control agencies (described in section 9(b) (2) and (4)) in an amount up to three-fourths of the cost of developing, establishing, or improving, regional air pollution programs. As used in this subsection, the term 'regional air pollution control program' means a program for the prevention and control of air pollution in an area that includes the areas of two or more municipalities, whether in the same or different States.

"(b) From the sums available therefor for any fiscal year, the Secretary shall from time to time make grants to air pollution control agencies upon such terms and conditions as the Secretary may find necessary to carry out the purpose of this section. In establishing regulations for the granting of such funds the Secretary shall, so far as practicable, give due consideration to (1) the population, (2) the extent of the actual or potential air pollution problem, and (3) the financial need of the respective agencies: *Provided,* That any agency receiving such grant shall not have reduced its non-Federal funds from the preceding fiscal year during the fiscal year in which it receives such grant.

"(c) Not more than 12½ per centum of the grant *funds* appropriated for purposes of this Act shall be expended in any one State.

"ABATEMENT OF AIR POLLUTION

"SEC. 5. (a) The pollution of the air in any State or States which endangers the health or welfare of any persons, shall be subject to abatement as provided in this section.

"(b) Consistent with the policy declaration of this Act, municipal, State, and interstate action to abate air pollution shall be encouraged and shall not be displaced by Federal enforcements action except as otherwise provided by or pursuant to a court order under subsection (g).

"(c) (1) (A) Whenever requested by the Governor of any State, a State air pollution control agency, or (with the concurrence of the Governor and the State air pollution control agency for the State in which the municipality is situated) the governing body of any municipality, the Secretary shall, if such request refers to air pollution which is alleged to endanger the health or welfare of persons in a State other than that in which the discharge or discharges (causing or contributing to such pollution) originate, give formal notification thereof to the air pollution control agency of the municipality where such discharge or discharges originate, to the air pollution control agency of the State in which such municipality is located, and to the interstate air pollution control agency, if any, in whose jurisdictional area such municipality is located, and shall call promptly a conference of such agency or agencies and of the air pollution control agencies of the municipalities which may be adversely affected by such pollution, and the air pollution control agency, if any, of each State, or for each area, in which any such municipality is located.

"(B) Whenever requested by the Governor of any State, a State air pollution control agency, or (with the concurrence of the Governor and the State air pollution control agency for the State in which the municipality is situated) the governing body of any municipality, the Secretary shall, if such request refers to allied air pollution which is endangering the health or welfare of persons only in the State in which the discharge or discharges (causing or contributing to such pollution) originate and if a municipality affected by such air pollution, or the municipality in which such pollution originates, has either made or concurred in such request, give formal notification thereof to the State air pollution control agency, to the air pollution control agencies of the municipality where such discharge or discharges originate and of the municipality or municipalities alleged to be adversely affected thereby, and to any interstate air pollution control agency, whose jurisdictional area includes any such municipality and shall promptly call a conference of such agency or agencies, unless, in the judgment of the Secretary, the effect of such pollution is not of such significance as to warrant exercise of Federal jurisdiction under this section.

"(C) The Secretary may, after consultation with State officials, also call such a conference whenever, on the basis of reports, surveys, or studies, he has reason to believe that any pollution referred to in subsection (a) is occurring and is endangering the health and welfare of persons in a State other than that in which the discharge or discharges originate. The Secretary shall invite the cooperation of any municipal, State, or interstate air pollution control agencies having jurisdiction in the affected area on any surveys or studies forming the basis of conference action.

"(2) The agencies called to attend such conference may bring such persons as they desire to the conference. Not less than three weeks' prior notice of the conference date shall be given to such agencies.

"(3) Following this conference, the Secretary shall prepare and forward to all air pollution control agencies attending the conference a summary of conference discussions including (A) occurrence of air pollution subject to abatement under this Act; (B) adequacy of measures taken toward abatement of the pollution; and (C) nature of delays, if any, being encountered in abating the pollution.

"(d) If the Secretary believes, upon the conclusion of the conference or thereafter, that effective progress toward abatement of such pollution is not being made and that the health or welfare of any persons is being endangered, he shall recommend to the appropriate State, interstate, or municipal air pollution control agency (or to all such agencies) that they take necessary remedial action. The Secretary shall allow at least six months from the date he makes such recommendations for the taking of such recommended action.

"(e) (1) If, at the conclusion of the period so allowed, such remedial action or other action which in the judgment of the Secretary is reasonably calculated to secure abatement of such pollution has not been taken, the Secretary shall call a public hearing, to be held in or near one or more of the places where the discharge or discharges causing or contributing to such pollution originated, before a hearing board of five or more persons appointed by the Secretary. Each State in which any discharge causing or contributing to such pollution originates and each State claiming to be adversely affected by such pollution shall be given an opportunity to select one member of such hearing board and each Federal Agency having a substantial interest in the subject matter as determined by the Secretary shall be given an opportunity to select one member of such hearing board, and one member shall be a representative of the appropriate interstate air pollution agency if one exists, and not less than a majority of such hearing board shall be persons other than officers or employees of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. At least three weeks' prior notice of such hearing shall be given to the State, interstate, and municipal air pollution control agencies called to attend such hearing and to the alleged polluter or polluters.

"(2) On the basis of evidence presented at such hearing, the hearing board shall make findings as to whether pollution referred to in subsection (a) is occurring and whether effective progress toward abatement thereof is being made. If the hearing board finds such pollution is occurring and effective progress toward abatement thereof is not being made it shall make recommendations to the Secretary concerning the measures, if any, which it finds to be reasonable and suitable to secure abatement of such pollution.

"(3) The Secretary shall send such findings and recommendations to the person or persons discharging any matter causing or contributing to such pollution; to air pollution control agencies of the State or States and of the municipality or municipalities where such discharge or discharges originate; and to any interstate air pollution control agency whose jurisdictional area includes any such municipality, together with a notice specifying a reasonable time (not less than six months) to secure abatement of such pollution.

"(f) If action reasonably calculated to secure abatement of the pollution within the time specified in the notice following the public hearing is not taken, the Secretary—

"(1) in the case of pollution of air which is endangering the health or welfare of persons in a State other than that in which the discharge or discharges (causing or contributing to such pollution) originate, may request the Attorney General to bring a suit on behalf of the United States to secure abatement of pollution, and

"(2) in the case of pollution of air which is endangering the health or welfare of persons only in the State in which the discharge or discharges (causing or contributing to such pollution) originate, may, with the written consent of the Governor of such State, request the Attorney General to bring a suit on behalf of the United States to secure abatement of the pollution.

"(g) The court shall receive in evidence in any such suit a transcript of the proceedings before the Board and a copy of the Board's recommendations and shall receive such further evidence as the court in its discretion deems proper. The court, giving due consideration to the practicability of complying with such standards as may be applicable and to the physical and economic feasibility of securing abatement of any pollution proved, shall have jurisdiction to enter such judgment, and orders enforcing

such judgment, as the public interest and the equities of the case may require.

"(h) Members of any hearing board appointed pursuant to subsection (e) who are not regular full-time officers or employees of the United States shall, while participating in the hearing conducted by such board or otherwise engaged on the work of such board, be entitled to receive compensation at a rate fixed by the Secretary, but not exceeding $100 per diem, including travel time, and while away from their homes or regular places of business they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 73b-2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

"(i)(1) In connection with any conference called under this section, the Secretary is authorized to require any person whose activities result in the emission of air pollutants causing or contributing to air pollution to file with him, in such form as he may prescribe, a report, based on existing data, furnishing to the Secretary such information as may reasonably be required as to the character, kind, and quality of pollutants discharged and the use of devices or other means to prevent or reduce the emission of pollutants by the person filing such a report. After a conference has been held with respect to any such pollution the Secretary shall require such reports from the person whose activities result in such pollution only to the extent recommended by such conference. Such report shall be made under oath or otherwise as the Secretary may prescribe, and shall be filed with the Secretary within such reasonable period as the Secretary may prescribe, unless additional time be granted by the Secretary. No person shall be required in such report to divulge trade secrets or secret processes and all information reported shall be considered confidential for the purposes of section 1905 of title 18 of the United States Code.

"(2) If any person required to file any report under this subsection shall fail to do so within the time fixed by the Secretary for filing the same, and such failure shall continue for thirty days after notice of such default, such person shall forfeit to the United States the sum of $100 for each and every day of the continuance of such failure, which forfeiture shall be payable into the Treasury of the United States, and shall be recoverable in a civil suit in the name of the United States brought in the district where such person has his principal office or in any district in which he does business: *Provided*, That the Secretary may upon application therefor remit or mitigate any forfeiture provided for under this subsection and he shall have authority to determine the facts upon all such applications.

"(3) It shall be the duty of the various United States attorneys, under the direction of the Attorney General of the United States, to prosecute for the recovery of such forfeitures.

"AUTOMOTIVE VEHICLE AND FUEL POLLUTION

"SEC. 6. (a) The Secretary shall encourage the continued efforts on the part of the automotive and fuel industries to develop devices and fuels to prevent pollutants from being discharged from the exhaust of automotive vehicles, and to this end shall maintain liaison with the manufacturers of automotive vehicles and fuel producers. For this purpose, he shall appoint a technical committee, whose membership shall consist of an equal number of representatives of the Department and of the automotive and fuel manufacturing industries. The committee shall meet from time to time at the call of the Secretary to evaluate progress in the development of such devices and fuels and to develop and recommend research programs which could lead to the development of such devices and fuels.

"(b) One year after enactment of this section, and semiannually thereafter, the Secretary shall report to the Congress on measures taken toward the resolution of the vehicle exhaust pollution problem and efforts to improve fuels including (A) occurrence of pollution as a result of discharge of pollutants from automotive exhaust; (B) progress of research into development of devices and fuels to reduce pollution from exhaust of automotive vehicles; (C) criteria on degree of pollutant matter discharged from automotive exhausts; (D) efforts to improve fuels so as to reduce emission of exhaust pollutants; and (E) his recommendations for additional legislation, if necessary, to regulate the discharge of pollutants from automotive exhausts.

"COOPERATION BY FEDERAL AGENCIES TO CONTROL AIR POLLUTION FROM FEDERAL FACILITIES

"SEC. 7. (a) It is hereby declared to be the intent of Congress that any Federal department or agency having jurisdiction over any building, installation, or other property shall, to the extent practicable and consistent with the interests of the United States and within any available appropriations, cooperate with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and with any air pollution control agency in preventing and controlling the pollution of the air in any area insofar as the discharge of any matter from or by such building, installation, or other property may cause or contribute to pollution of the air in such area.

"(b) In order to control air pollution which may endanger the health or welfare of any persons, the Secretary may establish classes of potential pollution sources for which any Federal department or agency having jurisdiction over any building, installation, or other property shall, before discharging any matter into the air of the United States, obtain a permit from the Secretary for such discharge, such permits to be issued for a specified period of time to be determined by the Secretary and subject to revocation if the Secretary finds pollution is endangering the health and welfare of any persons. In connection with the issuance of such permits, there shall be submitted to the Secretary such plans, specifications, and other information as he deems relevant thereto and under such conditions as he may prescribe. The Secretary shall report each January to the Congress the status of such permits and compliance therewith.

"ADMINISTRATION

"SEC. 8. (a) The Secretary is authorized to prescribe such regulations as are necessary to carry out his functions under this Act. The Secretary may delegate to any officer or employee of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare such of his powers and duties under this Act, except the making of regulations, as he may deem necessary or expedient.

"(b) Upon the request of an air pollution control agency, personnel of the Public Health Service may be detailed to such agency for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this Act. The provisions of section 214(d) of the Public Health Service Act shall be applicable with respect to any personnel so detailed to the same extent as if such personnel had been detailed under section 214(b) of that Act.

"(c) Payments under grants made under this Act may be made in installments, and in advance or by way of reimbursement, as may be determined by the Secretary.

"DEFINITIONS

"SEC. 9. When used in this Act—

"(a) The term 'Secretary' means the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

"(b) The term 'air pollution control agency' means any of the following:

"(1) A single State agency designated by the Governor of that State as the official State air pollution control agency for purposes of this Act;

"(2) An agency established by two or more States and having substantial powers or duties pertaining to the prevention and control of air pollution;

"(3) A city, county, or other local government health authority, or, in the case of any city, county, or other local government in which there is an agency other than the health authority charged with responsibility for enforcing ordinances or laws relating to the prevention and control of air pollution, such other agency; or

"(4) An agency of two or more municipalities located in the same State or in different States and having substantial powers or duties pertaining to the prevention and control of air pollution.

"(c) The term 'interstate air pollution control agency' means—

"(1) an air pollution control agency established by two or more States, or

"(2) an air pollution control agency of two or more municipalities located in different States.

"(d) The term 'State' means a State, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, and American Samoa.

"(e) The term 'person' includes an individual, corporation, partnership, association, State, municipality, and political subdivision of a State.

"(f) The term 'municipality' means a city, town, borough, county, parish, district, or other public body created by or pursuant to State law.

"(g) All language referring to adverse effects on welfare shall include but not be limited to injury to agricultural crops and livestock, damage to and the deterioration of property, and hazards to transportation.

"OTHER AUTHORITY NOT AFFECTED

"SEC. 10. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b) of this section, this Act shall not be construed as superseding or limiting the authorities and responsibilities, under any other provision of law, of the Secretary or any other Federal officer, department, or agency.

"(b) No appropriation shall be authorized or made under section 301, 311, or 314(c) of the Public Health Service Act for any fiscal year after the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, for any purpose for which appropriations may be made under authority of this Act.

"RECORDS AND AUDIT

"SEC. 11. (a) Each recipient of assistance under this Act shall keep such records as the Secretary shall prescribe, including records which fully disclose the amount and disposition by such recipient of the proceeds of such assistance, the total cost of the project or undertaking in connection with which such assistance is given or used, and the amount of that portion of the cost of the project or undertaking supplied by other sources, and such other records as will facilitate an effective audit.

"(b) The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Comptroller General of the United States, or any of their duly authorized representatives, shall have access for the purpose of audit and examinations to any books, documents, papers, and records of the recipients that are pertinent to the grants received under this Act.

"SEPARABILITY

"SEC. 12. If any provision of this Act, or the application of any provision of this Act to any person or circumstance, is held invalid, the application of such provision to

other persons or circumstances, and the remainder of this Act, shall not be affected thereby.

"APPROPRIATIONS

"SEC. 13. (a) Funds appropriated by Public Law 88-136 under 'air pollution' shall be available to carry out the purposes of this Act.

"(b) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to carry out this Act not to exceed $25,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, not to exceed $30,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, not to exceed $35,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, not to exceed $42,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and not to exceed $50,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969.

"SHORT TITLE

"SEC. 14. This Act may be cited as the 'Clean Air Act'."

SEC. 2. The title of such Act of July 14, 1955, is amended to read "An Act to provide for air pollution prevention and control activities of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and for other purposes".

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be agreed to en bloc, and that the bill, as so amended, be considered as original text for the purpose of amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Maine? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, Senate bill 432, the Clean Air Act, introduced by the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF] and 24 cosponsors, would replace the Air Pollution Control Act of 1955 with a new and more comprehensive program for the improvement of air quality.

Briefly, S. 432, as reported by the Committee on Public Works, provides the following:

First. Encouragement of cooperative activities between State and local governments for air pollution control.

Second. Expanded research and development in air pollution control programs.

Third. Grants for the support of State and local efforts to initiate and improve air pollution control programs.

Fourth. Enforcement authority for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in interstate air pollution cases.

Fifth. Increased control of air pollution by Federal installations.

These expanded areas of Federal activity are essential to a meaningful national air pollution control program. Federal, State, and local cooperation can meet the growing crisis in air pollution. But we cannot allow ourselves to be dissuaded from a forceful and determined effort to meet this problem by those who want to wait until we know more; by those who are more interested in avoiding the cost of cleaning up than in cleaning up the cost of doing nothing.

The proposals in S. 432, as amended, are based on hearings by the special Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution on the following bills:

S. 432, sponsored by Senator RIBICOFF and others; S. 444, sponsored by Senator ENGLE and others; S. 1009, sponsored by Senator NEUBERGER; S. 1040, sponsored by Senator CASE of New Jersey; S. 1124, sponsored by Senator WILLIAMS of Delaware; and H.R. 6518, as enacted by the House of Representatives.

Each of these proposals has contributed to the development of the bill as reported by the Senate Public Works Committee. From the provisions of the several bills and from the constructive suggestions made by the Senators and other witnesses who appeared before the subcommittee or submitted statements, we have been able to develop a legislative proposal which should advance the cause of air pollution control in all parts of the Nation.

I want to take this opportunity to express my appreciation to the chairman of the Senate Public Works Committee [Mr. MCNAMARA] for his leadership and cooperation in our efforts to develop sound air pollution legislation. I am grateful to the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] and my other majority colleagues on the Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution for their constructive assistance on S. 432, and to the minority members of the subcommittee, led by the able Senator from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS] for their cooperative spirit and help. Because of the joint effort we were able to muster, and the contribution of our able staffs, the legislation we have presented today has the unanimous approval of the Senate Committee on Public Works and substantial support from various segments of our society.

Mr. President, there is today a national recognition of the air pollution problem. For years men have been aware of the sooty deposits which accompany industrialization and we have been aware of the nuisance of unpleasant odors from manufacturing processes in certain industries. But so long as these side effects of industry and modern technology seemed to be nuisances and no more, we accepted them as one of the necessary drawbacks in our modern civilization.

With the outbreak of sickness and death associated with air pollution, our scientists became concerned that air contaminants could cause harm to man. Now, the Nation is aroused.

In the recent hearings of the special Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution of the Senate Commitee on Public Works, civic leaders, industrialists, medical doctors, and technicians all agreed that air pollution is a growing menace and that it must be controlled.

Air is life. We all know that we need fresh air every few seconds if we are to live. What we are not always aware of is that air is needed to sustain the kind of world in which we live. But the use of air in heating our homes, running our factories, driving our cars, and burning our wastes discharges pollutants into the air and results in physical and economic damage to the Nation.

Air pollution is injurious to health. We know, for example, that air pollution cost 4,000 lives in London in December 1952, 340 deaths in the same city 10 years later, 17 lives in Donora, Pa., in October 1948, and 200 lives in New York in November 1953. Untold thousands of Americans have suffered and died as a result of the long-term injurious effects of air pollution.

As the staff report on air pollution, prepared for the special Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution, has pointed out:

> Of much greater overall significance than acute episodes (of air pollution) is a growing body of evidence that long-term, low-level air pollution can contribute to and aggravate certain diseases.

We do not know all we want to know about the relationship between certain harmful agents in the air and disease, but we do know enough to establish a connection between various substances in the air and numerous respiratory ailments. These include: First, the common cold and other upper respiratory tract infections; second, chronic bronchitis; third, chronic constrictive ventilatory disease; fourth, pulmonary emphysema; fifth, bronchial asthma; and sixth, lung cancer. Close correlations have been shown between all of these diseases and the level of air pollution. In addition, there is a close correlation between the size of cities, the amount of air pollution, and the incidents of respiratory disease as a result of air pollution.

There are those who say that not enough is known to justify cleaning up air pollution now. They say we must wait until we have more specific evidence on the connection between air pollution and disease before we insist on cleanup in the air. I say there is no time to wait. We are not experimenting with the mortality of fungus, or of plants, or of mice. We are faced with the problems of injury and death to human beings—to ourselves, to our neighbors, and to our children. This is a national problem, requiring the closest cooperation between the Federal Government, State, interstate, and local agencies. If we place any value on human life, we will act now.

Air pollution is not only a menace to health, it is source of economic loss in agriculture, in the conservation of fish and wildlife, and in the upkeep of homes and the maintenance of personal property.

Air pollution injures plants and causes hundreds of millions of dollars of losses to our agricultural economy every year. Recent research in plant pathology has demonstrated that the kinds of plants affected and the nature of injury produced vary with the agent. This has made it possible to identify some of the specific pollutants which injure plants and to prove, in some cases, that they have caused damage as far away as 100 miles or more from the point where they originate. Eastern white pine, grapevines, tobacco, spinich, grains, fresh vegetables, and flowers have suffered from air pollution. Livestock have suffered serious adverse effects from airborne fluorides. Corn and peaches are susceptible to hydrogen fluorides.

The annual cost of air pollution damage to property has been estimated at

$11 billion for the Nation. Air pollution accelerates deterioration of metals, fabrics, leather, rubber, paint, concrete and building stone, glass and paper.

For the homeowner air pollution adds to the cost of painting, cleaning of clothing and furniture, and the replacement of many items. For industry, the cost of air pollution is measured in the replacement and protection of precision instruments and other complex control systems which are so important to modern technology.

Travel is affected by air pollution. In at least two recent instances—one in Pennsylvania and another in Louisiana—major turnpike crashes were attributed to poor visibility caused by air pollution. Air pollution, aggravated by atmospheric conditions, has increased transportation costs for air carriers. It has been estimated that 15 to 20 air crashes in the United States in 1962 could be attributed to air pollution.

To these health and economic hazards we may add the nuisances of irritated eyes, unsightly haze, soiled clothing and buildings, and unpleasant smells. Air pollution makes life difficult, costly and unpleasant.

Air pollution is no respecter of persons, property lines, community boundaries or State lines. Subject only to the laws of nature, it moves across the face of the earth in the envelope of air which surrounds and sustains us. Air pollution is local in origin, but its effects are widespread. Only a forceful and coordinated attack on the problem will bring us to a meaningful solution.

Our supply of air is limited. It cannot be increased. The supply of air is fixed as are our supplies of other natural resources such as coal, petroleum, iron ore, uranium, and water. We realize that these are not limitless and must be conserved. We must take the same view of our air resources.

Our population is increasing and our standard of living is going up. Our industries, homes, and office buildings and motor vehicles take the air, combine it with fuels and return the air-polluting compounds to the air. The more we prosper, the more we foul the air we breathe.

Approximately a ton of air is required for every tankful of gasoline used by a motor vehicle. The billion gallons of fuel consumed annually by motor vehicles in the United States used 94 trillion cubic feet—640 cubic miles—of air.

Other fuels need comparable quantities of air. Burning a ton of coal consumes about 27,000 pounds of air, and a gallon of fuel oil about 90 pounds of air, while approximately 18 pounds of air are used in burning a pound of natural gas. About 3,000 cubic miles of air must be provided annually to satisfy the oxygen requirements of the fossil fuels presently used in the United States alone.

If we do not halt the present rate of pollution from all major sources we will be heading down a one-way road to physical and economic disaster.

We are doing something about air pollution. But our efforts have been late in coming and they have been very limited. We need to do much more. Our Federal air pollution program really got underway, in a very limited fashion, in 1955. Our present Air Pollution Control Act has a threefold program of research, technical assistance, and public education. It recognizes the primary place of local and State programs to control air pollution. At the same time, the act is based on the realization that air pollution is not confined to a single jurisdiction. It is a national problem, requiring a national program of research, technical assistance, and support.

One-third of the States have established programs to deal with air pollution. Most of these, however, are quite limited in scope. Local government programs, where they exist, are generally understaffed and without sufficient financial and trained manpower resources to meet their needs. Only 34 local programs have annual budgets exceeding $25,000. Seven of these are in California. Of the other 51 local air pollution control agencies, 21 tried to function on less than $10,000 per year. In the past decade, despite a 30-percent increase in urban population, there has been, outside of California, no overall increase in manpower to combat air pollution at the local level.

Mr. President, S. 432 represents a major step forward in our effort to combat the insidious threat of air pollution. It is similar to H.R. 6518, passed by the House. It is my belief that we will be able to reach an agreement with the House in the near future on a clean air act.

At this point I would like to summarize the provisions of S. 432. The purpose of S. 432, as amended, is to:

First. Replace the Air Pollution Control Act of 1955 in its entirety with a new version, a Clean Air Act.

Second. Express the findings of the Congress that the increase in air pollution and the complexity of the problem of air pollution has been brought about by urbanization, industrial development, and the increasing use of motor vehicles. The act further recognizes the damage to the public health and welfare and the economic losses resulting from air pollution. It indicates also that the primary responsibility for the prevention and control of air pollution rests with State and local governments and that Federal financial assistance and leadership is essential.

Third. Express the purposes of the act to protect the Nation's air resources, to continue and extend the national research and development program, to provide technical and finanical assistance, and to encourage and assist the development and operation of air pollution control programs.

Fourth. Encourage cooperative activities by State and local governments for control of air pollution and uniform State and local laws. Authorize the Federal Government to participate in such measures.

Fifth. Grant the consent of Congress to two or more States to negotiate and enter into agreements or compacts—requiring ultimate approval by Congress—for the prevention of air pollution, and the establishment of such agencies as may be necessary to make effective such agreements or compacts.

Sixth. Authorize a broad program of research, investigations, training, and other activities relating to air pollution control.

Seventh. Authorize the compilation and publication of criteria reflecting accurately the latest scientific knowledge indicating the type and extent of effects which may be expected from the presence of air pollutants, such criteria to be revised in accordance with latest developments in scientific knowledge.

Eighth. Authorize grants to air pollution control agencies to develop, establish, and improve programs for the prevention and control of air pollution, specifying that grants to air pollution agencies shall not exceed 20 percent of total funds authorized.

Ninth. Authorize grants up to two-thirds of the cost of developing, establishing, and improving air pollution control programs to air pollution control agencies, and up to three-fourths of such costs to intermunicipal or interstate air pollution control agencies.

Tenth. Authorize a procedure to carry out abatement actions whenever the health and welfare of persons is being endangered by air pollution.

Eleventh. Direct the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to encourage continued efforts on the part of the automotive and fuel industries to prevent pollutants from being discharged from the exhaust of automotive vehicles.

Twelfth. Authorize the establishment of a technical committee to evaluate progress in the development of automotive pollution control devices and fuels, and to develop and recommend research programs which would lead to the development of such devices and fuels; also to make the necessary reports on the findings with respect to results obtained and steps necessary to alleviate or reduce pollution from these sources.

Thirteenth. Recognize the need for cooperation by Federal departments in controlling air pollution from installations under their jurisdiction and authorizing a procedure whereby the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare may establish pollutant sources for which a permit must be obtained in cases where any matter is being discharged into the air which may add to the overall air pollution problem.

Fourteenth. Authorize establishment of such regulations as are necessary for the effective administration of the bill and provide for accountability of financial assistance furnished under the act.

Fifteenth. Authorize fiscal year funds for 1964 to be used for the purposes of this bill, and authorize funds as follows: Fiscal year 1965, $25 million; fiscal year 1966, $30 million; fiscal year 1967, $35 million; fiscal year 1968, $42 million; and fiscal year 1969, $50 million. The total authorization for the 5-year program would be $182 million.

Mr. President, S. 432 is a sound piece of legislation. It is a meaningful step in the right direction on the road to more effective air pollution control, and a healthful environment for all of us.

I urge its passage by the Senate.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, I am very happy that the Senate is considering S. 432 as amended, known as the clean air bill. It was my privilege to be a cosponsor of this legislation.

The increase in air pollution and the complexity of the problem of air pollution has been developing to the extent that it has become a serious public hazard, a damage to the public health and welfare and to the economy. It has become necessary that every reasonable and practical step be taken at every level of Government to help meet the air pollution problem.

It is well to keep in mind that much is being done already by industry and local governments, but the problems of air pollution have been developing in scope, number and complexity much faster than have our efforts to deal with them. Therefore, this legislation is timely and provides for a more realistic and effective clean air program.

This legislation recognizes that the primary responsibility for the prevention and control of air pollution rests with State and local governments while at the same time providing Federal financial assistance and leadership.

It is my belief that this legislation will help provide the coordination, stimulus, research and technical assistance essential to a successful clean air program.

It is a privilege to serve on the subcommittee under the chairmanship of the distinguished junior Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE]. The subcommittee of the Committee on Public Works under his leadership, along with the other members of the committee and the staff, worked most effectively, objectively, and diligently on this legislation.

Air is probably the most important of all our natural resources. Everyone is aware that we need fresh air in order to live. This legislation will go far in overcoming air pollution and assuring safe and clean air for our citizens.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, for myself and the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], I offer a patent amendment to insure that the fruits of the research to be funded by this legislation will be freely available to Federal and State governments and to the general public, and I ask that the amendment be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 7, between lines 23 and 24, it is proposed to insert the following new subsection:

(d) All scientific and technological research or development activity contracted for, sponsored, cosponsored, or authorized under authority of this Act which involves the expenditures of Government funds shall be provided for in such manner that all information, uses, processes, patents, and other developments resulting from such activity will (with such exceptions and limitations, if any, as the Secretary may find to be necessary in the interest of national defense) be available to the general public. This subsection shall not be so construed as to deprive the owner of any background patent relating thereto of any right which he may have under that patent.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, this amendment has been discussed with the Senator in charge of the bill. I believe he is agreeable to accepting it at this time.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, there were some reservations in the committee about such a provision in the bill. The provision was included in the bill introduced by the distinguished Senator from Oregon. The reservations resulted because we had not taken much testimony on this subject.

Since the hearings we have explored the record with reference to the problem. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement I have had prepared on other pieces of legislation to which similar amendments have been attached.

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

The Senate of the United States has on many occasions expressed its view that the results of publicly financed research should be freely available to the general public.

The Atomic Energy Act of 1954 contained such provisions, which were reaffirmed in 1958.

So did the coal research and development bill enacted by Congress in 1960, the helium gas bill enacted in 1960, the oceanography bill passed by the Senate in 1961, the saline water and the disarmament bills passed by the Congress in 1961.

In this session of Congress the Senate unanimously legislated in the public interest by making sure that research authorized by the mass transit bill (S. 6) and the water resources bill (S. 2) would be used for the benefit of all the American people.

Mr. MUSKIE. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare policy in this field, which is consistent with the amendment of the Senator from Oregon.

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

STATEMENT OF THE PATENT POLICIES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE SUBMITTED TO THE HOUSE GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS COMMITTEE BY MANUEL B. HILLER, DEPARTMENT PATENTS OFFICER, MAY 24, 1963

Consistent with the Department's statutory responsibility for the advancement of science and knowledge and the dissemination to the public of the results of research, it is the general policy of the Department that the results of Department-financed research should be made widely, promptly, and freely available to other research workers and the public. This availability can generally be provided by dedication of a Government-owned invention to the public. Consequently, our regulations, in which our patent policies are expressed, uniformly provide as to employee inventions, inventions resulting from Government grant support or from contract, that the ownership and manner of disposition of all rights to such inventions shall be subject to determination by the head of the constituent unit responsible. Copies of the pertinent regulations are attached hereto.

Part 6 of the regulations establishes the general policy of the Department: viz, to provide by publication or other means for free access to the results of Department research. It also provides the criteria for issuance of licenses under patents for administration of which the Department has responsibility (45 C.F.R. 6.3).

Part 7, covering employee inventions, insures that such inventions when directly related to the employee's official functions or to which the Federal Government has made a substantial contribution shall be owned and controlled by the Government for the public benefit. The criteria for determining domestic rights to employee inventions, which are set forth in section 7.3 and are identical to those provided in Executive Order 10096, provide for flexibility in making determinations respecting title to employee inventions.

Part 8 of the regulations governs inventions resulting from research grants, fellowship awards, and contracts for research. As to research grants, the regulations provide—

"That the ownership and manner of disposition of all rights in and to such invention shall be subject to determination by the head of the constituent unit responsible for the grant" (45 CFR 8.1(a)).

The criteria upon which that determination is to be made, set forth in section 8.2, are similarly calculated to secure wide availability of the invention.

However, where a grantee institution has an established patent policy and its objectives are consonant with the policy objective of the Department, disposition of invention rights may be left with the grantee by the head of the operating agency making the grant provided a formal agreement can be reached between the Department and the grantee which then governs invention rights arising under all grants to that institution by that operating agency of the Department. Such agreements are executed only where there is assurance that any invention resulting from the project will be made available to the public without unreasonable restriction or excessive royalties (sec. 8.1(b)).

Section 8.6 provides for similar disposition of invention rights arising out of the performance of work under research contracts. The same alternative provided to nonprofit grantee institutions is carried forward in the contract area by a provision in the regulation that contracts for research with nonprofit institutions may leave the invention rights for disposition by the institution if its policies and procedures are acceptable as meeting the requirements applicable in the grant situation.

There is one exception to the Department's policy against relinquishment of invention rights to a private contractor, viz, where contracts with industrial profit-making organizations in the cancer chemotherapy program are involved. That program represents an intensified effort of the Public Health Service, with special appropriations made available under a congressional directive, to explore exhaustively and rapidly the potentialities of chemical compounds in the control of cancer. Because of the peculiar exigencies of this program and in order that the resources of pharmaceutical and chemical firms may be brought to bear with a minimum of delay, an exception to general Department policy has been authorized in the negotiation of industrial contracts for this program. (Sec. 8.7; and see, patent policy statement of the Secretary applicable to cancer chemotherapy industrial research contracts, July 31, 1958, set forth in section 6-10-20 of the materials attached hereto.) In essence, that exception provides that in

industrial research contracts in the cancer chemotherapy program, the contractor may accept either the standard patent clause which implements the general policy of the Department reserving the right of disposition of inventions to the Surgeon General, or a standard alternative clause leaving the right to patentable inventions with the contractor subject to certain limitations deemed necessary to protect the public's interest in the results of contracted research. The crucial provision therein (sec. B.4 of the policy statement) reserves to the Surgeon General the right to either dedicate the invention to the public or to issue royalty-free, nonexclusive licenses notwithstanding and in derogation of any patent which the contractor had theretofore obtained. The exercise of that right is conditioned upon a finding that either the supply of the invention is inadequate to meet the public need, the price is unreasonable or its quality is insufficient. Moreover, the right is subject to certain procedural safeguards which are specifically spelled out in paragraph B.4 of the Secretary's statement of policy.

There is thus provided a mechanism by which the public interest in any invention resulting from Government-financed cancer research is protected against insufficient supply to meet the public need, unreasonable price or inadequacy of quality. At the same time, the Department's policy and the contracts executed pursuant thereto provide reciprocal protection against precipitate governmental action which might destroy rights to which a contractor might reasonably be entitled.

Summarizing, the criteria employed by the Department for the disposition of invention rights in the field of employee inventions, research grants, fellowships, and research contracts are designed to foster the dissemination of the scientific and technical information gained thereby and to insure that the benefits of such work will be available to the public.

Mr. MUSKIE. With this background, I am perfectly willing to accept the amendment and take it to conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon for herself and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG].

The amendment was agreed to.

CLEAN AIR ACT

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, we are about to come of age in our relationship with our environment. The bill now before the Senate, S. 432, the Clean Air Act, represents the product of joint effort by the distinguished chairman of the Special Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution [Mr. MUSKIE], the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], who has given us the benefit of his broad experience as Secretary of HEW, and others among us who have long sought appropriate action to preserve the purity of our skies.

For myself, this legislation represents the culmination of an effort begun nearly 3 years ago. The bill which I introduced at that time and the bill which we are called upon to debate today were in measured response to the indelible portrait of death and destruction by air pollution, drawn for us in deep strokes by President Kennedy in his health message to the Nation:

Economic damage from air pollution amounts to as much as $11 billion every year in the United States. Agricultural losses alone total $500 million a year. Crops are stunted or destroyed, livestock become ill, meat and milk production are reduced. In some 6,000 communities various amounts of smoke, smog, grime, or fumes reduce property values and—as dramatically shown in England last year—endanger life itself. Hospitals, department stores, office buildings, and hotels are all affected. Some cities suffer damages of up to $100 million a year. One of our larger cities has a daily average of 25,000 tons of airborne pollutants. My own home city of Boston experienced in 1960 a "black rain" of smoke, soot, oil, or a mixture of all three.

Last week's New York Times carried a report from the annual meeting of the American Public Health Association of the first conclusive finding that normal city air pollution affects death rates.

The report, the joint report of the Division of Air Pollution of the U.S. Public Health Service and the Vanderbilt University School of Medicine, found that residents of polluted areas suffered increased death rate from respiratory infections.

This report follows close upon several recent investigations which have revealed the peculiarly lethal role played by sulfur compounds. These studies have demonstrated the existence of a dramatic relationship between the levels of sulfur dioxide and sulfur trioxide in the air and the frequency and duration of chronic respiratory diseases including asthma, emphysema, bronchitis, and even the common cold which each year costs this Nation tens of millions of lost workdays. There is also evidence that sulfur dioxide and sulfate levels have been extremely high during the several acute episodes of air pollution in this country and abroad which took the lives of many victims.

Sulfurous compounds in the air are produced primarily by the combustion of sulfur-containing fuels such as coal or oil. It is abundantly clear that if we were able to remove the sulfur from fuels before they were burned, economically and efficiently, we would have taken a great stride toward curing the air pollution problem. As of yet, however, such methods have not been perfected.

It was for this reason that I proposed that the subcommittee adopt a provision directing the Secretary of HEW to conduct extensive research toward the development of improved low-cost techniques for extracting sulfur from fuels. Happily the committee bill incorporates this measure.

As a cosponsor of S. 432, I commend the committee for its creative work in bringing before the Senate legislation truly deserving of the title "Clean Air Act."

I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "Polluted Air Said To Raise Death Rate" be printed at the close of my remarks.

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

POLLUTED AIR SAID TO RAISE DEATH RATE

(By Walter Sullivan)

KANSAS CITY, MO., November 12.—What is said to be the first clear evidence that normal city air pollution affects death rates was presented here today.

The report dealt with a survey of deaths in and around Nashville, Tenn., in the 12 years that ended in 1960. It found that two factors strongly affected death rates from diseases of the respiratory system: the extent of air pollution and economic status.

Those who did the study believe it demonstrates that the levels of pollution characteristic of city air have important long-term effects on health. They were surprised, however, to find no correlation between air pollution and the incidence of lung and bronchial cancer.

The report was presented to the annual meeting of the American Public Health Association being held here this week. Some 4,000 specialists from this country and abroad are in attendance.

The weakness of present administrative machinery for combating air pollution and other health problems was also discussed at today's sessions. A series of reports was presented on the nationwide survey of this machinery, initiated last year by the National Commission on Community Health Services.

The target date for reports by the seven task forces delving into various aspects of this problem is next November. In the spring of 1963 there is then to be a National Conference on Community Health Services. The project is being sponsored by a number of national health agencies.

The Nashville study was developed jointly by the Division of Air Pollution of the U.S. Public Health Service and the Vanderbilt University School of Medicine. The Tennessee health department furnished business machine cards giving data on the death of 38,207 people in and near Nashville.

Those of the deceased for whom addresses were available were classified both according to the economic level of the section in which they lived and the air pollution characteristics of that section. To this end 123 air-sampling stations were operated for a year. Data were drawn from 67 census districts in the city area. It was then possible to study the air pollution effect, free from influence by economic considerations. Similarly the effect of economic status could be separated from that of pollution.

For example, the socioeconomic factor was presented only for those exposed to moderate levels of pollution. This, presumably, eliminated the pollution effects on the relative statistics. Likewise, air pollution factors were presented only in terms of those tabulated as middle class.

Residents were divided economically into three classes. Those of the lowest class had a death rate from respiratory disease of more than 60 per 100,000 compared to only 25 per 100,000 for those of the upper class. The effects of air pollution were broken down according to various indexes of pollution, such as dust fall and the content of sulfur oxides. The latter are byproducts of the burning of coal and other fuels.

In all cases, the sections of the city subjected to heaviest pollution were areas of maximum deaths from respiratory diseases. Past surveys of this sort have been criticized on the ground that the effects of poverty were intertwined with pollution effects. If a person is poor he is likely to live in a smoky section of town.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement on this subject prepared by the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], who is perhaps the Senate's most determined and articulate champion of a sound public patent policy, may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR RUSSELL B. LONG, DEMOCRAT, OF LOUISIANA

Polluted air is injurious to the health and welfare of our people. The Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is authorized by S. 432 to conduct research; promote the coordination and acceleration of research investigations, experiments, and studies; and to engage in other designated activities that would assist in protecting the public health and welfare and the productive capacity of the population.

The growth of urbanization, industrial development, and increasing use of motor vehicles have resulted in polluting the air, with serious danger to the health and well-being of the public. Air pollution prevention and abatement is essential if growth and progress is to continue.

The research to be financed by these funds is intended to benefit the public. Its purpose is the increase in knowledge and the development of devices that will enable us to lessen the dangers resulting from air pollution. It may even become a "must" for the public to use specific inventions designed to reduce air pollution. Such inventions could well include devices to curtail poisonous gases coming from automobile exhausts and industrial plants, devices for burning all kinds of wastes and for many other purposes. It is natural, therefore, that the results of the research should be available to those whom the research is intended to benefit: The United States, the individual States, the general public, and the populations of many areas which suffer from problems of polluted air.

The effects of air pollution in my State of Louisiana, in New Orleans, for example, are all too evident. The incidence of lung cancer is considerably higher there than the national average. In addition, in the New Orleans area there are periodic epidemics of asthmatic attacks. At that city's Charity Hospital, for example, the normal load of asthmatics appearing for emergency treatment increases from an average of 25 to 30 per day up to 200 or more at certain times. This condition can be benefited potentially by better control of atmospheric conditions.

The amendment proposed by myself and the junior Senator from Oregon will assure that the intent and purpose of this legislation will be carried out for the benefit of all our people. This amendment is substantially the same as the corresponding provisions of S. 1009, the air pollution control bill introduced by Senator NEUBERGER, and H.R. 4415, introduced by Congressman ROBERTS. A reading of the hearings on this bill, at least on the House side, indicates that the Public Health Service approved the patent section.

This item is one of the two stressed by Senator NEUBERGER before the Special Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution as being required to maximize the public benefits of this legislation.

The subcommittee chairman recognized the necessity of the amendment, and stated during Senator NEUBERGER'S testimony that the "provision in your bill is a sensible one and that is as we achieve breakthroughs in the state of art in dealing with the problem, unless those are made available on a wide scale, we are going to substantially inhibit progress in the field." [1]

On October 10 of this year the President of the United States issued a memorandum on Government patent policy to the heads of the executive departments and agencies. Under that document the results of Government-funded research in fields which directly concern the public health or public welfare would be made freely available to the general public. Obviously, the research authorized by S. 432 would fall under this category. We must remember, however, that the President's memorandum does not have the force of law and is only a policy recommendation. My proposed amendment is consistent with that policy recommendation.

The Senate of the United States has on many occasions expressed its view that the results of publicly financed research should be freely available to the general public.

The Atomic Energy Act of 1954 contained such provisions, which were reaffirmed in 1958.

So did the coal research and development bill enacted by Congress in 1960, the helium gas bill enacted in 1960, the oceanography bill passed by the Senate in 1961, the saline water, and the disarmament bills passed by Congress in 1961.

In this session of Congress the Senate unanimously legislated in the public interest by making sure that research authorized by the mass transit bill (S. 6) and the water resources bill (S. 2) would be used for the benefit of all the American people.

The only difference between those bills I just mentioned and this air pollution control bill is that this one directly concerns the health and welfare of our people. It does not seem reasonable to me that we try to protect the public interest in disarmament or helium gas bills and then fail to do so in legislation, the primary purpose of which is to guard the health of the public.

To carry out the provisions and the objectives of this act, it is imperative that inventions, know-how, and technical data resulting from air pollution prevention and control should be freely available to everyone. To permit private interests to acquire proprietary rights to withhold from the public or to delay the benefits of such research would be to defeat the worthy purpose of the measure.

I believe that the amendment we have offered is the absolute minimum that is necessary.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I am aware of the fact that the bill was reported by the committee virtually unanimously.

Mr. MUSKIE. It was.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I know that all minority members of the committee support the bill.

Some opposition has been registered with me on the ground that industry has done such an excellent job in researching this whole problem and is a little alarmed about the intrusion of the Federal enforcement power. I understand that intrusion could not occur unless it came on the request of a Governor in a given State or when the pollution started in one State and carried over into another, therefore making it an interstate matter.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I have amendments on this subject which I believe will take care of what the Senator has in mind.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I should like to record what the Commission said in Pittsburgh, where an exceedingly good job has been done:

Industry's determination to do everything in its power to rid all affected areas of air pollution is perhaps better realized when measured in dollars and cents. It is spending at the rate of $500 million a year for pollutant control, a sum which exceeds the annual taxes collected by 32 States and exceeds the annual budgets of 42 States. And it is only fair to point out that much of these expenditures are for equipment, sometimes massive in size, that is not only nonproductive but often slows normal production in a plant.

In connection therewith, the Illinois Manufacturers' Association made a statement on the bill. I ask unanimous consent to include it in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRUENING in the chair). Is there objection?

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

STATEMENT BY ILLINOIS MANUFACTURERS' ASSOCIATION, RE PENDING FEDERAL LEGISLATION, RE AIR POLLUTION

The Illinois Manufacturers' Association (IMA) fully appreciates that prevention of air pollution is a subject of importance to every citizen and that effective action is required to achieve and maintain a goal of cleaner air.

However, IMA is opposed to Federal intrusion in this matter in the form of S. 432 or H.R. 6518, or of any other proposed Federal legislation on air pollution control that would expand the Federal Government's role in local air pollution control and abatement.

The Federal Government's role should be limited strictly to that of providing research material and technical know-how to assist the several States and their local governments in their responsibility for policing and enforcement.

This is clearly stated in the existing law, Public Law 159, 84th Congress, approved July 14, 1955, as amended.

Public Law 159 stresses research and technical assistance and development of methods for control and abatement of air pollution by the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare and by the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service. It recognizes the primary responsibilities and rights of the State and local governments in controlling air pollution and authorizes Federal grants to assist local governments in their programs.

The specific objection of the IMA to S. 432 or H.R. 6518 or to the other proposed Federal legislation on the subject of air pollution, is that such bill or bills provide for direct Federal intervention into State and local government affairs—specifically, Federal activity in the area of abatement or control.

It is IMA's position that the purported need for Federal interference, as was contended in hearings on this bill in the House, was based on a premise that there has been over the past years, an increase and growth in the amount, volume and complexity of air pollution which has resulted in increased hazard to public health.

IMA believes this contention is refuted by substantial evidence showing that air pollution nationally is on the decline now. Industries have made significant progress in controlling smoke emissions. They have substituted oil and gas heat for coal in many

[1] "Air Pollution Control," hearings before Special Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution of Committee on Public Works, U.S. Senate, Sept. 9, 10, and 11, 1963, p. 200.

instances and have installed and are installing new cleaning devices, as well as engaging in better housekeeping. Evidence shows that in a period a few years, measured dustfall in Chicago proper has decreased substantially. The same experience will be found in other areas of the country.

The only other possible justification for further injecting the Federal Government into this area of local jurisdiction is the assumption that the State or local governments are either not able to handle the problem or have refused to do so. This certainly is not true, as successful local programs have been instituted in recent years in Pittsburgh, Chicago, and St. Louis and at the State level, here in Illinois; during the last session of the legislature, a very effective air pollution statute was enacted with the cooperation of Illinois industry and with the active assistance of this association.

Where air pollution problems arise between States and action need be coordinated, IMA believes that States involved (for example, Illinois and Indiana, or Illinois and Wisconsin) can cooperate by means of interstate compacts as is being done currently in regard to automobile safety device legislation. This is certainly preferable to Federal legislative control.

The Illinois Manufacturers' Association expresses the hope that the legislation relating to this subject now pending in the U.S. Senate will be rejected because it is unnecessary and represents an unwarranted intrusion by the Federal Government into the prerogatives of the State and local governments.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I think there is much to be said about the fear and apprehension of consistently calling upon the enforcement arms of the Federal Government to intervene in matters that are essentially local in character and should not go beyond State lines. I am glad to know that the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] will in part cure this problem with an amendment which he proposes to offer.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, it has been consistently the intention of the committee to protect the primary areas of the States and local governments in this field. I invite the attention of Senators to the fact that the Manufacturing Chemists' Association, Inc., expressed the same concern which the minority leader has expressed. Many changes in the bill were responsive to that concern. Since the bill has been reported, we have received a letter from the Manufacturing Chemists' Association commending the committee's work on the bill.

I ask unanimous consent to have the letter printed at this point in the RECORD as further reassurance to the minority leader.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thank the Senator from Maine.

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

MANUFACTURING CHEMISTS' ASSOCIATION, INC.,
*Washington, D.C., November 6, 1963.*

HON. EDMUND S. MUSKIE,
*Chairman, Special Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution, Committee on Public Works, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Having seen S. 432, the Clean Air Act, as amended and reported, we would like to commend your subcommittee for the highly significant improvements it made therein, rendering the bill, in our view, far superior to its original form or to the bill received from the House. We believe the provisions, in sections 3(a)(3) and 5(c)(1)(C), for Federal cooperation with local, State, and interstate agencies, and for the discretionary exercise of Federal enforcement authority in interstate situations represent constructive and eminently desirable amendments. They clearly reflect the conscientious efforts of the subcommittee to protect local, State, and interstate air pollution control agencies in meeting their responsibilities without Federal action wherever they are able and willing to do so.

From the position taken by our association during the subcommittee hearings, you are aware of our belief that Federal enforcement of air pollution control should in each instance be predicated upon an invitation issued at the State level. This would allow for fully effective Federal leadership, and at the same time it would minimize diversion of Federal effort from research, training of technical personnel, and related technically oriented endeavors where we believe the Federal Government can make the greatest overall contribution to progress in this important field. While this position is not fully reflected in the bill as reported by the subcommittee, we wish to express our deep appreciation for the careful consideration accorded our recommendations by the subcommittee and staff assistants concerned.

Sincerely,

G. H. DECKER,
*President.*

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment, on behalf of myself and the junior Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING], and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the senior Senator from New York, for himself and the junior Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING], will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed, on page 12, after the period on line 5, to insert the following:

No grant shall be made under this section until the Secretary has consulted with the appropriate official as designated by the Governor or Governors of the State or States affected.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, under section 4 of S. 432, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is authorized to make grants directly to local air pollution control agencies without the concurrence, approval or consultation of the States in which the local recipients of Federal funds are located. The deep concern that the State air pollution agencies might be bypassed by direct allocation of funds by the Federal Government to local air pollution agencies is reflected in the report of the Senate Public Works Committee on this bill and in the testimony before the Special Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution. The Public Works Committee specifically recognized and dealt with the problem of the local agencies bypassing the State by stating at page 8 of its report on S. 432:

The committee would expect, however, that in the administration of this program, the Department will take precautions to insure that a grant will be made only after appropriate consideration has been given to the views of the State air pollution control authority (where such a State authority exists) with respect to the particular program for which a grant is sought.

Secretary Celebrezze recognized the problem in testifying before the subcommittee at page 72 of the subcommittee record of hearings that:

I would recommend that we be permitted to make grants directly to local communities with the State, of course, taking an active part.

Edward Michaelian, county executive of Westchester County, N.Y., representing the counties of the United States, expressed his concern over the bypassing of the States in the allocation of funds when he testified at page 132 of the record of hearings that:

It is my personal opinion that the State should be a party to such interlocal agreements, acting in a supervisory capacity subsequent to the receipt of a grant for assistance or a grant-in-aid from the Federal Government.

New York State, however, is sufficiently concerned with this problem to feel that the requirement for coordination between local and State air pollution control agencies be expressly provided for in the bill.

I am, therefore, introducing an amendment to prohibit the allocation of funds under section 4 of the bill until the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare has consulted with the appropriate officials as designed by the Governor or Governors of the State or States affected. In view of the fact that only one-third of the States have established programs to deal with air pollution, it is evident that all States do not have State air pollution control agencies with whom the Secretary of HEW may consult. It is intended that the Secretary of HEW would, in good faith, consult with the appropriate official designated as responsible for air pollution control matters by the Governor or Governors of the State or States in which the local agencies receiving the funds are located.

My amendment is thus intended to require that the work of the local agencies, receiving Federal funds, be coordinated with the State agencies to insure an effective air pollution program and to prevent duplication of effort. After full discussion with the Senator from Maine and others interested in the bill, it is our feeling that the provision for consultation satisfies the previously stated requirements and provides adequate safeguards for the problems I have depicted.

I hope that the chairman of the subcommittee and the Senate will consider the amendment favorably.

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

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. MUSKIE. As the Senator from New York has pointed out, the proposed amendment is completely consistent with the entire philosophy of the committee and the intentions of the committee. It is a constructive change in

the bill, and I am willing to accept the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] for himself and the junior Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I send another amendment to the desk, which I offer on behalf of myself and my colleague from New York [Mr. KEATING].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed, on page 19, line 19, beginning with the word "may", to strike out all before the period on line 22, and insert in lieu thereof "at the request of the Governor of such State, shall provide such technical and other assistance as in his judgment is necessary to assist the State in judicial proceedings to secure abatement of the pollution under State or local law or request the Attorney General to bring suit on behalf of the United States to secure abatement of the pollution."

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the primary concern reflected by this amendment is that the States have an opportunity through their own law enforcement agencies to enforce intrastate air pollution violations. With respect to the institution of proceedings on intrastate air pollution, section 5(f)(2) of S. 432 presently provides that "in the case of pollution of air which is endangering the health or welfare of persons only in the State or local law. It would also permit charges in which the discharge or discharges (causing or contributing to such pollution) originate", the Secretary with the written consent of the Governor of such State, may request the Attorney General to bring a suit on behalf of the United States to secure abatement of the pollution. My amendment would allow the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, upon the request of the Governor of the State affected, to provide such technical and other assistance as in his judgment would be necessary to assist the State in bringing proceedings under State or local law. It would also permit the Secretary, again upon the request of the Governor of the affected State, to request the U.S. Attorney General to bring suit on behalf of the United States. In effect, the amendment would authorize the Secretary, contingent upon the request of the Governor of the concerned State, either to assist the State in bringing abatement proceedings under local law in State courts or to request the U.S. Attorney to bring proceedings in a Federal district court. This amendment would be consistent with the policy of S. 432 as expressed in section 1(a)(3).

Secretary Celebrezze, on page 64 of the record of hearings of the Special Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution of the Public Works Committee, testified to his preference for State enforcement. The report of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare also reflects the Department's preference for enforcement by State or local authorities to the procedure of the U.S. Attorney General bringing suit. There is additional testimony, presented by the National Association of Attorneys General, supporting the enforcement by State legal officers of intrastate problems.

The concern for local enforcement was also reflected in the intrastate air pollution enforcement section of H.R. 6518 which the House passed on July 24, 1963. The House-passed bill provided that, at the request of the Governor or Attorney General, the Secretary shall provide such technical and other assistance as is necessary to assist the State in judicial proceedings to secure abatement of the pollution under State or local law.

It is believed that State and local enforcement of purely intrastate pollution problems would be a healthy and constructive contribution to the air pollution program. Moreover, the flexibility of alternatives for enforcement provided for in this amendment will go a rather considerable distance toward meeting the point made by the Senator from Illinois, as well as satisfying the concerns of many of us.

Again I emphasize that we are dealing with differing states of preparation in different States. Hence, there must be flexibility of approach. Not every State is equipped, as my own State is, to deal with enforcement problems. Therefore, I believe, after much consideration, this is a fair and equitable way to work out the problem, consistent with the policy of the bill.

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

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. MUSKIE. The thrust of the amendment offered by the Senator from New York is that in intrastate pollution, any action by the Federal Government shall be initiated only by the request of the Governor. Therefore, in intrastate questions, control is within the State entirely or the State administration. I think this, too, is consistent with the philosophy of the bill and the thinking of the committee. It is a constructive addition to the bill, and I am willing to accept the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KEATING subsequently said: Mr. President, I am happy to join with my colleague the distinguished senior Senator from New York in offering these amendments. I would like to take this opportunity, also, to compliment the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF] and the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE] for their diligent efforts to devise the best possible bill.

The main objective of our two amendments is to insure Federal-State cooperation in preventing air pollution. The New York State Department of Health, under the leadership of Dr. Hollis Ingraham, spends more than a quarter of a million dollars a year on an extensive air pollution control program. In addition, a number of cities and communities in the State have their own programs. Since our State and many others have had considerable experience in this field, we want to be sure that they are given a substantial part to play in this Federal program.

Our amendments provide:

First. That the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare consult with the State government before awarding a grant within the State; and

Second. That the consent of the Governor of the State be obtained before the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare gives technical assistance to the State and before the Attorney General of the United States was asked to take any action to combat intrastate pollution.

I am gratified that the distinguished Senator from Maine has agreed to accept these amendments and trust that their inclusion in this bill will bring about a strong Federal-State program—with shared responsibilities and pooled resources—to eliminate this menace to our health and welfare.

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

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, under the leadership of the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE] the Special Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution of the Senate Committee on Public Works has brought to the floor of the Senate two bills of great importance.

First, the water pollution control bill, S. 649, which was overwhelmingly approved by the Senate on October 16. I was proud to be a cosponsor of this measure which makes meaningful improvements in the Nation's clean water program.

Second, the clean air bill, S. 432, now before the Senate. As author of the bill I know I speak for its many cosponsors in paying tribute to the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE] and his entire subcommittee for the prompt attention it has given this important problem. And I think special praise is due the ranking minority member of the subcommittee [Mr. BOGGS] who joined with me last January as one of the first cosponsors of S. 432.

The Muskie subcommittee, Mr. President, in less than a year of intensive study and effort has presented to the Senate carefully worked out effective measures to deal with air and water pollution. Since, like sin, everyone opposes dirty air and water few realize how controversial measures to deal with the problems can be. The bill before us was no exception—but by careful and deliberate action the subcommittee has worked out a landmark bill deserving of the unanimous approval it received by the full Committee on Public Works. This in itself is a tribute to the leadership of the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE]. And to the effective assistance given him by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS] and all the members of the subcommittee.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I wish to express my gratitude to the Senator from Connecticut for his very generous remarks. He is, of course, the leader in the Senate with reference to this legislation and what has been accomplished by "holding our feet to the fire," in a sense, by calling attention to these problems and by the proposals he has made. I am grateful for his leadership.

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

Mr. MUSKIE. I yield.

Mr. BOGGS. I want to endorse what the distinguished Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE] has so ably said to the Senator from Connecticut in appreciation of his leadership in this field. I am glad to be a cosponsor of the bill that was introduced to establish this air pollution control authority. I thank the Senator from Connecticut for his kind remarks.

Mr. RIBICOFF. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, after listening to the Senator from Illinois, I should like to point out to him and to other Senators that within the next few days I will introduce an amendment to the tax bill, which recognizes the role industry must play if we are to accomplish the objectives of the bill. I believe the enactment of a tax program to encourage private industry and the bill which will pass today will be a two-pronged attack on the problems of air pollution.

Mr. President, this bill is a good reminder that dirty air is not a partisan matter and partisanship went out the window in order to work out an acceptable and at the same time effective bill.

Actually, Mr. President, when it comes to the problem of dirty air there is neither room nor time for partisanship. The original air pollution control bill establishing the present Federal clean air program was introduced by the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], who was also an early cosponsor of S. 432, and effective air pollution control has long been sought by the junior Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE]. Adequate legislation in this field has consistently been advocated by the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], another cosponsor of S. 432, whose special concern about the health effects of air pollution have been incorporated in the bill.

We must face up to the fact that the land on which we live and work, the air we breathe, the water we drink and use in industry, agriculture, and recreation have been altered over the past half century by a manmade fallout far more abundant and potentially more dangerous than the contamination of nuclear weapons testing. The nuclear test ban treaty we begin debate on today will be a great step toward ending one source of air pollution—radioactive fallout. We must not miss the opportunity to prevent and bring under control all the other poisons in our atmosphere.

Since there is such a vast amount of air above us, many people ask how is it possible that pollution can be a serious problem. The answer is that only a small part of the total air supply is available for our use in any single location. Over one-half of our population now lives on less than 10 percent of the land area of the country. For the most part, sources of air pollution are concentrated where people are concentrated. Furthermore, there is every indication that, by 1970, two-thirds of our population at that time will live in this same limited land area.

We are already overburdening those portions of the air resource available to many of our cities. Few people realize the enormous amount of pollutants being discharged into the atmosphere. One of our larger cities has a daily average of 25,000 tons of air-borne pollutants. More than 180 million Americans live on the bottom of an ocean of air contaminated by an ever-growing volume and variety of pollutants.

How did all this happen? The answer is found, oddly enough, in the very hallmarks of contemporary society—our technological capacity, industrial output and rising standard of living. Manmade forests of advanced technology sprout up across our land, creating an abundance of services and consumer goods, and creating vast amounts of waste materials.

As our Nation has grown—as more people crowd together in bigger cities and drive more millions of automobiles and trucks—contamination of our air becomes more serious—sometimes critical.

The essential elements of the problem are simple. We burn fuels in thousands of ways to produce the power and products necessary to our high standard of living. Often we burn them poorly—hardly ever completely. Our factories and automobiles throw chemical compounds into the air. Acted upon by sunlight, they produce new compounds more damaging and toxic than the original wastes.

So we turn our precious air supply into a vast dump for gases, fumes and many many different dusts. We have created sewers in the sky.

The damage caused by this dirty air is appalling. It hurts our lands, stunts or destroys our crops, makes our livestock ill, reduces our meat and milk production. It soils and corrodes buildings, bridges, monuments, and physical structures of all kinds. It causes extensive plant damage of many types. It irritates the eyes. By reducing visibility it creates traffic hazards. It causes unpleasant odors. It endangers our very health and lives. Expert estimates of the high price we are paying for filth in the air today run as high as $11 billion a year, and this figure does not include the most important cost—the cost to our health. We do not have any realistic figures for the medical and hospital care of people made sick by breathing—day in and day out, year in and year out—air that is simply not fit to breathe. Neither do we know exactly how many people each year die of air pollution. But some things we do know.

We all know the story of Donora, Pa. There, during 3 days of dense, choking smog, in October 1948, 20 people died and more than 4,000 suffered acute illness because their part of the ocean of air was too polluted for safe breathing.

In 1952 between 4,000 and 5,000 Londoners died in a single week. The cause? Polluted air.

In December 1953 New York City was pinned under an inversion that trapped filthy waste between layers of air, making the air unfit—even lethal—for human lungs. When the weeklong smog was over, 200 people were dead. These 200 deaths were not even noted until 9 years later when a statistical study brought this quiet tragedy to light.

Just last December, London was hit again. The death toll was 300 to 400 at the latest count, and British health officials think the real number killed will prove much higher after hospital records and death certificates have been thoroughly examined.

This episode occurred 3,000 miles from our shores. At almost exactly the same time, a stagnant air mass over the northeastern United States caused a steady, alarming increase in pollution levels from Richmond to Boston. In our Northern Hemisphere, weather systems move from west to east. The set of meteorological circumstances which caused the London smog, developed in the eastern United States several days earlier, with the result that sulphur dioxide levels in Philadelphia and New York, between November 30 and December 4 of last year, averaged three and a half times normal, and were, for several days, over five times normal.

During this same period, levels of solid matter in the air rose correspondingly. In my own State of Connecticut, the 5-day average in Hartford and Middletown was over three times normal with individual days of from four to five times normal.

If we had not been lucky—if this mass of contaminated air had not been blown out over the ocean—the United States might have suffered the worst air pollution calamity in history.

I think in this mid-20th century, as we contemplate putting a man on the moon, we would be negligent if we continued to rely on the wind to save us from air pollution disasters.

These episodes of acute illness and death are serious but of even greater concern is the problem of the long-term effects of air pollution. Constant exposure of urban populations to low concentrations of air poisons which could result in gradual deterioration of health, chronic disease, and premature death is a modern day fact of urban life. Leading scientists feel air pollution may have a good deal to do with aggravating heart conditions and increasing susceptibility to respiratory disease—asthma, bronchitis, emphysema, and lung cancer—particularly among older people and the ever-growing urban population.

Studies will show that death rates for cardio-respiratory diseases in the United

States are greater in urban than in rural areas, and, in general, increase with city size. Within the last few years, this urban-rural difference has also shown up in mortality of infants less than 1 year of age and is accounted for by respiratory illness.

A recent study in a southern city shows that acute asthmatic attacks among susceptible patients were directly correlated with variations in total sulfate air pollution from time to time.

Finally, although I am not a scientist, I think only commonsense is needed to tell us that the rising incidence of lung cancer in this country, particularly in cities, emphasizes the need for a careful look at the health importance of air polluted with potentially carcinogenic substances.

Analyses of air samples from over 100 cities by the Public Health Service have shown that 3–4 benzpyrene, a potent carcinogen, is present in concentrations which could result in human dosages approximating or exceeding that from cigarette smoking.

A recent report entitled "Atmospheric Factors on Pathogenesis of Lung Cancer" by Kotin and Falk, states:

> The most satisfactory explanation for the consistent observation of an increased incidence of lung cancer in urban populations is exposure to polluted air.

According to the recent report of the Committee on Environmental Health Problems:

> Because a number of statistical studies have indicated a higher incidence of lung cancer in urban than in rural areas and because such well-known experimental carcinogens as benzpyrene have been found in community air, the finger of suspicion has been pointing for some time to atmospheric benzpyrene and related aromatic polycyclic hydrocarbons as at least contributory etiologic agents in lung cancer. Certainly it does not seem possible to attribute the alarming increase in lung cancer incidence to smoking alone. A growing body of experimental evidence incriminates atmospheric hydrocarbons.

Mr. President, the problem of air pollution *has obviously* gone beyond the simple eye irritation nuisance stage. These are deadly poisons being poured into our atmosphere. It is time we do something more than talk about them. We need a national clean air program as envisioned in S. 432.

The role of the Federal Government to date in this field has been limited to a supporting one of research, technical assistance to public and private organizations, and training of technical personnel. We urgently need significant expansion in the scope of the Federal air pollution control program.

The Federal Government must provide leadership, encouragement, technical know-how, and financial assistance to local and State governments in the development of a national program of research and development for the prevention and control of air pollution. This is its proper job. This national problem requires national effort. State and local agencies cannot deal with the situation alone.

Current city, county, and regional air pollution control activities need expansion, also. Data submitted at the National Conference on Air Pollution show that only 34 local governmental air pollution control agencies have annual budgets of $25,000 or more; fewer than 1,000 people are employed by all local governments to control their air pollution problems; and only 13 air pollution control agencies employ more than 10 people. About 200 cities with populations over 50,000 are considered to have air pollution problems, but only approximately half of them have an air pollution control program—and many of these programs are seriously understaffed.

In addition, State air pollution control programs must be strengthened. Of the more than $2 million all 50 States spent for air pollution control in 1961, more than half was spent by California alone. Although today most States have air pollution control legislation of some kind, only 17 States spend more than $5,000 annually for their programs; only 9 States spend $25,000 or more. And only approximately 150 people are employed by all State Governments to combat their air pollution problems. State activities must be greatly accelerated if all citizens are to enjoy clean air.

We must obviously elevate the Federal role in air pollution control to a proper status of responsibility and leadership while recognizing the basic responsibilities of State and local governments and helping them fulfill those responsibilities. This is the purpose of S. 432. Adoption of this legislation will give us an action program with two basic elements—first, stepped-up research on some still unanswered questions regarding the sources, the nature, and the effects of air pollution and on better methods and instruments for abating it; and second, more effective control through application of our present knowledge.

I am convinced the American people are now ready to support such a program and to accept the regulation and costs that are necessary to carry it out. They realize that the days of letting poisonous wastes billow into the air are over—that air pollution is a threat to our economy, to our health, and to our lives.

The air we breathe is free, but when it is filled with filth, it is no bargain.

I urge the enactment of S. 432.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I join my colleagues in the Senate in expressing appreciation to the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF] for sponsoring the basic bill and for campaigning for its enactment. I shall be glad to join in sponsoring the tax amendment, as will other Senators also. This is extremely constructive proposed legislation.

I have had occasion to work closely with the Senator from Maine. Sometimes he has been with me, and sometimes he has been against me, but always he has worked most creditably and always has made a very fine contribution to this body.

My old friend, CALEB BOGGS, is a constant source of joy and pleasure, and has always been, as I have seen him come along through the House of Representatives, as Governor of his State, and now in this present august position. He has always given to the people of our Nation a luminous mind and understanding.

I shall conclude my remarks in a moment. I call attention to subsection 4(b) of the bill, and the fact that it provides three criteria upon which grants under the bill shall be made. First, there is population; second, the extent of the actual or potential air pollution problem; and, third, the financial need of the respective agencies.

Rather than trying to do anything further with the bill by way of amendment, as this is essentially a matter of administration, I should like to ask the Senator in charge of the bill on the floor this question, so that the legislative history may be clear.

With respect to subsection 4(b) of S. 432, is it not the committee's intention, in considering the three factors to which due consideration shall be given in establishing regulations for the granting of funds, that the Secretary shall place primary emphasis on "the extent of the actual or potential air pollution problem?"

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, the committee intends that in evaluating the three factors the Secretary give primary consideration to the extent of the actual or potential air pollution problem. The House version of the Clean Air Act contained a general formula for the allocation of grants to the several States to "assist them in meeting the costs of establishing and maintaining programs for the prevention and control of air pollution." The Senate committee modified the language to insure that the Secretary gives sufficient weight to the areas of serious air pollution as he administers the grant program. We want to meet the problem where it exists.

It is clearly the intent of the committee that primary emphasis be given to the extent of the actual or potential air pollution problem in the community or area for which an application for funds is made. The committee recognizes that air pollution is most severe in the areas of concentrated population, where there are large numbers of motor vehicles, and where there is a substantial volume of pollution from industrial buildings, refineries, and other chemical plants, and homes, apartments, and public buildings.

I assure the Senator from New York that it has been the understanding of the committee that this is the area of primary emphasis.

Mr. JAVITS. I am grateful to the Senator from Maine. I believe his statement clarifies the legislative history.

I close my remarks by calling attention to another provision in the bill, which I believe is a very important one for Senators to bear in mind as we move into this new concept in our country. I refer to the provision giving an incen-

tive for interstate cooperation through interstate compacts.

We talk about decentralization. This is the way to do it. I had the honor to sponsor, in connection with the mass transportation bill, a provision enabling States operating under interstate compacts to pool their participation.

The committee has made a valuable contribution by endorsing the use of incentive premiums, increasing the amount of the Federal participation where such pooling under interstate compacts takes place.

I call the attention of Senators to an excellent precedent in terms of the Government techniques which are involved. I congratulate the committee, and I thank the chairman for his cooperation.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I do not want to delay the passage of the bill. I merely wish to express my congratulations and gratitude to the distinguished Senator from Maine for assisting in this matter and accepting these amendments to this very helpful and constructive bill.

Mr. JAVITS. My colleague from New York may not have been in the Chamber at the time, but I made it clear that both of us sponsored these critically important amendments.

Mr. MUSKIE. I thank my friends from New York.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, without delaying the Senate, I also wish to add my voice to the expressions of my colleagues in the Senate in appreciation for the work that has been done by the Senator from Maine. I am in favor of the whole bill. In particular, I am glad that there was included in it a provision I suggested during the consideration of the bill by the subcommittee and the full committee. It deals with the mandatory application of the criteria with respect to various agencies. This provision will be most helpful. I support the whole bill, and I am grateful to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. MUSKIE. The committee drew very heavily on the Senator's own bill in shaping that provision in the bill now before the Senate.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, this body is once again charged with the responsibility of enacting legislation for the improvement of our physical environment in the enhancement of public health and the general welfare.

Recently, under the exceptionally able leadership and floor management of the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], the Senate passed by an overwhelming majority the Water Pollution Control Act of 1963. The same philosophy of Federal responsibility within a framework of Federal, State, and local partnership is implicit in the pending Clean Air Act. I have cosponsored both of these vital bills.

We have long recognized the right of the people of our communities to have pure foods, pure milk, and pure water. And we have increasingly come to recognize the regulative powers of Government to assure those rights. It is now evident that additional governmental action and authority is necessary to assure the right to breathe clear air—the most ubiquitous of the elements of our natural environment.

During our hearings of the Special Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution, conducted under the chairmanship of Senator MUSKIE, it was amply demonstrated that local and State efforts to control air pollution are not keeping pace with the rapid process of industrialization, the increase in our national fuel and energy requirements, and the growing concentration of our population in great metropolitan centers, many of which cross State boundaries. It is in answer to the problems generated by these conditions that the pending measure calls for increased research and training activities, grants for local air pollution control programs and limited Federal authority in the field of abatement. West Virginia has established a State air pollution unit, and we would hope to fit it within the framework of cooperative assistance of this act.

Findings presented to our subcommittee by the Public Health Service indicate that all communities in the United States with populations of more than 50,000 have air pollution problems, as do about 40 percent of the communities in the 2,500 to 50,000 population range.

Yet, only 17 States maintain air pollution programs which require expenditures of more than $5,000 annually, and local agencies in 1961 spent approximately $8.2 million. This is a grossly inadequate effort when compared to the estimated $10 billion in annual property damage wrought by air pollution on farm and flower crops, livestock, soiling and corrosion of buildings and materials, and in the hazards to surface and air transportation.

One cannot, of course, measure in dollar terms the cumulative effect of air pollution in the creation and aggravation of respiratory and bronchial ailments. It has been frequently demonstrated by investigators in the United States and abroad that the frequency of occurrence of such illnesses is higher in areas which have higher air pollution levels.

Mr. President, all the evidence testifies that the pending measure is a necessary and desirable advance in the exercise of Federal responsibility for enhancing the public health and general welfare. I am confident that the Senate will act with dispatch in approving S. 432.

PROGRESS IN AIR POLLUTION CONTROL

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, there is no doubt that a great deal more research needs to be done in the field of air pollution. I am for research; I think it has been valuable, and I hope it is continued.

But I also think there is a great need for action—a need to put into practice the air pollution control methods and devices which research has already provided. The existing air pollution program is fundamentally inadequate, because it provides funds solely for research, and research alone will never clear away the smog.

The Clean Air Act of 1963, which I was pleased to join Senator RIBICOFF in sponsoring, would provide funds to State and local agencies for air pollution control programs, and it seems to me that this is the approach we need if we are going to do the job of eliminating air pollution. I think that the House vote of 272 to 102 in favor of a similar proposal is evidence of concern over the damage to health and property caused by air pollution, and I hope that the Senate will show the same concern by passing S. 432 overwhelmingly.

A New Jersey allergist, Dr. Frank L. Rosen, has made a long study of the effects of air pollution on the human body, and I would like to call the attention of the Senate to some of his observations.

In addition, the September issue of Reader's Digest contains an article which not only lists the dangers of air pollution, but also describes progress that has been made in some areas and could be made in others if public opinion demanded it.

I think an examination of these articles can be of substantial help in clarifying the issues involved in the control of air pollution, and I ask unanimous consent that they be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the Reader's Digest, September 1963]

HOW POLLUTED IS THE AIR AROUND US?

(The stuff we pour into the air we breathe adds up to a major hazard for city dwellers. This hopeful study shows how the problem can be licked.)

(By Wolfgang Langewiesche)

People can have clean air if they demand it. The remedies for air pollution are known; they need only to be applied. Some cities already have applied them: in Pittsburgh, the housewife now washes her curtains twice a year, instead of once a week. St. Louis has abolished its pall of smoke. In London, the big fog of December 1962 killed only 340 people as against 2,000 for a similar fog in 1952. And Los Angeles, despite a spectacular increase in population and industry, is at least holding its own.

But, while the worst places are getting better, good places are getting bad. It's the shadow side of prosperity and progress: more power used; more cars; and even the poor now keep warm. In Paris, days with fog have increased in our lifetime from 90 per year to 150. Metal roofs that used to be good for 20 years now last only 5. Lung cancer is on the increase. In Austria and Italy, the beautiful valleys are filling with smoke. In Rome, the picturesque pines are dying, their needles coated on the underside by an oily deposit that comes from the air.

Everywhere the lungs of city dwellers, which should be pink inside, are black with dirt.

Different cities have different problems because of different climates and different fuels. In Los Angeles, the main problem is automobile exhaust. In London, it's coal smoke. In New York City, it is ash and smoke from burning garbage. Elsewhere it's smoke and dust and smells from steel mills, cement works, powerplants, smelters, oil refineries, papermills, chemical plants.

Though the mixture varies from city to city, the ingredients are always much the same. There are solid particles—many of them too small to be seen; bits of metal, bits of stone, bits of carbon and ash. There are droplets of oily and tarry matter. They float in the air almost as a gas; or slowly fall out, coating windshields, vegetation—everything. And there are gases, some of them visible or smelly, others not noticeable. Some of these things are poisonous; others are merely dirty. Some attack stones and metal. Some are known cancer agents. Some react chemically with others to form new poisons: stuff that kills vegetation, cracks rubber or attacks ladies' stockings. And all of this dirt is put into the air by nobody else but us.

Most of this dirt can be stopped at the source.

Industrial air pollution can be stopped by fitting the right kind of device. For instance, the electrostatic precipitator. It works by electromagnetic attraction—the way, in school, a glass rod rubbed with silk picks up bits of paper. Mounted in a factory chimney, the precipitator picks the soot and fly-ash out of the smoke. Other devices mix the escaping gases with water in a whirling cyclone, or run them through filterbags like those of a vacuum cleaner, or expose them to chemicals which capture the noisome vapors. Any industrial operation can be made virtually smokeless, odorless and dustfree. All it takes is money—a lot of money.

Small household fires are harder to clean up. The open fireplace, which still heats most homes in England, is responsible for most of the smoke problems of the world's coal-burningest country.

To clean up home fires in England, the Clean Air Act of 1956 empowered local governments to set up smoke-control areas. These are parts of town in which, quite simply, smoke must not be seen to come from chimneys. But you are excused if you burn coke or "smokeless" coal. To burn these, you may need a more elaborate grate or an enclosed stove; or else you can change to gas or electric heat. The cost of the conversion is borne 30 percent by the householder, 30 percent by the local government, 40 percent by the National Government. Progress is slow—but measurable. In London's West End the air now contains, on the average, one-third fewer soot and ash particles than 10 years ago.

St. Louis cleaned up using a similar method, right after the war, by passing an ordinance requiring that only smokeless coal could be fired by hand; the smoky coal may be used only with mechanical stokers. Smoke and soot are a sign of incomplete combustion—too little air. With enough air and a hot-enough fire, smoke will burn, but it takes the forced-draft, elaborate furnaces of industry to do it. Coal was classified; coal dealers were licensed and forbidden to sell the wrong kind. Inspectors, instead of policing and annoying everybody, policed the dealers' delivery books. It has worked like magic.

But visible smoke is only part of the problem. When you burn coal, or coke, or heavy fuel oil, you liberate an invisible gas—sulfur dioxide. This gas comes out of the most scientific industrial plant just as it does out of sooty household fires.

This sulfur gas makes building stones crumble and eats into metals. What it does to our lungs we don't know. Where it can clinge to floating bits of ash and soot, it often changes into a chemically even more aggresive form, sulfur trioxide, which penetrates deeply into the lungs. There's now a German and an American process being developed that takes the sulfur out of the flue gases of big powerplants. Both, however, will be expensive, maybe too expensive.

Los Angeles now forbids the burning of sulfurous fuel oils during the 7 months of the smog season. Industry then shifts to natural gas. Los Angeles is lucky, as are other U.S. cities, in that it has plenty of cheap natural gas, and the smog season is in summer, when gas is not needed for house heating. Europe has more difficulty. It has not yet found many deposits of natural gas, and the smog season is in winter.

The British will soon bring natural gas from the Sahara by ship. The French are the first Europeans to store gas in porous rock layers underground, creating artificial gas wells. The use of natural gas wherever it can replace coal or other fuels may help clean Europe's air.

But now, the automobile. The bulk of automobile exhaust is carbon dioxide and water vapor—both of them harmless. Mixed in with this is carbon monoxide, a deadly poison; benzpyrene, a cancer agent; all sorts of other fumes produced by incomplete combustion of the gasoline. Add fumes from hot and half-burned oil, and a sloppage of raw gasoline. All this we breathe as we drive in each other's wake.

There's worse to come. It is what happens to automobile exhaust after it has blown away with the wind, and we've forgotten about it. At first it is invisible and unsmellable. Then, in the next few hours, under the influence of sunlight a lot of chemical reactions take place between the oxygen and water vapor of the air, the half-burned gasoline vapors, and similar pollutants from other sources. Entirely new substances form, both gases and submicroscopic droplets, with chemical names and chemical smells. And that is the famous smog of Los Angeles. Photochemical smog is the accurate name for it.

This stuff is bad in an entirely new way. It sickens trees and damages commercial crops. It irritates noses and lungs, makes eyes smart, cracks rubber tires. It cuts down visibility and spoils what once was a paradise on earth. It is a specialty of southern California because that region has so much sunshine, and a car for just about every adult. But you see photochemical smog now also in New York, Rome, Paris, even in Honolulu. It has damaged growing tobacco in Connecticut, vegetables in Maryland. All it takes is a windless day, a lot of traffic, and sunshine.

California is trying to starve the smog of its raw material by stopping the flow of unburned and incompletely burned gasoline vapors into the air. Automobile exhaust can be cleaned up with ease—in the laboratory. You simply run the exhaust gas through an afterburner, a chamber where the unburned or half-burned portions of it are burned up. The problem is how to build the same idea into a practical accessory that will do it on an automobile—one that costs no more than, say, $100, lasts at least 10,000 miles, and works under all driving conditions.

So determined are Californians to clean up their air that they have done a novel thing in lawmaking: a law in full force now requires afterburners on all new cars sold in California—starting a year after a special board will have certified at least two such devices as practical.

Another California law is already having effect. The smogmaking fumes an automobile spews out come not only from the exhaust pipe, but also from the crankcase breather tube, hidden under the hood. Beginning this year, new cars sold in California must have this vent connected to the air intake of the engine, so that the engine will suck these fumes back into itself and burn them up. In response to this California law, all American cars, for all markets, now how this arrangement. Many European makes have long had it.

It takes not only smoke to make a smog, but also a special weather setup. The air is clear on days when upward currents can carry the smoke away to high levels, and thin it out in the vast air ocean. The air gets thick on days when these upward currents are not working. What stops them? Normally the air aloft is colder than the air near the ground. Sometimes this normal condition is reversed, and a layer of warmer air lies aloft, on top of cooler air. Such an "inversion" acts as a lid. A batch of smoke rising from a chimney, for instance, the moment it rises into a warm-air layer finds itself cool by comparison, has no lift, and cannot rise farther. All the smoke gets trapped below the inversion.

The most dramatic of all air-pollution problems, the classic London fog, is caused by a strong inversion which forms very low—only 300 or 400 feet above the ground. Below this lid, the smoke of millions of coal-burning fireplaces is trapped and can not get out. The inversion usually lasts several days. Visibility goes down to 5 yards, officially; unofficially, you cannot see your own feet. The beastly stuff is a dirty yellow. Being not fog but almost solid coal smoke, it comes into the houses and does not dissolve, as real fog would.

The inversion that brings on Los Angeles smog is much higher—about 2,500 to 4,000 feet. It leaves much more room for smoke to dissipate. But it is persistent. Elsewhere in the world, an inversion lasts a few days, then is blown away. The Southern California inversion can be there day and night all summer long.

Since inversions cause smog, could we blow them away? Could we somehow heat dirty air so it will balloon away? It would take too much energy—megatons of heat every hour. The same goes for "smoke sewers" which would collect smoke and lead it to a superchimney high on a mountain: they would cost too much. Maybe someday we can spray chemicals from high-flying airplanes to clean the air.

But, for the present, the only known way to clean up our air is to put less smoke into it, and this needs the compulsion of law.

It's much like taxes: nobody wants to do his share if he can't be sure that everybody else will pay up, too. Smog control is expensive. A catalytic cracking unit in a refinery may cost $7 million; smog-control equipment for it costs $3 million. An open-hearth furnace in a steel plant may cost $200,000; smoke control costs another $150,000. A little drycleaning shop may need a $3,000 carbon filter. It is difficult for a business to go voluntarily to such expense.

Industry, therefore, generally fights back: First against smoke-control legislation in general, then against its detailed provisions, then against their enforcement. The arguments are always the same: "You'll drive jobs out of town." "It will price our product out of the market." "The stuff may stink, but you can't prove that it is a menace to health." "We have been making smoke here for 50 years. Why are we suddenly the villain?" None of these arguments is phony; some make good points.

Just the same, where public opinion is determined, smog control wins. The fact is that industry does not fight back very hard. Often a company is quite willing to be compelled, provided only that its competitors are forced to go to the same expense. In the last analysis, if industrial costs rise across the board, the bill is paid by the public. And the rewards are very great: Apart from

health angles there's the effect on real estate values, the savings in cleaning bills, the reduction in airline delays, and the overall effect on the community.

The world's most smog-controlled city is Los Angeles. Not only is there that seasonal prohibition of sulfurous fuels, but every other source of pollution is covered, too. In Los Angeles you can't burn refuse; you can't let raw gasoline vapors escape from storage tanks; you can't run a dry-cleaning shop, printing press, restaurant kitchen, dog-food factory, coffee roasting plant without a vapor filter. You can't even make dust. Before a contractor starts an earth-moving job, he has to soak the ground deeply with water.

Industry has greatly cleaned up, at enormous cost. The refineries are almost odorless and smokeless. The Kaiser steel mill at Fontana is a good example of virtually smokeless steel making; it looks dead by contrast to the spectacular belchings of, say, South Chicago. The great remaining dirt source is the automobile, and the law about that is already in force.

All this may sound a little ridiculous, since Los Angeles is still so much troubled. But with its difficult climate and its enormous growth, Los Angeles would by now have disaster days if Californians acted as most other people act. If Los Angeles can hold its own, other cities can have their air crystal-clear.

A hundred years ago the civilized world made a great effort to get clean drinking water. At the time, this seemed unnecessary to some, impossible to others; but it was done. Now the world wants clean air.

---

[From Consumer Bulletin, September 1963]

THE ROLE OF THE ALLERGIST IN THE BATTLE AGAINST AIR POLLUTION

(By Frank L. Rosen, M. D.)

In many respects we are the cleanest people in the world. Our teeth glisten and gleam. We bathe often with the finest soaps, use millions of dollars worth of deodorants lest our perspiration offend—yet the air we breathe is dirty. And in this dirt there is danger.

Air pollution, a major peril to all of us, is a far greater menace to our allergic patients. They also are more susceptible to variations in weather, and changing weather factors themselves may induce asthma without the existence of any air pollution problem. When a combination of both factors occurs, then allergic patients are hit much harder than the general population.

Epidemics of air pollution with resultant bronchial asthma, bronchitis, and other respiratory and cardiac aggravations have been described in medical literature and received wide coverage by the lay press. I reported one such incident in New Jersey which occurred in November 1953. The individual patient, however, who gets asthma, bronchitis, running nose, burning of the eyes, etc., from polluted air, has received remarkably little attention. In his search for the cause of these symptoms, rarely does the general physician or even the allergist consider air pollution as a cause.

The menace of air pollution is great. Yet, strangely enough, most people consider it no more than a minor annoyance, like an unusual, irritating odor or a larger laundry bill, although it causes losses in the United States estimated at $1.5 to $11 billion a year. We are more disturbed by local sewage problems, and certainly by the more dramatic but less universally encountered problem of cancer related to smoking.

AIR POLLUTION MORE IMPORTANT THAN SMOKING?

Benzpyrene is a leading chemical substance that is blamed as a cause of lung cancer. "It was estimated that the average quantities of benzpyrene inhaled by persons exposed for a year ranged from 0.1 microgram in a State forest to 150 micrograms in one of the cities. By comparison, it was estimated (in a U.S. Public Health Service publication) that a person smoking one pack of cigarettes daily for a year, might be exposed to 60 micrograms. Thus, a person breathing the air of some cities over a year's time might inhale as much benzpyrene as from smoking two packs of cigarettes daily." Hoffman and Wynder of the Sloan-Kettering Institute for Cancer Research have reported finding that gasoline engine exhaust gas condensate contains agents that promote tumors on mouse skin. Its tumor activity was compared to that of corresponding concentrates of cigarette smoke condensate. It was found that the tumor potency was about two times higher for the exhaust tar than for the cigarette smoke condensate.

Thus one can see that air pollution is just as important, if not more so, than cigarette smoking in the causation of lung cancer. Unfortunately, one can give up smoking but one cannot give up breathing polluted air.

AIR POLLUTION FROM MOTOR VEHICLES

A 40-year-old woman moved to a new home within a block of a heavily traveled highway. Her asthma attacks increased in both frequency and severity and were relieved only when she moved to a new area.

A 40-year-old man gets asthma attacks chiefly on his way to work and coming home from work, while he is in heavy traffic surrounded by noxious fumes. This is such a widespread occurrence that it is essential that our cars be equipped to make exhaust products innocuous or nearly so, regardless of cost. During New York City's unprecedented ban on nonessential vehicles during the February 1961 blizzard, air pollution dropped dramatically, by 66 percent.

AIR POLLUTION FROM INDUSTRIAL FACTORS

I have several patients who get asthma attacks on days when the wind blows a pollutant from a nearby factory. I also have a patient who gets asthma only on days when a neighboring chemical plant makes penicillin. The meteorologist at a nearby airport informed me that many people who work there have nasal and bronchial symptoms when pollutants are blown in from local industrial areas by the winds. A new offender at large airports is the jet plane. The takeoff of one commercial jetliner has been estimated to create a quantity of air pollution equivalent to that produced by 6,850 passenger cars.

In industrial medicine we see patients whose asthma attacks have been precipitated by minute concentrations of chemicals in the factory air. These triggered attacks often persist for years, causing untold headaches for the courts in compensation cases.

AIR POLLUTION FROM SPRAY AND INSECTICIDES

Rachel Carson, in her recent bestselling book, "Silent Spring," dramatically portrays the universally harmful effects of insecticides and sprays. The allergic patient suffers to a far greater extent not only from the toxicity but from sensitization reactions.

Recently, I saw a 9-year-old boy who would come home with asthma after attending day camp. At first I thought it was due to exertion or exposure to pollens and molds in the fields. I later found that these factors were not the cause, but that he had been exposed to spray in the area. It seems that many day camps spray the grounds daily with insecticides before camp starts, and sufficient time was not allowed for complete dispersion of the vapor.

AIR POLLUTION FROM LEAF BURNING

In October, in the suburbs, leaf burning becomes a menace for patients with allergic respiratory disease. In New Jersey, the Air Pollution Control Code states:

"Prohibition of air pollution: No person shall cause, suffer, allow or permit to be emitted into the outdoor atmosphere substances in quantities which shall result in air pollution."

Note well, however, that "open burning of plant life grown on the premises is not intended to be covered by this code." In other words, you may burn your own leaves in your own backyard, even if your neighbor gets an asthma attack from the smoke. Many towns have passed local ordinances prohibiting the burning of leaves because of a fire or pollution hazard. Other towns have passed laws that such burning may be stopped if it is a nuisance to a neighbor. Certain towns in New Jersey, like many others elsewhere, do nothing, because they say, "We cannot afford the cartage and many people will not use the leaves for compost."

The allergist must take the lead in warning the health officers, the physicians, and the public as to the dangers that leaf burning adds to the air pollution problem.

AIR POLLUTION FROM RAGWEED POLLEN

Unfortunately, a patient may listen to the pollen count on the radio, read it in the newspapers and, if it is high, his symptoms are increased by the power of suggestion. Often these pollen counts are taken many miles from his environment, and have little relationship to the count in his immediate area. It is the pollen that is in his own environment that is important.

I have a large framed picture of a ragweed plant in my examining room. Not long ago, I saw a 30-year-old woman with severe hay fever symptoms who looked at the picture and asked, "Is this ragweed? Does this cause my hay fever? It's growing very high right outside my bedroom window. It even comes into the bedroom." She was getting a pollen count of thousands when the reported count was ten. Her symptoms cleared dramatically when her husband cleared up the backyard.

Meteorologic factors are just as pertinent as the amount of pollen produced. The pollen is borne on the wind, and its direction is of primary importance. For example, hay fever patients who live in shore areas do well on days with an ocean breeze, but with a land breeze their symptoms are similar to those of their inland brothers in distress. Pollen can blow into a community from 100 miles distant. So local laws, even if they are strictly enforced, do comparatively little to cut down the amount of pollen in the air.

WHAT CAN ALLERGISTS ACTUALLY DO ABOUT AIR POLLUTION?

We can think about air pollution as a cause of symptoms of many of our patients. I am convinced, after being in the practice of allergy for 25 years, that many asthmatics are wrongly labeled psychosomatic, when their trouble is actually coming from polluted air. Studies are now going on in Los Angeles, New Orleans, Nashville, and other cities to determine the effect of air pollution on bronchial asthma. Far more work of this nature is needed.

The U.S. Public Health Service, the State, city, and county health departments are eager to cooperate with us, but allergists must be the ones to inform them of the particular problems of the allergic patient. We must initiate interdisciplinary conferences where we can exchange information with health officers, engineers, botanists, etc. After all, our patients are more susceptible than anyone else to air pollution factors, and

the more we learn about this subject the more we can do to make their environment—and that of all the rest of us—a healthier and more pleasant place to live in.

We have taken great strides in other fields of preventive medicine, but we are only beginning to grapple with the vital problem of air pollution. The air is a giant open sewer, and since we have no choice but to breathe it, it is high time we paid some attention to the garbage we spew into it.

ADDITIONAL POINTS FROM DR. ROSEN'S ATLANTIC CITY PAPER, READ BEFORE A SESSION OF THE AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION

Medical evidence has been piling up in the past few years that air pollution is deadly—it can kill you quickly, as it did 4,000 in London in 1 week in December 1952, or 400 in a week in December 1962. It can kill you slowly with an earlier death from prolonged chronic illness like lung cancer, bronchial asthma, chronic bronchitis or emphysema.

THE MOTOR VEHICLE AND AIR POLLUTION

Motor vehicles cause 60 to 80 percent of the pollution problem in cities. "I thought they had something to put on a car now so that it's harmless," is a remark I hear frequently. The comment refers to the crankcase ventilating device (blowby). It seems to me that the public is being lulled into a false sense of security with this mechanism.

So far as I know, no practical solution has yet been achieved for the tail pipe exhaust, which is responsible for at least 70 percent of the air pollution from motor vehicles.

LEAF BURNING

"Last year at least one and possibly two deaths were reported in local papers of asthmatic children who died after inhaling the smoke of burning leaves," says a Long Island, N.Y., physician.

THE RAGWEED PROBLEM

In a letter to the New York Times, dated August 2, 1959, Dr. Louis Mamelok stated, "Many years ago, after the first frost, when hay fever sufferers (in New York City) stopped sneezing, their symptoms returned. The cause was a windstorm from Louisiana, bringing ragweed pollen from an area where frost had not appeared yet."

A booklet on hay fever revised by the Allergy Foundation of America in August 1962, states, "The seed of ragweed may lie dormant in the soil for 20 years, so that weed eradication must be continued for many successive seasons."

The Air Pollution Code of my own State, New Jersey (January 1962), certainly gives authority for eradication of ragweed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendments to be offered, the Chair places before the Senate the House bill, which will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 6518) to improve, strengthen, and accelerate programs for the prevention and abatement of air pollution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the House bill?

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

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I move to strike out all after the enacting clause in the House bill, and insert in lieu thereof the text of S. 432, as amended.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

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

The bill (H.R. 6518) was read the third time and passed.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senate bill, S. 432, is indefinitely postponed.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendment and request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Maine.

The motion was agreed to; and the Chair appointed Mr. MUSKIE, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. MOSS, Mr. METCALF, Mr. BOGGS, and Mr. PEARSON conferees on the part of the Senate.

## ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is my intention to call up another bill, on which I understand the debate will not take too much time. Before I do so, I would be derelict in my duties and responsibilities if I did not commend the distinguished junior Senator from Maine. In this session he has reported to the Senate two extremely worthwhile bills, among others, one having to do with water pollution, and, today, the bill having to do with air pollution. He is to be commended for the initiative and consideration he has shown with respect to these two most difficult problems. The same goes for the distinguished ranking minority member of the subcommittee, the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS].

All members of the subcommittee and of the Committee on Public Works, which reported the bill to the Senate, are entitled to the thanks of the Senate and the country. A special vote of thanks should go to the distinguished Presiding Officer, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], who, as Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare did so much to get these programs started, and deserves great credit.

## AMENDMENT OF HOUSING ACT OF 1954

Mr. MANSFIELD. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 622, Senate Joint Resolution 129.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 129) to amend section 702 of the Housing Act of 1954 to increase the amount available to the Housing and Home Finance Administrator for advances for planned public works.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

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

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I wish to take a very brief period of time to give a short explanation of the bill.

The bill seeks to amend, by additional authorization, section 702 of the Housing Act of 1954. This section, providing for advances for public works planning, was written into law in 1954. The first appropriation was made the following year, and appropriations have been made each year since that time. The total authorization to date has been $58 million. All of that amount has been appropriated except $2 million, and that $2 million is carried in the current independent offices appropriation bill as it passed the House.

The Committee on Banking and Currency recommended that the authorization be increased by an additional $10 million. The administration had requested $18 million, but the committee recommended $10 million. The purpose of the bill is to authorize the appropriation of the additional $10 million.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I oppose the passage of Senate Joint Resolution 129. The Community Facilities Administration advances for public works planning program is becoming one of the most popular of Federal programs—and well it should.

Under the advances for public works planing program, Community Facilities Administration provides interest-free loans—interest-free planning money—for public works projects. Practically every non-Federal public agency is eligible to borrow the money. Repayment to Community Facilities Administration is not necessary if the project work does not go into construction. If the borrowing public agency decides to construct only a portion of the project, only that corresponding portion of the advanced planning cost must be repaid to Community Facilities Administration. So there are three repayment practices in effect:

First, the money does not have to be paid back at all.

Second, only a part of it has to be paid back.

Third, the money that is paid back is interest free—that is, interest free to the borrowing agency, not to the Federal Government.

Also, do not forget the grand prize if the project is lucky enough to be the recipient of an accelerated public works program grant. In this case, the entire project can be constructed at Federal Government expense.

All kinds of planned projects are available for these interest-free advances, even recreation facilities. I hope Community Facilities Administration does not begin to compete with other Government agencies and go into the bowling alley and ski-lift businesses.

The financing for the advances for public works planning program is provided from a revolving fund. The interest-free advances that are repaid are returned to the revolving fund and spent

again. However, the revolving fund has not been revolving fast enough. It is impossible for it to do so when money is offered free to communities large and small, urban and rural, throughout the country.

Senate Joint Resolution 129 provides for an increase of $10 million authorization for the advances for public works planning program. Community Facilities Administration requested $18 million for this fiscal year. It supported the request by facts and figures. At present there is a backlog of applications for the free money in the amount of $16.5 million. Community Facilities Administration would like to process those applications immediately, I suppose, so that another $16.5 million in applications, or $20 or $30 million, can be accepted and processed next year. I am not pulling these latter figures out of the air. The budget program level for Community Facilities Administration for fiscal 1964 is $25 million.

Thus, the following situation exists: HHFA offices throughout the country and CFA fieldmen stand ready and willing to accept applications for free money from communities throughout their area. The applications are accepted; but alas, there is no money. So what does the community do? It gets up in arms. It wants to know why its application does not get the community the free money, as it did for its neighbors. CFA has the answers. One can imagine what is said: "There is no money, but when Congress authorizes and appropriates some, you will get yours."

Then the mail becomes heavy: "Our applications for free money have been accepted," the local communities say, "so please vote for more money for the whole program so that we can get ours."

I am not being critical of CFA's personnel or its office operation. Every question I have asked of CFA has been answered in a thorough, detailed, and apparently conscientious manner. They have always been most cooperative. I am worried about how far the advances for public works planning program could conceivably go. I am worried about its inherent tendency to stifle and discourage local public initiative—the initiative of communities to make their own plans and to solve their own problems.

It seems to me that this is one more instance of the Federal Government, by a calculated effort, reducing communities to the status of dependency on the Federal Government to the extent that their sense of individual, local initiative and responsibility is being destroyed. It is my fervent hope that this measure will be defeated.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. TOWER. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, many of the views expressed by the Senator from Texas are shared not only by me, but by many other people throughout the country as well. As a result, I have been examining into the program as presented to see if any of its phases might be changed or corrected, or any of its problems solved. I have not been able to ascertain how this money can be kept in the advance planning stage and at the same time be free if it is not used. If it is to be used for advanced planning, presumably the money will be needed. If it does not come through in the form of construction, there is very little that can be done to have it paid back. Otherwise, presumably, application would not have been made for the money from CFA.

It seems to me that a perfect opportunity is afforded to put more sense into the Government loan program, regardless of the type of program. So I have prepared an amendment which would provide that any loan which is made to a local community, and which then goes through the construction process and is repaid, must bear interest from the time of the advance at the cost of the money to the Government. This would solve one problem.

What would the distinguished Senator from Texas, who has been so kind as to yield to me temporarily, think of that type of approach?

Mr. TOWER. The Senator from Colorado has suggested an eminently reasonable and sound approach.

Mr. DOMINICK. I thank the Senator from Texas. At this point, if the Senator from Texas has finished, I should like to obtain the floor in my own right, so that I may offer an amendment.

Mr. TOWER. I yield the floor.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

At the end of the joint resolution, insert a new section, as follows:

"SEC. 2. Section 702(c) of the Housing Act of 1954 is amended to read as follows:

"'(c) Advances under this section to any public agency shall be repaid by such agency when the construction of the public works is undertaken or started: *Provided*, That if the public agency undertakes to construct only a portion of a planned public work it shall repay such proportionate amount of the advances relating to the public work as the Administrator determines to be equitable. Any advance or part thereof required to be repaid shall bear interest from the date the advance was made to the date construction is undertaken or started at a rate determined by the Administrator which shall be not more than the higher of (1) 3 per centum per annum, or (2) the total of one-half of 1 per centum per annum added to the higher of 2½ per centum or the average annual interest rate on all interest-bearing obligations of the United States then forming a part of the public debt as computed at the end of the fiscal year next preceding the date of the making of the advance: *Provided, however*, That, in the event repayment is not made promptly, the unpaid sum shall bear interest at the rate of 6 per centum per annum from the date of the Government's demand for repayment to the date of payment thereof by the public agency'."

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, this amendment would really make only two changes in existing law. The first change provides that any advance funds to be repaid under existing law shall bear interest at the average interest rate charged by the Government or that is charged to the Government now for bonds sold for a maturity period of 10 years.

The other change is in the penalty rate which was established in cases in which repayments were not made promptly. It was 4 percent previously, and I propose to change the rate from 4 to 6 percent. The reason for the change upward is that interest payment—this is on advances that are required to be repaid at the present maturity—will be in the neighborhood of 4 percent. It seemed to me that the penalty rate for not paying when payment was due should at least be higher than the interest rate. That is the real reason for this proposed change.

There are certain factors that should be explained. Out of a total of $58 million that has been appropriated for the advance planning program, $52.6 million has been disbursed, according to the schedule on page 6 of the report, as of July 31, 1963. Advances repaid have amounted to $22.3 million. Not a single one of those advances has borne any interest.

It does not seem to me that at a time when the Government is having constant and recurring deficits and when the Secretary of the Treasury said no later than yesterday that the national debt limit might easily have to be raised to $330 billion in 1966, we should continue going ahead with a spending program without even requiring the recipients of the so-called benefits of the Federal spending to repay the cost to the general taxpayers of the money advanced—because the general taxpayers pay that cost to the Government; on any occasion when Government money is loaned, the general taxpayers are actually lending it to the community involved, which is getting the benefit of the money, and should pay the cost of the money to the general taxpayers.

That is what I am trying to provide for—plus a charge of the usual one-half of 1 percent for administrative costs, as recommended by the Bureau of the Budget, in order to pay for the administrative costs.

I hope the distinguished Senator from Alabama will be willing to accept the amendment.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RIBICOFF in the chair). Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. DOMINICK. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Will the Senator from Colorado modify his amendment so as to make it comply with the existing law in regard to public facility loans? There is very little difference in the interest rate—probably less than one-eighth of 1 percent, I believe. I refer to the rate called for by section 203 of the housing amendments of 1955. In other words, this formula is already set out in the law.

If the Senator from Colorado wishes me to do so, I shall read a part of that act. The formula for interest charges may be found in two places. First let me read the requirements by the HHFA

Administrator on interest payments to the Treasurer:

Such notes or other obligations shall bear interest at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury which shall be not more than the higher of (1) 2½ per centum per annum, or (2) the average annual interest rate on all interest-bearing obligations of the United States then forming a part of the public debt as computed at the end of the fiscal year next preceding the issuance by the Administrator and adjusted to the nearest one-eighth of 1 per centum.

Now let me read the formula for interest charges made by the Administrator to the community:

The interest rate shall be not more than the higher of (A) 3 per centum per annum or (B) the total of 1 per centum per annum added to the rate of interest paid by the Administrator on funds obtained from the Secretary of the Treasury.

It makes a difference of approximately one-eighth of 1 percent in the interest rate. That formula is already in the law which relates to public facilities. After all, that is the formula the communities are accustomed to. The interest formula for college housing loans is based on the same concept.

So if the Senator from Colorado will consent to that modification of his amendment, I shall certainly have no reluctance whatsoever in accepting his amendment as thus modified.

Mr. DOMINICK. First, let me say to the distinguished Senator from Alabama that, personally, I am not in favor of the formula now used in connection with college housing and now in the Communities Facilities Construction Act, for the reason that it does not return to the Treasury the cost of the money to the general public, when the money is borrowed in order to provide funds for communities which will use them. I believe that both in connection with this bill and in connection with other bills which include lending-rate formulas, the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] objected to some of the provisions in regard to computation of the interest rate, and suggested that we should use the formula proposed in my amendment. This is one reason why I wish to have provision made for a formula which will establish a pattern to be followed throughout the lending operations of the Government, and thus will pay back to the Government at least the cost to it—which is all I am requesting; I am not proposing that the Federal Government make a profit from these transactions.

Mr. SPARKMAN. But I believe the formula now in the law does that. In connection with loans to communities one-half of 1 percent is added to the rate charged by the Treasurer. I read the formula by means of which the Secretary of the Treasury makes the money available to the agency. The agency in turn charges an additional one-half of 1 percent. That provision is found in the preceding subsection. The actual cost to the community under the formula provided at the present time would thus be 3⅞ percent.

I understand that the formula the Senator from Colorado proposes probably would be 4 percent or probably a little less than 4 percent. So there is very little difference between the two; and the formula provided by existing law does pay to the Treasury the cost of the money loaned. In fact, the Government makes a little profit from the transactions, and this formula is already being used. So I wish the Senator from Colorado would accept this modification of his amendment.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I wonder whether at this time I may suggest the absence of a quorum, without losing my right to the floor.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Colorado may be allowed to suggest the absence of a quorum, without losing his right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOMINICK. Then, Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I have suggested to the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK] that if he would modify his amendment in accordance with the present formula, I would be willing to accept it. It is my understanding that he is willing to do that, and I send it to the desk and ask to have it stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment, as modified, will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the end of the joint resolution it is proposed to insert a new section as follows:

SEC. 2. Section 702(c) of the Housing Act of 1954 is amended to read as follows:

"(c) Advances under this section to any public agency shall be repaid by such agency when the construction of the public works is undertaken or started: *Provided*, That if the public agency undertakes to construct only a portion of a planned public work it shall repay such proportionate amount of the advances relating to the public work as the Administrator determines to be equitable. Any advance or part thereof required to be repaid shall bear interest from the date the advance was made to the date construction is undertaken or started at a rate determined by the Administrator which shall be not more than the higher of (1) 3 per centum per annum, or (2) the total of one-half of 1 per centum per annum added to the higher of 2½ per centum or the average annual interest rate on all interest-bearing obligations of the United States then forming a part of the public debt as computed at the end of the fiscal year next preceding the date of the making of the advance: *Provided, however*, That, in the event repayment is not made promptly, the unpaid sum shall bear interest at the rate of 6 per centum per annum from the date of the Government's demand for repayment to the date of payment thereof by the public agency."

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I accept the modification.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Colorado, as modified.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Colorado for proposing what I consider to be a vast improvement on the measure. He has, I believe, improved it considerably and made it far more acceptable.

However, this does not obviate my opposition to the measure. The fact still remains that the advances for public works planning programs proffer free money, in many instances, which does not have to be repaid. I believe that sometimes encourages planning on the part of a community under Federal auspices, rather than a community taking its own initiative and financing its own program.

I still believe it has the objection of rendering communities too dependent on the Federal Government. I shall therefore vote against the measure, even though I wholeheartedly support the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK].

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I can well appreciate the reservations that the Senator from Texas has, and I share a great many of them. I also have been active in my own local community. I have served in several different capacities, in the process of trying to plan what the community developments will be for community facilities of all kinds.

There are many areas, even in my own State, where it becomes difficult to find the necessary funds unless a program of the kind proposed is available.

I am not so sure this is the only program that should be available, or that it is the best program; but it is the only one we have at the moment. I am perfectly willing, with this amendment, to support the program for this year until something better can be devised.

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

Mr. DOMINICK. I am glad to yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I share the feelings expressed by the Senator from Colorado. It is the smaller communities that are able to avail themselves of this program, and therefore to plan and put into effect badly needed community programs.

I am indebted to both the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK] for their cooperation. I fully understand the viewpoint of the Senator from Texas. I believe that as he examines the record of what has been accomplished, and as he visits around in his own State, he will see how much good has been done by this program.

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

Mr. DOMINICK. I am glad to yield.

Mr. TOWER. I am well aware that there are about 30 applications pending from my State at the present time, but the program is not necessarily good merely because some communities would benefit from it.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I did not intend it that way.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD tables

showing how this program has been carried out. The first table shows the advances made under the program by States and the second shows lists of cities in my State of Alabama which have participated under the program.

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

TABLE VI-7.—*Net advances for public works planning approved by States during calendar year 1962 and cumulative through Dec. 31, 1962*

| State | January through December 1962 | | Cumulative through Dec. 31, 1962 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Number of projects | Amount | Number of projects | Amount |
| Alabama | 10 | $412,735 | 39 | $1,750,519.00 |
| Alaska | 13 | 428,306 | 46 | 1,319,468.25 |
| Arizona | 4 | 52,888 | 50 | 735,594.57 |
| Arkansas | 19 | 151,337 | 40 | 238,782.90 |
| California | 43 | 890,062 | 322 | 6,423,492.40 |
| Colorado | 7 | 48,511 | 33 | 1,168,551.79 |
| Connecticut | 11 | 267,864 | 41 | 1,696,730.34 |
| Delaware | | | 1 | 14,206.87 |
| District of Columbia | | | 1 | 27,500.00 |
| Florida | 10 | 142,100 | 66 | 1,327,523.16 |
| Georgia | 8 | 232,132 | 29 | 587,393.08 |
| Hawaii | 2 | 78,125 | 5 | 106,831.40 |
| Idaho | 5 | 75,880 | 22 | 174,709.84 |
| Illinois | 18 | 121,076 | 97 | 2,732,873.00 |
| Indiana | 1 | 3,000 | 10 | 384,161.25 |
| Iowa | 5 | 60,685 | 25 | 256,383.50 |
| Kansas | 22 | 147,585 | 72 | 482,607.61 |
| Kentucky | 6 | 33,400 | 27 | 513,265.85 |
| Louisiana | 31 | 472,048 | 118 | 2,432,006.98 |
| Maine | 20 | 284,450 | 40 | 473,441.65 |
| Maryland | 5 | 86,278 | 26 | 939,437.00 |
| Massachusetts | 18 | 261,052 | 95 | 2,296,472.19 |
| Michigan | 9 | 173,937 | 34 | 1,239,339.31 |
| Minnesota | 5 | 134,200 | 28 | 374,340.64 |
| Mississippi | 13 | 122,510 | 37 | 534,973.64 |
| Missouri | 11 | 174,248 | 26 | 708,967.51 |
| Montana | 17 | 151,888 | 141 | 1,388,684.67 |
| Nebraska | | | 2 | 32,519.60 |
| Nevada | 2 | 52,335 | 11 | 120,193.13 |
| New Hampshire | 10 | 90,000 | 43 | 732,713.02 |
| New Jersey | 33 | 1,883,183 | 111 | 5,402,766.08 |
| New Mexico | 1 | 10,000 | 3 | 13,000.00 |
| New York | 20 | 598,119 | 94 | 2,690,044.66 |
| North Carolina | 9 | 66,535 | 31 | 345,751.07 |
| North Dakota | | | | |
| Ohio | 3 | 185,713 | 51 | 1,969,067.61 |
| Oklahoma | 1 | 2,213 | 4 | 212,332.00 |
| Oregon | 35 | 557,360 | 106 | 1,443,358.24 |
| Pennsylvania | 64 | 1,806,605 | 218 | 6,673,454.87 |
| Rhode Island | 2 | 42,300 | 9 | 376,564.42 |
| South Carolina | 1 | 63,213 | 12 | 344,288.88 |
| South Dakota | | | 3 | 58,250.00 |
| Tennessee | 6 | 97,162 | 23 | 356,777.00 |
| Texas | 19 | 308,894 | 81 | 1,770,058.79 |
| Utah | 5 | 72,460 | 19 | 194,120.00 |
| Vermont | 11 | 454,428 | 76 | 1,325,550.83 |
| Virginia | 3 | 56,800 | 29 | 436,185.16 |
| Washington | 32 | 1,440,272 | 135 | 6,350,816.96 |
| West Virginia | 15 | 390,117 | 44 | 934,435.63 |
| Wisconsin | 1 | 9,000 | 12 | 227,650.45 |
| Wyoming | | | 8 | 74,950.00 |
| Puerto Rico | 9 | 1,057,690 | 9 | 1,057,690.00 |
| Virgin Islands | | | | |
| Total (net approvals) | 595 | 14,250,696 | 2,605 | 63,470,796.80 |

Source: 16th Annual Report of Housing and Home Finance Agency.

*Program of advances for public works planning, State of Alabama*

| Location | Type | Project No. | Advance |
|---|---|---|---|
| APPROVED PROJECTS—ACTIVE | | | |
| Abbeville | Sewer | 3076 | $3,125 |
| Arab | do | 3070 | 22,228 |
| Auburn (Auburn University) | Educational | 3035 | 16,065 |
| Bayou LaBatre | Sewer | 3036 | 6,336 |
| Birmingham | do | 3018 | 131,426 |
| Do | Roads | 3044 | 260,000 |
| Collinsville | Sewer | 3050 | 2,500 |
| Cottonwood | do | 3063 | 1,500 |
| Cullman | Water | 3074 | 10,000 |
| Dothan | Airport | 3060 | 21,250 |
| Gadsden | Sewer | 3009 | 135,000 |
| Haleyville | do | 3024 | 22,500 |
| Huntsville | Hospital | 3066 | 150,000 |
| Do | Library | 3064 | 35,000 |
| Lafayette | Sewer | 3058 | 2,850 |
| Leighton | do | 3031 | 3,000 |
| Mobile | Water | 3032 | 40,000 |
| Montgomery | Sewer | 3040 | 13,268 |
| Do | do | 3072 | 6,955 |
| Do | Storm drains | 3014 | 5,859 |
| Prichard | Sewer | 3069 | 19,332 |
| Sheffield | do | 3026 | 13,050 |
| Tuscaloosa | Water | 3034 | 98,175 |
| Do | do | 3056 | 152,441 |
| Tuskegee | Sewer | 3002 | 4,000 |
| Winfield | Water | 3073 | 9,250 |
| Total (26 projects) | | | 1,185,110 |
| APPROVED PROJECTS—REPAID | | | |
| Arab | Water | 3052 | $23,985 |
| Birmingham | Sewer | 3005 | 27,500 |
| Chickasaw | do | 3010 | 13,650 |
| Do | do | 3011 | 9,156 |
| Cullman | do | 3006 | 10,000 |
| Huntsville | City hall | 3046 | 75,048 |
| Jasper | Sewer | 3027 | 28,000 |
| Do | do | 3049 | 4,424 |
| Mobile | Water | 3004 | 103,800 |
| Do | Hospital | 3017 | 67,000 |
| Do | Sewer | 3030 | 30,000 |
| Montgomery | do | 3039 | 4,121 |
| Pritchard | do | 3028 | 30,000 |
| Scottsboro | Water | 3021 | 27,000 |
| Tuscaloosa | Sewer | 3001 | 94,347 |
| Total (15 projects) | | | 548,031 |
| APPROVED PROJECTS—CANCELED | | | |
| Athens | Sewer | 3054 | $14,194 |
| Birmingham | Grade separation | 3057 | 33,000 |
| Glencoe | Sewer | 3053 | 1,350 |
| Montgomery | do | 3019 | 15,000 |
| Do | do | 3041 | 2,200 |
| Newton | do | 3059 | 1,150 |
| Tuscaloosa | Educational | 3016 | 11,000 |
| Total (7 projects) | | | 77,894 |
| APPLICATIONS PENDING | | | |
| Montgomery | Water | 3075 | $94,000 |

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I also wish to express my gratitude to the Senator from Alabama, who as usual has been very courteous and very thoughtful in his consideration of the bill and the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the modified amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK].

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 129) is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the joint resolution pass?

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 129) was passed, as follows:

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That section 702(e) of the Housing Act of 1954 is amended—

(1) by inserting after "July 1, 1961;" the following: "$10,000,000 which may be made available to such fund on or after July 1, 1963;"; and

(2) by striking out "$58,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$68,000,000".

SEC. 2. Section 702(c) of the Housing Act of 1954 is amended to read as follows:

"(c) Advances under this section to any public agency shall be repaid by such agency when the construction of the public works is undertaken or started: *Provided,* That if the public agency undertakes to construct only a portion of a planned public work it shall repay such proportionate amount of the advances relating to the public work as the Administrator determines to be equitable. Any advance or part thereof required to be repaid shall bear interest from the date the advance was made to the date construction is undertaken or started at a rate determined by the Administrator which shall be not more than the higher of (1) 3 per centum per annum, or (2) the total of one-half of 1 per centum per annum added to the higher of 2½ per centum or the average annual interest rate on all interest-bearing obligations of the United States then forming a part of the public debt as computed at the end of the fiscal year next preceding the date of the making of the advance: *Provided, however,* That, in the event repayment is not made promptly, the unpaid sum shall bear interest at the rate of 6 per centum per annum from the date of the Government's demand for repayment to the

date of payment thereof by the public agency."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the joint resolution was passed.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

## INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS, 1964

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. H.R. 8747, making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes.

## EXCESSIVE IMPORTS OF BEEF PRODUCTS

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, the Agriculture Department on Monday released a report which forecasts that net farm income will decline by nearly $400 million in 1963 and by another $600 million next year—a total reduction over the 2-year period of around $1 billion.

Naturally, the Department has a readymade scapegoat to blame for this anticipated decline in net farm income—the failure of the wheat referendum last May and the alleged expected lowering of wheat prices. As further insurance, the Department tacks on the sharp rise in production expenses as another possible excuse. What this attitude boils down to is this: The farmer is at fault for any plight he may be in today, this year or next year.

The wheat referendum is only a smokescreen to hide the reasons for the decline. I suggest that ill-advised policies of the administration are the real reasons. And I submit that the farm income situation is even worse than the administration would have us believe—that certain "adjustments" were made to peg the decline at a $1 billion level, when in actuality it should be more.

I believe that Secretary Freeman need not look any further than the plight of the livestock industry to pinpoint a major reason for this decline in net farm income. If he would bother to check livestock marketings for the first 10 months of this year, he would find that his own Department estimates receipts at nearly $160 million below the comparable period of last year.

And if he bothered to check, he would find that the open-end, unrestricted beef importation policy of this administration is having a serious impact on cattle prices throughout the United States—between 25 and 30 cents per 100 pounds on the price of marketed choice steers and about 50 cents per 100 pounds on the price of marketed utility cows. I will have more to say about this later.

Few will deny that world trade is imperative to improvements in world economy. And it would be contrary to long-established policy to totally exclude certain imports as a means of resolving an economic problem in any one segment of our domestic economy. But it is economically untenable and suicidal to completely ignore the gradual strangulation of an industry through depressed prices induced to a considerable degree by this open-end and unrestricted importation policy, which is so seriously affecting the livestock industry in general and the cattle industry in particular.

Much has been said and written in recent weeks about the condition of the livestock industry. Recently, my distinguished colleagues—Mr. CARLSON, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. DOMINICK, and Mr. SYMINGTON—entered into a colloquy over the seriousness of the threat of surging beef imports and the effect on U.S. livestock prices. The Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] correctly observed that "the livestock industry is facing a critical situation and in many instances it is disastrous to our livestockmen." As long ago as last April, I brought this to the attention of my colleagues in the Senate—see pages 6560–6561 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for April 18.

The untimely importation policy of this administration is a major cause of the declining farm income situation, but the administration failed to mention it in its release Monday.

It does not do any good to pretend the problem does not exist and that if one looks the other way long enough it will disappear. This has been the approach of the administration and more particularly the Agriculture Department. In his trip through the farm belt recently, Secretary Freeman was continually questioned by very concerned cattlemen on the zooming meat import problem. Heavy imports, they said, add to the already high domestic production and keep prices down. Mr. Freeman countered with the argument that most of the imported beef is cheaper quality types not under price pressure here, and therefore the contention of the cattlemen was incorrect.

Apparently he completely overlooked the fact that the animals producing cheaper quality beef eat feed grains, and increased imports means less consumption of our own feed grains, which are in surplus.

Typical of the answers was one given in response to a question from Marvin Russell of the Nebraska Farmer. As reported in the November 2 issue of that farm magazine, Mr. Freeman had this to say:

> At this time I would say there is no reason to believe that beef imports, according to our most careful calculations, are adversely affecting beef prices to any significant degree.
>
> We're, of course, very concerned that there's been a significant increase in the volume of imports, but those imports are almost exclusively of cow beef rather than fed steer beef, and cow beef prices have been holding up very, very well. There has not been any dropoff.
>
> The price weakness has been in fed beef, and here there have not been imports. That price weakening has been from increased and quite heavy marketings rather than imports.
>
> And so at this time, although we're watching this very, very carefully, we do not feel that the imports are having any adverse price effect on American producers.

Russell dryly observed:

> We doubt that many ranchers or cattle feeders will buy Freeman's explanation. Their opinions generally seem to be that when imports amount to as much as 10 percent of our total meat supply, there just can't help being some influence on price.

Even as Mr. Freeman was talking, his Department was compiling statistics which indicated that in August alone, beef imports were running at a rate of 12.3 percent of domestic production and for the first 8 months of this year, at a rate of 11 percent.

The highly respected Wallace's Farmer also had some comments on Mr. Freeman's statements. In an editorial on October 5, it said that Secretary Freeman's answers have not been completely satisfactory. I would like to quote pertinent passages from this editorial:

> He said cow prices have remained steady, and this is the grade we import. We are not marketing enough hamburger and sausage-type animals to satisfy our markets. Therefore, reasons Freeman, beef imports do not hurt fed steer beef prices.

The editorial then went on to say—

> We feel his statement is only partly true. Every meat competes with every other meat, to some extent. If a consumer's belly is full of Australian hamburger, he isn't going to be in the market for U.S. steak, ham, or lamb chops. Furthermore, some 30 to 40 percent of a fed beef carcass goes into ground beef in direct competition with the imported product.

First, I think that Secretary Freeman should reexamine those cow prices which he claims have remained steady. According to official USDA figures, cow prices in January 1961 were $15.70 per hundred weight; in October 1963, the price had declined to $14.64. The annual for 1961 was $15.66 and thus far for the first 10 months of 1963, the price is running at an average of $15.36. Just what does he mean by prices being steady?

Second, in making his comments, and downgrading the effect of beef imports, Mr. Freeman obviously was not aware of what was going on within his own Department. In the 1964 Outlook Issue of the "Livestock and Meat Situation" of November a study by the Economic Research Service indicates that when the imports equal about 10 percent of total domestic beef production—as they have more than been doing recently—they would cause, on the average, a drop of about 1 percent in the price of Choice steers and nearly 3 percent in the price of utility cows.

If this is true—although I believe the impact is even greater—livestock producers would otherwise have received an additional 47 cents per hundred pounds in the price of utility cows in 1961 and 1962.

And what does this mean in receipt losses? For 1961, it comes to $6.6 mil-

lion and in 1962, $6.62 million. And with the imports running even higher this year, the 1963 loss due to unrestricted importation policies will no doubt be greater.

In this 3-year period, the income loss for this grade of beef alone will amount to some $20 million.

Now, let us examine the effect on Choice steer prices. In 1961, the reduction, as a result of the level of imports, amounted to approximately 27 cents in the price of Choice steers per 100 pounds; in 1962, a reduction of nearly 30 cents.

This means that, in 1961, the out-of-the-pocket loss to livestock producers amounted to $28 million and in 1962, nearly $31.4 million. There will be, according to every barometer, at least a $32 million loss this year. The 3-year totals add up to some $91.5 million in marketing losses.

That is a total pocketbook loss to beef producers of $111.5 million in this 3-year period—just in these two grades of beef alone. Needless to say, losses in the slaughter livestock industry mean losses elsewhere in agriculture.

Here is a rundown on the receipt losses incurred in shipping to various markets on the one grade of Choice steer alone: Chicago: 1961, $2.8 million; 1962, $2.7 million; Omaha: 1961, $1.4 million; 1962, $1.4 million; Sioux City: 1961, $1.2 million; 1962, $1.3 million; St. Louis: 1961, $190,000; 1962, $208,000; South St. Joseph: 1961, $485,000; 1962, $547,000; Kansas City: 1961, $349,000; 1962, $312,000; Denver: 1961, $377,000; 1962, $289,000; Indianapolis: 1961, $190,000; 1962, $188,000; South St. Paul: 1962, $364,000; Sioux Falls: 1961, $235,000; 1962, $253,000.

Receipts from marketings of livestock and livestock products during the first 9 months of 1963 are reported down $50 million from the comparable period for 1962 even though the volume increased—on page 6 of Farm Income Situation for November. Actually, it appears that receipts were down $99 million—page 10 of the report shows receipts for the period January through September of 1962 at $14,462 million; whereas for the same period of 1963, receipts are shown at $14,363 million—a difference of $99 million—not $50 million. I suppose press releases have been issued showing the smaller loss so that farmers will think things are not as bad as they actually are. But in addition, for the month of October these receipts are estimated at $2 billion—down about 3 percent.

In light of these figures, I seriously question Mr. Freeman's statements that imports are not having a significant effect on cattle prices in the United States. He had better check his story with his Economic Research Service, which made this statement in the November report:

> If imports are a smaller proportion of domestic production, the effect on fed cattle prices is less; if they are a larger proportion, the effect on prices is greater.

Mr. Freeman should be reminded that livestock production expenses zoomed from the $2.5 billion recorded in 1960 to more than $3 billion last year, with every indication, borne out by official reports, that they will be even higher this year. He should be told that the parity ratio—the relation between the prices farmers received to the prices farmers paid for goods and services—stood at 77 in October, compared to 81 in December 1960, the last month of the Eisenhower administration.

He should be informed that beef producers are encountering recurring short-term price difficulties, even though beef has been one of the few products for which demand has been growing faster than the population—with the per capita consumption of beef jumping from 85.2 pounds in 1960 to an estimated 95.1 in 1963, and an even higher estimate of 97 pounds in 1964. He should be advised that the beef steer-corn price ratio has dropped from 26.2 in December 1960 to 20.3 in October 1963; that the hog-corn ratio has dropped from the 18.1 of December 1960 to 14.1 in October of this year; that the monthly average price of Choice grade slaughter steers at Chicago has decreased from $26.86 per 100 pounds recorded in December 1960 to $24.03 this last October, and that the price received by producer for slaughter steers, all grades, has gone down from the $26.61 of December 1960 to $23.97 in the month of October 1963; that livestock loans under the Farmers Home Administration have jumped from the $41.3 million reported in fiscal year 1960 to close to $75 million in fiscal year 1963; that purchases of feeder cattle on loans under the Production Credit Administration have soared from a total of 32,246—valued at $97 million—in 1956 to 36,319—valued at close to $253 million—in 1962.

Perhaps Mr. Freeman should try to coordinate the needs of the Armed Forces with the problems of the beef producers in order that more beef will be procured in this country. Total military purchases dropped from 275 million pounds, valued at $149 million, in fiscal year 1960 to 268 million pounds, valued at $146.7 million, in fiscal 1962, while the total in the Armed Forces was increasing over 200,000. And even now, it is estimated that these purchases, running at approximately 20 to 22 million pounds a month, will be lower this year, bringing the fiscal year total to less than $140 million.

The Defense Establishment, it is estimated, is purchasing abroad for resale purposes in commissaries about 1 million pounds a month; this would come to a rate of more than $4 million a year in non-U.S. purchases; a factor which has an influence on the flow of gold as well as on the income of our beef producers.

Then Secretary Freeman should read further the 1964 Outlook Issue of the Livestock and Meat Situation of November.

I quote from page 21 of that report:

> Cattle feeding programs representative of typical feeding programs in the Corn Belt generally showed small profits, and substantial losses in some cases, during the 1962–63 feeding season. * * * According to these representative feeding programs, net returns per head have not been so low, or losses so large, in many years for most types of feeding operations. Compared with the previous season, lower returns were due primarily to a combination of higher prices for feeder stocks and lower prices for fed cattle in all but one of the programs. Feed costs for all types of programs were somewhat higher in 1962–63, but this accounted for only a small part of the decline in net returns. Transportation and marketing expenses and pasture costs were practically the same in both years.

He should examine this table—a table which shows the net return per head on heifer calves dropping from $29.88 in 1961–62 to $7.14 in 1962–63; the net return on steer calves dropping from $64.87 to $1.46; the net return on good yearling steers dropping from $28.08 to a loss of $20.12; and the net return on heavy steers dropping from $54.19 to a loss of $17.14.

These are conditions which demand action—not an ostrichlike attitude.

The import situation, which Mr. Freeman determines is of no significance, contains the ingredients of disaster for our livestockmen.

Despite continuing price difficulties, cattlemen have been and are faced with soaring imports of beef and veal. No one is claiming that the growing level of imports is the sole cause of lower fed cattle prices, but I maintain that it is a major factor, resulting from the unfortunate policies of the Kennedy administration. And the problem will be worsened if the United States does not hold to a firm position in negotiations upcoming with the Common Market.

Back in May, Gerald Leighton, president of the Chicago Live Stock Exchange, was quoted in the Chicago Tribune to the effect that the deluge of foreign beef swamping this country's markets presents such a threat to the freedom of U.S. cattlemen that it has become frightening. The Tribune quoted Mr. Leighton as charging that cattlemen are being—and I quote—"sold out" for a dual purpose: to buy the friendship of foreign nations and to shackle the freedom of one of the most independent groups of men in agriculture.

If Mr. Freeman pursues his intentions as expressed in his "Report of the Secretary of Agriculture" for 1962 released earlier this year, he will continue to look the other way while imports continue to soar.

In his report, Mr. Freeman said and I quote:

> An agricultural policy for today's world must be based on the principle of supply management, whereby agriculture would be provided with a means of doing, through Government, what most industry does for itself when it adjusts production to the amount it can sell for a profit.

Whether this attitude reflects a policy of do-nothingness in order to bring the livestock industry to its knees from which it would have to plead for price supports in exchange for Government regulation is a timely question. Mr. Freeman cannot blame cattlemen if his continued inaction causes them to draw such an inference.

And I most emphatically disagree with another statement by Mr. Freeman in that same report:

> The year 1962 thus set in motion new forces to add momentum to the upswing in agriculture which is being felt throughout the land. There was in rural America a

firmer mood of confidence and optimism than had prevailed in many years. Obviously, agriculture turned an important corner in 1961 and 1962 and hopes were bright that progress would continue in 1963 and beyond.

If we have turned a corner, it is the wrong one, especially as it involves the livestock industry.

When imports of beef and veal reach a per capita level of 9.4 pounds, up 4.1 pounds from 1960, it is time all of us became concerned. When beef and veal imports jump from 775,510,000 pounds—carcass weight equivalent—valued at $182,175,000 in 1960 to 1,445,058,000 pounds valued at $312,153,000 last year, with imports during the January–August 1963 period running 22 percent above the same months of last year, then this administration had better get off dead center.

Australia, in 1962, contributed 46 percent of the total U.S. tonnage imported, and its share this year will be even greater. Its beef and veal imports have increased from 17.7 million pounds recorded in 1958 to 444.9 million pounds last year with 253 million pounds already shipped to the United States from January through July of this year. Australia, since modification in late 1958 of the United Kingdom-Australian Meat Agreement, which restricted Australia from shipping other than token quantities of meat to countries other than the United Kingdom, has emphasized exports to the United States. Australian exports of beef and veal totaled 549 million pounds in 1962, of which 81 percent was shipped to the United States. And there is no letup in sight since cattle numbers in that country have increased in the past 4 years and supplies of meats for export are expected to continue at high levels.

New Zealand has increased its total from 130.7 million pounds in 1960 to 213.6 million pounds in 1962, with 138.3 million pounds exported to the United States through July of this year. New Zealand accounted for 22 percent of the total imported into the United States and was the second largest supplier last year.

And what are the prospects for 1964? I think the best answer is provided by the Department of Agriculture in its 1964 Outlook:

Prices of cows in 1964 will depend on imports of beef as well as domestic cow slaughter * * *. Imports will likely be up again in 1964, and prices of cow beef, although expected to be somewhat lower, will not be down enough to curb imports of beef and veal.

The gain in beef production in 1964 likely will be around 3 percent—a little smaller than the increase in cattle slaughter because marketings likely will be at lighter weights. The experience in the past decade indicates that normal gains in population, income and continued preference for beef could make it possible to absorb 3 percent more beef and still maintain relatively stable prices to cattle producers. With consumer incomes likely to advance by a significant amount in 1964, prospects are that cattle prices for the year as a whole will not differ much from 1963 levels.

In other words, things are not going to be any better for the beef producer next year, so far as the U.S. Department of Agriculture is concerned. The time for action on imports is long past due. There can be no real national economic prosperity unless our basic livestock industry shares fairly in the national net income. More money in the livestock men's pockets means more money to be spent for goods produced elsewhere in the Nation.

I do not advocate the elimination of beef and veal imports, but I do say that with feed grain surplus problems and depressed livestock prices, we should hold these imports to the 1960 levels. I do not necessarily advocate a limitation on the basis of volume. I believe that perhaps a limitation on the basis of percentage of domestic consumption would be satisfactory. For example, if 1960 imports of beef and veal equaled 5 percent of domestic production, that is what the rate should be this year, instead of 11 or 12 percent.

Because our increasing population demands increased domestic production, the volume of imports could be expected to rise, although the percentage limit would remain constant. This would be a fair and workable approach. Later, if the feed grain program were eliminated, and if the farmers started to receive a fair share of national net income, consideration could be given to permitting the percentage figure to increase.

Mr. President, I have a group of approximately 28 items, consisting of various tables and articles. I ask unanimous consent that they be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Nov. 18, 1963]

FARM INCOME EXPECTED TO DROP BY $1 BILLION OVER 2-YEAR PERIOD

(By Julius Duscha)

The Agriculture Department had some bad news for farmers yesterday that undoubtedly will hurt President Kennedy and other Democrats in the 1964 campaign.

Department economists estimated that net farm income will decline by nearly $400 million this year and may go down by as much as another $600 million next year.

This would mean a total reduction of $1 billion in net farm income over a 2-year period and obviously would give Republicans a telling political issue in rural areas.

In the Midwest and the West farmers generally vote Republican, but in the South they usually support Democrats.

Net farm income was at its height in 1947 when it reached $17.3 billion. During the Eisenhower administration the figure reached a low of little more than $11 billion in 1957.

By 1960 the figure had climbed back almost to $12 billion. In 1961 net farm income increased to $12.5 billion and in 1962 it totaled $12.6 billion.

The 1963 estimate is now $12.2 billion. A 5 percent reduction next year, which Department economists say is possible would place the figure at $11.6 billion.

The farm income forecasts were made by the Department's Economic Research Service. The annual Agricultural Outlook Conference begins today.

The 1964 outlook issue of the Department's quarterly publication, Farm Income Situation, attributes the 1963 decline in net income "to production expenses rising faster than realized gross farm income."

Much of the 1964 income drop, the publication continued, will probably be the result of lower wheat prices.

Last May wheat farmers rejected in a referendum a program that would have guaranteed them high prices but would have sharply restricted their production. As a result, wheat prices may drop from their current level of $2 a bushel to as low as $1.25 a bushel next year. More than half of the Nation's farmers grow wheat.

The reduction in farm income this year will probably mean no decrease in income per farm, however, because of the continued decline in the number of farms.

Current estimates place the number of farms at 3.5 million, compared with the 3.7 million during the last farm census in 1959.

Per farm income was at a record high of $3,414 last year and is expected to be about the same this year. But a reduction in per farm income is expected next year if net farm income declines by 5 percent.

Farm income declined this year despite large direct Government payments to farmers, which the Agriculture Department said are expected to be slightly higher than the 1962 figure of $1.7 billion. More than $1 billion went for the wheat and feed grain programs.

The Budget Bureau estimated last January that the Federal Government would spend nearly $5 billion in the current fiscal year on "special aids and services for farmers."

This amounts to about 40 percent of net farm income, but not all of this money goes to farmers.

---

[From the Nebraska Farmer, Nov. 2, 1963]

HERE'S WHAT FREEMAN LEARNED IN NEBRASKA: WHEAT PROGRAM FAVORED; FEED GRAIN PROGRAM OK'D; BEEF IMPORTS CAUSING GRAVE CONCERN

(By Marvin Russell)

Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman made a flying trip through Nebraska last month. And he learned some things about what Nebraska farmers and ranchers are thinking.

He learned that:

1. They want some kind of wheat program.

2. They generally approve the feed grain program.

3. They are highly concerned about imports of beef and the effect of these imports on beef prices here at home.

There was no indication on his part, however, that he will attempt to do anything about what he learned. In fact, he indicated there's not much that he can or will do.

He said he had worn out quite a bit of shoe leather trudging up to Congress to see what might be done about a wheat program after last spring's referendum. He has gotten no encouragement there, he said. He said there is just flatly no chance of getting a new voluntary wheat program approved by Congress at the present session.

Nevertheless, Freeman said he found more support for a wheat program in Nebraska than in any place he had visited up to that time in his series of "report and review" meetings with farmers. His two meetings in Nebraska—at North Platte and at Grand Island—were Nos. 6 and 7 in the series. He went on from Nebraska to Montana and the State of Washington.

WHEAT PROGRAM 3 TO 1

Discussing the Nebraska desire for a wheat program, he said no one would expect the people gathered at North Platte to be "screaming advocates of farm programs," but in a show of hands they favored a wheat program by 3 to 1.

Incidentally, this caused him to make at least one change in the speech he had prepared for delivery later at the ASCS conven-

tion in Grand Island. The advance copy of that speech had one sentence which read: "In my trips to wheat areas so far, I have not yet found strong support for any wheat programs."

Freeman must have found Montana and Washington State wheat growers also in favor of a program, for when he got back to Washington, D.C., he announced he had found sentiment "sharply favorable to continued programs."

"But when I have asked farmers to describe the kind of a wheat program they would support, the answer is not clear at all," he said.

"There is also a hard core of vocal opposition to any kind of wheat program or farm program. This opposition is making itself heard very effectively."

Recommending that wheat growers get together on the kind of program they want, Freeman concluded: "As matters now stand, there is little prospect for a wheat program to pass the Congress in 1964."

Concerning the feed grain program, Freeman said he found some concern in Nebraska regarding "some aspects" of it, but generally it seemed to have whole-hearted approval. The "some aspects" apparently referred to the Dawson County dispute over rates allowed for diversion payments on certain farms.

BOOST BEEF TARIFF?

We asked Freeman if he didn't think tariff rates on beef imports ought to be boosted. He replied at considerable length, although his answer really boiled down to: No, he didn't think tariff rates should be boosted.

Here's what he said:

"At this time I would say there is no reason to believe that beef imports, according to our most careful calculations, are adversely affecting beef prices to any significant degree.

"We're of course very concerned that there's been a significant increase in the volume of imports, but those imports are almost exclusively of cow beef rather than fed steer beef, and cow beef prices have been holding up very, very well. There has not been any dropoff.

"The price weakness has been in fed beef, and here there have not been imports. That price weakening has been from increased and quite heavy marketings rather than imports.

"And so at this time, although we're watching this very, very carefully, we do not feel that the imports are having any adverse price effect on American producers."

We doubt that many ranchers or cattle feeders will "buy" Freeman's explanation. Their opinions generally seem to be that when imports amount to as much as 10 percent of our total meat supply, there just can't help being some influence on price.

The week Freeman was in Nebraska, cow beef prices were about steady but cows on the hoof at Omaha were 25 to 50 cents lower.

---

[From Wallace's Farmer, Oct. 5, 1963]

STOP MEAT IMPORTS?

We like to increase exports of farm products. But we get upset about rising imports of foods that compete directly with those we produce.

Cattlemen are getting more and more alarmed over rising beef imports. We imported a record 1.4 billion pounds of beef and veal in 1962. The 1962 imports amounted to about 9 percent of our domestic production. And the live feeder cattle imported equaled 3.6 percent of the cattle slaughtered.

Should we clamp down on meat imports? They are especially irritating at a time when feeders are taking losses because of sharply lower fed cattle prices.

Secretary Freeman's answer to this question at Monticello, Iowa, did not completely satisfy. He said cow prices have remained steady, and this is the grade of beef we import. We are not marketing enough hamburger- and sausage-type animals to satisfy our markets. Therefore, reasons Freeman, beef imports do not hurt fed steer beef prices.

We feel his statement is only partly true. Every meat competes with every other meat, to some extent. If a consumer's belly is full of Australian hamburger, he isn't going to be in the market for U.S. steak, ham, or lamb chops. Furthermore, some 30 to 40 percent of a fed beef carcass goes into ground beef in direct competition with the imported product.

---

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Tribune, May 28, 1963]

FOREIGN BEEF POURS INTO THE UNITED STATES, SAYS LEIGHTON—CATTLEMEN BEING "SOLD OUT," HE CHARGES

(By Arnold Erickson)

The deluge of foreign beef swamping this country's markets presents such a threat to the freedom of U.S. cattlemen that it has become frightening, Gerald Leighton, president of the Chicago Live Stock Exchange, warned yesterday.

He charged that cattlemen are being "sold out" for a dual purpose: (1) "to buy the friendship of foreign nations and (2) to shackle the freedom of one of the most independent groups of men in agriculture."

"The dictatorial possibilities of the beef import situation is obvious," Leighton said. "The seven countries that ship us beef are increasing cattle herds at a record pace. They already have 4,500,000 more cattle than the United States, a total of 108,247,000."

ACCOUNT FOR 85 PERCENT

The seven countries are Australia, New Zealand, Argentina, Paraguay, Uruguay, Mexico, and Brazil. In 1962, these countries shipped to the United States 818,251,392 pounds of beef, or 85 percent of that imported.

"In the last year, they added 4,181,000 to their herds," Leighton said. "Since the 1956–60 period, these herds have been increased by 7,766,000, and since 1951–55 by 12,059,000. None of these countries can consume the beef from these record numbers of cattle.

EARMARK MORE TONNAGE

"This group of countries is confidently earmarking an ever-increasing tonnage of beef for future shipment to the United States. They obviously have assurances of some sort from spokesmen in authority in this country on which to base such expansion plans for surplus beef that has no place in their domestic trade.

"The United States recently has become the world's greatest beef importer, a position formerly held by the United Kingdom. According to the foreign agricultural service at least one of this group of countries has agreed to curtail beef shipments to Britain for the remainder of the year to assist in stabilizing cattle prices in Britain. As a result that country may face a surplus problem unless it can dump more beef in the United States."

Leighton said cattlemen are asking these questions: "Must cattlemen curb production to make room for foreign beef in order to stave off further market collapse? Is this the position Washington planned when it allowed the record imports?"

In the first quarter of 1963, beef imports soared 18 percent above the 1962 record, and took more than 30 percent of the trade for manufacturing beef, a grade used extensively for hamburgers and canning.

*U.S. imports of cattle and beef, lambs, and lamb and mutton compared with production, 1950–63*

CATTLE AND CALVES AND BEEF AND VEAL

| Year | Imports | | | | Meat production [3] (million pounds) | Imports as a percentage of production |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Live animals | | Meat (million pounds) | Total [2] (million pounds) | | |
| | Number (1,000 head) | Meat equivalent [1] (million pounds) | | | | |
| 1950 | 438 | 157 | 348 | 505 | 10,764 | 4.7 |
| 1951 | 220 | 91 | 484 | 575 | 9,896 | 5.8 |
| 1952 | 138 | 47 | 429 | 476 | 10,819 | 4.4 |
| 1953 | 177 | 62 | 271 | 333 | 13,953 | 2.4 |
| 1954 | 71 | 35 | 232 | 267 | 14,610 | 1.8 |
| 1955 | 296 | 93 | 229 | 322 | 15,147 | 2.1 |
| 1956 | 141 | 43 | 211 | 254 | 16,094 | 1.6 |
| 1957 | 703 | 221 | 395 | 616 | 15,728 | 3.9 |
| 1958 | 1,126 | 340 | 909 | 1,249 | 14,516 | 8.6 |
| 1959 | 688 | 191 | 1,063 | 1,254 | 14,588 | 8.6 |
| 1960 | 645 | 163 | 775 | 938 | 15,835 | 5.9 |
| 1961 | 1,023 | 250 | 1,037 | 1,287 | 16,341 | 7.9 |
| 1962 | 1,232 | 280 | 1,445 | 1,725 | 16,311 | 10.6 |
| January–August 1962 | 583 | 132 | 893 | 1,025 | 10,895 | 9.4 |
| January–August 1963 | 555 | 118 | 1,086 | 1,204 | 11,386 | 10.6 |

LAMBS AND LAMB AND MUTTON

| Year | Imports | | | | Meat production [3] (million pounds) | Imports as a percentage of production |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Live animals | | Meat (million pounds) | Total [2] (million pounds) | | |
| | Number (1,000 head) | Meat equivalent [1] (million pounds) | | | | |
| 1950 | 97 | 3 | 3 | 6 | 597 | 1.0 |
| 1951 | 14 | (4) | 7 | 7 | 521 | 1.3 |
| 1952 | (5) | (4) | 6 | 6 | 648 | .9 |
| 1953 | 1 | (4) | 3 | 3 | 729 | .4 |
| 1954 | 1 | (4) | 2 | 2 | 734 | .3 |
| 1955 | 8 | (4) | 2 | 2 | 758 | .3 |
| 1956 | 3 | (4) | 1 | 1 | 741 | .1 |
| 1957 | 18 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 707 | .7 |
| 1958 | 40 | 1 | 41 | 42 | 688 | 6.1 |
| 1959 | 76 | 2 | 104 | 106 | 738 | 14.4 |
| 1960 | 50 | 1 | 87 | 88 | 768 | 11.5 |
| 1961 | 1 | (5) | 101 | 101 | 832 | 12.1 |
| 1962 | 21 | 1 | 143 | 144 | 809 | 17.8 |
| January–August 1962 | 3 | (5) | 95 | 95 | 533 | 17.8 |
| January–August 1963 | 1 | (5) | 115 | 115 | 503 | 22.9 |

[1] Estimated at 53 percent of the live weight of all dutiable imports of cattle and for lambs an average 30 pound carcass.
[2] Canned and other processed meats have been converted to their carcass weight equivalent.
[3] Total production (including an estimate for farm slaughter).
[4] Less than 500,000 pounds.
[5] Less than 500 head.

*Meat imports: United States, by country of origin, 1958 to date*

[In million pounds]

| Product and year | Imports, by country of origin, product weight | | | | | | | | | | | | Total imports | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Canada | Mexico | Argentina | Brazil | Denmark | West Germany | Poland | Netherlands | Ireland | Australia | New Zealand | All Other | Product weight | Carcass weight equivalent |
| Beef and veal: [1] | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1958 | 53.6 | 75.0 | 216.7 | 13.6 | 2.5 | 0.3 | | 0.3 | 23.8 | 17.7 | 183.7 | 32.0 | 619.2 | 909 |
| 1959 | 22.6 | 48.9 | 128.6 | 36.0 | 3.4 | .3 | | .3 | 42.0 | 224.0 | 161.6 | 54.6 | 722.3 | 1,063 |
| 1960 | 18.9 | 39.1 | 52.7 | 9.0 | 4.5 | .3 | (2) | .1 | 52.8 | 144.7 | 130.7 | 39.3 | 512.6 | 775 |
| 1961 | 32.3 | 53.4 | 65.2 | 16.3 | 6.5 | .3 | 0.1 | .1 | 64.4 | 233.9 | 154.4 | 33.5 | 689.2 | 1,037 |
| 1962 | 19.4 | 59.3 | 55.9 | 17.2 | 7.7 | .4 | .4 | .1 | 70.7 | 444.9 | 213.6 | 49.8 | 970.9 | 1,445 |
| 1963, January-July | 11.1 | 39.8 | 53.5 | 3.3 | .6 | .2 | 1.0 | (2) | 40.0 | 253.0 | 138.3 | 62.9 | 603.7 | 907 |
| Lamb and mutton: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1958 | 1.2 | | | | | | | | | 14.6 | 7.0 | 1.2 | 24.0 | 24 |
| 1959 | .8 | | | | | | | | | 40.6 | 12.8 | 2.6 | 56.8 | 57 |
| 1960 | .1 | | | | | | | | | 38.5 | 9.1 | 2.0 | 49.7 | 87 |
| 1961 | .1 | (2) | | | | | | | (2) | 44.6 | 10.8 | .2 | 55.8 | 101 |
| 1962 | .5 | | .1 | | | | | | .2 | 65.9 | 11.1 | .3 | 78.2 | 143 |
| 1963, January-July | (2) | | | | | | | | | 50.1 | 9.2 | .2 | 59.5 | 107 |
| Pork: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1958 | 61.9 | (2) | (2) | | 38.7 | 7.0 | 27.0 | 44.7 | .1 | | .1 | 3.3 | 182.8 | 193 |
| 1959 | 59.1 | (2) | (2) | | 37.3 | 4.7 | 26.9 | 43.4 | .2 | | .2 | 3.1 | 174.9 | 186 |
| 1960 | 47.3 | (2) | (2) | | 40.7 | 2.7 | 35.1 | 42.0 | .2 | | .1 | 5.9 | 171.3 | 186 |
| 1961 | 44.7 | .1 | | | 46.2 | 1.7 | 34.7 | 42.0 | .2 | | (2) | 5.8 | 173.7 | 187 |
| 1962 | 46.8 | (2) | | | 63.8 | 1.3 | 39.8 | 43.4 | 2.0 | (2) | .1 | 7.9 | 203.8 | 216 |
| 1963, January-July | 25.7 | | | | 44.2 | .4 | 25.3 | 26.4 | 1.1 | | (2) | 4.3 | 127.4 | 135 |
| Total: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1958 | 116.7 | 75.0 | 216.7 | 13.6 | 41.2 | 7.3 | 27.0 | 45.0 | 23.9 | 32.3 | 190.8 | 36.5 | 826.0 | 1,126 |
| 1959 | 82.5 | 49.0 | 128.6 | 36.0 | 40.7 | 5.0 | 26.9 | 43.7 | 42.2 | 264.6 | 174.6 | 60.3 | 954.1 | 1,306 |
| 1960 | 66.3 | 39.2 | 52.7 | 9.0 | 45.2 | 3.0 | 35.1 | 42.2 | 52.9 | 183.2 | 139.9 | 47.2 | 733.7 | 1,048 |
| 1961 | 77.1 | 53.5 | 65.2 | 16.3 | 52.7 | 2.0 | 34.8 | 42.1 | 64.6 | 278.5 | 165.2 | 39.5 | 918.7 | 1,325 |
| 1962 | 66.7 | 59.3 | 56.0 | 17.2 | 71.5 | 1.7 | 40.2 | 43.5 | 72.9 | 510.8 | 224.8 | 58.0 | 1,252.9 | 1,804 |
| 1963, January-July | 36.8 | 39.8 | 53.5 | 3.3 | 44.8 | .6 | 26.3 | 26.4 | 41.1 | 303.1 | 147.5 | 67.4 | 790.6 | 1,149 |

[1] Includes quantities of other canned, prepared, or preserved meat not elsewhere specified. Assumed to be mostly beef.

[2] Less than 50,000 pounds.

Source: Compiled from official records of the Bureau of the Census.

*Hogs and corn: Prices received by farmers and hog-corn price ratio, United States, by months, 1961 to date*

| Month | Hogs, per 100 pounds | | | Corn, per bushel | | | Hog-corn price ratio | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1961 | 1962 | 1963 | 1961 | 1962 | 1963 | 1961 | 1962 | 1963 |
| January | $16.70 | $16.50 | $15.40 | $0.963 | $0.951 | $1.03 | 17.3 | 17.4 | 15.0 |
| February | 17.60 | 16.30 | 14.80 | 1.00 | .956 | 1.06 | 17.6 | 17.1 | 14.0 |
| March | 17.10 | 16.00 | 13.70 | 1.01 | .968 | 1.06 | 16.9 | 16.4 | 12.9 |
| April | 16.80 | 15.40 | 13.60 | .965 | .988 | 1.08 | 17.4 | 15.7 | 12.6 |
| May | 16.10 | 15.30 | 14.30 | 1.02 | 1.03 | 1.10 | 15.8 | 14.8 | 13.0 |
| June | 15.80 | 16.10 | 16.00 | 1.03 | 1.03 | 1.16 | 15.3 | 15.4 | 13.8 |
| July | 16.60 | 16.90 | 17.10 | 1.05 | 1.04 | 1.19 | 15.8 | 16.3 | 14.4 |
| August | 17.30 | 17.40 | 16.80 | 1.04 | 1.02 | 1.19 | 16.6 | 17.2 | 13.9 |
| September | 17.50 | 18.20 | 15.40 | 1.04 | 1.04 | 1.21 | 16.8 | 17.4 | 12.7 |
| October | 16.60 | 16.40 | 15.20 | 1.02 | 1.02 | 1.08 | 16.3 | 16.3 | 14.1 |
| November | 15.70 | 16.20 | | .938 | .938 | | 16.7 | 17.3 | |
| December | 16.10 | 15.70 | | .947 | 1.00 | | 17.0 | 15.7 | |
| Average [1] | 16.70 | 16.40 | | 1.00 | .998 | | 16.6 | 16.4 | |

[1] Simple average.

TABLE 7.—*Number of cattle and calves on farms Jan. 1, calf crop, number slaughtered, and imports, United States, 1955 to date*

[By 1,000 head]

| Year | Number of farms Jan. 1 | | Calf crop | Imports | Number slaughtered | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Cattle and calves | Cows | | | Cattle | Calves | Total |
| 1955 | 96,592 | 49,121 | 42,112 | 314 | 26,588 | 12,864 | 39,452 |
| 1956 | 95,900 | 48,283 | 41,376 | 159 | 27,755 | 12,999 | 440,754 |
| 1957 | 92,860 | 46,859 | 39,905 | 728 | 27,068 | 12,353 | 39,421 |
| 1958 | 91,176 | 45,430 | 38,860 | 1,152 | 24,368 | 9,738 | 34,106 |
| 1959 | 93,322 | 45,244 | 38,938 | 709 | 23,722 | 8,072 | 31,794 |
| 1960 | 96,236 | 45,871 | 39,353 | 663 | 26,026 | 8,611 | 34,637 |
| 1961 | 97,319 | 46,370 | 39,954 | 1,043 | 26,467 | 8,081 | 34,548 |
| 1962 | 99,782 | 47,379 | 40,960 | 1,250 | 26,905 | 7,854 | 34,759 |
| 1963 | [1] 103,530 | [1] 48,594 | 41,752 | [2] 1,100 | [2] 28,100 | [2] 7,300 | [2] 35,400 |
| 1964 | [3] 106.5-107 | | | | | | |

[1] Preliminary. [2] Partly forecast. [3] Forecast.

*Specified costs and net returns in 6 selected Corn Belt cattle feeding programs, 1961–62 and 1962–63* [1]

| Feeding program | 1961–62 | | | | 1962–63 | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Price per 100 pounds | | | Net return per head [2] | Price per 100 pounds | | | Net return per head [2] |
| | Paid for feeder | Received for fed cattle | Margin | | Paid for feeder | Received for fed cattle | Margin | |
| CALVES | | | | | | | | |
| Heifer calves, short fed: Bought as Good and Choice, September–October. Sold as Choice, June–July | $25.01 | $25.21 | +$0.20 | $29.88 | $26.20 | $23.40 | −$2.80 | $7.14 |
| Steer calves, long fed: Bought as Good and Choice, September–November. Sold as Choice, August–October | 27.86 | 29.18 | +1.32 | 64.87 | 30.49 | 24.24 | −6.25 | 1.46 |
| YEARLINGS | | | | | | | | |
| Medium yearling steers, short fed: Bought as Medium, September–October. Sold as Good-Standard, January–February | 21.14 | 24.35 | +3.21 | 18.34 | 21.89 | 24.33 | +2.44 | 12.11 |
| Good yearling steers, short fed: Bought as Good, September–November. Sold as Choice, April–June | 23.79 | 26.24 | +2.45 | 28.08 | 25.74 | 23.02 | −2.72 | −20.12 |
| Yearling steers long fed: Bought as Good and Choice, September–November. Sold as Prime, July–September | 24.68 | 30.14 | +5.46 | 72.41 | 26.99 | 25.02 | −1.97 | −4.74 |
| HEAVY STEERS | | | | | | | | |
| Heavy steers, short fed: Bought as Good, September–November. Sold as Choice and Prime, March–May | 22.44 | 28.23 | +5.80 | 54.19 | 24.62 | 23.91 | −0.71 | −17.14 |

[1] Feeding programs designed to be fairly representative of average feeding programs in the Corn Belt. Feeders are purchased in Kansas City and sold at Chicago.

[2] Net return over cost of corn, hay, protein supplement, pasture, transportation and marketing expenses. Does not include labor, overhead, cost of other feeds and death loss, or credit for manure and for hogs following feeders.

*Steer prices at Chicago by weight group and differences between grades, by months, 1960–61*

PRIME

| Month | 1960 | | | 1961 | | | Difference in prices between Prime and Choice (all weights) | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 900 to 1,100 pounds | 1,100 to 1,300 pounds | Margin | 900 to 1,100 pounds | 1,100 to 1,300 pounds | Margin | 1960 | 1961 |
| January | $27.90 | $28.14 | $0.24 | $29.00 | $28.90 | −$0.10 | $1.65 | $1.37 |
| February | 28.51 | 28.54 | .03 | 27.96 | 27.60 | −.36 | 1.78 | 1.57 |
| March | 30.53 | 31.33 | .80 | 27.42 | 27.41 | −.01 | 2.98 | 1.67 |
| April | 30.50 | 31.09 | .59 | 26.98 | 27.22 | .24 | 3.07 | 2.09 |
| May | 30.28 | 31.01 | .73 | 25.15 | 25.32 | .17 | 3.42 | 1.73 |
| June | 28.82 | 29.47 | .65 | 23.81 | 23.56 | −.25 | 2.77 | .99 |
| July | 27.44 | 27.86 | .42 | 23.46 | 22.88 | −.58 | 1.74 | .70 |
| August | 26.32 | 26.60 | .28 | 25.07 | 24.95 | −.12 | 1.28 | .88 |
| September | 25.92 | 26.06 | .14 | 25.01 | 25.10 | .09 | 1.11 | .80 |
| October | 26.08 | 26.09 | .01 | 25.26 | 25.55 | .29 | .95 | .78 |
| November | 27.22 | 27.24 | .02 | 26.25 | 26.59 | .34 | 1.06 | 1.00 |
| December | 27.96 | 28.06 | .10 | 26.95 | 27.40 | .45 | 1.11 | 1.20 |

CHOICE

| Month | 1960 | | | 1961 | | | Difference in prices between Choice and Good (all weights) | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 900 to 1,100 pounds | 1,100 to 1,300 pounds | Margin | 900 to 1,100 pounds | 1,100 to 1,300 pounds | Margin | 1960 | 1961 |
| January | $26.74 | $26.39 | −$0.35 | $27.97 | $27.15 | −$0.82 | $1.68 | $1.83 |
| February | 27.23 | 26.75 | −.48 | 26.66 | 25.84 | −.82 | 1.59 | 1.94 |
| March | 28.46 | 28.49 | .03 | 25.92 | 25.71 | −.21 | 2.17 | 1.86 |
| April | 28.08 | 28.24 | .16 | 25.26 | 25.14 | −.12 | 2.07 | 1.59 |
| May | 27.84 | 27.98 | .14 | 23.67 | 23.49 | −.18 | 1.99 | 1.36 |
| June | 26.24 | 26.42 | .18 | 23.04 | 22.38 | −.66 | 1.89 | .80 |
| July | 25.73 | 25.63 | −.10 | 23.03 | 22.07 | −.96 | 1.54 | .64 |
| August | 25.01 | 24.85 | −.16 | 24.35 | 23.82 | −.53 | 1.36 | .81 |
| September | 24.91 | 24.69 | −.22 | 24.45 | 24.20 | −.25 | 1.23 | .77 |
| October | 25.12 | 24.93 | −.19 | 24.59 | 24.60 | .01 | 1.13 | .94 |
| November | 26.41 | 26.10 | −.31 | 25.48 | 25.54 | .06 | 1.15 | 1.16 |
| December | 27.03 | 26.61 | −.42 | 26.14 | 26.14 | 0 | 1.44 | 1.44 |

Source: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Agricultural Marketing Service, Livestock Division.

*Steer prices at Chicago by weight group and differences between grades, by months, 1962–63*

PRIME

| Month | 1962 | | | 1963 | | | Difference in prices between Prime and Choice (all weights) | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 900 to 1,100 pounds | 1,100 to 1,300 pounds | Margin | 900 to 1,100 pounds | 1,100 to 1,300 pounds | Margin | 1962 | 1963 |
| January | $27.36 | $27.92 | $0.56 | $28.26 | $28.53 | $0.27 | $1.46 | $1.17 |
| February | 28.00 | 28.63 | .63 | 25.94 | 26.02 | .08 | 1.89 | 1.17 |
| March | 28.88 | 29.97 | 1.09 | 24.79 | 24.92 | .13 | 2.81 | 1.18 |
| April | 28.80 | 30.35 | 1.55 | 24.82 | 25.07 | .25 | 2.69 | .98 |
| May | 27.36 | 28.21 | .85 | 23.79 | 23.75 | −.04 | 2.30 | .88 |
| June | 26.58 | 27.25 | .67 | 23.78 | 23.79 | .01 | 1.89 | .52 |
| July | 27.03 | 27.86 | .83 | 25.58 | 25.69 | .11 | 1.40 | .88 |
| August | 29.25 | 30.06 | .81 | 25.38 | 25.26 | −.12 | 1.88 | .52 |
| September | 31.18 | 32.55 | 1.37 | 24.75 | 24.64 | −.11 | 2.60 | .39 |
| October | 30.51 | 31.63 | 1.12 | 24.72 | 24.90 | .18 | 2.10 | .74 |
| November | 30.94 | 31.96 | 1.02 | ---------- | ---------- | ---------- | 1.74 | ---------- |
| December | 29.65 | 30.62 | .97 | ---------- | ---------- | ---------- | 1.82 | ---------- |

*Steer prices at Chicago by weight group and differences between grades, by month, 1962–63*—Continued

CHOICE

| Month | 1962 | | | 1963 | | | Difference in prices between Choice and Good (all weights) | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 900 to 1,100 pounds | 1,100 to 1,300 pounds | Margin | 900 to 1,100 pounds | 1,100 to 1,300 pounds | Margin | 1962 | 1963 |
| January | $26.27 | $26.50 | $0.23 | $27.21 | $27.27 | $0.06 | $1.75 | $1.70 |
| February | 26.74 | 26.94 | .20 | 25.11 | 24.86 | −.25 | 2.22 | 1.24 |
| March | 27.34 | 27.69 | .35 | 23.94 | 23.75 | −.19 | 2.33 | 1.24 |
| April | 27.60 | 28.22 | .62 | 24.06 | 24.02 | −.04 | 2.01 | 1.04 |
| May | 26.10 | 26.46 | .36 | 22.99 | 22.67 | −.32 | 1.69 | .94 |
| June | 25.29 | 25.50 | .21 | 22.99 | 22.90 | −.09 | 1.35 | .79 |
| July | 26.22 | 26.58 | .36 | 24.85 | 24.75 | −.10 | 1.55 | 1.16 |
| August | 27.42 | 28.34 | .92 | 24.88 | 24.52 | −.36 | 1.89 | .76 |
| September | 29.55 | 30.14 | .59 | 24.10 | 23.62 | −.48 | 2.23 | .74 |
| October | 29.06 | 29.92 | .86 | 24.11 | 23.93 | −.18 | 1.80 | .75 |
| November | 29.74 | 30.62 | .88 | | | | 1.85 | |
| December | 28.61 | 29.20 | .59 | | | | 1.89 | |

Source: Livestock and Meat Situation, Nov. 8, 1963, Economic Research Service.

*Slaughter steers—Monthly average price: Chicago*

| | 1960 | 1961 | 1962 | 1963 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| CHOICE GRADE (100 POUNDS) | | | | |
| January | $26.42 | $27.42 | $26.39 | $27.27 |
| February | 26.69 | 26.17 | 26.76 | 24.93 |
| March | 28.08 | 25.70 | 27.31 | 23.63 |
| April | 27.76 | 25.05 | 27.45 | 23.77 |
| May | 27.43 | 23.43 | 26.02 | 22.61 |
| June | 26.04 | 22.45 | 25.25 | 22.69 |
| July | 25.64 | 22.38 | 26.50 | 24.72 |
| August | 25.07 | 24.13 | 28.19 | 24.60 |
| September | 24.80 | 24.34 | 29.85 | 23.94 |
| October | 24.94 | 24.55 | 29.50 | 24.03 |
| November | 26.08 | 25.58 | 30.13 | |
| December | 26.86 | 26.13 | 28.91 | |
| Average | 26.24 | 24.65 | 27.67 | |

| | 1960 | 1961 | 1962 | 1963 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| ALL GRADES | | | | |
| January | $26.10 | $27.02 | $25.90 | $26.90 |
| February | 26.37 | 25.84 | 26.04 | 24.69 |
| March | 27.40 | 25.33 | 26.65 | 23.30 |
| April | 27.13 | 24.73 | 26.80 | 23.51 |
| May | 26.75 | 23.09 | 25.62 | 22.43 |
| June | 25.58 | 22.30 | 24.91 | 22.54 |
| July | 25.30 | 22.23 | 26.12 | 24.66 |
| August | 24.75 | 24.01 | 27.88 | 24.47 |
| September | 24.62 | 24.21 | 29.63 | 23.80 |
| October | 24.83 | 24.45 | 29.29 | 23.97 |
| November | 26.00 | 25.44 | 29.89 | |
| December | 26.61 | 25.84 | 28.59 | |
| Average | 25.93 | 24.46 | 27.20 | |

Source: Livestock Division, Agricultural Marketing Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture.

*Beef-steer-corn price ratios, Chicago basis* [1]

| | 1960 | 1961 | 1962 | 1963 [2] |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| January | 22.8 | 24.5 | 24.0 | 22.8 |
| February | 23.4 | 22.9 | 24.2 | 20.7 |
| March | 23.8 | 22.9 | 24.1 | 19.2 |
| April | 22.5 | 22.9 | 24.0 | 19.5 |
| May | 22.1 | 20.4 | 22.3 | 18.3 |
| June | 21.3 | 20.0 | 21.9 | 17.5 |
| July | 21.2 | 19.6 | 23.4 | 18.6 |
| August | 20.9 | 21.3 | 25.4 | 18.5 |
| September | 21.1 | 21.9 | 26.7 | 17.7 |
| October | 23.5 | 22.4 | 26.6 | 20.3 |
| November | 27.1 | 23.2 | 27.8 | |
| December | 26.2 | 23.9 | 25.5 | |
| Average | 23.0 | 22.2 | 24.7 | |

[1] Bushels of No. 3 yellow corn equivalent in value to 100 pounds of beef steers from the Corn Belt, sold out of 1st loads at Chicago for slaughter, all grades. Explanation and example: The price of slaughter steers per hundredweight at Chicago in March was equivalent in value to 19.2 bushels of corn, as compared to 26.2 in December 1960, the last month of the Eisenhower administration and below.

[2] Preliminary.

Source: Feed Situation, ERS, USDA.

*Production Credit Administration loans for the purchase of feeder cattle* [1]

| | Value | Number |
|---|---|---|
| 1956 | $97,093,000 | 32,246 |
| 1962 | 252,705,000 | 36,319 |

[1] Based on a 10-percent sampling.

Source: Library of Congress (Production Credit Association, under the Farm Credit Administration, is an independent agency located in the Agriculture Department Bldg.)

*Total military purchases centrally procured by the Defense Supply Agency for shipment on worldwide basis*

| | Fiscal year 1960 | | Fiscal year 1961 | | Fiscal year 1962 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Pounds | Value | Pounds | Value | Pounds | Value |
| Carcass beef | 131,000,000 | $55,500,000 | 119,000,000 | $46,700,000 | 100,000,000 | $39,400,000 |
| Boneless beef | 105,000,000 | 73,100,000 | 108,000,000 | 70,500,000 | 129,000,000 | 88,500,000 |
| Other beef | 39,000,000 | 20,400,000 | 40,000,000 | 18,000,000 | 39,000,000 | 18,800,000 |
| Total | 275,000,000 | 149,000,000 | 267,000,000 | 136,000,000 | 268,000,000 | 146,700,000 |

Source: Defense Supply Agency.

*Loans under the Farmers Home Administration*

| Operating loans | Total loans | | Loans, purchase of livestock | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | United States | Iowa | United States | Iowa |
| Fiscal year 1960 | $198,275,519 | $6,900,252 | $41,232,481 | $1,772,545 |
| Fiscal year 1961 | 233,324,651 | 7,470,708 | 50,626,238 | 1,934,145 |
| Fiscal year 1962 | 275,324,354 | 9,064,103 | 66,071,218 | 2,328,757 |
| Fiscal year 1963 | 300,467,098 | 12,926,192 | 74,801,495 | 2,972,373 |

Source: Operating Loan Division, Farmers, Home Administration, Department of Agriculture.

*Estimated impact on cattle prices of a 10-percent change in imports of beef and veal under different assumed levels of imports* [1]

[In percent]

| Assumed levels of imports as percent of total domestic production [2] | Estimated effect of a 10-percent change in imports on price of—[3] | |
|---|---|---|
| | Choice steers at Chicago | Utility cows at Chicago |
| 5 | −0.7 | −1.7 |
| 10 | −1.1 | −2.7 |
| 15 | −1.4 | −3.5 |
| 20 | −1.6 | −4.0 |

[1] Livestock and meat situation, November 1963, Economic Research Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture.
[2] Domestic production of beef and veal are held constant at 1962-63 levels.
[3] The estimated effects of beef and veal imports on cattle prices are based on the supply-price relationships shown in the following table.

*The effect of selected factors on the price of Choice steers and Utility cows at Chicago as measured by a statistical analysis, 1948-62* [1]

[In percent]

| Selected factor | Deflated price at Chicago of— | |
|---|---|---|
| | Choice steers | Utility cows |
| Effect on price of a 1-percent change in— | | |
| Per capita supply of steer and heifer beef | −1.33 | −2.29 |
| Per capita supply of cow beef plus imports of beef and veal | −.29 | −.74 |
| Per capita consumption of pork, veal, lamb, and mutton | [2] −.27 | −1.20 |
| Per capita disposable income deflated by Consumer Price Index | 1.25 | 2.61 |

[1] Based on statistical (regression) analyses using annual data in logarithms for the period 1948-62. The regression analysis also included a shift variable (0-1 variable) which took into account that conditions may have been different in the period 1948-57 and 1958-62.
[2] Coefficient does not differ significantly from zero when tested at the 5-percent level.

Source: "Livestock and Meat Situation," November 1963, Economic Research Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture.

*Production and consumption per person of red meat and poultry, United States, 1955–63 and forecast for 1964*

PRODUCTION (million pounds) [1]

| Year | Red meat | | | | | Poultry meat [2] | Red and poultry meat |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Beef | Veal | Lamb and mutton | Pork | Total | | |
| 1955 | 13,569 | 1,578 | 758 | 10,990 | 26,895 | 4,390 | 31,285 |
| 1956 | 14,462 | 1,632 | 741 | 11,200 | 28,035 | 5,174 | 33,209 |
| 1957 | 14,202 | 1,526 | 707 | 10,424 | 26,859 | 5,438 | 32,297 |
| 1958 | 13,330 | 1,186 | 688 | 10,454 | 25,658 | 6,043 | 31,701 |
| 1959 | 13,580 | 1,008 | 738 | 11,993 | 27,319 | 6,353 | 33,672 |
| 1960 | 14,727 | 1,108 | 768 | 11,605 | 28,208 | 6,390 | 34,598 |
| 1961 | 15,298 | 1,044 | 832 | 11,411 | 28,585 | 7,334 | 35,919 |
| 1962 | 15,296 | 1,015 | 809 | 11,841 | 29,961 | 7,132 | 36,093 |
| 1963 [3] | 16,470 | 940 | 760 | 12,200 | 30,370 | 7,300 | 37,670 |
| 1964 [4] | 16,950 | 900 | 750 | 12,000 | 30,600 | 7,450 | 38,050 |

CONSUMPTION PER PERSON (pounds)

| Year | Red meat | | | | | Poultry meat [2] | Red and poultry meat |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Beef | Veal | Lamb and mutton | Pork | Total | | |
| 1955 | 82.0 | 9.4 | 4.6 | 66.8 | 162.8 | 26.3 | 189.1 |
| 1956 | 85.4 | 9.5 | 4.5 | 67.3 | 166.7 | 29.6 | 196.3 |
| 1957 | 84.6 | 8.8 | 4.2 | 61.1 | 158.7 | 31.4 | 190.1 |
| 1958 | 80.5 | 6.7 | 4.2 | 60.2 | 151.6 | 34.1 | 185.7 |
| 1959 | 81.4 | 5.7 | 4.8 | 67.6 | 159.5 | 35.2 | 194.7 |
| 1960 | 85.2 | 6.2 | 4.8 | 65.2 | 161.4 | 34.4 | 195.8 |
| 1961 | 88.0 | 5.7 | 5.1 | 62.2 | 161.0 | 37.8 | 198.8 |
| 1962 | 89.1 | 5.5 | 5.2 | 63.9 | 163.7 | 37.2 | 200.9 |
| 1963 [3] | 95.1 | 5.0 | 4.9 | 64.9 | 169.9 | 37.4 | 207.3 |
| 1964 [4] | 97.0 | 4.8 | 4.7 | 63.5 | 170.0 | 37.8 | 207.8 |

[1] Production of red meats is carcass weight equivalent of production from total U.S. slaughter.
[2] Chicken, including commercial broilers, and turkeys, ready-to-cook (eviscerated) basis.
[3] Preliminary.
[4] Forecast.

*U.S. beef and veal imports, carcass weight equivalent*

[Thousands of pounds]

| Year | Beef | | | | | | | | Total veal | Total beef and veal |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Fresh and frozen | Pickled and cured | Canned | Sausage | Other beef | Other canned n.s.p.f. | Boneless | Total beef | | |
| 1954 | 7,520 | 27,416 | 168,784 | 398 | 8,187 | 5,766 | 12,537 | 230,608 | 1,048 | 231,656 |
| 1955 | 6,112 | 6,172 | 172,498 | 371 | 8,305 | 6,629 | 28,674 | 228,761 | 275 | 229,036 |
| 1956 | 5,140 | 9,799 | 143,999 | 468 | 7,338 | 6,915 | 36,894 | 210,553 | 245 | 210,798 |
| 1957 | 32,863 | 12,794 | 188,624 | 586 | 7,976 | 18,975 | 128,520 | 390,338 | 4,878 | 395,216 |
| 1958 | 58,880 | 7,250 | 224,606 | 874 | 12,691 | 176,753 | 414,488 | 895,542 | 13,506 | 909,048 |
| 1959 | 39,136 | 8,407 | 187,441 | 1,230 | 10,439 | 120,083 | 680,317 | 1,047,053 | 16,138 | 1,063,191 |
| 1960 | 14,685 | 1,107 | 151,538 | 1,135 | 8,369 | 26,636 | 556,765 | 760,235 | 15,275 | 775,510 |
| 1961 | 25,096 | 1,115 | 188,563 | 1,128 | 10,010 | 29,833 | 764,905 | 1,020,650 | 16,474 | 1,037,124 |
| 1962 | 18,767 | 620 | 166,238 | 1,159 | 16,223 | 28,908 | 1,187,632 | 1,419,547 | 25,511 | 1,445,058 |
| 1963 (January–August) | 12,255 | 533 | 148,626 | 669 | 12,123 | 22,461 | 876,756 | 1,073,423 | 12,100 | 1,085,523 |

*U.S. production of beef and veal by major classes, imports of beef and veal, and prices*

| Year | Production of steer and heifer beef, and veal [1] | | Production of cow and bull beef [1] | | Imports of beef and veal [2] | | Cow and bull beef production plus imports | | Prices at Chicago | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Actual | Per capita | Actual | Per capita | Actual | Per capita | Actual | Per capita | Utility cows | Choice steers |
| | *Million pounds* | *Pounds* | *Million pounds* | *Pounds* | *Million pounds* | *Pounds* | *Million pounds* | *Pounds* | | |
| 1947 | 7,564 | 53.0 | 4,025 | 28.5 | 64 | 0.4 | 4,089 | 28.7 | $14.26 | $26.22 |
| 1948 | 6,495 | 44.7 | 3,594 | 24.8 | 356 | 2.4 | 3,950 | 27.2 | 19.49 | 30.96 |
| 1949 | 7,412 | 50.2 | 2,970 | 20.1 | 254 | 1.7 | 3,224 | 21.8 | 16.33 | 26.07 |
| 1950 | 7,235 | 48.2 | 3,150 | 21.0 | 505 | 3.4 | 3,655 | 24.3 | 19.36 | 29.68 |
| 1951 | 6,543 | 43.3 | 2,978 | 19.7 | 575 | 3.8 | 3,553 | 23.5 | 24.48 | 35.96 |
| 1952 | 7,482 | 48.8 | 2,935 | 19.1 | 476 | 3.1 | 3,411 | 22.2 | 19.53 | 33.18 |
| 1953 | 9,760 | 62.6 | 3,746 | 24.0 | 333 | 2.1 | 4,079 | 26.1 | 12.41 | 24.14 |
| 1954 | 10,031 | 63.0 | 4,121 | 25.9 | 267 | 1.7 | 4,449 | 28.0 | 11.46 | 24.66 |
| 1955 | 10,251 | 63.2 | 4,449 | 27.4 | 322 | 2.0 | 4,771 | 29.4 | 11.52 | 23.16 |
| 1956 | 11,262 | 68.1 | 4,369 | 26.4 | 254 | 1.5 | 4,623 | 28.0 | 11.37 | 22.30 |
| 1957 | 11,208 | 66.6 | 4,086 | 24.3 | 616 | 3.7 | 4,702 | 27.9 | 13.61 | 23.83 |
| 1958 | 10,894 | 63.6 | 3,192 | 18.6 | 1,249 | 7.3 | 4,441 | 25.9 | 18.41 | 27.42 |
| 1959 | 11,278 | 64.6 | 2,884 | 16.5 | 1,254 | 7.2 | 4,138 | 23.7 | 17.79 | 27.83 |
| 1960 | 12,387 | 69.8 | 3,012 | 17.0 | 938 | 5.3 | 3,950 | 22.3 | 15.68 | 26.24 |
| 1961 | 13,137 | 72.8 | 2,753 | 15.3 | 1,287 | 7.1 | 4,040 | 22.4 | 15.66 | 24.65 |
| 1962 | 12,945 | 70.8 | 2,922 | 16.0 | 1,725 | 9.4 | 4,677 | 25.6 | 15.50 | 27.67 |

[1] Estimated from total commercial slaughter.
[2] Includes meat equivalent of live animals imported.

*Inspected imports of cattle (number) by months, 1961 to date* [1]

| Month | From Canada | | | From Mexico | | | Month | From Canada | | | From Mexico | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1961 | 1962 | 1963 | 1961 | 1962 | 1963 | | 1961 | 1962 | 1963 | 1961 | 1962 | 1963 |
| January | 22,321 | 23,371 | 29,253 | 68,909 | 82,886 | 105,876 | August | 59,886 | 21,978 | 10,090 | 11,061 | 16,547 | 10,154 |
| February | 8,618 | 14,694 | 15,383 | 47,411 | 83,777 | 71,382 | September | 65,101 | 28,402 | | 16,319 | 25,594 | |
| March | 9,837 | 24,412 | 11,997 | 59,976 | 83,568 | 58,070 | October | 122,866 | 101,066 | | 43,396 | 71,273 | |
| April | 14,744 | 27,411 | 22,422 | 65,741 | 73,673 | 84,077 | November | 110,327 | 135,561 | | 78,986 | 129,043 | |
| May | 18,560 | 32,784 | 17,533 | 32,109 | 50,970 | 46,297 | December | 27,352 | 57,757 | | 104,034 | 131,751 | |
| June | 13,822 | 16,870 | 11,480 | 8,311 | 15,085 | 15,326 | | | | | | | |
| July | 32,867 | 14,476 | 9,205 | 3,944 | 8,748 | 14,681 | Year | 506,301 | 498,782 | | 540,197 | 772,915 | |

[1] Inspected when offered for importation.

Compiled from reports of the Animal Inspection and Quarantine Division of the Agricultural Research Service.

*Imports of cattle from Canada and Mexico, excluding breeding animals, 1952 to date*

FROM CANADA

| Year | Dutiable cattle (head) | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 700 pounds and over | | Under 200 pounds | 200 to 699 pounds | Total dutiable cattle |
| | Cows for dairy purposes | Other | | | |
| 1952 [1] | 4,636 | 4,244 | 714 | 968 | 10,562 |
| 1953 [2] | 21,811 | 22,931 | 3,515 | 896 | 49,153 |
| 1954 | 17,633 | 46,798 | 2,872 | 3,377 | 70,680 |
| 1955 | 25,252 | 17,543 | 3,256 | 2,218 | 48,269 |
| 1956 | 22,678 | 2,914 | 3,571 | 1,390 | 30,553 |
| 1957 | 18,857 | 186,036 | 10,486 | 151,059 | 366,438 |
| 1958 | 19,586 | 230,025 | 13,580 | 373,671 | 636,862 |
| 1959 | 14,998 | 90,259 | 30,738 | 186,630 | 322,625 |
| 1960 | 20,247 | 60,865 | 32,079 | 140,471 | 253,662 |
| 1961 | 24,972 | 88,660 | 28,605 | 337,452 | 479,689 |
| 1962 | 15,481 | 72,205 | 41,315 | 351,336 | 480,337 |
| 1963, January–July | 6,776 | 34,899 | 35,471 | 30,324 | 107,470 |

FROM MEXICO

| Year | Dutiable cattle (head) | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 700 pounds and over | | Under 200 pounds | 200 to 699 pounds | Total dutiable cattle |
| | Cows for dairy purposes | Other | | | |
| 1952 [3] | 2,381 | 43,617 | 96 | 81,185 | 127,279 |
| 1953 [4] | 175 | 25,364 | 485 | 101,901 | 127,925 |
| 1954 | | | | | |
| 1955 [5] | 1,424 | 56,153 | 539 | 189,631 | 247,747 |
| 1956 | 1,684 | 11,124 | 848 | 96,594 | 110,250 |
| 1957 | 480 | 44,236 | 7,914 | 283,842 | 336,472 |
| 1958 | 1,255 | 80,589 | 3,231 | 403,166 | 488,241 |
| 1959 | 1,597 | 45,697 | 1,037 | 317,095 | 365,426 |
| 1960 | 371 | 19,631 | 1,773 | 369,113 | 390,888 |
| 1961 | 46 | 36,410 | 8,655 | 497,999 | 543,110 |
| 1962 | 34 | 36,732 | 24,925 | 690,228 | 751,919 |
| 1963, January–July | 7 | 16,078 | 23,408 | 391,004 | 430,497 |

[1] Imports prohibited beginning Feb. 25, 1962, due to foot-and-mouth disease.
[2] Embargo removed Mar. 1, 1953.
[3] Embargo removed Sept. 1, 1952.
[4] Imports prohibited beginning May 23, 1953.
[5] Embargo removed Jan. 1, 1955.

Source: Compiled from official records of the Bureau of the Census.

*Meat exports: U.S. exports and shipments by countries, 1958 to date*

[In million of pounds]

| Product and year | Exports, by destination, product weight | | | | | | | | | | Shipments to territories [1] | Total exports and shipments | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Canada | Mexico | Bahamas | West Germany | Jamaica | Trinidad | Netherlands | Venezuela | All other | Total | | Product weight | Carcass weight equivalent |
| Beef and veal: | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1958 | 15.8 | 0.4 | 1.0 | (2) | 1.1 | 0.5 | (2) | 0.6 | 5.4 | 24.8 | 8.8 | 33.6 | 49 |
| 1959 | 17.6 | .4 | 1.4 | (2) | 1.1 | .2 | 0.1 | 1.0 | 5.6 | 27.4 | 9.9 | 37.3 | 53 |
| 1960 | 19.5 | .2 | 1.8 | | 1.3 | .3 | .2 | .8 | 5.3 | 29.4 | 12.3 | 41.7 | 56 |
| 1961 | 18.9 | .2 | 1.8 | (2) | 1.6 | .5 | .1 | .1 | 6.7 | 29.9 | 13.3 | 43.2 | 58 |
| 1962 | 16.9 | .1 | 1.9 | (2) | 1.2 | .2 | .1 | (2) | 6.7 | 27.1 | 13.8 | 40.9 | 53 |
| Lamb and mutton: | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1958 | .4 | (2) | .1 | | (2) | (2) | | (2) | .2 | .7 | | .7 | 2 |
| 1959 | .4 | .1 | .2 | (2) | (2) | (2) | | (2) | .1 | .8 | | .8 | 2 |
| 1960 | .7 | (2) | .2 | | (2) | (2) | | (2) | .6 | 1.5 | | 1.5 | 2 |
| 1961 | .5 | (2) | .2 | (2) | (2) | (2) | .4 | (2) | .5 | 1.6 | | 1.6 | 2 |
| 1962 | .5 | (2) | .2 | | (2) | | | (2) | 1.3 | 2.0 | | 2.0 | 3 |
| Pork: | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1958 | 1.1 | 5.8 | 1.6 | 1.9 | 1.6 | 1.2 | .7 | 3.1 | 37.3 | 54.3 | 48.2 | 102.5 | 118 |
| 1959 | 1.1 | 11.0 | 1.4 | 3.4 | 2.0 | 1.4 | 1.8 | 4.1 | 44.7 | 70.9 | 55.4 | 126.3 | 143 |
| 1960 | 16.3 | 5.5 | 2.0 | 1.5 | 2.7 | 2.8 | .5 | 5.1 | 33.0 | 69.4 | 53.3 | 122.7 | 138 |
| 1961 | 36.2 | 6.7 | 1.8 | 2.3 | 2.9 | 2.9 | .7 | 6.4 | 8.4 | 68.3 | 56.8 | 125.2 | 139 |
| 1962 | 33.8 | 6.7 | 1.8 | 1.5 | 3.5 | 3.3 | .2 | 5.1 | 7.8 | 63.7 | 57.5 | 121.2 | 132 |
| Total: [3] | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1958 | 20.4 | 6.5 | 2.9 | 1.9 | 2.8 | 1.8 | .7 | 5.9 | 48.0 | 90.9 | 78.0 | 168.9 | 169 |
| 1959 | 22.6 | 11.9 | 3.1 | 3.5 | 3.2 | 1.7 | 1.9 | 7.3 | 53.6 | 108 8. | 85.5 | 194.3 | 198 |
| 1960 | 37.2 | 5.9 | 4.3 | 1.7 | 4.1 | 3.2 | .7 | 8.0 | 42.5 | 107.6 | 87.4 | 195.0 | 196 |
| 1961 | 56.2 | 7.1 | 4.1 | 2.5 | 4.6 | 3.5 | .8 | 7.0 | 19.8 | 105.6 | 95.0 | 200.6 | 199 |
| 1962 | 51.7 | 7.0 | 4.0 | 1.5 | 4.9 | 3.7 | .4 | 5.3 | 19.3 | 97.8 | 98.2 | 196.0 | 198 |

[1] Puerto Rico and Virgin Islands and Guam.
[2] Less than 50,000 pounds.
[3] Including sausage, bologna and frankfurters canned and not canned, sausage ingredients, meat and meat products not elsewhere classified, and canned baby food.

Source: Compiled from official records of the Bureau of Census.

*Meat animal imports: Number of cattle, sheep, and hogs imported, United States, 1940 to date* [1]

| Year | Cattle | | | | | | | | | Sheep and lambs | | | Hogs | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 700 pounds and over | | | Under 700 pounds | | | Dutiable cattle | Breeding cattle (free) [2] | Total cattle | Dutiable | Breeding sheep (free) [2] | Total sheep and lambs | Dutiable [3] | Breeding hogs (free) [2] | Total hogs [3] |
| | Cows for dairy purposes | Other | Total | Under 200 pounds | 200 to 699 pounds | Total | | | | | | | | | |
| 1940 | 9,600 | 169,720 | 179,320 | 104,602 | 346,289 | 450,891 | 30,211 | 13,621 | 643,832 | 205 | 3,178 | 3,383 | 274 | 38 | 312 |
| 1941 | 13,387 | 205,488 | 218,875 | 102,195 | 412,312 | 514,507 | 733,382 | 16,375 | 749,757 | 8,373 | 3,829 | 12,202 | 45,117 | 50 | 45,167 |
| 1942 | 19,566 | 180,054 | 199,620 | 66,518 | 386,495 | 453,013 | 652,633 | 16,218 | 668,851 | 1,859 | 3,604 | 5,463 | 460 | 89 | 549 |
| 1943 | 34,934 | 77,520 | 112,454 | 14,269 | 502,909 | 517,178 | 629,632 | 22,978 | 652,610 | 1,404 | 2,884 | 4,288 | 79 | 521 | 600 |
| 1944 | 33,624 | 25,696 | 59,320 | 5,861 | 276,297 | 282,158 | 341,478 | 16,791 | 358,269 | 137,476 | 3,257 | 140,733 | 25 | 192 | 217 |
| 1945 | 43,984 | 41,995 | 85,979 | 9,742 | 393,672 | 403,414 | 489,393 | 22,230 | 511,623 | 97,969 | 3,171 | 101,140 | 80 | 545 | 625 |
| 1946 | 66,085 | 25,915 | 92,000 | 10,053 | 413,665 | 423,718 | 515,718 | 42,186 | 557,904 | 3,885 | 3,627 | 7,512 | 115 | 1,189 | 1,304 |
| 1947 | 43,917 | 888 | 44,805 | 7,642 | 2,010 | 9,652 | 54,457 | 30,048 | 84,505 | 868 | 4,829 | 5,697 | 255 | 2,925 | 3,180 |
| 1948 | 84,275 | 214,645 | 298,920 | 23,571 | 96,335 | 119,906 | 418,826 | 42,853 | 461,679 | 50,517 | 3,892 | 54,409 | 355 | 2,028 | 2,383 |
| 1949 | 49,061 | 194,916 | 243,977 | 41,535 | 126,614 | 168,149 | 412,126 | 21,332 | 433,458 | 38,562 | 2,692 | 41,254 | 50 | 1,335 | 1,385 |
| 1950 | 46,591 | 173,000 | 219,591 | 38,985 | 179,709 | 218,694 | 438,285 | 22,684 | 460,969 | 97,127 | 3,340 | 100,467 | 120 | 865 | 985 |
| 1951 | 35,626 | 117,479 | 153,105 | 15,609 | 51,107 | 66,716 | 219,821 | 19,138 | 238,959 | 14,312 | 2,591 | 16,903 | 950 | 535 | 1,485 |
| 1952 | 7,017 | 47,941 | 54,958 | 810 | 82,280 | 83,090 | 138,048 | 2,413 | 140,461 | 304 | 603 | 907 | 185 | 11 | 196 |
| 1953 | 22,009 | 48,320 | 70,329 | 4,000 | 102,831 | 106,831 | 177,160 | 21,066 | 198,226 | 868 | 1,283 | 2,151 | 24,030 | 395 | 24,425 |
| 1954 | 17,633 | 46,798 | 64,431 | 2,872 | 3,377 | 6,249 | 70,680 | 15,376 | 86,056 | 1,480 | (4) | 1,480 | 30,715 | (4) | 30,715 |
| 1955 | 26,676 | 73,696 | 100,372 | 3,795 | 191,849 | 195,644 | 296,016 | 18,361 | 314,377 | 7,640 | ---------- | 7,640 | 6,588 | -------- | 6,588 |
| 1956 | 24,364 | 14,038 | 38,402 | 4,419 | 97,984 | 102,403 | 140,805 | 18,554 | 159,359 | 3,158 | ---------- | 3,158 | 382 | -------- | 382 |
| 1957 | 19,342 | 230,272 | 249,614 | 18,400 | 434,901 | 453,301 | 702,915 | 24,938 | 727,853 | 17,832 | ---------- | 17,832 | 746 | -------- | 746 |
| 1958 | 20,841 | 311,724 | 332,565 | 16,811 | 776,837 | 793,648 | 1,126,213 | 26,194 | 1,152,407 | 39,769 | ---------- | 39,769 | 9,094 | -------- | 9,049 |
| 1959 | 16,600 | 135,956 | 152,556 | 31,775 | 503,725 | 535,500 | 688,056 | 20,699 | 708,755 | 75,521 | ---------- | 75,521 | 2,367 | -------- | 2,367 |
| 1960 | 20,618 | 80,496 | 101,114 | 33,852 | 509,584 | 543,436 | 644,550 | 18,624 | 663,174 | 49,767 | ---------- | 49,767 | 6,162 | -------- | 6,162 |
| 1961 | 25,018 | 125,070 | 150,088 | 37,260 | 835,451 | 872,711 | 1,022,799 | 19,922 | 1,042,721 | 979 | ---------- | 979 | 3,151 | -------- | 3,151 |
| 1962 | 15,515 | 108,937 | 124,452 | 66,240 | 1,041,564 | 1,107,804 | 1,232,256 | 17,773 | 1,250,029 | 20,845 | ---------- | 20,845 | 3,277 | -------- | 3,277 |

[1] Imports for consumption 1940 to date. Imports from Virgin Islands not included.
[2] Includes other imports not subject to duty.
[3] Imports reported in pounds beginning 1940; pounds converted to 200-pound hog equivalent.
[4] Sheep and hogs for breeding are included with "Animals for breeding n.e.c." beginning 1954.

*U.S. imports of cattle and beef compared with U.S. production, by months, 1958–63*

CATTLE AND CALVES AND BEEF AND VEAL

[In millions of pounds]

| Year and item | January | February | March | April | May | June | July | August | September | October | November | December | Year |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **1958** | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Imports [1] | 86 | 90 | 79 | 94 | 96 | 95 | 123 | 112 | 123 | 121 | 111 | 120 | 1,249 |
| Domestic production [2] | 1,317 | 1,046 | 1,076 | 1,113 | 1,152 | 1,169 | 1,244 | 1,171 | 1,242 | 1,323 | 1,059 | 1,174 | 14,086 |
| Imports: Percent of domestic production | 6.5 | 8.6 | 7.3 | 8.4 | 8.3 | 8.1 | 9.9 | 9.6 | 9.9 | 9.1 | 10.5 | 10.2 | 8.9 |
| **1959** | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Imports [1] | 103 | 88 | 79 | 108 | 115 | 131 | 108 | 114 | 143 | 86 | 73 | 106 | 1,254 |
| Domestic production [2] | 1,202 | 1,013 | 1,102 | 1,172 | 1,141 | 1,185 | 1,246 | 1,159 | 1,264 | 1,278 | 1,160 | 1,240 | 14,162 |
| Imports: Percent of domestic production | 8.6 | 8.7 | 7.2 | 9.3 | 10.1 | 11.1 | 8.7 | 9.8 | 11.3 | 6.8 | 6.3 | 8.5 | 8.9 |
| **1960** | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Imports [1] | 73 | 72 | 74 | 90 | 72 | 76 | 85 | 113 | 81 | 64 | 62 | 76 | 938 |
| Domestic production [2] | 1,275 | 1,162 | 1,284 | 1,141 | 1,279 | 1,332 | 1,251 | 1,406 | 1,399 | 1,360 | 1,281 | 1,229 | 15,399 |
| Imports: Percent of domestic production | 5.7 | 6.2 | 5.8 | 7.9 | 5.6 | 5.7 | 6.8 | 8.0 | 5.8 | 4.7 | 4.8 | 6.2 | 6.1 |
| **1961** | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Imports [1] | 75 | 66 | 80 | 99 | 78 | 111 | 117 | 153 | 111 | 134 | 151 | 112 | 1,287 |
| Domestic production [2] | 1,316 | 1,159 | 1,324 | 1,209 | 1,400 | 1,412 | 1,279 | 1,433 | 1,352 | 1,427 | 1,321 | 1,240 | 15,890 |
| Imports: Percent of domestic production | 5.7 | 5.7 | 7.0 | 8.2 | 5.6 | 7.9 | 9.1 | 10.7 | 8.2 | 9.4 | 11.4 | 9.0 | 8.1 |
| **1962** | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Imports [1] | 121 | 98 | 170 | 119 | 99 | 119 | 118 | 182 | 168 | 165 | 191 | 176 | 1,725 |
| Domestic production [2] | 1,409 | 1,180 | 1,310 | 1,212 | 1,391 | 1,348 | 1,360 | 1,429 | 1,275 | 1,450 | 1,288 | 1,215 | 15,867 |
| Imports: Percent of domestic production | 8.6 | 8.3 | 13.0 | 9.8 | 7.1 | 8.8 | 8.7 | 12.7 | 13.2 | 11.4 | 14.8 | 14.5 | 10.9 |
| **1963** | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Imports [1] | 121 | 175 | 158 | 119 | 149 | 125 | 175 | 181 | ---------- | ---------- | ---------- | ---------- | ---------- |
| Domestic production [2] | 1,424 | 1,230 | 1,344 | 1,369 | 1,470 | 1,373 | 1,442 | 1,473 | ---------- | ---------- | ---------- | ---------- | ---------- |
| Imports: Percent of domestic production | 8.5 | 14.2 | 11.8 | 8.7 | 10.1 | 9.1 | 12.1 | 12.3 | ---------- | ---------- | ---------- | ---------- | ---------- |

[1] Beef, veal, and meat equivalent of live cattle and calf imports.
[2] Commercial beef and veal production. (Does not include farm slaughter.)

*Utility cows—Average prices, 12 markets*

| | 1961 | 1962 |
|---|---|---|
| Chicago | $15.66 | $15.50 |
| Denver | 16.17 | 15.79 |
| Fort Worth | 15.45 | 14.94 |
| Indianapolis | 15.14 | 15.08 |
| Kansas City | 15.76 | 15.58 |
| Oklahoma City | 15.14 | 14.76 |
| Omaha | 15.65 | 15.37 |
| St. Joseph | 15.52 | 15.06 |
| St. Louis | 15.72 | 15.40 |
| Sioux City | 15.57 | 15.47 |
| Sioux Falls | 15.37 | 14.68 |
| South St. Paul | 15.40 | 15.31 |

Source: Market News, Department of Agriculture.

*Utility cows—Average number of head* [1]

[Cows make up 20 percent of all slaughter cattle. Utility cows make up 25 percent of all cows]

| | Total, national slaughter of cattle | Total cows | Total, utility cows |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1961 | 25,500,000 | 5,100,000 | 1,275,000 |
| 1962 | 26,000,000 | 5,200,000 | 1,300,000 |
| 1963 [2] | ---------- | ---------- | ---------- |

[1] These figures are an estimate.
[2] The 1963 figure will run a little higher than the 1962 figure.

Source: Market News, Agriculture Department.

*Utility cows—Average prices, Chicago market*

| | 1961 | 1962 | 1963 |
|---|---|---|---|
| January | $15.70 | $14.87 | $15.07 |
| February | 16.14 | 15.26 | 15.00 |
| March | 16.48 | 15.97 | 15.52 |
| April | 16.95 | 16.06 | 15.74 |
| May | 16.53 | 15.91 | 16.31 |
| June | 16.52 | 16.42 | 16.26 |
| July | 15.02 | 15.31 | 15.33 |
| August | 15.42 | 15.20 | 15.65 |
| September | 14.70 | 15.65 | 15.10 |
| October | 14.78 | 15.31 | 14.64 |
| November | 14.70 | 15.22 | -------- |
| December | 14.97 | 14.91 | -------- |
| Yearly average | 15.66 | 15.50 | 15.36 |

Source: Market News, Agriculture Department.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may suggest the absence of a quorum, without losing my right to the floor.

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

Mr. CASE. Then, Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

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

Mr. MILLER. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. SIMPSON. First, Mr. President, I commend the Senator from Iowa for his exhaustive research on this important question. The Senator is making a vital contribution, which should be given consideration by the committee.

I invite the attention of the Senator from Iowa to the fact that, in January of this year, I was joined by a distinguished group of Senators in introducing a bill, S. 557, which would curb the extensive beef imports which are depressing cattle prices in this country. Our bill would establish an annual quota equal to the average annual quantity of beef imported during the preceding 5-year period. I assume the Senator is familiar with that bill.

If the bill were passed, our country would continue to import a reasonable quantity of beef to meet the supplemental beef needs of the country, and it would curtail the excessive imports of beef and veal, which pose such a threat to the cattleman.

As the Senator probably knows, recently the American National Cattlemen's Association, and other persons connected with State associations, have gone to New Zealand and Australia to do what the administration should be doing to protect the cattlemen and feeders, in order to establish some kind of rapport with New Zealand and Australia and bring about a voluntary restriction by those countries with respect to imports to this country. Does not the Senator feel that under the law the administration should have taken care of this matter?

Mr. MILLER. I do not believe it ought to be even a matter of law. It ought to be a matter of commonsense for nonelected public officials, who are being supported by the taxpayers, including the very people who are hurt by the depressed cattle prices, to have enough initiative by themselves to start trying to work out some kind of voluntary reduction in imports so far as these two countries are concerned. There are other countries also, but I focus attention on these two counties because of the tremendous increase in imports from them. It should have been a matter of plain, good administrative judgment.

Mr. SIMPSON. No doubt the Senator from Iowa remembers that on September 24 of this year the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] delivered an excellent speech, in which he called attention to a law which gives President Kennedy complete authority to eliminate the excessive beef import problem. The authority is contained in section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956, which provides:

> The President is authorized to negotiate agreements with foreign governments in an effort to limit the export to the United States of agricultural commodities or products.

At that time the Senator from Nebraska appealed to the President to act under authority granted to him by Congress. Does the Senator recall that speech?

Mr. MILLER. Yes; I appreciate the Senator's bringing up this point at this time, because it is very pertinent. Most of my remarks today have been directed at the Secretary of Agriculture. I wish to make it clear that I never said that the Secretary of Agriculture had the power to stop imports or to reduce imports. What I have said is that he should at least have enough gumption to go to the Secretary of Commerce or to the President and ask him to utilize the powers he already has. Instead of that he has compounded the problem by treating with disdain the statistics which his own Department has published, and using an ostrichlike approach. That is the reason why I do not believe the Secretary of Agriculture is a friend of the American farmers, particularly of the livestock men.

Mr. SIMPSON. I agree with the Senator. It is my belief, as well as the feeling and opinion throughout the Rocky Mountain States, especially in the State of Wyoming, that there is need for relief, and that the reason why we have not received relief is that the Kennedy administration is not sympathetic toward the livestock men; otherwise the administration would have employed the law already on the statute books.

There is drastic need for relief. We have not received it; and one reason is that the Kennedy administration is not sympathetic to the livestock man. If this administration understood the livestock industry or was interested in it we would not be experiencing these difficulties, because this serious situation could be corrected administratively.

Mr. MILLER. The Senator from Wyoming well knows that if there is any segment of our economy which is completely independent and is not leaning on the Government, it is the livestock industry.

He also knows that if there is any idea that the way to handle agricultural production is through supply management by some nonelected government official, who feels that the way to start chipping away is to get hold of the livestock industry and cause it to fall into such a plight that it has to look to the government for price supports and the accompanying regulations, the freedom of the agricultural industry in general, and the livestock industry in particular, will be a closed book. This possibly could motivate some of the nonelected public officials in the Department of Agriculture and elsewhere in their apparent disinclination to do anything about this situation, even to ignore it. But it is unfair to suggest that when cattlemen complain about imports of beef and veal, they are wrong; that they do not know what they talking about, when the Department of Agriculture Research Division itself knows that if imports rise to 10 percent—and they have been much higher than that—we can expect a 1-percent drop in the income from choice steers and a 3-percent drop in the income from utility cows alone.

Mr. SIMPSON. Would not that be a severe blow to the State of Kansas and to the other Plains States and the Rocky Mountain States?

Mr. MILLER. As the Senator from Wyoming knows, it has its effects, first of all, in the marketplace—the slaughter livestock marketplace and the cattle feeders in the Corn Belt, particularly Iowa, Nebraska, Illinois, Minnesota, and Kansas. In turn, if the slaughter livestock prices are depressed, that will inevitably affect the rancher who raises feeder cattle in the States of Wyoming, Montana, Colorado, and Nebraska, and in the Southern States as well.

In turn, if those producers are not going to be able to make a good income—if they incur losses of millions of dollars—they will not buy as much in goods and services, many of which are produced or performed in the Eastern States. So there is a chain reaction.

There is an old saying, and it has been proved so many times that I do not know why it even needs to be repeated, that there cannot be a healthy economy if basic industries, such as agriculture, are weak and depressed.

Mr. SIMPSON. I concur in the statement of the Senator from Iowa. I should like to lend further credibility to his excellent statement by pointing out that in 1960 the per capita civilian consumption of beef and veal in the United States was 91.4 pounds. The consumption rose to 95.4 pounds in 1962. During this 2-year period, the total meat consumption increased 4.3 percent, while the consumption of imported beef increased 81.8 percent. That is a good indication of the difficult situation confronting the livestock industry in America.

Mr. MILLER. As I said earlier, imports of beef and veal have more than doubled. I am not impressed merely by the percentage increase; I am impressed by the volume. When we consider 12 percent of our total domestic production and translate that into millions of pounds—over a billion pounds—and into the prices and the impact on the feed grain situation—because, after all, every one of those pounds could have contained some feed grain, and more feed grain could have been consumed in the United States. The 12 percent accounts for a staggering total.

So merely to slough off the figures and say, "It is not a significant impact on our livestock industry to have increased imports," or to look the other way and ignore the problem and hope that someone will not get hold of it, is a mistake, especially since no researchers have got hold of it. If Mr. Freeman thinks we are not going to say anything about it on the floor of the Senate, and if he

thinks the American people will be led to believe that everything is fine, and that we are barking up the wrong tree with respect to imports, he is sorely mistaken.

Mr. SIMPSON. He has disregarded the spirit of the stockmen, who have not asked for Government assistance, but who want to live under a system of private enterprise, in which they conduct their own business and make their own markets.

Mr. MILLER. I do not know whether the State of the Senator from Wyoming was visited by the Secretary of Agriculture on his recent swing around the country. According to press releases, the Secretary was seeking to feel the pulse of the farmer, to find out what farmers were thinking. But the Senator from Iowa can report that the Secretary of Agriculture visited his State, and that on the basis of conversations I have had with persons who were present at the meetings and persons who attended meetings of other States, it appeared that Mr. Freeman made his swing around the country not so much to listen to what farmers wanted to tell him, as to tell farmers what he wanted them to hear.

It is all very well to publish advance releases to the effect that the Secretary is going out to listen to what farmers have to say and that he wants to get the grassroots feeling, but it is another thing to go out and tell the farmers what he wants them to hear. Then, if there is a question-and-answer period, someone is planted in the crowd, someone who has been tipped off ahead of time concerning the questions the Secretary would like to ask. That is one thing, and that is the way it has been. But it is quite another thing to announce a meeting and then to sit back and listen to the farmers get a load off their chests.

The Secretary of Agriculture could just as well have come to the Senate and talked with persons like the distinguished junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON], who knows as well as any other Member of this body what the livestock picture is like, especially from the standpoint of the ranchers, because he has been in the industry himself, has been the Governor of his State, and knows as well as anyone else what the livestock situation is.

Mr. Freeman could have saved the taxpayers a large sum of money if, instead of running out to the Rocky Mountain area, he had sat down with the Senator from Wyoming for 20 or 30 minutes. He could have obtained from him all the information he needed, so far as the ranching area is concerned. Then the Secretary could have consulted with the Senators from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA and Mr. CURTIS] and with my own colleague from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], who is the ranking Republican member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, a longtime Member of the Senate, a former Governor and Lieutenant Governor, and an experienced legislator, one who knows what farmers are thinking about. I see no reason for the Secretary to be running around the country at the taxpayers' expense, when he can obtain the needed information in Washington.

Mr. SIMPSON. I agree with the distinguished Senator from Iowa in that respect. Again, I compliment him for the excellent contribution he has made concerning this onerous problem, which must be solved for the welfare of the people of his own area and for the economy of the entire Rocky Mountain region, as well.

Mr. MILLER. I thank the Senator from Wyoming for his kind remarks and constructive statements.

---

## PROPOSED ANNUAL DISCLOSURE OF SOURCES OF INCOME AND FINANCIAL TRANSACTIONS BY OFFICIALS AND STAFF MEMBERS OF EXECUTIVE AND LEGISLATIVE BRANCHES

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, Congress is now midway in the 11th month of the longest session in years. Unfortunately, the unusual length of the session is the only distinction—and a dubious distinction indeed—that this Congress has so far achieved.

It appears, however, that we may be on the verge of still another dubious distinction—a new low in public confidence in the integrity of the Congress as a whole. The resignation of the majority secretary and subsequent developments reported in the press have cast a reflection on the Congress as an institution, Members as well as staff.

Recently, the junior Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER] and I wrote to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration and urged that the provisions of our bill, S. 1261, of which the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] is a cosponsor, be made a part of the Baker inquiry established by Senate Resolution 2112. Our bill would require annual disclosure of all sources of income and financial transactions by elected as well as top appointed officials and by high level staff in both the executive and the legislative branches.

I am sure many Senators have been disturbed by the comments made on this subject—including one made by the majority leader, who, as I understand, has given at least tentative approval of the idea of disclosure.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield?

Mr. CASE. I am happy to yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I was speaking personally, only.

Mr. CASE. Yes, and I should have made that clear, although I believe it was implicit in what I said.

The chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration has since indicated that the committee has decided that the "scope of its present inquiry be pertinent to the terms expressly declared in Senate Resolution 2112 itself." The chairman added:

> Of course, this does not mean that the desirable objectives of S. 1261 and related proposals could not receive the appropriate attention of the committee in due course.

We hope the committee will make very clear that the committee's decision does not rule out following up all aspects of the matter, no matter where they may lead, for the good name of the Senate is at stake. It will be vindicated only if the committee demonstrates its determination to let the chips fall where they may. Specifically, we hope the Rules Committee will not limit its recommendations to the staff of the Senate.

The senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] ably pointed the way for a searching, objective inquiry. His own unbiased factual approach has earned the respect and confidence of press and public. I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, in connection with my remarks, several newspaper articles concerning the distinguished Senator from Delaware and several editorials.

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

[From the Elizabeth (N.J.) Daily Journal, Nov. 8, 1963]

### BAD PRACTICES IN U.S. GOVERNMENT

Incidents in Washington hint that Congress may feel compelled to do something about its own waywardness in the broad field on conflict of interest as well as kindred laxity among others in Government, also the bureaucratic tendency to withhold information from the public. In fact, two bills that would rectify much of this complex situation have been introduced—without perceptible subsequent progress.

The bills are a draft by Senator CASE of New Jersey and Senator NEUBERGER, of Oregon, requiring disclosure on interests that might subject a member of Congress, its staff, or others in the $20,000 category to suspicion of conflict, and another by Senator LONG of Missouri dispelling secrecy by various offices.

Either, if law, probably would have squelched the lush activities of the resigned Senate majority clerk, Robert Baker, who appears to have become a capitalist and entrepreneur on a $20,000 salary. Nobody likes to deprecate or tarnish another's ability to prosper, but the circumstances surrounding Mr. Baker's operations are grounds for the inquiry the Senate is contemplating.

If his activities were the only instance, his case might be passed over, but others have been equally conspicuous. More are suspected.

Hearings and indictments and even convictions are a matter of locking the barn too late. The Case-Neuberger legislation would head off these situations by spotlighting those growing too rich too fast while drawing Government salaries. The Long bill also would do much to correct the persistent practice of hiding pertinent data behind rubber stamps of security, a device often too thin to be tolerated.

The American Newspaper Publishers' Association and the American Society of Newspaper Editors believe the Long bill would put more facts about Government in the Federal Register, the official publication. The public might not see them, but they would be available to honest officials, to dedicated editors, and to reporters who wanted to find them.

Public dissatisfaction with the recurrence of chicanery, unethical if not illegal, is stirring Congress. Continued pressure will bring about corrective legislation—although not until next year.

---

### NONSTOP SESSION

Majority Leader MANSFIELD's announcement to the Senate that Congress will have to stay on until the start of the 1964 session on January 3 comes as no great surprise. The

possibility of a nonstop session was apparent as far back as May, when the first signs of the Washington stalemate appeared.

What is surprising is the fact that Democratic leaders insist this will be a year of accomplishment. They still hope to put the tax and civil rights bills on the President's desk before New Year's Eve.

But this optimism is not substantiated either by the record or the prospect. An unyielding calendar makes it almost certain Mr. Kennedy won't get the bills this year. Civil rights legislation, for example, faces long debate on the House floor and is not likely to reach the Senate before December 1.

The House-passed tax measure is in its fourth week of hearings before the Senate Finance Committee, with more than 100 witnesses still to be heard. Chairman BYRD won't be unhappy if he has to halt tax-cut consideration by reason of certain filibuster when civil rights arrives in the Senate. So the tax cut has even less chance than civil rights for 1963 enactment.

Also awaiting final action is other important legislation, much of it routine housekeeping matters. Take the appropriation measure: Only 4 of the 13 bills needed to run the Government in the current fiscal year have been sent to the White House. Even money for Congress' own payroll is deadlocked in a conference quarrel.

The last time Congress met continuously was in 1941, a war year. This year's reason can be only failure to try to reach legislative solutions to problems sent up from the White House. Such abdication of Congress constitutional function would be inexcusable.

---

[From the Star-Ledger]

HE LETS THE CHIPS FALL AS THEY MAY

(By Philip Meyer)

WASHINGTON.—If the U.S. Senate may be said to have a conscience, it resides in the person of Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS, Republican, of Delaware.

His is the still, small voice that got the Bobby Baker investigation on the road and is being counted on to help keep it on a straight line.

A 17-year Senate veteran who looks like a country preacher, WILLIAMS has not sought the role. In fact, he disclaims it. He has a much simpler explanation for his activity as a kind of freelance corruption seeker.

NONPARTISAN

WILLIAMS' investigative activity has been remarkably productive and nonpartisan. He uncovered the "Irving" Sachs-T. Lamar Caudle tax scandal in the Truman administration and was the first Member of the Senate to criticize President Dwight D. Eisenhower's aid, Sherman Adams. Earlier this year, he helped smoke out the details of New York Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL's oversea junkets.

Blessed with a small constituency—Delaware is smaller than many congressional districts—WILLIAMS has the staff manpower to devote to investigative work. But that is not the real secret of his success at digging up information.

Washington is full of people with stories to tell but no one to tell them to. The word has gotten around that WILLIAMS is a good listener who can be trusted and that he is not a man who will shrug off an accusation and drop it in the wastebasket.

"Once you get into a thing like this, people come to you," he says. "Then one thing feeds on to another, and you get the story uncovered."

NO STONE UNTURNED

Although he gets many crackpot tips and suggestions, WILLIAMS considers them all. "If I drop something," he said, "I immediately become a participant in covering it up."

Nevertheless, he demonstrated a charitable nature by admitting that he has files on minor offenses of Government officials that will remain forever closed. "A man can make an honest mistake."

"I've always said one political party is just as honest as another," he noted. "I don't think a man goes wrong because of his political affiliation. And, anyway, a man who's crooked would change his politics at the least provocation."

WILLIAMS rejected the suggestion that the Republicans might be more interested than the Democrats in pressing the Baker investigation.

"When you go into something like this," he said, "you never know where it will go. It might take us to either side of the aisle."

MISSED COLLEGE

Born 59 years ago on a Delaware farm, WILLIAMS was ninth of 11 children and never went to college. Unlike some politicians similarly situated, he refuses to put on the "plain folks" bit.

"Not going to college has been a real handicap," he admits.

This self-effacement extends even to his political prowess. He was a feed and grain dealer with no previous Government experience when he ran for the Senate.

"I got the nomination in 1946 because nobody else wanted it," he said. "Luckily that turned out to be a Republican landslide year, and I got elected."

Compulsive muckrakers tend to brag about the enemies they accumulate. Not WILLIAMS, who views the world in simple terms of good and evil, reflecting his Methodist upbringing.

"I think most people are pretty honest," he said. "The only enemies you create by uncovering wrongdoing are the participants, and I don't want them as friends anyway."

---

[From the Newark Evening News, Nov. 2, 1963]

THE SENATE'S ANSWER MAN—WILLIAMS OF DELAWARE SHUNS HEADLINES FOR FACTS

(By Doris Fleeson)

WASHINGTON.—The public's best hope of learning the complete Robert (Bobby) Baker story lies with the growing army of men and women who confide in Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS, Delaware Republican, the man who started it all.

The unique quality of WILLIAMS is that where other politicians attract followers, he attracts facts. In turn, he has such an attachment to data that he follows through on it and gets unusual results.

Most Senators can outtalk him. Few outknow him when he decides the facts warrant his personal and public attention.

He has never discussed the type of people who furnish him with information. It is a fair guess, though, that, unlike the glib hoodlums of plausible conspirators who put many Senate investigators in the headlines, they are citizens with unusual commonsense and a good grasp of double-entry bookkeeping.

TACIT ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The Senate has tacitly acknowledged that this is so in its failure to put WILLIAMS on its high-powered investigating committees and give him a staff. It knows that it would be hard to muddy a WILLIAMS trail once the Senator maps his course.

Perhaps this is just as well. Even the best staff tends to become corrupted by the good notices of press and magic lantern. Its members can easily be distracted from the hard labor of reports, controversial conclusions and—oh, horror—legislative remedies for the evils uncovered.

WILLIAMS has even startled Washington by rebuffing the customary surefire ingredient of a beauty-and-sex witness in the Baker case. He just said flatly that he did not know anything about a West German model discussed in the press and would not, therefore, mention her to the Rules Committee in private session.

The Senator's preferred figures are of a different kind. They may in the end prove more formidable, though he has not yet drawn any conclusions. He has, in fact, been entirely fair to Baker.

RELUCTANCE CRITICIZED

The Senate is being criticized for its plain reluctance to handle the Baker case in the same aggressive manner with which it pursues conflict of interest in the executive branch. It remains to be seen whether it proposes to pursue the apparent corrupters on the Washington scene as well as those it may decide were corrupted.

There is nothing really very secret about the Washington operations suggested by the Baker affair. Yet Congress has been resisting full disclosure of the affairs of its Members as a starting point and an example.

Baker was an important figure in the operations of the Senate but only as a mirror of Senate power. The word for the situation as it is developing seems to be not that it is sinister but shabby, a misuse of political relationships.

The employers of Baker and his associates can hardly claim they knew nothing of it at all. And the public, which likes to feel holier than its capital city, might remember that it employs in a very real sense the Congress and renders a verdict on its handling of affairs every 2 years.

---

[From the Evening Star, Washington, D.C., Nov. 6, 1963]

THE WORLD OF BOBBY BAKER

(By Richard Wilson)

A few months ago not very many in Washington, and certainly not the public generally, knew that a personable young man named Robert G. Baker was secretary of the Senate majority. Nor would any, except the initiated, have appreciated the nature of this position and its function.

The initiated know, however, that Baker was one of those essential functionaries who make representative government work. There are scores of men throughout the Government who are rarely mentioned publicly, but who grease the wheels of public administration. They remain happy, in Baker's case profitably so, in their anonymity.

Alger Hiss was one of these—no more. This is not to say there is any further comparison between Hiss and Baker, but perhaps the parallel serves to illustrate the place that these essential functionaries occupy, especially when they are rather young and energetic—young men on the go.

Baker did not make policy. He merely served the Democratic Senators and the leadership in various helpful ways, particularly the leadership because he kept tabs on how Senators would vote.

Baker was, therefore, at the very heart of entrenched privilege and position in the Federal hierarchy. Many people have tried to define the nature of the U.S. Senate and the status of its members, without much success.

Perhaps it is enough to say that the 6-year term, which transcends the 4-year term of the President, and the willingness of voters to return Senators term after term, creates in the body itself and its Members a certain permanency lacking in other high positions.

Out of this permanency grow privilege, perquisites and influence. This need not necessarily be related to partisan politics. Because of his status and influence on legislation or other matters, a Republican Senator may be a power in a Democratic administration, and vice versa. Senatorial relationships with private enterprise for gain are permissible; indeed, a Senator is remiss if he does not vigorously represent the varied interests, public and private, of his own State.

A complex interplay of status, position and influence create a political sea in which some men swim like fish and others flounder. Baker was a swimmer, with a natural affinity for such men as LYNDON JOHNSON of Texas and the late Robert S. Kerr of Oklahoma.

In this Senate sea, the dikes between what is public and what is private are not very firm. The dikes leak. As service and experience lengthen and status rises, a naturally endowed Senator comes to accept and exploit certain practices and privileges which at first may seem to him rather outside the spirit of representative government.

Thus the atmosphere of privilege and position grows, carefully nurtured and preserved by the Bobby Bakers who have come down through history in their varying incarnations.

This courtly world of the Senate is a pleasant one, peopled by well-dressed men and scented by the aroma of Havana cigars, face lotion and bourbon whisky. It includes also, it now develops, several stunning girls in their 20s, a ravishing German girl, and a lavender-carpeted modernistic townhouse within easy access of the Capitol.

This world of the Senate, this world of carpeted and well-decorated hideaways in the Capitol building itself, and of privilege and perquisite—this world is shaken.

It is not so much that Bobby Baker might have violated the law, if indeed there is any law violation at all, but that Bobby's way of life and work in the Senate atmosphere of privilege and preference enabled him to live in a $125,000 house, own another, and engage in profitable business ventures on a large scale.

In the current Senate investigation should show that these ventures were made possible, or easier, by Baker's cultivation of the great and powerful, then the spotlight should really turn on the Senate, itself.

For, it may well be that Bobby learned the formula of success by watching the example of his powerful friends. It is now commonly said that Baker has done nothing that his betters haven't done, but has only committed the ancient sin of being found out.

Nor, in the world of the Senate, is it astonishing that some pretty young ladies should have gotten mentioned, for this is part of the Senate legend, too. It would only be astonishing if, through the Baker case, what was legend was proved to be fact, and truth became stranger than fiction.

---

[From Newsweek, Nov. 8, 1963]

MESS IN WASHINGTON?

(By Kenneth Crawford)

Lamentations about the state of public morality are again heard in the land. This time the keening is over the activities of Bobby Baker, get-rich-quick former secretary of the Democratic majority in the U.S. Senate. The dirge is familiar. The history of revelations of questionable conduct in high places duly deplored by all good men reaches back to the Republic's beginnings.

There were land-speculation scandals in George Washington's administration. The notoriety of Peggy O'Neill almost disrupted Andrew Jackson's Cabinet. Teapot Dome still stands as the most conspicuous monument to the memory of Warren G. Harding. In more recent times there have been teapot tempests over deep freezes, fur and vicuna coats, and one oriental rug.

These affairs follow a pattern. First come rumors of misconduct and cautious reports weighted with innuendo. Then comes vindication of the accused or incriminating revelation. This, in case of revelation, is followed by a wave of righteous wrath. The wrongdoer is punished and reform of the system that made the wrongdoing possible is demanded. Sometimes a new law results. In any case, the excitement dies down and a period of complacency ensues.

INDIGNATION

There is some variety in the crimes and peccadilloes of sinners in government. But there is monotonous similarity about the expressions of indignation they inspire. The times and the customs are always called to account. From editorial sanctums, pulpits, and public forums come warnings that the Nation's moral fiber is dangerously frayed, particularly at the governing edge. There is invariably a blanket indictment under the heading, "Mess in Washington." Social critics speak of public virtue in the past tense, assuming that it went the way of the hoop skirt.

This is an unjust and unjustified assumption. Public servants are probably no better and no worse inherently than they were 30 years ago or 20 years ago. But observation over a long period suggests that legislators, judges, executives, and bureaucrats in the Federal service are better trained, better informed, and more competent now than they have been in the past. Moreover, ethical standards are more exacting, especially in the executive branch, which employs the most people.

In recent years, Congress has been severe in its surveillance of the executive and judicial branches. Its own members have made reputations as investigators more often than as legislators. It has passed scores of laws governing the conduct of the executive bureaucracy. Some of these have worked. But the watchdog has failed to watch itself. The result is that Congress is laggard in matters of ethics. Alone among the three branches, it openly condones conflicts of interest on the part of its members. Thus, perhaps, its long tolerance of one of its employee's adventuring in the thickets of the fast buck.

RESPONSIBILITY

It would be a mistake to conclude, however, that most Members of Congress, or even a large proportion of them, take advantage of their freedom to confuse public responsibility with private gain. A few doubtless feel that they are serving a constituent when they help themselves—that what's good for them is good for their State and for the country. This was approximately the attitude of the late Senator Robert Kerr of Oklahoma, an oil millionaire who guarded the interests of the petroleum industry without hesitation or apology. He also, incidentally, befriended Baker.

A contrasting concept of responsibility is presented by the case of the late Senator Estes Kefauver of Tennessee. Probate of his will revealed that he owned stock in several of the pharmaceutical companies whose practices he was investigating at the time of his death. His persistent inquiries had several times reduced the value of his own holdings.

Neither attitude—Kerr's nor Kefauver's—is typical. But Congress is becoming increasingly sensitive to criticism of its own shortcomings. It is not impossible that self-reform bills already introduced will eventually become law as a result of the Bobby Baker excitement.

---

[From the Oregonian, Oct. 31, 1963]

DOUBLE STANDARD

The Senate Rules Committee's investigation of the financial adventures of Robert G. Baker, resigned secretary of the Senate's Democratic majority, should focus congressional attention on a bill which, if enacted, would help prevent or expose conflicts of interest.

This is S. 1261, requiring annual disclosure of the sources of income and financial interests of top Government officials, including Members of Congress and congressional staff employees. Chief sponsors of this measure are Senators MAURINE NEUBERGER, Democrat, of Oregon, and CLIFFORD P. CASE, Republican, of New Jersey, who have advised the committee by letter:

"It is significant, we believe, that the inquiry in which the committee is now engaged was the result of public disclosure of certain business activities and financial transactions of the Senate majority secretary (Mr. Baker). Had the requirements of our bill been in effect, the Senate would not have had to depend on outside sources to alert it to a situation which reflects on the integrity of the Senate itself. Indeed, had our bill been law, the situation might not have arisen at all."

Senators and Representatives for years have clung to a double standard on conflicts of interest. While roughly treating by public exposure in hearings those officials and employees in the executive branch suspected of using their positions to enrich themselves, they have consistently and haughtily declined to apply the same standards to their own financial interests. A Senator with oil wells does not abstain from voting on an oil bill which means profit for him; rather, he is usually in the forefront in advocating it. Few Members of Congress give up their private business or professional incomes to avoid conflicts of interest. They are above such petty considerations.

Attempts by conscientious "reform" Senators and Representatives to at least require the provision of a public record of earnings and interests of Members and staff workers have failed in the past. Burial in committee is the fate of such bills. But if the Rules Committee is forced by public opinion to lay the Bobby Baker case bare, whether or not Members of Congress are involved, perhaps Congress can be shamed into adopting the Case-Neuberger bill or something similar. We commend our lady Senator for pursuing the matter at a most appropriate time.

---

[From the Orlando Evening Star, Nov. 2, 1963]

POLICE FOR THE POLICEMEN

(By James Marlow)

WASHINGTON.—Five years ago Senator Richard L. Neuberger, Oregon Democrat, complained that nobody polices the policeman, that Congress can investigate the whole area of government but nobody polices Congress.

For example: the head of a Government department must rid himself of his stock before the Senate, to prevent conflict of interest, lets him take office. This is to prevent his profiting from some company he may do business with.

But a Member of Congress can have all kinds of outside interests, and even fight for a law to help those interests, but he doesn't have to rid himself of anything or reveal anything about his total income.

Neuberger said, "I fear it has a corroding effect on government generally when a member of the President's Cabinet can be ordered to jettison his corporate portfolios by Senators who themselves may be dabbling in oil, cotton futures, television, hotel chains, or uranium.

"If Federal Commissioners are to be pilloried for accepting * * * airplane tickets to Palm Beach, how can Senators and Representatives continue profitable associations with law firms retained by banks, railroads, labor unions, and utility companies?"

In short Neuberger was calling on Congress, which has passed laws to prevent conflict of interest on the part of Federal officials and other Government employees, to pass a conflict of interest law on itself.

Congress ignored him with great calmness, as it has ignored similar proposals by other Members of both Houses for years. Recently two former Members of Congress were convicted of influence-peddling while they were in Congress.

Neuberger died of cancer in 1960. His wife, now Senator MAURINE NEUBERGER, also

an Oregon Democrat, was elected to succeed him that same year. Last week she picked up where her husband left off.

She and Senator CLIFFORD P. CASE, New Jersey Republican, asked consideration of a bill they had introduced requiring top Government officers, Members of Congress, and their staff to report their yearly income, including gifts of substance and assets and liabilities and their financial transactions to the Comptroller General, with these reports available to press and public.

CASE has made this kind of proposal repeatedly and, like the late Neuberger, has been ignored.

He and the present Senator NEUBERGER made their pitch in a letter to Senator B. EVERETT JORDAN, North Carolina Democrat, who is chairman of the Senate Rules Committee which today begins an investigation of a former Senate employee, Robert G. Baker.

Baker, who was paid about $20,000 a year, resigned this month as secretary of the Senate Democrats after newspaper disclosure that he seemed to have an extraordinary number of outside financial interests.

His duties for the Democrats included rounding up party members for rollcall votes in the Senate and a wide variety of personal and business favors for Democrats. In addition to his various outside business interests he had a law practice.

What started the disclosures about him was a $300,000 civil damage suit filed against him by the Capitol Vending Co. which charged he had accepted commissions of $5,600 to put its machines in plants working for the Government and then had ended the deal when Capitol refused to sell out to another vending company in which Baker is alleged to have held stock.

The Jordan committee's hearings on Baker's financial activities were to be held behind closed doors.

Mrs. NEUBERGER and CASE told JORDAN that if their bill on financial disclosures by Members of Congress and their employees had been law, Congress would not have had to be informed about Baker by outside sources.

While Congress has shown practically no interest over the years in proposals like those of NEUBERGER and CASE, it has been prompt to get indignant about wrongdoing in the executive branch and has had full-scale investigations.

Right after President Kennedy took office in 1961 he asked Congress to tighten and broaden the laws against conflict of interest as it applies to employees of the executive branch. He got quick action. The law was passed.

But there's hardly a chance in a billion that Congress will do anything about itself.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield?

Mr. CASE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. CLARK. I wish to express my general agreement with the statement of the Senator from New Jersey. As one member of the Committee on Rules and Administration, I hope very much that the bill introduced by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] and the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER] will receive—in due course, and perhaps "with all deliberate speed"—adequate hearings, and will be favorably reported to the Senate.

I agree that the bill which these two fine Senators have sponsored, and which I cosponsor, is not directly connected with the investigation now being made by the Rules Committee into the activities of employees of the Senate. There is no necessary logical connection between improper conduct by our employees and a conflict of interest on behalf of ourselves. And yet what has happened in the press and before the public, since the investigation which the Rules Committee is now conducting got underway, should be clear warning to us that we must take a good, hard look at our own situation. It seems to me abundantly clear that we cannot, like so many ostriches, put our heads in the sand while we insist on the most rigorous conflict-of-interest requirements with respect to all appointees of the executive arm of Government whose nominations must be confirmed by the Senate.

We cannot now, at long last, look into the conduct of employees in the Senate and impose upon them—as I have no doubt we shall in due course do—rigorous requirements to protect them against conflict of interest, and at the same time ignore widespread charges about our own.

I call the attention of Senators to Herblock's cartoon in this morning's Washington Post. It is entitled, "I Declare, I Don't Know Where-All the Lad Picked Up Such Habits."

The cartoon shows a character, who unfortunately has tended to become characteristic of Members of this body, entitled, "'Inner Circle,' Senate Finaglers," and he is talking to a young man dressed exactly the same way, entitled, "Bobby Baker."

For some time I have had before the Senate a proposed change in the rules which would enable us to put cartoons into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It is a shame we cannot do so, because the description of a cartoon—such as I have just given—is often quite inadequate to convey its biting satire.

For some time my colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] and I have made public to the Senate our own financial condition. We do that from time to time, because our investments may change. The majority leader did the same thing a year or two ago. I hope that the bill which has been jointly sponsored by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] and the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], and which I am happy to have cosponsored, will receive hearings and will be passed before the 88th Congress adjourns.

I thank the Senator.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] for his assistance in this matter, and also for his cosponsorship.

I make this observation on the points he has just made. The Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER] and I understand the priorities that the committee must follow in the orderly pursuit of its business. We recognize that the inquiry into the facts is of paramount concern at the moment.

We hope that eventually, when the committee finds itself in possession of the facts and its report thereon, it will consider legislative recommendations also, and at that time we believe a bill will be appropriate, at least for consideration.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. CASE. In one moment I shall.

We merely wish to urge that the inquiry should include not only individuals within the specific terms of the resolution—namely, members of the staff and officers of the Senate—but also Members of the Senate itself, and anyone else. The Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], the author of the resolution, has made clearly apparent to all that that was his intention. He has stated that he was advised by legislative counsel that his resolution is competent to permit the committee to do so.

I am now glad to yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK].

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, at my request, the Legislative Reference Service in the Library of Congress compiled a most interesting memorandum, entitled, "Conflict of Interest Procedure in the British Parliament." This memorandum was prepared by Virginia W. Brewer, an analyst in international relations. It sets forth that in the British Parliament a member is required to make the following statement:

> I swear that my constituents have no local interest in the bill and I have no personal interest in it.

It further requires that no Member who has a direct pecuniary interest in a question shall be allowed to vote on it.

I do not say that we should necessarily have the same conflict-of-interest rules as do our friends across the sea, but I believe this memorandum on conflict of interest in the British Parliament will be of real interest to Senators and to other readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Therefore I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the RECORD.

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

CONFLICT-OF-INTEREST PROCEDURE IN THE BRITISH PARLIAMENT

(By Virginia W. Brewer)

It "is the convention of the House of Commons that a Member must make known his financial interest in any subject that he discusses in debate. And every member of a standing committee must sign a 'declaration of independence that would cause quite a stir in Washington.'" It says: "I swear that my constituents have no local interest in the bill and I have no personal interest in it."[1]

The above quotation from George B. Galloway's "The Legislative Process in Congress," is a part of his brief discussion of differences between ethics in Congress and Parliament. The quotations within it are from a statement made at the New York Herald Tribune Forum in 1951 by Mr. Alistair Cooke, American correspondent of the Manchester Guardian. Mr. Cooke is further quoted, thus:

"When a man goes to Westminster, he does not go as a one-man delegation from an industry or a crop. Very often he may have only a rough idea of what his constituents do for a living. For there is no locality rule in the British system, which is not an oversight but a provision meant to leave the Member of Parliament comparatively free to give his best to the affairs that concern the nation as a whole. This is quite different from watching the Congress bring up a bill and expecting your man to amend it in your interest. This difference may not be so good for the folks back home, but it does make

[1] Galloway, George B., "The Legislative Process in Congress," New York, 1953, p. 385.

possible a national legislature and encourages the honesty of its members."

Dr. Galloway goes on to say:[2] "Thus the British system protects the Member of Parliament from temptation, whereas some other systems, as Mr. Cooke remarked, 'tend to put a representative on the receiving end of a cornucopia and then expect him to be a demigod. I believe with Mr. Dooley that no Congressman ever corrupted himself, but as long as he is half representative and half business agent or trade delegate, business will too often be able to call the tune of the lawmaker.' "

In British parliamentary parlance what is known in the United States as conflict of interest is referred to as personal pecuniary interest.[3] While it is a long-established principle in Great Britain that in both Houses of Parliament personal interest affects the right of Members to vote in certain cases,[4] "it should be further understood, [that] this interest * * * must be a direct pecuniary interest, and separately belonging to the persons whose votes were questioned; and not in common with the rest of his Majesty's subjects, or on a matter of State policy."[5] The principle that broad interests do not constitute sufficient ground for disqualification was asserted as early as 1604, and has been reiterated in Parliament on various occasions, as well as in the 1811 instance just quoted.

In the House of Commons the rule stands that no Member who has a direct pecuniary interest in a question shall be allowed to vote on it. But "on occasions when the objection of personal interest has been raised, which came obviously within the exemption from the application of the role * * * the Speaker or the Chairman has overruled the objection, or has decided that a motion to disallow the vote would be out of order."[6]

(For the only instance in which a vote was disallowed on a question of public policy, and for the very limited number of instances with regard to private bills see the accompanying paper.)

With respect to Ministers of the Crown (who are also Members of Parliament), Sir Winston Churchill, then Prime Minister, in reply to a question in the House of Commons, on February 25, 1952, furnished a copy from the official report of a recent ruling by himself on the subject. This "was referred to in toto by Mr. Butler in [a] recent case of its kind (i.e., that of the Minister of Transport, January 28, 1960), and it is that which is current today." This reference made in 1961, by D. C. M. Platt,[7] goes on to say that Sir Winston's statement consists largely of a compounding of earlier rulings, and gives the following digest of it:[8]

"Ministers are urged so to order their affairs that no conflict arises, or appears to arise, between their private interests and their public duties. They must not engage in any activities which may distract their attention from their public duties, and they must, in cases of retention of private interests, declare those interests if affected by public business, while detaching themselves from the consideration of that business. Ministers must resign all directorships, public or private, paid or unpaid, with the exception of directorships established for the maintenance of private family estates or directorships and offices held in connection with philanthropic undertakings. And even these should be resigned if any risk of conflict with Government interest arises. Ministers must divest themselves of a controlling interest in any company, and of shares, whether controlling or not, in concerns closely associated with a Minister's own Department. Finally, Ministers should scrupulously avoid speculative investments in securities about which they have, or may be thought to have, early or confidential information." (496 H.C. Deb. 53. 702–3.)

It will be evident that the above ruling applies to Ministers because of their executive capacity as well as their legislative duties. Yet the requirements are not a great deal stricter than those for the other Members of Parliament, with which they are interwoven.

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

Mr. CASE. I should like to yield to the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER] but I shall be happy to yield first to the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] for purposes of clarification of one point which came up in my colloquy with the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE]. He is correct in his analysis of the intent of the resolution. It would give to the Rules Committee full power to conduct the investigation and to find out at any point of the investigation whether employees of the Senate or Members of the Senate are involved in any wrongdoing.

I was advised by the legislative counsel that the Rules Committee already had ample jurisdiction. The resolution, as it was drawn, merely confirms such powers. While I hope we find as we get into the investigation that not too many people are involved. Nevertheless, we can stop at nothing less than a full and complete investigation and a determination of all the facts surrounding the case. We must lay all the facts out without regard to who may be involved—and that would include not only all employees but even, if necessary, ourselves as Members of the Senate.

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

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President——

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I am committed to yield to my colleague and cosponsor, and I should like to leave in her hands the matter of——

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield briefly now, at this point, as I must leave the Chamber.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. I am glad to yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. TOWER in the chair) The Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER] does not have the floor.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, with the consent of the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], I am glad to yield briefly to the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT].

Mr. SCOTT. With regard to what the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] has just said concerning the investigation now before the Rules Committee, there has been a great deal of speculation in the press, and a considerable amount of curiosity, as to what the Rules Committee will do.

Something should be said to clarify one phase of this matter. The Rules Committee has not unduly delayed the selection of its counsel, associate counsel, or investigative staff. The press may not be aware of the difficulty involved in persuading people to give up positions which they hold for a temporary job, the difficulty of finding counsel who are free virtually to drop their practice, and the difficulty of recruitment of what may be a much larger staff. The investigation so far being conducted is so extensive, both in volume and in geography, that in my judgment the staff will probably have to be substantially enlarged. I believe it is not impossible that in addition to the two experts from the General Accounting Office who are serving the majority investigator and the minority assistant investigator, there may have to be 8 or 10 other persons with investigative experience—perhaps with previous FBI training—to run down all the leads. With the possibility of well over a hundred witnesses to be heard, the groundwork being done, I believe, reflects creditably on the Rules Committee. It is certainly proceeding in a bipartisan fashion with complete agreement as to how this investigation should be conducted.

Confronted as we are with a towering mass of leads and evidence, and information presently falling short of evidence, the committee can be expected, in my judgment, to pursue the matter diligently, with great awareness of its responsibility to the Senate and to the people.

I would expect the integrity of the Committee on Rules and Administration to be respected by those who are interested in the investigation. I am perfectly satisfied that every lead will be explored and that everything relevant to the investigation will be most carefully looked into.

As one member of the committee, I share the determination of all other committees that nothing shall be "swept under the rug." Such inferences are hardly justified.

The committee can be expected to fulfill with great care, with diligence, and with the application of a great deal more time than any of us would like to give to it—the application of such time as is required—its responsibility of seeing that the investigation is completed as expeditiously as possible. Such an investigation will cover all matters which have in the course of time been referred to the committee.

I thank the Senator for yielding to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey has the floor.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania, and also thank the Senator from Delaware for his earlier remarks.

I now yield to my colleague the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER].

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I believe it is timely to comment once

---

[2] Galloway, op. cit., p. 385, quoting from: "Balancing Moral Responsibility and Scientific Progress," report of 20th annual New York Herald Tribune Forum; Oct. 22–24, 1951, p. 44.

[3] May, Sir Thomas Erskine, "Sir Thomas Erskine May's Treatise on the Law, Privileges, Proceedings, and Usage of Parliament," 16th (1957) edition, London, 1957, p. 439.

[4] May, op. cit., p. 439.

[5] Platt, D. C. M., "The Commercial and Industrial Interests of Ministers of the Crown," in Political Studies, vol. 9, 1961, p. 271, quoting 20 Parl. Deb., p. 1012.

[6] May, op. cit., p. 439.

[7] Platt, op. cit., p. 290.

[8] Ibid., p. 290.

more that the Senator from New Jersey and I have been interested in the legislation for lo, these many months preceding the recent confusion. The case which has received some recent notoriety is not necessarily pertinent one way or another to this particular legislation.

Most of my moments and days during the short period of time I have served in the Senate have been pleasant, and will leave me with wonderful memories. There is only one part of my task that I do not like, and that is when I serve on a committee and there comes before me an appointee of the President of the United States to serve as a part of his official family or to serve in a regulatory agency, and we "put him on the rack." He is usually someone taken away from business because he has a great contribution to make, or from labor, or from the professions; yet we treat him as if we are going to crucify him. We ask him to divulge his financial status and a good many of his private business arrangements.

We accept that procedure for appointees but we are unwilling to do the same for ourselves. So long as we believe it is necessary for a member of the President's Cabinet, it seems to me we should be willing to undergo the same scrutiny.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the distinguished lady yield?

Mrs. NEUBERGER. I am glad to yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The gentlewoman from Oregon forgets that Members of the Senate are screened by the electorate before they ever get to the Senate. They are confronted by people at election time. It does not make any difference how large or how small the meeting is; any American citizen can stand in his place and ask, "How many shares of General Motors do you own? What interest have you in the petroleum industry? How many shares of du Pont have you? How many shares of Ford Motor stock do you own, since they have Federal contracts?"

Those who come before the committees are not screened by the voters. Senators are screened. If the voters are on their mettle and want to know something about a Senator's personal affairs, they are perfectly free to ask. They can cause one's name to be placed on the front page and keep one from coming to the Congress, if they are interested. That situation does not obtain in the case of administrative and executive appointments.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President——

Mr. DIRKSEN. The appointees are culled out of industry. They come to this city. Obviously they must be screened.

I do not know that anybody—not even Charles Wilson—has been crucified or excoriated by a committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey has the floor.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. I should like to reply to my distinguished colleague.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Jersey yield?

Mr. CASE. I yield again to the Senator from Oregon.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Also, after the voters have put us in the Congress, if they find out that we have not performed well they can withdraw us from our positions. I do not believe, however, that this excuses our unwillingness to meet the standards which we require of others.

It seems to me that most legislators—I should say 99.99 percent of them—are honest and upright, people with whom I am glad to be associated. We seem to be reluctant, however, to put ourselves to the same tests as are applied to others.

Every one of us knows that we must go before the electorate. We are willing to go before the electorate. Why are we not willing, therefore, to live up to standards to which we expect other people to adhere?

Merely because the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from Illinois are willing to disclose their financial resources——

Mr. DIRKSEN. Oh; the Senator from Illinois is not.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey has the floor.

Mr. DIRKSEN. He has not reduced himself to a class B citizen yet.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I shall be happy to yield to my colleague the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am sorry.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. I appreciate the concern of my colleague the Senator from New Jersey, but I enjoy sparring with the Senator from Illinois, who is always gracious.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, since I have the floor, I interrupt the colloquy merely to say that I had no doubt of the competence of the Senator from Oregon to deal with our beloved colleague the Senator from Illinois on her own terms with adequate skill. It was merely because I wished to reassert my own possession of the floor that I interrupted the colloquy.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. I have only a few more words, if I may continue Mr. President.

Senators give the impression that they are trying to hide something. I should like to see a bill, of the type of the resolution the Senator from New Jersey and I support, considered. Then we would at least be saying that we are not above reproach, that we are not beyond the pale of such consideration. I do not believe it is asking too much of us to put ourselves upon the public altar, so to speak.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks an editorial entitled "Legislators Hurt Their Own Image," published in the Eugene, Oreg., Register-Guard of November 7, 1963, dealing with the proposal that Members of Congress reveal outside sources of income.

I thank the Senator for yielding to me.

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

LEGISLATORS HURT THEIR OWN IMAGE

Senator MAURINE NEUBERGER has dusted off an old proposal, one that was dear to the heart of her late husband when he was a Senator. She thinks Congressmen ought to let the public know what outside sources of income they have. In this she is joined by Senator JOSEPH CLARK, Pennsylvania Democrat, and Senator CLIFFORD CASE, New Jersey Republican. The proposal is timely because of the odor arising from the Senate Chamber as a result of the Bobby Baker case. The Senate is now investigating that case in a modest way, inquiring into the conduct of Senate employees, but not, repeat not, into the conduct of Senators themselves.

Congress has been very jealous of its immunity from public scrutiny. An official of, say, the space agency, would never be allowed to hold stock in a firm that did a lot of business with the agency. Heavens, that would be conflict of interest. But a Member of Congress can own a space capsule factory and still serve on committees dealing directly with the space program. That, according to the prevailing ethic, is not conflict of interest. It's just coincidence, and not very important coincidence at that.

In the House, EDITH GREEN and ROBERT DUNCAN have also urged that Congressmen bind themselves by the same rules they so readily impose upon employees of the executive department. But they aren't getting anywhere with their ideas.

Because Congressmen are so reluctant to bind themselves by the rules they impose upon others, the public wonders about Congress. And that leads to what may be the greatest single problem in American Government, the decreasing prestige of the legislative branch. Legislators themselves, who are responsible for the tarnished image of the legislative branch, should be deeply concerned about it. But they are not.

It is the idea of a freely elected legislature with real authority which distinguishes our form of government from the tyrannies around the world. A legislature in which the people have confidence is essential if free government is to prevail. But the people must have confidence in it.

The people cannot have confidence when they learn that Congressmen won't come through, themselves, with the kind of full disclosure they so readily demand of other Government employees. The public wonders about some of these trips around Europe that seem to have only the slightest bearing on public business. And, in a time when economies are so strongly demanded by Congress, the public wonders about the New Senate Office Building, which somewhat resembles the Taj Mahal—in cost if not in architecture.

Nor is this serious problem confined to Congress. It crops up in the States, too. Certainly here in Oregon the legislative branch is in poor repute. And it is the fault, largely, of the legislators themselves. Why won't they entertain Senator Ed Fadeley's suggestion for the registration of lobbyists? Why should legislators pay their own secretaries so much more than other State secretaries get? Why should there seem to be one set of standards for legislators, another for other State officials and employees?

Most legislators, State and National, are decent, competent, honest, hard-working people. But they are reluctant to let the public know it. Instead, they give the public the idea that they're trying to hide something.

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

Mr. CASE. Mr. President——

Mr. MAGNUSON. I have a little legislative conflict of interest today.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I shall be happy to yield the floor in just a moment.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The appropriation bill is highly necessary, and should be passed today.

I was assured that the colloquy would take only 2 or 3 minutes. I was assured that at 12:30. It is now 2:30.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I have no intention of keeping the Senator from Washington from his legislative duties, which we all share with him.

In conclusion, it has been a satisfaction to me not only from the standpoint of my duties as a legislator, but also in a personal way to have had an association with Dick Neuberger, our colleague's late husband and predecessor, and now with her and with the Senator from Pennsylvania in this particular matter. We are not the only Senators who have made such proposals. Both Senators from New York [Mr. JAVITS and Mr. KEATING], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and other Senators have been interested in the same sort of measure.

We have no pride of authorship. We believe the principle of disclosure is perhaps the key to the most serious problems we face in this area.

Unlike the Senator from Illinois, we do not regard this as any stain upon our escutcheon or as reflecting in any way upon the Congress as a whole. We suggest that this should be made a matter of general application, rather than a spotty and fortuitous application by individuals, as has been true in the past.

Mr. President, I yield the floor; and I thank the Senators for their patience.

Mr. DIRKSEN and Mr. KEATING addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me briefly?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I join in the remarks made by the distinguished Senator from New Jersey. The proposed legislation which I have introduced would require the disclosure of holdings in any corporation or other body regulated by the Federal Government. That, it seems to me, is the very minimum which any Member of Congress should disclose.

I hope very much that the Committee on Rules and Administration, in connection with its consideration of our present problems, will in due course consider all the bills which are before the committee. There are a number of such bills. The committee should consider them and report favorably to us one of those measures.

Like the Senator from New Jersey, I have no pride of authorship; but this has been a subject that has engaged my attention for a decade. I think we have been very remiss, and that some of the recent disclosures would not have taken place if some of this legislation had been on the statute books. I think it is high time we legislate, not only in regard to our employees, but also ourselves.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the issue ought to be made clear. First of all, there pends in the Rules Committee a resolution for an investigation. In addition, there are resolutions dealing with the question of disclosure of assets by staff and personnel, and by Members of the Senate. There seems to be a disposition in some quarters to give that latter resolution a free ride on the coattails of the present investigation. That is quite a different thing. Time and time again, we have had resolutions calling for the disclosure of assets. My position on the matter has not changed. I do not panic under attack. It is high time for the Congress to quit retreating when its Members are under attack.

Attack on the Congress is nothing new. I went back over a period of 125 years and examined editorial comment. It is almost always the same. I can show quotations from editorials over a period of a hundred years, stating that if God made Congress, He would not be proud of it. The number of quotations of that kind is legion. Always in an hour of crisis Congress becomes a whipping boy, and then it begins to run. That is when it ought to stand up to attack, because it is the most important branch of the three coordinate branches in this Government. Congress can abolish and dissolve every court in the land, except one, if it so desires. Congress can abolish every Cabinet position. It can abolish virtually every position in the Government. It is no wonder President Monroe said that Congress is the central core of the Government.

For 30 years I have been in one or the other Houses of Congress. I am proud of the service. I do not regret it at all. Shakespeare once said:

> Cowards die many times before their deaths; the valiant never taste of death but once.

When the attack comes, I want to be there to defend the legislative branch of Government. There is an attack. We see it in cartoons. We see it in editorials. The complaint about the archaic machinery is not the issue before Congress. Editorial writers write about absenteeism and many other superficial and frothy matters. We can resolve the issue by pinpointing where it belongs—the divergence and difference of opinion between the Congress and the President of the United States on his program. I shall reach that subject in due time. But I am not going to be pressured by this frothy attack, and I am not going to be taken in by a resolution which makes people think that we cleanse ourselves when we disclose our every asset.

As I previously stated, I have been on the platform before my constituents since 1926. Any man, any citizen, could stand up and say, "DIRKSEN, what do you own?" if he had wanted to know, and he would have received an answer. But I am not going to see it done by compulsion. That is the spirit of prohibition.

It required a long time for the prohibition period to incubate. At long last, those who thought alcohol was a curse and an evil felt they had to control the behavior of their fellow citizens. They were successful; and the 18th amendment went into the Constitution. It is the only amendment that, instead of saying, "Congress shall not," said otherwise, "The people shall not." It did not last, and it could not last, because it was alien to the whole spirit of the Constitution.

Now come people who say we must disclose our assets, when it is up to the electorate of each Member and the people back home to take a Member of Congress to task if they wish to do so. If they want to find out from EVERETT DIRKSEN, and if they will say, "You disclose all you own, including your income tax," maybe I will be prepared to do so. But if we say to 180 million taxpayers that we are going to accomplish it by having posted on the post office door all one owns, we will get around to disclosure that covers everybody.

I was here under the Roosevelt administration, when we passed the "Pink Slip" Act, so that there was a pink slip attached to one's income tax blank and people could find out what one's income was. One became the target of the blackmailers, the junk mailers, and everybody else. It did not take long to eliminate that provision.

Those who want to disclose their assets can do so. Why not? Nobody is stopping them. Nobody is stopping 537 Members of the House and Senate from putting into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a disclosure of how much they own in real estate, stocks and bonds, and so forth. What is to stop them?

No; that does not make them happy. They have to compel everybody else to do it, and then want to be the monitors over everybody else's morals. That is what I object to. Compulsion is becoming one of the fine arts in Government. I am opposed to such compulsion, and I shall continue to be opposed, because when I was elected to the Senate I was elected under the qualifications contained in the Constitution. I held up my hand to support the Constitution and defend the laws of the country. Now it is proposed that I be reduced to a class B citizen.

I did not give up my citizenship when I came to the Senate. I do not propose to do so. Public office would not be worth it. If the proponents of such proposals want to impeach my reputation or my character, they can do it, but they are not going to do it and see me remain silent in this seat. When these bills come along, the dignity and self-respect of the Senate demand that they be rejected by a substantial vote, because then we retain our respect as citizens of the United States, in addition to being Senators.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, it is clear that the Senator from Illinois, the Senator from New Jersey, and his colleagues have a difference of opinion, and I shall not detain the Senate, particularly the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] longer, except to say that I see no——

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I want the Senator to yield to me on that subject, if he will.

Mr. CASE. I shall be happy to yield to the Senator after my comments.

Mr. MAGNUSON. When the Senator from Illinois was talking, I could not help remembering the best example of compulsion I know of that related to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. CASE. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator now.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Some time ago a candidate was running against me. He kept the question going through the papers, "Why doesn't the Senator reveal his income tax?"—leaving the impression that there was something wrong. I

would not do it. But the day after election I did it, and he felt quite ashamed. I waited until the people had passed on me, because they had known me for years in my State. Then I had no objection whatever to revealing that information. That is the best example of compulsion I could think of while the Senator from *Illinois* was speaking.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I feel a little freer now to say a word or two, since I know the Senator from Washington wants to rest after that addition to our colloquy.

I see no relevancy whatever in the prohibition amendment. The opposite is true. The purpose is not to make anything illegal, but merely to make it possible for the facts to come out, so that the public may make a judgment. I agree that we are responsive, especially, to our constituents. For most purposes we rely upon their judgment to pass upon our conduct. The purpose of the proposed legislation is to make it possible for our constituents to know what the facts are, so they may pass judgment upon us with that knowledge.

When this is done, we shall have accomplished a purification—yes, I am not afraid of the word "purification"—of Congress which shall make it a stronger instrument of Government.

I am interested not only in ethics, but also in Congress and its procedures, and the reform of many governmental procedures in the executive branch of our Government, not in any case for the purpose of reducing Congress or any other department or agency, or degrading it, but for the purpose of making it stronger.

I have not in any way been shaken by the argument presented by the Senator from Illinois this afternoon.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I have listened with interest to the eloquent argument of the Senator from Illinois. For the moment I am compelled to say that I am in utter and complete disagreement with his argument. To my way of thinking the question of disclosure of financial interests by Members of this body is a simple question of right and wrong. I am for it.

---

## INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS, 1964

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 8747) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, if Senators will bear with me and the other members of the Appropriations Committee, who have spent some weeks on the Independent Offices appropriations bill, I shall make a brief statement about it. Because it is a very complex bill and involves some 26 agencies and a very substantial amount of money, I shall not discuss each item in detail. I am sure that Members of the Senate will have questions on the various agencies and amounts. I and the other members of the committee will try to answer any inquiries addressed to us by other Members of the Senate with reference to the pending bill.

So long as we are talking about the Senate, before I begin my discussion of the bill, and because I have been reading about what Congress is doing and not doing, and that we are late, I wish to say to the Senate that the bill did not come to us from the House of Representatives until the first part of October. We had to work on a bill of some magnitude, and we did it, I believe, with great dispatch.

I compliment the other members of the subcommittee and of the full committee. The appropriation bill for fiscal 1964 covers approximately 26 agencies, and the appropriations as reported to the Senate total $13,356,789,650, which is an increase of $287,270,950 over the House bill, and is under the estimates by $1,263,653,350. This is a very substantial cut from the budget.

Of the larger amounts in the bill, $5,387,843,000 is for the Veterans' Administration, of which $1,081,186,000 is for medical care.

This is in-hospital care. I repeat to the Senate what I have said on other occasions, that we still find that every other bed in the 180 veterans hospitals in the Nation is still used for a medical case. The line on the chart does not seem to go down.

The amount of $5,190 million is for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, which is $1.5 billion over last year, and accounts for a like increase in the totals for the bill over last year—$770,483,000 is for the Federal Aviation Agency—$597,671,750 is for the General Services Administration, of which $163,623,150 is for the construction of Federal buildings all over the country for the next fiscal year. The buildings are listed in the report, and a list of the sites and planning are listed in the report State by State, and city by city.

The $472,946,400 is for the Housing and Home Finance Agency, which includes $100 million for the urban renewal fund and $100 million for housing for the elderly fund; $373,200,000 is for the National Science Foundation; $135,338,000 is for civil defense, plus $30 million for the medical stockpile and health activities.

The committee recommends restorations totaling $298,420,950 over the House, and reductions of $11,150,000.

The largest restoration is $90 million to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. The next largest restoration is $50 million to the National Science Foundation.

The next largest is the restoration of $47,538,000 to civil defense, to provide for stocking the shelters in existing buildings that have been surveyed and marked.

Most of the small restorations were made to allow the agencies to continue at the 1963 level of positions.

In other words, the committee served notice on the agencies that the amount of money to be appropriated was appropriated with the understanding that there would be no increase in Federal employment for the present fiscal year. There is only one exception, and that is with respect to a small increase to the Federal Aviation Agency, which would allow new employees to man the safety towers which are being constructed or will be constructed during the coming year. The committee has taken a tough position on increasing the number of Federal employees, and has said to all the agencies that there will be no new employment, and that all agencies will continue at the 1963 level, with the one exception that I have mentioned.

One item is over the budget estimate by $2,978,000. This is for medical research in the Veterans' Administration. We felt that with the in-hospital medical care bill reaching the staggering amount of $1,081 million, the amount for medical research not only will save suffering, but might save some money in the Veterans' Administration.

This has been done on other occasions, and it has paid off in substantial benefits.

A technical mistake was made in reporting the bill. The language was approved by the committee, and the following amendment should be included in the bill:

On page 36, line 22, following the word "equipment" insert: "(including the purchase of aircraft for experimental purposes)".

This amendment was voted on and approved by the committee, but was inadvertently omitted from the bill. I ask that the amendment be adopted.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the remaining committee amendments be agreed to en bloc, and that the bill as thus amended be regarded, for the purpose of amendment, as original text; provided, that no point of order shall be considered to be waived by reason of agreement to this order.

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

The amendments agreed to en bloc are as follows:

On page 3, line 1, after the word "Office", to strike out "$4,045,000" and insert "$5,265,000", and in the same line, after the amendment just above stated, to insert a colon and the following proviso: "*Provided*, That not to exceed $1,000,000 of the foregoing amount shall remain available until expended for studies and research to develop measures and plans for emergency preparedness and telecommunications."

On page 3, line 12, after the word "activities", to strike out "$5,190,000" and insert "$4,190,000".

On page 4, line 6, after "per diem", to strike out "$780,000" and insert "$980,000".

On page 4, line 23, after the word "law", to strike out "$70,000,000" and insert "$70,638,000"; in line 24, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$13,500,000" and insert "$18,000,000", and on page 5, line 1, after the word "amended", to strike out the comma and "and not to exceed $14,078,000 shall be available for management expenses for civil defense including not to exceed 1,062 positions."

On page 5, line 8, after the word "shelter", to strike out "surveys and marking" and insert "surveys, marking and stocking", and in line 9, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out "$17,800,000" and insert "$64,700,000".

On page 5, after line 20, to strike out:

"No part of any appropriation contained in this Act, or of the funds available for

expenditure by any corporation or agency included in this Act, shall be used for construction of fallout shelters."

On page 6, line 11, after "(50 U.S.C., app. 2281(h))", to strike out "$25,000,000" and insert "$30,000,000".

On page 6, line 23, after "per diem", to strike out "$10,115,000" and insert "$10,365,000".

On page 7, line 6, after the word "Board", to strike out "$75,000,000" and insert "$81,000,000", and in line 7, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$3,000,000" and insert "$5,000,000".

On page 8, at the beginning of line 2, to strike out "$21,680,000" and insert "$21,930,000".

On page 11, line 24, after the word "snowshoes", to strike out "$515,775,000" and insert "$535,000,000", and in line 25, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out the colon and

*"Provided,* That total costs of aviation medicine; including equipment, for the Federal Aviation Agency, whether provided in the foregoing appropriation or elsewhere in this Act, shall not exceed $5,100,000 or include in excess of 315 positions"; and in lieu thereof, to insert a colon and

*"Provided,* That total costs of aviation medicine, excluding employee health services but including equipment, for the Federal Aviation Agency, whether provided in the foregoing appropriation or elsewhere in this Act, shall not exceed $6,500,000 or include in excess of 408 positions:".

On page 12, line 24, after the word "aircraft" to strike out "$110,000,000" and insert "$100,250,000".

On page 13, at the beginning of line 19, to strike out "$35,000,000" and insert "$45,000,000".

On page 14, line 2, after the word "ammunition", to strike out "$3,500,000" and insert "$3,663,000".

On page 14, line 12, after the word "ammunition", to strike out "$3,810,000" and insert "$4,045,000".

On page 16, line 16, after the word "only", to strike out "$15,800,000" and insert "$15,400,000".

On page 16, line 23, after the word "individuals", to insert "and not to exceed $1,000 for official reception and representation expenses", and at the beginning of line 25, to strike out "$11,750,000" and insert "$11,950,000".

On page 17, at the beginning of line 8, to strike out "$12,100,000" and insert "$12,329,500".

On page 18, line 11, after the word "moving", to strike out "$200,875,000" and insert "$214,875,000".

On page 19, line 22, after the word "including", to insert "fallout shelters therein and", and in line 23, after the word "buildings", to strike out "$152,540,700" and insert "$163,623,150".

On page 20, at the beginning of line 12, to strike out "$309,600" and insert "$326,800".

On page 20, at the beginning of line 14, to strike out "$2,075,400" and insert "$2,271,450".

On page 20, line 16, after the name "California", to strike out "$4,743,900" and insert "$5,130,000".

On page 20, at the beginning of line 18, to strike out "$990,000" and insert "$1,097,250".

On page 20, at the beginning of line 20, to strike out "$6,620,400" and insert "$7,129,750".

On page 20, line 21, after the name "Indiana", to strike out "$990,000" and insert "$1,098,200".

On page 20, line 24, after the name "Indiana", to strike out "$811,800" and insert "$902,500".

On page 21, line 2, after the word "Kentucky", to strike out "$279,000" and insert "$294,500".

On page 21, line 3, after the word "Maine", to strike out "$3,192,300" and insert "$3,470,350".

On page 21, line 6, after the word "provided", to strike out "$12,108,600" and insert "$13,020,700".

On page 21, line 8, after the word "Michigan", to strike out "$3,591,000" and insert "$3,790,500".

On page 21, line 10, to strike out "$1,581,300" and insert "$1,740,400".

On page 21, line 12, after the word "Missouri", to strike out "$1,421,100" and insert "$1,564,650".

On page 21, line 14, after the word "Montana", to strike out "$1,953,000" and insert "$2,142,250".

On page 21, line 16, to strike out "$308,700" and insert "$325,000".

On page 21, line 18, after the word "Montana", to strike out "$1,436,400" and insert "$1,516,200".

On page 21, line 20, after the word "Nevada", strike out "$4,185,900" and insert "$4,533,400".

On page 21, line 22, after the word "New Hampshire", to strike out "$310,500" and insert "$349,600".

On page 21, line 24, after the word "New Hampshire", to strike out "$2,078,100" and insert "$2,276,200".

On page 22, line 2, after the word "New Mexico", to strike out "$317,700" and insert "$335,350".

On page 22, line 4, after the word "New Mexico", to strike out "$747,000" and insert "$788,500".

On page 22, line 6, after the word "New Mexico", to strike out "$1,377,000" and insert "$1,515,250".

On page 22, line 7, after the word "Ohio", to strike out "$36,639,000" and insert "$39,161,850".

On page 22, line 10, after the word "Rhode Island", to strike out "$715,500" and insert "$755,250".

On page 22, line 12, to strike out "$2,529,900" and insert "$2,757,850".

On page 22, line 14, to strike out "$288,000" and insert "$319,200".

On page 22, line 16, to strike out "$510,300" and insert "$570,950".

On page 22, line 17, after the word "Texas", to strike out "$13,898,700" and insert "$14,880,800".

On page 22, line 20, to strike out "$937,800" and insert "$1,039,300".

On page 22, line 22, to strike out "$270,000" and insert "$285,000".

On page 22, line 24, to strike out "$292,500" and insert "$308,750".

On page 23, line 2, after the word "Washington", to strike out "$284,400" and insert "$300,200".

On page 23, line 4, after "District of Columbia", to strike out "$11,434,500" and insert "$12,069,750".

On page 23, line 7, after "District of Columbia", to strike out "$32,580,000" and insert "$34,823,200".

On page 24, line 14, after the word "law", to strike out "$45,500,000" and insert "$46,500,000".

On page 24, line 24, after the word "law", to strike out "$9,275,000" and insert "$9,500,000".

On page 25, at the beginning of line 17, to strike out "$4,725,000" and insert "$4,975,000".

On page 26, at the beginning of line 12, to strike out "$2,712,000" and insert "$3,112,000", and on page 27, line 14, after the word "transfer", to insert "in kind".

On page 28, at the beginning of line 12, to insert "and for reimbursable services"; in line 14, after the word "operations", to insert "and for reimbursable services"; in line 15, after the word "activities", to insert "and for other agencies"; at the beginning of line 19, to insert "administrative operations for"; at the beginning of line 21, to insert "excluding reimbursements for automatic data processing services)"; in line 22, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$18,150,000" and insert "$13,580,000", and in line 24, after the word "program", to insert "(excluding reimbursements for automatic data processing services)".

On page 32, line 13, after the word "only", to strike out "$15,325,000" and insert "$15,725,000".

On page 35, line 14, after "(12 U.S.C. 1701q et seq.)", to strike out "$75,000,000" and insert "$100,000,000".

On page 36, line 9, after the word "only", to strike out "$24,500,000" and insert "$24,840,000"; in line 10, after the word "than", to strike out "$1,910,000" and insert "$1,918,000", and in line 12, after the word "than", to strike out "$1,270,000" and insert "$1,276,000".

On page 37, line 3, after the word "Administration", to strike out "$3,926,000,000" and insert "$4,006,000,000".

On page 37, line 9, after the word "law", to strike out "$680,000,000" and insert "$690,000,000".

On page 38, after line 12, to strike out:

"No part of any appropriation made available to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration by this Act shall be used for expenses of participating in a manned lunar landing to be carried out jointly by the United States and any Communist, Communist-controlled, or Communist-dominated country, or for expenses of any aeronautical and space activities (as defined in section 103(1) of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958) which are primarily designed to facilitate or prepare for participation in such a joint manned lunar landing."

And, in lieu thereof, to insert:

"No part of any appropriation made available to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration by this Act shall be used for expenses of participating in a manned lunar landing to be carried out jointly by the United States and any other country without consent of the Congress."

On page 39, line 23, after the word "services", to strike out "$323,200,000" and insert "$373,200,000", and on page 40, line 9, after the word "Act", to strike out the colon and *"Provided further,* That no part of the foregoing appropriation may be transferred to any other agency of the Government for research".

On page 40, line 25, to strike out "$13,775,000" and insert "$14,100,000".

On page 41, line 13, after the word "Specialists", to strike out "$37,840,000" and insert "$37,940,000".

On page 42, line 18, after the word "law", to strike out "$14,510,000" and insert "$14,800,000".

On page 42, at the beginning of line 23, to strike out "$31,720,000" and insert "$36,720,000".

On page 43, line 18, after the word "Code", to strike out "$1,075,186,000" and insert "$1,081,186,000".

On page 45, line 10, after the word "Code", to strike out "$72,754,000" and insert "$76,877,000", and in line 11, after the word "expended", to insert a colon and *"Provided,* That the limitation under the head "HOSPITAL AND DOMICILIARY FACILITIES" in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1956, on the amount available for technical services for rehabilitation of the neuropsychiatric hospital at Downey, Illinois is reduced from $2,063,225 to $1,575,000: *Provided further,* That $1,722,000 shall be used for the sites and planning expenses involved in the construction of a Veterans Administration hospital at Bay Pines, Florida".

On page 46, line 5, after the word "expenses", to strike out the comma and "but not to exceed $246,240,000,".

On page 54, line 4, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$770,000" and insert "$1,000,000".

On page 56, line 8, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$9,200,000" and insert "$9,600,000", and in line 19, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$76,065,000" and insert "$77,065,000".

On page 58, line 2, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$1,240,000" and insert "$1,600,000".

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the committee worked long and hard on this complex bill. I am sure Senators will have some questions to ask about the various items.

The distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] worked with me on the bill, as he has done in years past. The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE], a new member of the committee, and other Senators ably assisted in reaching our decisions on the items in the bill.

The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences [Mr. ANDERSON] and members of other committees gave us the benefit of their advice.

Other amendments are pending. I believe the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] have amendments to offer.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am ready to offer my amendment, if the Senator from Washington has concluded.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Unless Senators desire to ask general questions, I will yield the floor temporarily.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield for a question?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. INOUYE. I direct attention to page 21 of the committee report, under the heading "National Science Foundation." The fourth paragraph relates to Project Mohole, and states:

Such a diversity of scientific and engineering opinion has been presented to the Committee on Project Mohole that it is obvious that construction of the large drilling platform at this time would be unwise. The committee therefore directs that no planning, research, or construction funds leading to such platform be expended until more data is available to this committee upon which it can base a more informed judgment.

Does that statement mean that Project Mohole is canceled?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I shall ask the Senator from Colorado to add to what I am about to say. My feeling, and I believe it was also the feeling of the committee, was that this directive would not stop Project Mohole. We said, in effect, that because there is a great diversity of scientific opinion, and because some of the problems are controversial, the National Science Foundation should, for the next 5 or 6 months, keep the program in suspension and not spend any money on the construction of a platform or do engineering work connected with the platform, until such time as they can appear before the Bureau of the Budget, which will be within the next 30 days, and give the Bureau the benefit of better and more cohesive information concerning this controversial program. Then we might continue with Project Mohole and obtain better results. I do not have the impression, and I do not think the committee has either, that Project Mohole has been abandoned. We are merely suggesting a little different procedure than has been followed heretofore.

I yield to the Senator from Colorado, if he desires to add to what I have said.

Mr. ALLOTT. I do not regard this directive as an abandonment of Project Mohole. It would require an hour and a half or 2 hours, to give a complete history of this subject, although I shall be perfectly willing to do it if the Senator wishes me to do so.

Even the Bureau of the Budget saw fit last spring to eliminate construction funds for this project. So far as I know, up until the last few days, the cutoff was still in effect. It was in effect when the agency appeared before the committee.

The facts are that the minutes of several meetings of the Amsoc Committee, which was the official adviser to the National Science Foundation on this project, showed that the overwhelming sentiment was in support of an intermediate vessel, an intermediate approach to the Mohole project. There are several members of the Amsoc Committee, which is a Committee of the National Academy of Science. "Amsoc" stands for American Miscellaneous Society.

Dr. Haworth, the new director of the National Science Foundation, testified before the committee that in view of the 3 months he had been in his position and the limited opportunity he had had to consider the question, he had formed no conclusion.

The House Merchant Marine Committee held an extensive investigation in the last few weeks, and held the most recent hearing in the last 2 or 3 days. I understand that they intend to look further into the question.

I believe the language in the report should be construed to mean that until the National Science Foundation and the scientists of the country who are skilled in this area—and I assure the Senator from Hawaii that I do not consider myself to be skilled in this area—can reach some consensus as to the best way to proceed with the actual planning, the design and building of this big platform should stand in abeyance.

I hope I have answered the question of the Senator from Hawaii. If he has specific questions, I shall try to answer them.

Mr. INOUYE. I thank the Senator from Colorado. I have been advised that the Subcommittee on Oceanography of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries completed hearings on this subject on November 12. I have been further advised that there is every reason to believe that the committee will, upon completion of its deliberations, come forward in support of the National Science Foundation and recommend proceeding with the construction of a large platform.

Mr. ALLOTT. If the Senator from Hawaii has such information, the conclusion his informant drew was different from the conclusion drawn by my informant when he discussed the problem with me.

Mr. INOUYE. I have been told that the temporary moratorium on the project would, in effect, mean total cancellation. That fear has been expressed by certain members of the National Science Foundation. Would the Senator from Colorado say that that is a correct understanding?

Mr. ALLOTT. I would not say it is correct.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the chairman of the committee yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. On pages 20 and 21 of the report are four directives. The Senator from Washington will recall that this question arose concerning power transmission lines in the REA work. There was no opportunity to take the item out of the report. The Parliamentarian has informed us that there is no way to strike an item from a report. We wanted to strike some language pertaining to the REA, but there was no way to do so. So a stipulation was written into the report.

I call attention to the items for the National Science Foundation, to which the Senator from Hawaii has referred. The language to which he has referred does stop the work. It reads:

The committee therefore directs that no planning, research, or construction funds leading to such platform be expended until more data is available to this committee upon which it can base a more informed judgment.

That is legislative action in the report, and Congress cannot act on it.

I read further from the report:

The committee notes the conflict of asserted jurisdiction in the field of administration of common trust funds. It is our opinion that national banks are adequately supervised by the Comptroller of the Currency, and directs that no funds appropriated in this bill be expended by the SEC for that purpose.

That deals with a legislative function which belongs to the Banking and Currency Committee.

And the report refers as follows to the Space Administration:

The committee found that the National Aeronautics and Space Administration has initiated an academic grant program which is projected to cost between $21 and $28 million per year in the near future. Because of the overlap with other governmental grant education programs, the committee questions the propriety of such a program administered by this agency, and therefore directs that no new grants be made without specific authorization and appropriation.

So this is a new method of putting legislation into an appropriation bill in such fashion that it cannot be attacked by either House.

Mr. MAGNUSON. No; it is only a limitation on the appropriation.

Mr. ANDERSON. But these are included in the report. If they were provisions of the bill, a Senator could move that they be stricken out. But when they are put in the report, they cannot be attacked.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I do not think that language would be subject to a point of order if it were a part of the bill.

Mr. ANDERSON. I did not say that. I said that if it were in the bill, it might be stricken out by means of a motion. But when it is put in the report, it is immune to any action by the Senate.

Mr. MAGNUSON. But this has been done for years.

Mr. ANDERSON. For years?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. ANDERSON. A long study was made of it, in connection with the construction of the REA transmission lines; and it had not been engaged in for so many years then.

Mr. MAGNUSON. This has been a common practice by the Appropriation Committee; namely, to put such statements in the report. The House Committee does this, too.

Mr. ANDERSON. I will not argue about what the House Committee does.

Mr. MAGNUSON. When we wish to express an opinion about certain expenditures of funds, we do so by including such statements in the report. This has often been done.

Mr. ANDERSON. Does not the Senator from Washington think that is a legislative function, rather than an appropriation function?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I do not think it is, because this statement is not included as a part of the proposed law. In the report we merely suggest to the agency that this is the way we feel about the matter. I suppose that technically any agency could ignore what the committee says in the report, and could proceed to disregard it.

Mr. ANDERSON. But the agency would have its head chopped off when its representatives appeared before the Appropriations Committee at the next session, would it not?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Perhaps so; but the agency could ignore the report.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I think this is a very strange procedure.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Sometimes we have been ignored when we included certain statements in a report.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I would also like to voice the concern expressed by the Senator from New Mexico as he related it to the committee report section's dealing with NASA as well as the National Science Foundation.

NASA is now conducting a program of predoctoral training which I feel is most necessary to further encourage an increase of doctorates in aeronautical and space-related fields. The need in these fields is now and not in the future. Every report indicates a present critical manpower deficiency.

It should be made clear that in this day of domestic program's to lessen the unemployment problems in certain areas of our Nation an improvement in the intellectual climate of such areas would go far toward encouraging the expansion of a technical industry, resulting in increased employment possibilities.

The added duty of not only NASA but the Congress as well, to insure U.S. leadership in aeronautical and space-related science and technology is clear in this period of the cold war.

I believe I am correct in stating that six schools in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania are participating in this program.

The amount of predoctoral grants is $1.1 million. With the national and area benefits that could be derived from such a program, I hope that the Congress will not unreasonably limit or stymie the present and future program.

With respect to the provision relating to the National Science Foundation, I am glad to see that the Committee restored the $50 million cut by the House. However I would personally prefer an additional increase, with emphasis on undergraduate science education facilities. A strong base for advanced science and engineering must grow from and be developed on the undergraduate education level. This is the source that our scientists reach for, for original orientation, motivation, and basic scientific fundamentals.

A present emphasis on undergraduate education and facilities will broaden the number of educational institutions that might furnish our scientific community a valuable source of qualified students.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NELSON in the chair). Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. I wish to say to the distinguished Senator from New Mexico, who helped us with the NASA appropriations—and let me say that the particular limitation he discussed a moment ago I have also discussed with him privately—that I am glad of his interest and of the interest of the committee in this; but we have found it necessary to be very specific in writing the report, because in many cases the various agencies disregard the expressed wishes of Congress. So in that connection it is necessary to be very explicit.

Mr. MAGNUSON. And in reports we often state that a certain amount of money is to be spent for a certain project; and in other cases we say we do not want the money spent for this or that project.

Mr. ANDERSON. Let me consider the first example of the four on these two pages. I read now from the top of page 20 of the report:

> The committee takes notice of the fact that there is substantive legislation pending before the Congress designed to solve the recurring boxcar shortage. Until the Congress has had a chance to pass upon such legislation, the committee directs the Commission—

To do certain things.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. ANDERSON. Why not wait until the legislation is enacted, and see what the legislative committee decides is the proper thing to do, and wait until Congress approves.

Mr. MAGNUSON. We merely say that with the money available to them, we expect them to direct personnel to work on the boxcar shortage, particularly at harvest time. That language is a directive to them to do so. But the reason why we state that legislation is pending is that the Interstate Commerce Commission now has no authority to direct the movement of boxcars, but personnel of the Car Safety and Service Division can encourage, persuade, and take similar action. When the boxcar bill comes before us, if it is enacted, the Interstate Commerce Commission will have legal responsibility to take action.

But this is a very difficult situation. I have introduced the bill every year; but every year the Members from the States east of the Mississippi River have opposed the bill, although Members from States west of the Mississippi were in favor of it. Unfortunately, the eastern group is the larger.

Mr. ANDERSON. But I point out that on this basis, when the foreign aid appropriation bill is being dealt with by the Appropriations Committee, it could write certain items into the report, and thus could be successful in stopping certain operations of the foreign aid program without permitting the Senate to have a chance to pass on that question. So I think this is a dangerous trend.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I am a member of the subcommittee. The chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee [Mr. FULBRIGHT] is present. I believe we have written into many reports on foreign aid certain directives.

Mr. ANDERSON. Have they been included in the bill, where Congress could deal with them; or have they been included in the report, where Congress could not deal with them?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Both.

Mr. MAGNUSON. At times it is better not to clutter up a bill with too many things. If the agencies will read the report, perhaps it is better to have them proceed voluntarily—rather than by law—to do what the committee requests. This is common practice by the Appropriations Committees; it has been done many times. We do it all the time. We could write such a provision into the bill, but sometimes among the parliamentary experts there is a difference of opinion as to whether such a provision is language added to an appropriation bill, and, therefore, whether a two-thirds vote, rather than a majority vote, would be required in order to approve such a provision. I suspect that sometimes when certain language is a little controversial, the committee says, "Let us put it in the report."

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes; I suspected that that was the situation.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes; and that frequently happens. But the Appropriations Committee will express its opinion on all these matters. It always has, and it has a responsibility to do so. Otherwise, I do not think the committee would be carrying out its responsibility to Congress or to the Government agencies themselves.

Furthermore, sometimes an agency will say, "Please put something in the report, to help us do certain things," and we do so. A good example of that is—and I am sure the Senator from New Mexico and all other Senators will agree about this—the part of the report which deals with the General Services Administration. The testimony shows that it would like the inclusion of language

by means of which we would direct certain things to be done. So in the report we state:

In approving funds for the construction of Federal Office Building No. 5 in Washington, D.C.—

A so-called little Pentagon which will be built—

the committee took note of the fact that the Administrator is making a concerted effort to remove the temporary buildings on the Mall and on Constitution Avenue. The committee completely agrees with and supports the Administrator in this effort and urges that FOB No. 5 be used to accomplish the demolition of the World War II temporary buildings, as well as the Navy and Munitions Buildings still standing from World War I, through the relocation of employees from such structures or through other space adjustments which will accomplish this purpose.

The General Services Administration needed that language in the bill, because it never could get the Defense Department—even after the new Pentagon was built—to vacate the old buildings on Constitution Avenue. So, in effect, we are directing them to do so, and we hope they will. This is an instance in which the Department itself wanted language of this sort to be used.

Mr. ANDERSON. I merely point out that it substitutes the opinion of a majority of the committee for the opinion of a majority of the Congress.

I am not pressing; but, except I dislike to see it appear in the appropriation bill. I believe that a majority vote of the Congress is more important than merely a majority vote of the committee, as reflected in the report.

Mr. MAGNUSON. We must make some statement in the report. Suppose a part of the space program would cost $9 million, the appropriation for which would come under general appropriations for NASA, and for which the committee did not appropriate money. It would be said none of that money within the total should be used for that particular project. That would be done without picking it out and putting the name of the project in the bill.

I believe the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] has an amendment to offer.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 325 and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Arkansas will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 37, line 3, strike out "$4,006,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$3,605,400,000".

On page 37, line 9, strike out "$690,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$621,000,000".

On page 37, line 22, strike out "$494,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$444,600,000".

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to add to the amendment as cosponsors the names of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MCGOVERN], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK].

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, my amendment to the bill would reduce the appropriations for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration by $519 million. It would cut a flat 10 percent in each of three categories: "Research and development," "Construction of facilities," and "Administrative operations." The reduction would be as follows: Research and development, $400,600,000; construction of facilities, $69,000,000; administrative operations, $49,400,000.

Before I proceed further, it might be said that the reduction would be an across-the-board cut of 10 percent, which is true. I believe that the nature of this organization and of its own budget warrants this kind of approach. In further defense of the approach, I point out that on page 38 of the bill, at the top of the page, under "General Provisions," the following appears: "not to exceed 5 per centum of any appropriation made available to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration by this Act may be transferred to any other such appropriation."

So, even though the Senate should cut the amount—which I urge it to do—the agency will have plenty of leeway in case of any emergency under that transfer power to transfer 5 percent of the amount which, even if the amendment is adopted, would be $4½ billion, which is quite a substantial sum.

I wrote to the space agency some time ago requesting a breakdown as to the effect of a cut of this kind, and the agency was unable to supply it. I have that letter, which I shall place in the RECORD at the end of my remarks. In any case, that is the way I had to approach the question. I believe it is the only feasible way to approach it.

Simply stated, the purpose of the amendment is to allow time to reevaluate the goal of trying to reach the moon in this decade and to proceed on a more deliberate and thoughtful basis. Even with this reduction the appropriation would be about $1 billion—or 27 percent above last year's amount. I might point out parenthetically that the proposed reduction is approximately the same as the amount which the Senate, for reasons of economy, cut from the foreign aid bill.

I have already expressed my views on the crash program to reach the moon. I believe, as I said in a speech on October 17, that there is a dangerous imbalance between our efforts in armaments and space on the one hand, and employment and education on the other. The proposed appropriation for NASA, in my opinion, reflects this imbalance. I believe that it should be substantially reduced. I further believe that any funds which are withheld from the space program should be reallocated to programs of education and employment which are before the Congress this year. I subscribe to the view expressed by the senior Senator from Louisiana, who said during the Senate hearings on the appropriation bill:

I do not believe that the people of our Nation, on the whole, are interested in who gets to the moon first.

The question before us, as I said on October 17, is not whether we should or should not send a manned rocket ship to the moon but whether the project is so vital and so urgent as to warrant the indefinite postponement of other national efforts. This question has been debated at length in recent months. I have heard nothing to persuade me that it would be a national calamity if the landing on the moon were delayed until 1980 or 1990. I have heard and seen a great deal which persuades me that our continuing neglect of deteriorating schools and rising unemployment would be a national calamity.

Judging from the many letters which I received in response to my speech of October 17, my own constituents and many people from all over the country subscribe to this view. In this instance, the people are well ahead of the Congress and the administration.

When we speak of a manned lunar landing program, we are talking about the expenditure of at least $20 billion of tax money, and probably a great deal more. Some estimates run as high as $50 billion. In our debate on this appropriation bill it is essential that we maintain some perspective on the vast sums of money involved, and particularly on the projected $20 billion—to take the minimum figure—for a landing on the moon. The sum of $20 billion represents more than the total cost of running the Nation's public elementary and secondary school system last year, including outlays for new construction. It is nearly four times the amount spent last year for our public colleges and universities.

We could build 10 TVA's with $20 billion. And it represents about twice the amount invested in Corps of Engineers water development projects since the turn of the century. If we are to examine the space program in meaningful perspective, we must relate space expenditures to the costs of pressing public needs and attempt to establish reasonable priorities among them.

The question facing the Senate in deciding the level of appropriations for NASA is not whether or not we want to go to the moon or indeed whether we want to beat the Russians in getting there. We would obviously like to do both. The issue is rather one of priorities and of the relative urgency of public needs. Our Federal budget is nothing more than a reflection of national needs as determined by the President and the Congress. The plan to place a man on the moon and to return him safely to earth during this decade is a national goal set by the President and approved

by the Congress. Perhaps it was set at a time when there was a need for distraction of public attention from problems that were most unpleasant and not susceptible to easy solutions. But we should now judge this "great adventure" in the cold light of reality without being swayed by extraneous issues. There is no virtue in "muddling through" with a bad decision. If the Congress decides that a mistake was made and that the goal is too risky and expensive, it should face up to its error and proceed to correct it. It is not easy for Congress to admit that a mistake has been made, but when vast sums of money—and quite possibly human lives as well—are involved, it cannot afford to do otherwise. Congress must determine whether reaching the moon in this decade is an enterprise so vital to the national interest as to warrant a priority call on the Treasury over all of the other pressing needs in the public sector of the economy.

During the first 5 years of NASA's existence, $7 billion has been expended on a $35 billion space program to be carried out by the end of this decade. The budget request for NASA jumped from $3.7 billion in fiscal year 1963, to $5.7 billion for this year, an increase of 54 percent. I doubt that any other Federal program can match NASA's growth record. Mr. Webb has told the Congress that approximately this same amount would be required for another fiscal year before the program would begin to taper off. The reasons offered for this vast public expenditure have been less than persuasive. Having heard the arguments about prestige and spinoff to the civilian economy and a great human adventure, I remain unable to understand what great catastrophe would befall us if the manned space program were to be delayed by 10, or even 20 years.

At the risk of being considered something of a troglodyte, I cannot bring myself to believe that going to the moon is essential simply because it is new and creative and adventurous. Still less can I bring myself to believe that the education and welfare of our people warrant lower priorities than space simply because these are old and unimaginative objectives of public policy. The real question before the Congress is not whether we should or should not explore outer space but whether we want to spend 17 times as much on space adventure this year as on clearing urban blight and slums, whether we want to spend 25 times as much on space as on providing adequate public housing for low-income families. These are the essential questions that confront the Senate.

The manned lunar program is not essential to the Nation's security. It is not another Manhattan project in which every day counts and money is no object. No one to my knowledge contends that the Nation will be weaker or less able to defend itself if this program is substantially cut back. During hearings before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations earlier this year, I asked Gen. Maxwell Taylor if he felt that the moon project had a direct bearing on our military security. "No sir," he replied, "I do not think it does." I also asked if he saw any military significance in the program to put man on the moon. "Personally," he said, "I see no present military need."

General Taylor's views are backed by space agency officials and scientists. During the hearings before the House Appropriations Subcommittee, Mr. Webb was asked if the military at this time had any need or any use for Saturn 1, 1–B, or V boosters. "As of today," he said, "no military mission has been established."

Dr. Harold Urey, one of the Nation's most distinguished scientists, stated that the moonshot program "has no contribution to make to the national defense at all." In fact, he said, "very little of the space program outside of the first 500 to 1,000 miles above the earth has any importance to military things at all. It certainly has no importance from the standpoint of trying to deliver missiles from one part of the earth to another." Dr. Robert Seamans, Jr., NASA Deputy Administrator, was quoted in the Washington Sunday Star earlier this year as saying:

> As for the trip to the moon, this obviously is not being carried out for military reasons. There is no military advantage in the foreseeable future of being on the moon. But it is an extremely exciting adventure and will provide important scientific data.

I would add that it is also an extremely expensive adventure and I know of no reason why we cannot explore the heavens at a more leisurely pace.

Our military experts have also disclaimed any use for the large boosters being developed for the manned space effort. Gen. Curtis LeMay, Chief of Staff of the Air Force, told the House Armed Services Committee last February:

> We can't really define an offensive weapon for use in space that will be more efficient and less costly than one we could do the same job with on the ground or in the air.

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

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Would the distinguished Senator prefer to have questions asked and comments during his address or prefer to conclude his address?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I will abide by the Senator's desire, if he wishes to ask a question.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I appreciate the opportunity to do so with respect to the military advisability of the program, and would comment on three or four points made by the able Senator.

With respect to the military aspect, we heard testimony by the experts—I remember Dr. Seamans was one of them—that, of the $20 billion planned for the lunar project, only between $1 billion and $2 billion would be directly allocated to the moon effort. The other $18 billion or more incident to the lunar program, primarily because of the tremendous interest in additional thrust on the part of the military, necessary to possible new weapons—could be considered a defense effort and would have to be spent, regardless of whether there was decision to go to the moon or not.

I remember at the retirement dinner for Gen. Thomas White, as intelligent and broadminded a military officer as I have known—a great linguist, and a great student of the military art—who at the present time is the military editor of Newsweek. He said, in effect, at his retirement dinner, "I want to leave one short message with you. There was a day when those who controlled the ground controlled the world. Then those who controlled the sea controlled the world. Today, as we know, those who control the air control the world. My prediction is, if I can be sure of anything, I am sure that tomorrow those who control space will control the world."

The people I respect most in the military field, ones who understand the importance of the new environments are interested in the vital importance of space to our national security.

The problem, as I see it, is one that has many facets. However, the question of national prestige is important here. So is education of the utmost importance. The budget for the National Science Foundation has increased more, in percentage, in recent years than has the budget for the space program, to the best of my knowledge. The National Science Foundation budget in 1958 was $48 million. The request made by the administration for this year was $589 million.

I only mention that to present that some of the other budgets responding to the nature of the world around us at the present time are increasing in comparable manner to the space budget.

This is a great deal of money, but I was looking recently at the figures of gross national product of this country. Last year the GNP was $554,900 million, of which $357 billion actually comprised consumer demand. I understand consumer income is now about $450 billion.

If the estimates in NASA, including those of the Director and the first or second assistant, Dr. Seamans, are correct, the cost of going to the moon—leaving aside the defense aspects of the program—are about one day's GNP of the United States. I hope the Senator will give those facts some consideration when we come to a vote on this bill.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I appreciate the Senator's contribution. He cites General White, who is retired. I was citing General Taylor, who is not retired and who presently has responsibility for the defense of this country. In committee I asked him specifically if the moon project had any direct bearing upon our military security. He said, "No, sir, I do not think it does." I also asked him if he saw any military significance in the program to put a man on the moon. He said, "Personally, I see no present military need."

I do not think the Senator from Missouri would discount General Taylor as also being cultivated, intelligent, and linguistically inclined. He happens to be Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff at the present time.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The Senator puts me in an embarrassing position, because not only he but General Taylor were both born in a famous Missouri town.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator should not be embarrassed; I was, too.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Therefore I hesitate to criticize either of these eminent fellow Missourians. I am sure General Taylor could verify that what he was talking about was that, in that particular part of the overall $20 billion assigned to the effort to reach the moon, if figures are segregated, we are talking about 5 to 10 percent, at the most, as the straight lunar effort.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I referred only to the military aspect of the program. The Senator is reading more into my comment than I said.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The Senator said the lunar project.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I said "military."

Mr. SYMINGTON. Yes, but the lunar project, the part about putting the man on the moon, has nothing to do with the vital military importance of getting adequate thrust, whether we put a man on the moon or not, to have a space platform comparable to what we hear the Russians are planning to have.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If the Senator has any special information about what the Russians are going to do that is not available to us at the present time, I would be interested in it. I question whether such information is reliable.

Mr. SYMINGTON. We do know of their recent orbits. We know of their superiority in thrust. We do know they have done, not once, but a number of times——

Mr. FULBRIGHT. But that is not going to the moon.

Mr. SYMINGTON. But this is the thrust the military need, the thrust they require, and the effort to get that thrust is included as part of the cost of going to the moon.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. There are other experts, scientists and others, that I shall quote, who have testified directly in this connection. I have already quoted Dr. Seamans. I was trying to respond to your question item by item—to consider the military significance of space, the prestige factor, and its economic fallout, as they call it. I was speaking now only of the military significance.

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

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I think it ought to be pointed out again clearly that the question the Senator from Arkansas dealt with was direct benefits to the military effort by going to the moon.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct.

Mr. ANDERSON. There is this difference between this $20 billion and the project of going to the moon. What they have been talking about is 2,000 hours of earth orbiting, and that every dollar of that will be useful to the military.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The military has its own program. There is $1,700 million in the budget this year for the military space program, in addition to the NASA budget.

Mr. ANDERSON. The space program of NASA in general is completely tied in with the space program of the military. They are identical.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I would not be surprised that they are identical and completely duplicating.

Mr. ANDERSON. No. NASA has things it needs to know about Gemini, and the military has things it needs to know about Gemini.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I would not be surprised. The military looks after its own. It has $1,700 million to look after its own. General Taylor is a responsible man. Earlier this year, when we were talking about the test ban treaty, everybody, particularly the opponents, thought that General LeMay was the last word on the treaty. He said we cannot really design a weapon for use in space that would be more efficient and less costly than one that could do the job on the ground or in the air. This statement directly relates to the military value of going to the moon.

I am not saying it is not a great feat for those who feel inferior and who think we, as a Nation, need the prestige. I do not see why the United States should feel so inferior that we have got to show the Russians that we can get to the moon first. That is the only real question.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the able Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The military have not been known for having unanimous opinions on military weapons.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Over the years I have noticed that all three services have firm ideas as to what the military weaponry should be. Seldom do any one of the three services agree with each other. That position is now further refined. We learn that in the Navy there will be some admirals who feel the carrier is the primary answer, whereas others believe the submarine is the answer. Also, in the Air Force, some thinking revolves around the newer, faster, larger, long-range bombers. There is no secret about that. Other persons in the Air Force, however, disagree, believe that the long-range, high-altitude, faster B–70 or its equivalent is out from the standpoint of the best way to enter a country that had attacked the United States. They believe the Dyna-Soar furnishes a new avenue of research and development. They believe in manned orbiting units.

Fortunately, we have a Secretary of Defense who, for the first time is really trying to coordinate these constant disagreements, which are very expensive, and pick out from the various requests what he believes is best for each of the services, fitting them into a single defense policy.

With that premise, it is important to give consideration to the fact that Secretary McNamara, who has already had such success in reducing costs, is 100 percent behind the President's proposed space program, as presented on the Senate floor this afternoon.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. However, that is not his particular responsibility.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The Senator quoted General LeMay. His responsibility is not NASA either.

If we wish to quote anyone from the military, I would rather quote the Secretary of Defense than anyone else.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I quoted Dr. Seamans, the NASA Deputy Administrator, who said:

> As for the trip to the moon, this obviously is not being carried out for military reasons. There is no military advantage in the foreseeable future being on the moon. But it is an extremely exciting adventure and will provide important scientific data.

I can well imagine that it is exciting to scientists to play with these boosters. It is a wonderful thing. As I said in the beginning, I am not against anyone going to the moon if he wishes to do so. However, I am simply against putting the program on a crash basis and devoting so much money to it that it cramps the whole budget so we cannot get money for much more important items, some of which I have mentioned, and others which I will mention later. It seems absurd to me to have an expansion of this program almost overnight from nothing to 32,000 employees and more than $5 billion, when it will have no real bearing on our security in the immediate future.

This is not like the Manhattan project. There is no great war in progress. No one feels that we are about to be attacked. In any case, this is a long-range program and I merely propose that we go at it a little more moderately. I am only proposing a cut of 10 percent, which is very nominal. We cut the foreign aid bill very substantially last week, without blinking an eye. I believe the Senator from Missouri voted for the cuts. I do not want to go over that again.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I did not want to get into it, either, the foreign aid debate. There was one country for which we were putting up money to train paratroopers; then we found they did not have airplanes. But I present this point for the distinguished Senator's consideration. Dr. Seamans testified that only 10 percent, at a maximum, down to 5 percent, of the lunar project can be segregated to the actual part of the program of going to the moon, with the rest necessary for the defense effort. It seems to me that is very important. I have one more point to make.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. On that point, let me say——

Mr. SYMINGTON. May I just add one more point?

In August 1957, as an ad hoc member of the Senate Subcommittee on Military Appropriations, an admiral came up and asked for $40 million more. When questioned by the subcommittee, he said, "We wish to be sure that we will be the first to orbit."

He got the $40 million. Within about 6 weeks however, the Soviets put up the first Sputnik. Then we had some hearings because of the reaction of the American people to this extraordinary technical accomplishment on the part of the Soviets.

Therefore, I hope that the Senator, who of all people in the Senate—and I say this with great sincerity—knows the importance of a favorable position for the United States with other countries, will not write off the tremendous impact on world opinion which would come, re-

gardless of any military need if the Russians were first to land on the moon.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator is now getting into the question of national prestige. In all frankness, sputnik was a shock to us, because we were so complacent and conceited that we thought we were the only one who could do it. Until then we considered Russia a backward country. Momentarily it had quite an impact. Look at the Russians now, coming to us hat in hand to buy wheat, or at least to the Canadians and the Australians, who have enough sense to do business with them. What about the prestige that sputnik gave them? In does not feed their people. It does not convert anyone to communism. It was a trick, a kind of gambit, or whatever one wishes to call it.

So far as real prestige goes, it is nothing unless it is followed through. They orbited first, it is true, but we orbited second. I do not know but that we are just as well off as they are, even in the orbiting business.

We are certainly a great deal better off in being able to feed our people, in providing them with a decent living, and educating them.

I do not mind if someone wishes to go to the moon. I merely object to our trying to go tomorrow, and spending $5 billion doing it. If we try to do that, a great deal of the money will be wasted. Much of it has already been wasted. I shall ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article published in Fortune magazine, written by Richard Austin Smith. This is the most persuasive article I have seen on this subject. I suppose the Senator would say that Mr. Smith is prejudiced. However, to me it is a most persuasive article. If anyone wishes to take some ridiculous example of waste, he can find them in the space program. This part of the space program does not seem to bother anyone.

We have had an endless number of misdirected efforts in connection with the missile program. In the beginning we went all out in the direction of developing, first, the Bomarc missile. Then when that did not pan out, we decided to go into the Minuteman program, then to the Titan, and so on.

Some failures are inherent in this kind of program and I am not saying that we should abandon the program. I merely say that if we balloon this program all out of reason, we will find that there will be nothing comparable to it in size and in the amount of money involved. It is downright silly for us to go overboard with the idea that we will impress someone by going to the moon.

The headlines will be forgotten a week after they appear.

If we allow basic sources of strength, such as our schools, our cities and the other things that I have mentioned, to deteriorate, I believe it will be said that this democracy has failed. Going to the moon will not save the democratic system. I do not believe it is important or significant, but I am willing to go along with a reasonable expansion of the space program, an expansion far greater than any other program that I know of in government.

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

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I have very great respect for the Senator, as he well knows. In this particular case, however, for reasons we have already discussed, I cannot agree, and would add one more point. When we establish a program in private business that runs into say only a few million dollars, the most important thing to do is carry out the program, once it is agreed upon. The expense comes about in readjusting the program, increasing or decreasing it. We can easily triple the cost of any manufactured article by increasing or decreasing the program.

I remember when with the Air Force, the Chief of Research and Development, at that time General LeMay, once said he was upset, saying "We have done nothing during the first 6 months of this year except program. First we say we will spend so much money; then we say we will spend less. We go first to the War Department—then we go to the Bureau of the Budget. Then we go to the Treasury Department and the President. Finally we come to Congress with a program they change; so it is all actually readjusted not less than five times."

His point was that scientists and engineers, instead of being engaged in research and development, had been engaged in reprograming, per se. Everyone knows that when there is a program of this scope, especially one rapidly expanding, there will be waste, mismanagement, and personnel problems.

But one thing is certain. If the program is cut, then increased, then cut again, 5 percent, 10 percent, or any other amount, without having the reduction apply to specific items, and even so, there will be much more waste before the end result sought is accomplished.

I am a member of the Committee on Astronautical and Space Sciences, ununder the chairmanship of the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], and believe an excellent defense in support of the program was made by Mr. Webb and his assistants. We ought to give consideration to a program of such vital importance for the future of the United States, rather than chip at it year by year. If we do I guarantee there will be more inefficiency. We ought to decide whether we want to go to the moon or not, and then stick to the program.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I would be delighted to proceed in that way. I am not chipping at the program. I am trying to avoid an extraordinary ballooning of it this year. A 54-percent increase is provided this year. My own guess would be that we will go through with this program; there is great momentum behind it on the part of many Senators, because a large part of the work will be done in particular States——

Mr. SYMINGTON. The Senator means American States?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes; Mississippi, Florida, Missouri, and others. The work will be well distributed this year to get votes.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Do not leave Arkansas out.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Arkansas does not have any of it, that I know of, so I can take an objective view. I am not speaking contrary to the personal interests of any of my constituents.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I honestly do not think this program is approached on that basis.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator has been talking about chipping away.

Mr. SYMINGTON. A 10 percent reduction is a chip.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. But the amount has not yet been approved. The committee seeks to increase the amount by about $2 billion, but the amount has not yet been approved. I assume the agency is not yet spending it—although perhaps they are so sure of its appropriation that they are already spending it.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The House has approved.

Mr. FULBRIGHT But it has not been appropriated. I was trying to save us from making this mistake.

I will venture to prophesy that if this amount is approved, it will not be many years—perhaps one or two—before Americans will be disgusted with it. We will then cut it back, as we have cut back foreign aid, because the moon program is a silly program; and proceeding on a crash basis is bound to result in extraordinary and unnecessary waste.

I am not saying that the program should be eliminated. I am not chipping away at anything. I am saying we should not double it—almost 54 percent—in 1 year.

This is a new program. Its personnel are comparatively inexperienced with it. I know Mr. Webb. He is a fine man. I do not wish to reflect upon Mr. Webb. But only 3 or 4 years ago he was running an oil company in Oklahoma. What does he know about space? I imagine he has read much about it in the last 2 or 3 years; but his knowledge is certainly not comparable to that of General Taylor in the military field or with that of some other men who have spent their lives in the military field.

I am not talking about eliminating the program. I merely say we should examine it a little more carefully and be a little more deliberate in the way we spend money on it.

Mr. SYMINGTON. If it is decided that we shall go to the moon, it will be necessary to have research and development, which will entail a relatively small investment by the people.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If it is decided to go by 1970. That would be all right if it were decided to go by 1990.

Mr. SYMINGTON. We can follow the instructions of the Commander in Chief. He says he wants to proceed this way this year.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Who is the Commander in Chief?

Mr. SYMINGTON. The President.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Since when does the Senator from Missouri have any respect for his opinion?

Certainly the Senator did not follow any of the President's advice last week on the foreign aid bill. Why, all of a

sudden, is the President an expert on this subject?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am disappointed by that remark of the Senator.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It is the truth. I pleaded with the Senator from Missouri to support the foreign aid bill.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I voted for the foreign aid bill.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. After cutting—after cutting it substantially.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am certain that my percentage of support of the President is at least equal to that of the able Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. In any case, I did not put it on that basis.

Mr. SYMINGTON. If I may continue for a moment, suppose we decided, on the basis of what this administration would like to do, that we should go to the moon by a certain time. That would mean the research and development would start. After that, it would be necessary to spend considerably more to get into design and engineering. The machinery, equipment, and units needed to proceed would then be designed. Then there would be added expense for production engineering. Then there would be still more expense in getting into the tool engineering. Then it would be necessary to make the tools to manufacture the equipment needed, steadily increasing cost.

Finally the production itself would begin, before the operation of the finished product.

The point I make is that it is logical, when we go into a big program like this, to have additional expense in each successive year.

Otherwise, procedure would be totally contrary to the normal design and production of anything first designed, then built in the United States, from an automobile to an air force.

The fact we are each year increasing the amount of money quietly but steadily——

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It is not increasing quietly and steadily. What is proposed is an enormous, outrageous increase. What was last year's appropriation? Was it not $3.7 billion? This year the amount asked was $5.7 billion, and the bill recommends $5.19 billion. That is a tremendous increase in 1 year. It is not a gradual increase.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Last year $323 million was provided for the National Science Foundation. This year the amount recommended is $589 million, at the request of the Administrator. I am not necessarily against that, but everything in this situation today is increasing steadily.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is such a small amount that I did not bother with it. The one I am talking about is so big that it makes a tremendous impact. It is prejudicing many of the important activities of the country that are essential to its long-term life, as I shall mention in a moment. I have mentioned them in passing, but I have additional illustrations. The amount sought for space would have a tremendous impact upon other activities that are really important to the country.

We cannot afford to play around with this project in the limited period until 1970. I do not propose to eliminate the program. Does not the Senator believe that to increase the amount from $3.7 billion to $4.5 billion would be quite an increase in 1 year?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Yes, I do.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is all I am suggesting; nothing more.

Mr. SYMINGTON. As a member of the subcommittee headed by the distinguished senior Senator from Washington, where this subject was discussed in detail, based on what is wanted and why, provided it is desired to accomplish this aim at all, I believe this is the right way to do it.

All I say is, let us decide whether we want to do it or do not want to do it. Otherwise, each year the Senator from Arkansas will feel the same way about this program that I feel about the scope of the foreign aid program.

I do thank the very able Senator from Arkansas for permitting me to make these observations.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The fact is that the Senator's amendment would still permit a substantial increase in the space program, by some $1 billion.

It will mean that since 1960, when there was a $550 million appropriation, there will have been, approximately, a ninefold increase for this agency; and after the Senator's amendment is adopted, this program will be one of the largest of all the programs of the Federal Government.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes; after my amendment is adopted, the total increase over last year's appropriation will be more than $1 billion a year.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Perhaps even more important than the increased spending for the program is the fact that this program, more than any other Government program, will absorb a great many of the scientists of the country, and thus will prevent their working on other projects, including education projects?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes; and it will also keep them from working in industry.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Yes. It is my understanding that in 1970, one out of every four U.S. scientists will be working for NASA, in the space program; and also that approximately 10 times as many scientists are now working for NASA, as compared the number working for the various branches of NIH—and in my judgment NIH is overstaffed now. So my point is that NASA attracts a very large number of scientists; but scientists are in very short supply, particularly in defense activities, but also in education. If they are absorbed by this agency, that will mean we shall have to make a choice between our various priorities, and we shall have to starve some of the other priorities, which are also very important.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think the Senator from Wisconsin is entirely correct. He may have overstated the percentage involved. Later I shall submit figures in that connection.

Nevertheless, the Senator's main point about distortion of the normal distribution of our supply of scientists is, I believe, quite correct.

Mr. ANDERSON. I should like to know the source of the Senator's information that by 1970, one out of every four scientists in the United States will be working for NASA.

Mr. PROXMIRE. In a few minutes I will give an exact source. But the statement is generally based on an article which I wrote for Nation's Business. My staff and I spent some time getting the material together. We corresponded with a number of scientists. Based on the projections in regard to the size of the NASA program by 1970 and on the number of scientists who then would be working for it, this was our estimate; and I assure the Senator from New Mexico that it is not an off-the-cuff estimate, but is based on very careful study by my staff and me over a period of several weeks.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Let me read from an interview with Dr. Seamans:

> At the beginning of this year something like 3 to 4 percent of the scientists and engineers required by this country were being used by the space program. This proportion will grow to 6 to 7 percent by the beginning of the next year, and may get slightly higher as we continue through the decade. Although this represents a significant proportion, it does not approach the figures used by those who say we are taking much larger numbers. Moreover, through our graduate training program with American colleges and universities, we are augmenting the national capability and pool of scientists and engineers.

Mr. ANDERSON. I appreciate that statement, because probably it states the fact. But 25 percent is a ridiculous figure, and it should not be stated on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. This is a statement on the priority to be given this program. The Senator from Missouri was discussing priorities. The NASA officials would not state the priority to be given the proposed cuts. The Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON] asked for this information at the hearings; and I also requested such information.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURDICK in the chair). Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from West Virginia?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I shall support the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I shall be highly pleased to have the Senator from West Virginia do so.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I shall do so because it is reasonable and realistic.

Will the Senator from Arkansas indicate in detail—as I believe he proposes to do—the imperative but unmet needs in this country?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes, I shall try to develop that point.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I consider it to be a very important point, and I believe that we in no wise diminish the prestige of the United States by delaying the effort to place a man on the moon by a certain number of years, whatever that number may be in our best judgment. There are problems facing the American people

here on earth; and I presume the Senator from Arkansas will give considerable attention to these needs—imperative needs—in the course of the presentation of his views.

I understand that his amendment would make a 10-percent cut. Is that correct?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I point out that I stated for the RECORD that I joined with the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MCGOVERN] in supporting a similar amendment in connection with the defense program. Our amendment received two affirmative votes. Several Senators manifested interest in reducing defense appropriations substantially but indicated reluctance to support such action because it would amount, in their opinions, to unilateral disarmament.

However, I feel that the pending amendment will receive much wider support in the Senate because the defense structure is not as directly involved.

On August 2, 1963, the conscientious Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MCGOVERN] spoke meaningfully in this forum in justification of reducing spending in the area of defense, including the military aspects of atomic energy. He discussed new perspectives on American security. I commended him and associated myself with his viewpoint in general. Subsequently, as stated, I supported the specific amendment for a percentage reduction of the defense appropriations as recommended by the Committee on Appropriations.

On numerous occasions since August 2, I have spoken on the need to cut expenditures sharply in the areas of defense, nuclear activities, foreign assistance, and in the space exploration program. Not only have I been encouraged by the high degree of acceptance of my declaration that the security of our country rests on economic and political as well as military competence, I have been amazed by the extent of the public response.

Many citizens have spoken and written their agreement with my further observation that unsurpassed military power in combination with areas of grave economic weakness is not the only basis for a sound security policy. The net result can be domestic and international political weakness.

In addressing the subject of defense appropriations reductions during debate on the bill before the Senate on September 24, 1963, I said:

> We must achieve savings in military spending, and if we are to do so we must begin by reducing the appropriations proposals now before us. We must follow through with cuts in the Atomic Energy Commission weapons acquisition and subsidy appropriations requests. It is my view that there must be reductions in the money requests to come before us for the space program. And there must be further savings realized when we reach the business of appropriating for the foreign aid programs.
>
> We can and we must save billions in these categories that drain off so much of our gross national product and require so much of our national income that we are unable to fulfill our obligations to our own people at home and to provide the economic foundation that makes all the rest possible.
>
> A higher priority and a higher percentage of the budgeted dollar must be assigned to the requirements of our domestic programs, especially in the fields of education, health, job opportunities and job training, and public improvements, including continuation of the program of accelerating public works on a Federal-local matching basis.

Mr. President, we have failed to achieve significant reductions in the defense appropriations, insofar as compared with last year's level. We have assured substantial cuts in foreign assistance by reason of the actions of both bodies on the authorization bill. We now must face our responsibilities and opportunities in the appropriations for the space program, just as we soon will meet those relating to appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission.

Both NASA and AEC funds can be pared without, in my judgment, doing violence to the program of either agency.

Obviously, there is a considerable manifestation of economy-mindedness because of the feeling that tax reduction legislation will be enacted. We must not place all of the burden of budget cuts on domestic social and economic programs while continuing to subscribe huge funds to the defense, atomic energy, and space programs.

Some persons term percentage reductions an approach with the use of an ax, but I prefer affording agencies some leeway in reducing items within a total budget, with Congress directing an overall percentage reduction to achieve a stated ceiling.

I will support the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT].

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thank the Senator from West Virginia very much for his support, and I shall try to develop the point he has mentioned.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield to me?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I have been asked by many Senators whether an attempt should be made to complete action by the Senate on the bill this evening. The bill contains many other important items, and Senators wish to know whether it is anticipated that the bill will be passed this evening or whether the Senate will proceed for some time with further debate on the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas, and resume consideration of the bill tomorrow.

Can the Senator from Arkansas estimate how much longer his remarks will take. I know he has been interrupted by a number of questions.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes; there have been a number of questions, although I think they have been quite proper.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes, for this is a very important matter.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It is a very important matter and I would much prefer to have the vote on the amendment taken tomorrow, inasmuch as very few Senators are now in the Chamber. By tomorrow all Senators will at least have had an opportunity to read the debate which has occurred and consider the views presented this afternoon.

I agree with the Senator from Washington that it is important for us to determine whether we are to send a man to the moon by 1970 and, if so, whether we are to devote to that project $20 billion or $30 billion or $40 billion. An article published today in the Washington Star notes that there has been a delay of 2 years in working on a booster because some of the material used was faulty. It might be 1980 or 1990 before we place a man on the moon, if we have an orderly project.

Therefore, I hope the Senator from Washington will not seek to force the Senate to vote today on this amendment, but, instead, will permit the vote on it to be taken tomorrow.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I will discuss this point with the leadership.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield briefly to me?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield for a question.

Mr. ANDERSON. I understand from both the majority leader and the minority leader that they hope to have the Senate complete its action on the bill tonight. I hope so, too.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes. I was trying to obtain the estimate from the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. In my judgment this bill is as important as the foreign aid bill and merits more time. I do not wish to delay the Senate merely for the purpose of delay, and I have no intention of attempting to do so.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I was merely trying to obtain a rough idea or estimate.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator from Washington says there are other items to be debated, too.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes. I believe this amendment should be put in the proper perspective.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am trying to do so.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The committee voted for this amount because after the House had acted and long after the original budget had been determined by the administration, the Senate Space Committee went over all these items with a rather fine-tooth comb.

They came forth with an estimate of all the scientists—I do not care who they are—that this was a lunar program to get a man on the moon by 1970. It was not a crash program. It was not dragging its heels. It was going along with what might be called reasonable progress. The committee tried the very thing we are talking about—to separate the difference in amounts—and we cut the Senate authorization a couple of hundred million.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. And the Senate increased the authorization voted by the House.

Mr. MAGNUSON. In the Senate authorization.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. We tried to separate, dollarwise, what it would cost to have what we might call a reasonable space program without going to the moon. To do so is most difficult because they are intertwined. The work is stated in the report. But the testimony was clear to all of us that if the moon did

not exist, we would still proceed with 90 to 95 percent of the program. Perhaps. There are many who might wish to vote for a cut that would accomplish that result dollars and cents wise, but it is difficult for the Space Committee to take these programs apart.

*One big* item is the booster—the Saturn program. It may turn out to have a hundred times more value in the defense of this country, even though it must be used to go to the moon, or to any other place. Space platforms, and the meeting of people in space, are most important. Those objectives are intertwined, and going to the moon is a part of the project, though it may be glamorized more.

It is easy to ask—and I, myself have asked—"When we get to the moon, so what? What have we found out?" What is discovered may be useful in connection with many problems in space. Even civilian uses may be discovered. There is a medical spinoff on the project, too, which may be of untold value to the people of this country and the rest of the free world. There are many other things—the use of metals is one—in all parts of the program which bring us closer to the objective of the program, if we go ahead with it.

Read the testimony of a year ago or 2 years ago. We were told that the agency would ask for a great increase this year because the program would have reached a point at which it would have to be increased. Some of the great increases are necessary because this is difficult hardware to buy. The orders must be sent in. The hardware cannot be manufactured overnight. Most of the work is contractual. Many industries involved in the thousands of contracts are receiving a great deal of benefit from the research, even though one industry may be making a very small gadget which fits into the overall plan. I know of several. The aircraft industry is one. They claim they work with the Defense Department in all these efforts and that they have other jobs. We can read that in the testimony. Defense has its other jobs, but the agencies work together. Without the two, Defense could not do certain things; no one else could.

The committee arrived at the figure in the bill after long days of hearings by the Committee on Aeronautics and Space Sciences as to how far it could cut the appropriation. So the RECORD will be clear, the budget estimate was $5,712 million. The authorization was $5,350 million. So the committtee, of which the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] is chairman, cut one-half billion dollars from the estimate. The Senate appropriation was $5,190 million. So we are down $600 million at the present time from what it was thought was needed a year ago.

There is one other point to be considered. They are about 5 months behind now. That is not the fault of the Senate. Why the other body did not get busy on these appropriation bills, I do not know. They may have had good reason, but they are behind at the present time. If we are going ahead with this project, we must "get in there" to get this hardware to do these necessary things.

I am no expert in this field. We must get the advice of experts. There is some scientific controversy involved.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does the Senator believe there are any experts in that field?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I believe some of the men are experts.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Who does the Senator think is an expert?

Mr. MAGNUSON. There have been people in the scientific field in the U.S. community who have been interested in space matters for years. This is not an overnight thing. I do not know how many people are aware that the first space effort made by anyone was in Russia, during the days of the Czar. It was an effort in rocketry. Then the Germans picked it up. We have had scientists in this field for a long time. We are lucky to have men like Von Braun and others who have the necessary background. They are as expert as anyone can be. Of course, no one knows everything about the subject.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. But they are experts only in the technical sense.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I am talking in the technical sense.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am talking about those qualified to evaluate the importance of this project.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Physicists are involved in this program.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Not long ago we were told that atomic energy would solve all our problems. We have poured billions of dollars into atomic energy, and we now hear little about it except as it applies to weaponry.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Oh, the Senator from Arkansas should have been with me——

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Atomic energy was going to furnish power to everybody free, and——

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator from Arkansas should have been with me 2 weeks ago when we dedicated the biggest atomic powerplant in the whole world.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator from Washington has been very successful in getting money for his State. I congratulate him on it. I envy him his record. If I had such a fine record, I would certainly not worry about reelection any more than the Senator from Washington does. But, of course, that is not what we are talking about. I merely think we have been grossly oversold on what to expect out of the space program. I am not minimizing its importance. I do not say it is unimportant, or that we should not go to the moon. I am saying it is not so important that we should lay aside education, urban renewal, unemployment problems, and everything else, in deference to it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator from Arkansas is setting himself up as one who knows the exact amount that would be required. One cannot build a $20,000 house for $18,000.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not believe anyone else knows. I have before me a letter. I tried to obtain guidance from the space agency but I did not get very much. I am perfectly willing to submit this letter to the Senate. I intended to do so before.

Mr. MAGNUSON. There are books of testimony to which I have listened.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON] tried to get some information on where cuts could be made, and he got nowhere. Frankly, I do not believe they are capable of giving it to the Senate.

Mr. MAGNUSON. We went into that question, too. I admit it is very difficult to get any of them to separate the amounts.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. They want the whole amount.

Mr. MAGNUSON. There are many other things involved. As I have said, if the question were merely one of going to the moon for prestige——

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is the main excuse.

Mr. MAGNUSON. If that were the whole purpose of the program, I would vote to cut the whole program.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is the purpose—to get to the moon by 1970.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is all there is to it?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The program has gained momentum under the impetus of getting there before the Russians. That momentum has begun to fade a little, in view of Khrushchev's latest statement. Director Webb and others first tried to downgrade the cost. When it was first discussed, they were not bothered about the cost. Going to the moon was going to cost $20 billion. The momentum is beginning to fade because the Russians have said they are not so interested, and Mr. Webb is now saying they did not mean $20 billion. Within a year there has been a complete change in their approach.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I wish to make one more comment and then I will yield to the Senator from Arkansas and let him proceed.

I do not believe it would be accurate to suggest that Director Webb, Dr. Dryden and others involved in the program—and there are many others whose names I shall not state—have not been very frank with the committee in previous years to tell them that the program will cost a great deal of money.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. They surely have.

Mr. MAGNUSON. They would have been much happier with us, I am sure, if they could have said, "It will not cost much. Can we go ahead with it?"

Mr. FULBRIGHT. They have been "weaseling" lately, saying it will not cost so much.

Mr. MAGNUSON. And if we had said, "Go ahead." Everybody was for it.

I do not know whether this is the exact amount in dollars and cents needed, but I know that this will not keep the program from reasonable progress.

This is a program on which we have put our stamps of approval. The money is spent, it is true, in a thousand different places in the United States. It is difficult even to evaluate some of the things which occur, considering that a small company might have a subcontract or even a sub-subcontract for one of

the items which might be used in this effort.

I hope that we shall not create the impression that the business of landing a man on the moon, literally and technically, is all that we are talking about. It is only one of the things about which we are talking.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator will admit that that is the way in which it is being glamorized. It has been brought out that all the astronauts are going to get a million dollars for their stories. This appeals to young people. I see stories published about going to the moon that I am sure create a great deal of interest on the part of youth.

The Senator knows that this is one of the principal things involved.

Mr. MAGNUSON. If the Senator does not believe that to be the case, he can go to any toyshop at Christmastime and see what the young children are buying and what the stores are selling to the young people of America. The youngsters are interested in it, whether it is right or wrong.

There was a NASA exhibit at the fair in my State. There have been many around the country. Any day at the exhibit a person would see the youngsters, from the age of 7 or 8 up to 15 years, lined up four deep. They were quite interested in the program.

This program involves many tough scientific problems, and the answers will be of value to us.

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

Mr. MAGNUSON. I was not criticizing the Senator for taking time. If I was construed to be so doing, I apologize. I have been taking up some time, too.

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

Mr. CLARK. I hope the Senator from Arkansas will encourage the leadership not to ask for a vote on the amendment tonight, but to permit an extensive and searching debate of the serious questions of national policy raised by the excellent speech of the Senator from Arkansas.

I sometimes wonder what is happening in the Senate. Perhaps because of my wonderment I was categorized last Sunday by a very able member of the press as probably the most unpopular Senator in this body. I rise this afternoon to make myself even more unpopular, because I bring to the attention of my colleagues the fact that it required more than a month, as the Senator from Arkansas knows, for the Senate to approve the test ban treaty. In my opinion, that treaty could have been approved, and should have been approved in 2 days.

It required the Senate exactly 2 hours to pass the Defense Department Appropriation bill, immediately after consideration of the test ban treaty. That bill involved tens of billions of dollars. There was no adequate discussion.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It was $47 billion, was it not?

Mr. CLARK. Forty-seven billion dollars.

It took the Senate about 20 minutes to pass a bill to extend the draft for 4 years.

Yet, with respect to foreign aid—a proposal for peace, as to which I supported the Senator from Arkansas in his unsuccessful effort to prevent the President's program from being mutilated—the Senate took 3 weeks to consider the bill, cutting out $10 million here and $25 million there, with Senators becoming upset and aroused, and carrying on in a way which I could not well describe within the limitations of the rules of the Senate.

Now the Senator from Arkansas, with great courage, raises a fundamental question of the priorities for programs, which relates to the entire concept of our American civilization. Do we wish to be a group of "Buck Rogers"? Do we wish to placate the children in the toy stores, about whom the Senator from Washington was talking? Shall we respond with our immediate votes when we find that at Christmastime all the children want to go to the moon, or to play that they are going there?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I was responding to a question about the children.

Mr. CLARK. I did not yield to the Senator.

Or, instead, shall we do something important about upgrading the education of American young people? Shall we do something important about rebuilding our cities and remedying the situation in the slums? Shall we do something important about the No. 1 problem in my State, which is unemployment?

We do not have in Pennsylvania all of the great space and defense agencies which seem to take up most of the real estate of the great State of Washington.

I should like to see something done about the problems which face the American people. I should like to see some kind of civilized perspective taken about where we are heading.

The Senator from Arkansas has raised that question, not only in the Senate in speech after speech, but also in New York, where I heard him make a great speech last January, and elsewhere.

I believe the Senator from Arkansas is entitled to the complete attention of the full membership of the Senate. I have a speech to make, which will not be too brief. I should like to make that speech on this subject before the Senate reaches a vote. This afternoon we are facing one of the most important issues of policy which will come before the Senate in this session.

Mr. MAGNUSON rose.

Mr. CLARK. I do not blame my friend the Senator from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator has just finished blaming me.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is an able representative of the State of Washington. He and his junior colleague have done a magnificent job for the State of Washington. The Senator has done a wonderful job as chairman of the appropriations subcommittee, in bringing the bill to the Senate for consideration.

But the Senator from Washington, like the chairman of every other subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, and the chairman of every subcommittee of every legislative committee of the Senate, has a vested interest in the matter consigned to his authority, in respect to bringing the bill to the Senate. He would like to give us the biggest and best space program that the scientists can devise.

I am chairman of the Subcommittee on Employment and Manpower of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. I have a vested interest in seeing to it that some of the money of this great Republic is spent to put people back to work. I know that the space program has a very small impact on employment, compared with many other industries, such as the rebuilding of cities, the educational system, and a number of other matters. I should like to see this question fully debated. I commend the Senator from Arkansas for his efforts in that regard.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President——

Mr. MAGNUSON. Just a minute.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I will yield to the Senator in a moment.

I believe the Senator from Pennsylvania has raised a crucial point. This is a question of priorities. Neither of us is saying, "Let us eliminate the space program." We say, "Let us not turn everything over to it and let everything else fall by the wayside."

I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Either the Senator from Pennsylvania did not hear what I had to say a few minutes ago, or perhaps he was not in the Chamber.

I rose to ask the Senator how much time he thought he needed, so that the Senate could do the very thing the Senator is talking about.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I believe I stated the proposition very fairly to the Senate.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator did.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I said that if we did not want this program I would vote against it.

The State of Washington does not have much interest in the space program, technically. We are interested in the power business.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. All kinds of power businesses.

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

Mr. CLARK. All kinds of power businesses.

Mr. MAGNUSON. We do not have many contracts in this field in the State of Washington. We probably have fewer than any other State of our size. Boeing Aircraft had some.

The main contracts are in Louisiana, at Cape Canaveral, and at other places. It is a little unfair to make such a statement about Washington.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I was talking about atomic energy. The Senator will admit that atomic energy has a pretty important position in Washington.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield briefly?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Will the Senator yield to me first?

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

Mr. MAGNUSON. Naturally, since we spent so many days studying this program, we feel that at least a little knowledge on the subject has rubbed off. We

have a responsibility to make decisions and to tell the Senate why we made certain decisions.

We know that no matter what we do in regard to this problem, there will be some who will not agree with us.

I do not know how I could have stated the proposition in any fairer way.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. CLARK. I agree with the Senator.

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

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

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] asked me a question a few minutes ago about how I arrived at the estimate that one out of every four American scientists will be working for NASA by 1970. While this was based on an estimate of independent scientists, not NASA spokesmen, it was specifically cited in the New York Times for July 28, 1963.

The New York Times article read in part as follows:

> Citing NASA's own estimates of its trained manpower needs through the decade, Prof. Barry Commoner, of Washington University, St. Louis, says that the Space Agency will require the services of one in every four U.S. scientists by 1970.

Dr. Commoner is not paid by the Space Agency. He has every right to make estimates, as other scientists have. Perhaps his independence of NASA gives his estimate a greater objectiveness.

The Senator from New Mexico has used some excellent sources. I do not say the source I have used is correct, but it is relevant to the fact that the agency is absorbing an enormous amount of one of the most important resources this Nation has: scientific manpower.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator is quite correct. It must be a rather broad estimate, because much depends on what the Congress does. If we appropriate the amount requested, I suppose it could approach that figure. I did not have that particular statement.

I return to my argument about the particular significance of this program.

It should also be remembered that the military has its own space program designed to fit its particular needs, and this program is being pursued this year at the rate of some $1.7 billion. In an article in the current Fortune magazine, to which I referred a moment ago, Richard Austin Smith comments:

> Even the young space colonels of the Air Force never saw much utility in Apollo. The plain fact is that if Apollo and all the other programs that made up NASA's $5.7 billion budget request for 1964 were to be suddenly scrapped, the military (which has a $1.7 billion space program of its own) would have to spend only an additional $500 million to make up for whatever help NASA had been giving.

That is a very significant statement. It states that if the whole Apollo project is obliterated, and NASA's other programs, the military, by adding $500 million, instead of having the $5 billion, could make up whatever NASA is doing to supplement the military aspect.

So I think the conclusion of the statement of both the scientists and others I have mentioned that the aspect of national security is of no real significance in the national budget is accurate.

The security argument is even less persuasive when it is remembered that the Congress has never been hesitant about emasculating the foreign aid program even though every President, Secretary of State, and Secretary of Defense since the program began, and our top military leaders as well, have consistently said that foreign aid was essential to the Nation's security.

Over the years I think practically every important member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff also consistently has said that foreign aid was essential to the Nation's security. They said it this year, and they have said it every year while I have been in the Senate. There was no more determined advocate of the foreign aid program than President Eisenhower throughout his administration. I may say he was more successful in restraining those who wished to cut it than the present administration has been.

Despite strong and consistent support for the foreign aid program by the Nation's top military and civilian defense officials, the Congress has freely slashed the President's aid requests by hundreds of millions each year.

The Senate, as no one needs to be reminded, has just completed its most spectacular effort in this field, having rendered its sovereign judgment that the President and his top civilian advisers are quite mistaken in the importance which they attach to the aid program as an instrument of national security. Having overruled the Nation's defense experts on foreign aid, the Congress should have no hesitancy, from the standpoint of security, at least, in cutting back the crash program for a landing on the moon, which our defense experts assure us has little, if any, relevance to national defense.

The program to land a man on the moon is scarcely more valuable as a scientific enterprise than for military purposes. One leading scientist has said that by including men in the moon exploration program, results will come much slower and the cost will be much greater.

Mr. Webb, the Director of this enterprise, when asked during a hearing before the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee if the prospective scientific benefits of the moonshot justified the cost, replied:

> The answer is no, if you limit it to science.

Dr. Newell, who is in charge of space science for NASA, added:

> A very large fraction of the scientific information that we will obtain by the lunar landing project could also be obtained by the unmanned technique.

Dr. Philip Abelson, director of the Geophysical Laboratory, Carnegie Institution of Washington, and editor of Science magazine, conducted a straw poll among scientists not connected with NASA programs. He reported that the vote was 110 to 3 against the manned lunar program.

Dr. Polykarp Kusch, chairman of the Department of Physics of Columbia University, told the Senate Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences last June that he felt the space program, from a scientific standpoint, "attempts to do too much too fast."

The President's science adviser, Dr. Jerome Weisner, told the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee that if the program were judged purely as a scientific program, "We could do it at another pace." He went on to say that he thought "the cost would be more or less the same if we did it in twice the time."

There are, of course, many distinguished scientists who support the present program, but I do not know of one who has attempted to justify its pace and cost as essential to scientific objectives.

If the moonshot program cannot be justified on the basis of its importance for science or national defense, it can only be justified as a program—a very costly program—for enhancing national prestige.

I think this is really at the root of the whole program.

Assuming that prestige can be bought, who can say with any degree of certainty how much it costs and what kind of activity pays the richest dividends? The probable truth is that we are in a race not with the Russians, but with ourselves. Khrushchev's latest statements, which may or may not be taken at face value, indicate that the Russians are continuing their efforts to send a man to the moon, but do not wish to engage in a race with the United States. It may well be that we have entered a trap of our own making, that we have committed ourselves to a futile race of which the outcome can only be outright failure or a pyrrhic victory.

I think that the policies of our Nation will have a far greater impact on the world if we sustain our space program on a more reasonable scale and divert some of the talent and money involved to solving some of our pressing problems here on earth. The uncommitted nations of the world are far more likely to be impressed by the way in which we use our resources to create a better world than by our spectacular achievements in space—achievements that may dazzle the world for a day or a week but that will soon be lost in the tides of history. In this connection it is worth noting that not a single nation has succumbed to Soviet influence as a result of the launching of sputnik and subsequent Russian space exploits. It seems clear that the triumph of being first on the moon will be a fleeting and costly one, a 9-day wonder of history, a gaudy sideshow in the real work of the world.

It is argued that the space program, like the defense program, is such a great boon to the economy that much harm would come to many important industries and any number of communities if the pace were retarded. I am fully aware of the significance of the great industries whose financial health is dependent on the space program. With

nearly $589 million authorized this year for construction of new facilities related in one way or another to the manned lunar landing program, NASA-supported activities have become major economic factors in many States. Our economy obviously needs stimulation to achieve a higher growth rate, to reduce unemployment, and to bring about utilization of idle productive capacity. The aerospace industries, however, where these billions for the space program will be spent, are not in need of stimulation. A look at the help wanted section of the classified ads is convincing proof that there is no unemployment problem in space oriented industries. It is difficult for me to imagine how spending $280 million more in construction of new facilities at Cape Canaveral will ease the lot of an unemployed West Virginia coal miner or a farmer eking out a bare existence in the Ozarks.

Expansion of the space program will undoubtedly accentuate existing distortions in the economy brought about by disproportionate concentration of human and physical resources in the defense and space oriented industries. One commentator has said that the significant aspect of the problem is not that 10 percent of the gross national product is devoted to military and space purposes but that three-fourths of the engineering and scientific talent of the country is occupied by work in these fields, thus draining away the technological competence that would normally be devoted to civilian purposes. It is interesting to note that only about one one-hundred-and-fiftieth, or $3.5 million, of the NASA budget is slated to be invested in finding ways to adapt knowledge gained through the space program to industrial applications. That is an almost infinitesimal part of the huge budget. According to Dr. Seamans, the space program utilized some 3 to 4 percent of the Nation's scientists and engineers at the beginning of this year, but he predicts that this proportion will grow to 6 or 7 percent by the beginning of 1964, and may continue to increase throughout the decade. NASA and its contractors have in fact been drawing off large numbers of the most creative scientists and engineers, leaving the less gifted for the civilian-based economy. The June issue of Mechanical Engineering reported a survey of engineering salaries which showed that an average of $9,300 annually was paid in machinery and capital goods industries compared with $11,500 in aerospace industries. As the space effort absorbs the talents of more and more scientists and engineers, the disparity will no doubt increase.

Of more basic concern is the growing role of the Federal Government in science. It is not a healthy situation to have a large segment of the scientific community working directly or indirectly for the Government. In the fiscal year 1963 Federal funds made up more than two-thirds of all expenditures for research and development in the Nation. The $14.4 billion spent by the Government last year was more than triple the research and development outlays made during all of World War II. Defense and NASA programs accounted for 80 percent of Federal research and development expenditures last year and will account for an even larger share this year. I recently read that 76 percent of all scientists and engineers working in electronics for example, are supported by Federal funds. The impact of this on civilian oriented electronic needs is not difficult to imagine.

In contrast to the volume of Federal outlays for defense and space oriented research, only $95 million was committed by the Government last year for research in the social sciences.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, the figure the Senator used involves all defense.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct.

Mr. ANDERSON. Including space. If the Senator is going to deliver an antispace speech, I wish he would separate the two items. If he did so, he would find that nearly all the figures he used relate to defense.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am not delivering an antispace speech. It is an anti-man-on-the-moon speech. These are two distinct items.

Mr. ANDERSON. The Senator was present, I am sure, when the late Senator Connally talked about the man who had a little fish in his hand, and said, "Don't wiggle so, fishie; I don't want to do anything to you but gut you."

The Senator from Arkansas does not want to do anything to the Space Administration but gut it.

I am sorry he feels that way, but I can understand why he does. At the same time I do not want him to charge all of the cost to the space program.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I said that the $14.4 billion spent by the Government last year was more than triple the research and development outlays made during all of World War II. Does the Senator disagree with that statement?

Mr. ANDERSON. No.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I also said that the Defense and NASA programs accounted for 80 percent of the Federal research and development expenditures last year, and will account for an even larger share this year. Is that not an accurate statement?

Mr. ANDERSON. I think it is. I only wish that he would tell us how much was for space and how much for defense. A person reading his speech could very easily be confused by these statements.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. We know that the Defense budget is outrageous. Yet it is sacrosanct, and no one dares raise his voice against it, or question it in any way.

Mr. ANDERSON. I am perfectly satisfied if the Senator has made that clear.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator knows that that is no excuse for NASA growing up like its daddy. The Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] challenged the idea that this program has no military significance. I believe that the military justification for NASA is minimal.

Mr. ANDERSON. The military uses of the guidance system are of far more significance to the military than to NASA. The booster that goes into it does not know whether it is carrying a civilian or a military man.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The military, under their own program, are exploring items that are useful within a range of 500 to 1,000 miles. I believe several of the witnesses testified that for military purposes that is about the extent of their interest. I do not know whether the Senator was present when I quoted General Taylor as saying that so far as he could see, the space program has no military significance.

Mr. ANDERSON. I was present.

I tried to point out to the Senator from Arkansas that General Taylor's comment was directed to a specific question, the direct military value to that small portion of NASA devoted to going to the moon, which is $1.9 billion to $2 billion.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is not small when we consider what we have been getting for such a program as accelerated public works and vocational training.

Mr. ANDERSON. The Senator should recognize that if we cut $800 million out of this budget, we will not get anything more for education.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I believe that the prospects for getting it are that much enhanced. I cannot accept the idea that Congress is going to continue to reject education. We came very close to passing a Federal aid to education bill and only the Rules Committee in the House defeated the will of both Houses. The Senator knows that. I only wish to leave the door open, in the hope that we shall not continue to condemn the next generation to ignorance and illiteracy. I am hoping that in some way we will get around the stumbling blocks to education legislation.

Mr. ANDERSON. I join the Senator in that hope. He and I have been in Congress for a quarter of a century, in one body or the other. He recognizes that while all these speeches are made, if this money could be siphoned off, how wonderful it would be for education. But Congress has not passed an education bill.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is only one item. There are others which are less controversial.

Mr. ANDERSON. I recognize that.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Education is only one. It happens to be the most important and in the past 20 years Congress has come close to enacting an education bill. Last session it came closer than ever, but the bill became fouled up in the Rules Committee. I grant that is a major stumbling block, but I have not given up hope that sooner or later it will be possible to educate the young people of this country adequately.

Mr. ANDERSON. I compliment the Senator from Arkansas. I am not giving up hope on education, although many times I have been close to giving up hope. I do not want to give up hope on anything.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I have a copy of a publication entitled "Federal Funds For Science XI, for fiscal years 1961, 1962, 1963," published by the National Science Foundation. It relates in part to the exchange we have just had. Perhaps I

should read a portion of it into the RECORD:

The relative amount of support by the three agencies having the largest research and development programs was expected to change during the 3 years. The National Aeronautics and Space Administration's rate of increase from fiscal year 1961 to 1963 was expected to be greater than that of any other agency. In fiscal year 1962 the National Aeronautics and Space Administration became the second largest supporter of research and development, supplanting the Atomic Energy Commission. During the 3-year period, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration's obligations for research and development were expected to increase from 9 to 22 percent of the total Federal research and development programs.

Mr. ANDERSON. So if the two of them add to 80 percent, only 60 percent was military and 20 percent might be NASA.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It was 22 percent.

Mr. ANDERSON. What we might keep in mind is that if a man started to build a boat, he might spend a small amount for the design of the boat. Suddenly when he began to build it, the costs might rise rapidly. That is what is taking place in this instance. Sixty-eight percent of the NASA budget is for hardware, which we are only now finally getting ready to build.

The Senator wants to take us back closer to the limit of what we spent when we were trying to plan ways to build the hardware.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. All I am trying to do is to slow down the pace of the program. I believe it is impinging upon other activities; and I do not mean education alone. I believe that the space program is impinging upon the whole budget. The entire Arkansas delegation and the entire delegation from Oklahoma had to rush to the Budget Bureau a few weeks ago in response to a rumor that there was to be a slowdown of the Arkansas River program, a program to which the Budget Bureau is committed. Three hundred and fifty or four hundred million dollars has already been spent on it. I am sure the pressure upon the Bureau of the Budget on such items as the Arkansas River navigation project unrelated as it is on its face, comes in large degree from the great increase in funds for the space program.

I cannot say that if funds are cut from this program, they will be spent in a certain other program. But I do know that there is a probing throughout the Government to determine where money can be saved.

This pressure colors the prospects for passage of the tax bill. Much as I personally disagree with the view that there cannot be a tax cut until there is a saving of money somewhere, for those who accept that philosophy, I say here is a good place to save. Here is an opportunity to move toward a balanced budget.

The cut I propose in the space budget would be comparable to the one that was made last week in the foreign aid authorization bill. If every week we could make a healthy cut in programs which are superfluous, perhaps the budget could be balanced.

I say that the pace of this program is not essential. We should explore space in a reasonable way. If we proceed on a crash basis, I believe the results will be grossly disappointing, as they were in connection with the atomic energy program.

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

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I started to speak a while ago. I do not want to extend the Senator's time. However, I think we are pretty well satisfied with the results of the atomic energy program. We promised to make it available for civilian power. We are entering the 300,000-kilowatt range and are now building some stations that are economically worthwhile.

Atomic energy is also worthwhile in medicine. There are many worthwhile aspects of atomic energy. If the opportunity permitted us to do so this afternoon, we could have a most interesting discussion of the progress of atomic energy.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not want to be misunderstood. The Senator makes my views appear to be too black or too white. I have never opposed the atomic energy program. I am only saying it was allowed to come into existence so rapidly that it required a great deal of money, while other programs that I have mentioned, and shall mention later, have been shoved aside because of a desire to limit the budget. My whole argument is based upon the question of priorities. I would never say that atomic energy should not have been pursued. All I am saying is that we rushed in and acted hastily. The time when atomic energy is to be competitive with oil and gas is more remote than we at one time thought it was. Will not the Senator from New Mexico agree to that?

Mr. ANDERSON. That is a correct statement.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is all I am saying. I have never said that the atomic energy program should not have been pursued. We should have done it, but we should have given a little higher priority to some other items, such as urban renewal. We are driving urban people mad by the kind of traffic conditions that exist in the cities and States.

There are other important problems in our society such as crime and the pollution of our streams. Stream pollution is a national disgrace. I pass beside the Potomac River and Rock Creek every day. If the wind is right, they smell like the sewers they are.

Similar conditions exist all over the country. Those are conditions that I think should have priority over the possible advantages of going to the moon.

This is my only point.

I thoroughly agree with the Senator that some day atomic energy will come into its own.

Mr. ANDERSON. I believe it has already come into its own. A moment ago, the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] mentioned the very large Hanford plant. We know that that plant was included in an appropriation bill a couple of times. It was eliminated from the atomic energy bill. At that time, people said, "If this enormous plant is not to be built, we should not build the great laboratory that is to be constructed near Stanford University, including the accelerator. Those moneys could be used for something else." The Hanford plant was eliminated, but we did not see 5 cents of the money go to medicine or education.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Large sums have been spent for medical research. That has been one of the fastest growing fields of research. The Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] has almost equalled the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] in persuading Congress to appropriate money. The increase in funds for cancer research the past 5 years has been remarkable. Does not the Senator from New Mexico agree?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I was paying the Senator from Washington a compliment.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator did not need to do so.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I know the Senator does not need it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Since the Senator from Alabama and I started on this program, the longevity of the American people has increased 6 to 8 years.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does the Senator believe that while they are here, they are any happier, even though their lives have been lengthened?

Mr. MAGNUSON. They are unhappy about some things. I do not know whether they would be much more unhappy if they thought they would not have those 6 extra years.

Speaking of percentages, the bill is $1,263 million under the budget estimate. The biggest cut under the budget amount is for the Space Agency. In other words, we have treated the Space Agency very much like the other agencies. No agency will have any increase in positions.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I have not considered the other agencies, but the second largest agency is the Veterans' Administration. By how large a percentage was the Veterans' budget increased over last year's, compared with NASA's?

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Veterans' Administration has a fixed budget. We have provided $5 billion.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It does not have to be fixed.

Mr. MAGNUSON. By law, the benefits must be paid.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. But more can be paid, if Congress wishes to do so.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I know that a law would have to be enacted.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is what is being done in this instance. To what other agency has an increase been given that is comparable with the increase given to the Space Agency?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Percentagewise?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes; in any substantial amount.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The National Science Foundation asked for a comparable increase.

The increase made for the Veterans' Administration was only for fixed charges.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. But dollarwise, are not those very small increases over the amounts in last year's budget?

Mr. MAGNUSON. This year the Veterans' Administration appropriation will be almost $6 billion.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. What was its appropriation last year?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Almost $1 billion less. It has increased almost $1 billion in this bill.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. In 1 year?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes, because of the increase in the number of veterans who receive the benefits and the retirement pay.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does not the number decrease as time goes by?

Mr. MAGNUSON. World War II accounts for 17 million veterans who are on the rolls. So many of them are still alive, and I hope that continues to be the case, for I am one of them.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. How about the veterans of the First World War?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Some of them are dying. But quite a few of these payments go to Spanish-American War veterans.

However, the point is that the cut made in this item is perhaps the largest cut made in any appropriation item.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. But this item was the largest one to begin with.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes; but last year we were told that if we continued this program, it would increase to this extent. So I do not think this surprises us.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not think anyone is deceived; but in the very mad life we lead, until substantial amounts of money are required for a program, people do not pay much attention to it. I confess that I may have been preoccupied with something else last year, because it was an election year, but I had no idea that there would be a $20 billion or $30 billion lunar project, until the program was discussed again this year. Now we are told that we are committed to it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. But Congress can always turn down the request.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am asking that there be only a slowdown, not a turndown.

Mr. MAGNUSON. But this was made known to us long ago. I have been on the Space Committee ever since it was created; and we always were told that if we went ahead with this program, this would be the year when the amount required would be this large.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Did not this program become important only after the Russian sputnik was launched?

Mr. MAGNUSON. No. A Space Committee was working prior to that.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I mean the lunar project.

Mr. MAGNUSON. No; thought was given to it all along.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not recall that.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McGOVERN in the chair). Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. That is not the situation at all. The first work done in this field was done by Dr. von Braun and others on what they called Project World Series. If they had been able to obtain from Congress the money they then requested, we would have been from 3 years to 5 years ahead of the Russian sputnik. But Congress would not provide the money then requested.

Furthermore, the cost of moving from earth orbit to the moon is only a relatively small one; perhaps only $3 billion or $4 billion more will be required for the last jump.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. But we have had men in orbit. Do we now have the jump on the Russians?

Mr. ANDERSON. No.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Why not?

Mr. ANDERSON. Because their most recent development is a very significant one. I refer to the fact that they are able to move their space vehicle backward, forward, up, and down. The Russian woman who orbited, orbited more times than the total number of orbits by all the Americans who have orbited. That was possible because she had a larger spaceship, a better spaceship, and a more maneuverable spaceship.

I do not say that we have not done very well. I think we have done very well; and the fact that we have done very well prompted Khrushchev to propose that the United States and Russia work together in this field. But a few days later he followed up that statement by saying that the Russians would proceed on their own.

I agree with the Senator that the hope is to proceed into space a great deal farther by 1964; and that development will involve the most important space project next to the project to reach the moon.

The original program called for $6,700 million. The Bureau of the Budget made them trim it down, and they trimmed it down to approximately $5,700 million, as I recall—a very large cut. Then the House made another very large cut. The conference committee reached an intermediate figure—but still there was a very large cut.

When this item was considered by the Independent Offices Appropriation Subcommittee headed by the Senator from Washington, the additions which were made were only for items which we believed absolutely essential.

I have watched the Appropriations Committees work a number of times, and I think our Appropriations Committee was as careful with this item as it could possibly be. Therefore, we did not request an exorbitant amount, and I do not think an exorbitant amount would have been allowed if we had requested it.

I commend the committee, and particularly the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], for what I regard as a very sensible amount for the program. I do not believe the amount the Senate subcommittee voted as an addition to the amount voted by the House is at all exorbitant, for it is only an additional $90 million.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Perhaps so, but the total for the program to reach the moon is a very great amount.

Mr. ANDERSON. I say only that after the House cut the amount very substantially, the Senate subcommittee added only a very small amount, and only for specific purposes. So I do not think the Senate committee failed to discharge its obligations. I think it performed very well.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I hope the Senator from New Mexico realizes that I am not criticizing either him or his committee or the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]. There is an honest difference of opinion as to the relative importance of this activity when compared with other activities. This is the only point I am endeavoring to make.

Mr. ANDERSON. I realize that. I merely say to the Senator from Arkansas that we can easily say that if we spend less money for this program, larger amounts can be spent for education or for other purposes. However, we find that that does not happen.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I grant that probably it would be very difficult to spend such additional amounts for education. However, as I proceed I shall mention many other programs which I believe are being delayed or reduced because of a desire to reduce expenditures. For example, why is the vocational education bill being held up now?

Mr. ANDERSON. I assume that all programs dealing with education are being held up until we get further along.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. No, I do not think that is the reason. The problem is with the budget. The accelerated public works program has done a lot of good for the people of my State. Yet there is no more money for it—not unless the public works appropriation bill is enacted, and that bill provides only another $45 million for it. We are almost ashamed to mention the amounts we are providing for other programs and yet look at the amount we are providing for the send-a-man-to-the-moon program. Ten TVA's could be built with the amount being devoted to the reach-the-moon program.

Mr. ANDERSON. No, for I accept the national goal the President announced to Congress, and which Congress endorsed. I do not believe in marching forward one day and marching backward the next day. I want to proceed with the program which has been agreed upon, and for which plans were made. However, it is not a $20 billion program. The part which represents only sending a man to the moon involves less than $2 billion, according to the testimony of Dr. Seamans.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. However, that testimony is difficult to understand. The Senator from Washington himself said it was almost impossible to segregate the cost of getting a man to the moon from Dr. Seamans' testimony.

Mr. MAGNUSON. It is difficult to do so because so many of the programs are interrelated, and involve space activities, weather activities, medical items, and many others.

Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield briefly to me?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I have been trying to divert some money from this program

to the program for work in oceanography. I have been attempting for a long time to do that.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The oceanography program appeals to me much more than space.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I succeeded in having some funds diverted from the man-to-the-moon project; but I must agree with the Senator from New Mexico that the money thus diverted did not find its way into the oceanography program. Actually, we know more about the back side of the moon now than we know about three-quarters of the earth's surface.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think that is a disgrace. I shall support the Senator.

Perhaps this is an accurate measure of our national sense of values. Few, if any, questions are ever raised about spending billions for developing new and more efficient ways to kill, but a loud outcry is raised over any effort to increase support for research in those fields which are concerned with ways of improving human life and building a more rational and peaceful world.

Inevitably, we return to the question of priorities. How can we justify a space budget of over $5 billion for the current fiscal year when so much remains to be done to eliminate unemployment, to provide adequate classrooms and teachers for America's young people, to eliminate slums and urban blight, to clear our polluted streams, to expand our parks and recreation areas, and to find living space and facilities for a population increasing by millions every year? The list of social challenges is seemingly endless and Congress has scarcely begun to devise adequate programs to meet them, particularly in the field of education. Until we have made significant progress toward the solution of these great problems of our own society, the expenditure of vast sums of money on outer space can only be regarded as reflecting a tragic distortion of our national values and priorities.

The most neglected area of our national life is public education, and there is an extreme imbalance in the quality of education between the rich States and the poor States. This imbalance is reflected in such statistics as the following: In 1962, 54 percent of the registrants for the draft in South Carolina failed the mental test, compared with a 4-percent failure rate in the State of Washington. In Louisiana, 21 percent of the adult population have less than 5 years of schooling compared with only a 3-percent rate in Iowa. In my own State, as another example, only 29 percent of adults have finished high school compared with 56 percent in Utah. The root of the problem is the disparity in annual per pupil expenditures—for example, $645 in New York compared with $255 in Alabama. There is little hope that these great gaps can be eliminated without substantial help from the Federal Government. And there is little hope that such help will be forthcoming unless we divert resources from such costly and marginal projects as the program for landing on the moon before 1970.

Recently the Senate passed a badly needed, long-delayed bill to expand the Federal Government's contribution to vocational education. The Senate bill provided only $173 million for this program. By comparison, each of the big boosters that will be used in the manned lunar program will cost approximately $150 million. The vocational education bill is apparently in deep trouble because of a dispute between the Senate and House conferees over the distribution formula, and it may never come out of the conference committee. It is difficult for me to understand how the Congress can justify spending $150 million for one fleeting probe into space and have such great difficulty in agreeing on a comparable amount for a full year's support of vocational education on a national scale.

The Senate has passed a Federal aid to education bill four times since World War II. Yet Congress is probably less inclined to enact a general aid to education bill now than it was when the first bill passed some 15 years ago. The administration's request for a program of $1.5 billion over 4 years apparently has no chance for passage in the foreseeable future although the total requested for 4 years of aid to improve schools amounts to less than half of the cost of the manned space program this 1 year. I might point out that the appropriation in this bill for NASA is more than the total spent for all public colleges and universities last year. When we have reached the point that the Federal Government is spending as much for a space adventure, ostensibly to enhance national prestige, as is spent for all of our public colleges and universities, it is clearly time for the Congress to do some very serious thinking about our national scale of values.

For another comparison, Senators should note that the entire natural resources program of the Federal Government this year calls for an expenditure of $2.6 billion. This sum represents the total annual investment of the Federal Government for parks, forests, dams, power facilities, drainage and irrigation projects, and all other activities to conserve and to develop the Nation's natural resources. All of these projects will yield public benefits for many years to come. Their projected cost is a billion dollars less than the amount authorized for the manned space program in this fiscal year and $2 billion less than the amount that will be appropriated for NASA even if my amendment for reductions is adopted.

Consider the following hypothetical examples: If the manned space program were eliminated, we could easily add the $970 million water project advocated by the junior Senator from Arizona to the budget for natural resources this year, pay for the entire package and still have some money left over. And only one-third of the amount authorized this year for the manned space program would fully defray the costs of the 24-year, $1.2 billion program to develop the Arkansas River for power, flood control, navigation, and recreation.

Senators might contrast the $5.19 billion requested this year for space exploration with the meager support given Federal activities to make our communities cleaner and more healthful places in which to live. Urban renewal projects which are cleaning up slums and blighted areas in communities throughout the Nation are budgeted for less than $300 million this year. The program to assist in providing decent housing for low-income families in hundreds of cities and towns is supported at $205 million. Federal grants to aid in construction of community sewerage facilities to clean up our polluted rivers and streams will be financed at a level of $90 million. Each year billions of gallons of unusable water flows through the rivers and streams of communities suffering from severe water shortages. Here in the Nation's Capital we have a river so polluted it offends the nose and the eyes. Its water is not fit for swimming, fishing, or drinking. There is indeed something very wrong, it seems to me, when the Congress refuses to provide funds to cope with these problems but is apparently willing and eager to provide $20 billion or more to send a man to the moon.

I do not contend that funds saved by reductions in the space program can be diverted directly to education or other neglected projects where greater effort is needed. I do believe, however, that the adoption of my amendment would make it easier and more practical for Congress to give serious attention to some of the pressing domestic problems to which I have referred. The minimum result of a reduction of $519 million in the NASA appropriation and of a decision to abandon the goal of reaching the moon by the end of this decade would be to ease the fiscal situation to the point where chances for enacting needed domestic legislation should be significantly improved. The Senate has passed a number of measures this year—such as the ARA extension, mass transit, vocational education, and Youth Conservation Corps bills—which are now being held up in the other body obviously for budgetary reasons. If the space program were cut back a billion dollars below the original budget request, as I propose, and the Congress were to make it clear that the program was to be continued on something less than a crash basis, with consequent decreases in annual funding requirements, many Members in the House now opposed to the Senate bills might be willing to reconsider their opposition to this important domestic legislation.

In reflecting on the crash program to reach the moon and the irrational priorities of public policy which it involves, I am reminded of the passage in Jonathan Swift's "Gulliver's Travels" in which the author visits the Academy of Projectors in Lagado. The academy is an institution in which scientists engage in studies and experiments of brilliant inventiveness, which, however, are grotesquely irrelevant to the needs of the destitute society in which they live. One scientist is engaged in a project for extracting sunbeams out of cucumbers, to be put in hermetically sealed vials and let out to warm the air in raw and rainy summers. Another has devised a method for building houses from the roof downward to the foundations and another has invented a contrivance by which the most ignorant person would be able to write books on philosophy,

poetry, politics, law, mathematics, and theology without having to study.

The Academy of Lagado, and others like it, the author explains, had become great centers of scientific progress and invention. The only drawback of the great preoccupation with science, Swift points out, is that in the meantime, the whole country lies in waste, the houses are in ruins, and the people are without food and clothes. But far from being discouraged, the people are enormously enthusiastic about the academies and their work and the few troglodytes who persist in living in neat houses and raising edible crops are looked on with contempt as enemies of art, who preferred their own ease and comfort to the general improvement of the country.

In closing, I assure my colleagues that it is neither the purpose of my amendment, nor my personal desire, to eliminate the manned lunar program. My purpose in offering this amendment is to place the space program in some perspective in relation to long-neglected domestic needs. The exploration of outer space, including the landing of Americans on the moon, is a worthy and inspiring objective whether or not it is pursued in competition with the Russians. But so long as millions of Americans are deprived of employment and adequate education, of material needs, and the opportunity for personal fulfillment, the exploration of space cannot be more than a secondary and long-term objective. Our first responsibility is to our own people, whose character and well-being are the ultimate source of national strength and the ultimate concern of a free society.

Mr. President, I wish to commend to my colleagues an article that appeared in the November issue of Fortune magazine written by Richard Austin Smith and called "Now It's an Agonizing Reappraisal of the Moon Race." In this article, Mr. Smith examines the various factors involved in the moon landing project and urges that the crash program be abandoned in favor of a long-term program to develop a broad capability in space. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Smith's article may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

NOW IT'S AN AGONIZING REAPPRAISAL OF THE MOON RACE

(By Richard Austin Smith)

(NOTE.—Two and a half years after the President committed the United States to getting there before the Russians, serious doubts about the burdens of a crash program are plaguing science, industry, and NASA. A drastic change of pace may be coming. James Webb and Congress seem to be increasingly far apart on the need for an eventual $20 to $40 billion to finance the moon race. But are they really? Webb, the NASA Administrator, opposes congressional budget cuts but appears to yearn for the more orderly, broadly based program of the old days. He is too good a bureaucrat to argue publicly with the President, but was quick to point out to Congress that Kennedy had already begun to soft-pedal the "moon first" goal.)

It is probably too much to say, as some of NASA's more panicky partisans have, that the whole U.S. space program now stands in mortal peril. The $600 million that Congress has so far whacked out of NASA's $5.7 billion budget request seems intended to put the portly giant on combat rations, not a starvation diet. Capitol Hill's tougher, more critical attitude toward NASA appears confined to counting the cost of our achieving preeminence in space rather than challenging the aspiration. A halt has simply been called to issuing the agency any further blank checks and this in turn ends Congress indulgent custom, begun in 1961, of encouraging NASA to double its budget every year. Nevertheless, NASA and the space program have reached a critical stage in their evolution; the next 2 years could very well see a realinement and reevaluation as sweeping as that which rocked NASA a little over 2 years ago when President Kennedy suddenly committed the Nation to a $20 to $40 billion program of beating the Russians to the moon.

This time, as before, the moon race lies at the heart of the reevaluation and this time the President again appears as a prime mover in bringing about the reappraisal. By accident or design, he clearly signaled a change in pace in his United Nations speech inviting the Russians to make manned exploration of the moon a joint venture instead of a competition. True, the U.N. proposal had all the earmarks of a trial balloon hurriedly inflated at the 11th hour to make a headline. But those who knew what had been going on in the lunar program found strong support for their view that reappraisal was now inevitable. So astonishing an invitation from the man who had started the race in the first place implied at least a new Washington view about the urgency of winning.

The fact is the President has been keenly aware of growing skepticism in many quarters. Among scientists the initial enchantment has faded before the mounting costs and the fear of heavy drain on other fields of scientific endeavor. Less and less is heard of the military urgency of exploring and "conquering" the moon; on second thought even the Air Force has decided its interests lie more in "inner-space" capability (up to 500 miles) than in the moon. Even some of those who put enormous emphasis on being first to the moon for reasons of national prestige are beginning to question whether an orderly development of space capability is being sacrificed just to achieve a prestige victory.

To be sure, the space race still has plenty of powerful adherents. Congressional support has been fortified by the judicious spreading of Apollo contracts among congressional districts; many citizens still want to beat the Russians to the moon at any cost; some scientists retain an almost mystical attachment to Apollo as a stimulating challenge and the greatest of adventures. And the race idea might regain powerful support overnight should the Russians pull off another space spectacular. But even so, the problems of the moon race as now conceived are of the kind that will progressively worsen.

The trouble stems from the simple fact that the Apollo program as a race is a far different undertaking from Apollo pursued at a reasonable pace. The race timetable calls for bringing it to a culmination in 1967 or 1968 instead of sometime in the seventies, as NASA originally planned; this speedup has increased the cost by around $8 billion. The drain on scientific manpower has gone up commensurately; the original time schedule envisioned recruitment of personnel through an expanded educational program, while the race schedule demands a rising percentage of scientific and technological talent in the pool today. Moreover, the preeminence given Apollo has made it virtually impossible for NASA to achieve orderly progress in other lines of space endeavor. Such a balanced approach has to give way as Apollo gets the best men, the highest priorities, and the bulk of the money. Apollo has become, not surprisingly, the tail that wags the dog.

Nobody is more aware of the possibility of a drastic realinement in space than NASA Administrator James Webb himself. Though Webb is a consummate high-level operator and takes his breaks as they come, he is, at the same time, one of Washington's more experienced administrators, which means that he has learned to be cautious. He has always seen the practical wisdom of a balanced, orderly program. His enormous management problems would be reason enough. Even before the advent of Apollo he had been hard pressed handling an agency that was at best a loose collection of research centers—Ames, Lewis, Langley, Edwards—plus one development center, Huntsville. Huntsville had been inherited from the Army, which in the postsputnik era was accustomed to letting Director Wernher von Braun write his own ticket. The research centers had been inherited from the old NACA, perhaps the most loosely run organization in the Government. But tough as things were in the early days of NASA, the saddling of this shaky management structure with the moon race seemed to magnify every problem. The agency virtually exploded. Its $915 million budget for fiscal 1961 shot up to $1.8 billion in fiscal 1962, more than doubled again in 1963 ($3.7 billion); personnel increased from the 17,500 people of 1961 to 28,500 in 1963.

Webb established the Office of Manned Space Flight with responsibility for the Apollo project and tried to bring the major centers under control, but the best he could work out was a kind of informal council. The centers, which had always had considerable autonomy, helped themselves to more of it, using the pressure of the race to justify their doing pretty much as they pleased. The Office of Manned Space Flight itself rapidly became an overbalancing element of the organization (claiming 60 percent of NASA's 1963 and 1964 budget and getting 90 percent of all the publicity), with its own separate Washington offices and a director rivaling the Administrator in importance.

To be sure, Webb is well aware that the idea of beating the Russians at anything has great utility in loosening up the congressional purse strings—and he has made the most of this. The United States, he admonished a congressional committee early this year, could not hope to get to the moon in this decade if NASA's requested $5.7 billion budget for 1964 was seriously cut. Yet, somewhat ambivalently—and much to the exasperation of those in direct charge of Apollo—he went out of his way to point out that the United States was no longer trying to be first to the moon. In a most remarkable statement this March he told the Congress, in essence, that it should take its cue from what the President had not said in an important speech on our space effort the previous fall. "The President," Webb emphasized, "did not say that our national goal is that of landing the first man on the moon or for that matter of being first with respect to any single achievement in space. We have done many things first and we will do many other things first including, we hope, sending the first explorers to the moon, but this is not the objective the President stated. Rather he forcefully declared our determination to attain 'a position of preeminence' in space and to 'become the world's leading space-faring Nation.'" Was Webb even then signaling an end to the moon race in favor of something eloquently if vaguely described as "space-faring"?

THE COSMONAUT AND THE BAY OF PIGS

To keep the current reappraisal in perspective, it is worth remembering that even as late as January 1961 a moon shot was not NASA's primary objective; it was instead

a goal toward which the agency would judiciously move as its knowledge of space developed through more fundamental programs. Those programs were described by the NASA Administrator at the time as being: (1) The early application of earth satellites to practical uses, (2) the study of the space environment and celestial bodies to gain specific knowledge, (3) the determination of man's capacity to function usefully in space, in order to open the way to manned exploration of space, the moon, and the planets. What had changed all this, of course, were the events of April 1961. On the 12th, the Russians won a second epochal triumph in space, cosmonaut Yuri Gagarin becoming the first human being to orbit the earth. On the 19th, U.S. prestige suffered a humiliating setback when the invasion of Cuba ended in disaster at the Bay of Pigs.

An aroused President had then asked NASA what we could possibly do to surpass the Russians in space. It was not an easy question to answer. The demonstrated Soviet superiority in booster power foredoomed our chances of beating them in any middle-range achievements such as a manned space station or a manned circumnavigation of the moon; the United States, NASA reasoned, would have to pick a goal that was so far in the future as to diminish the importance of the present Russian advantage. After a month of feverish pencil work within NASA and soulsearching within the White House's Space Council, it was finally decided that a crash program of manned lunar exploration, using specially developed boosters, the Saturns, was the earliest venture on which the United States could reasonably hope to come out ahead. The point to be noted, in the light of reappraisal, is that the moon race was chosen not because the moon itself had a special value but because a moon landing—out of several other ventures seriously considered—offered the first important space victory the United States could hope for.

On May 25, 1961, Kennedy officially launched the moon race in his special message on urgent national needs. We were confronted, he said, by the need to embark on "a great new enterprise * * * to take a clearly leading role in space achievement," and the heart of the enterprise was landing a man on the moon and returning him safely to earth "before this decade is out." From then on, Project Apollo was a reality. The combination of national prestige, scintillating new horizons, and pork in the sky pushed the venture through Congress with unexampled speed. By July 20, with hardly a dissenting vote, Congress authorized a space budget 60 percent bigger than Eisenhower's January request. Kennedy's moon race became a national goal with a DX (top) priority.

The effect of this decision on NASA is without a parallel in Government since the crises of the great depression. Even in war—the $2-billion Manhattan Project comes most readily to mind—NASA's ordeal would have been virtually without peer as an organizational convulsion. Its job was to take a project on which feasibility studies had been completed only the week before Kennedy's speech and proceed to major hardware development at top speed.

Whole new facilities had to be planned, built, and staffed, existing programs such as Mercury had to be revamped to speed Apollo, new intermediate programs like Gemini (the two-man space capsule) had to be initiated, and hundreds of other projects that should have been done sequentially had to be done concurrently because of the tremendous pressures of time—e.g., the program for unmanned exploration of the moon, previously intended to precede manned exploration by 5 or 6 years, went forward almost hand in hand with the development of the hardware for manned lunar capability. By the same token NASA's methodical examination of alternate avenues of development had to be sacrificed to the demands of the time schedule. Principal case in point: because the big liquid-fueled rockets had been under development for 4 years at Huntsville, they offered a greater prospect of successful performance than giant solid-fueled boosters, so the moon shot was built around them—though the military interest lay in easily stored, instantly ready solids. Some hint of the breakneck speed is reflected in the fact that $630 million worth of contracts were signed in the 6 months following Kennedy's speech, $921 million more in the next 6 months.

All this made trouble enough, but NASA's Apollo problems were compounded by an additional handicap: while it was hiring hordes of new people and letting hundreds of millions of dollars worth of contracts, the agency still had to operate in the dark. NASA had only the most general notion of how it would get to the moon or what would be found there. Was a direct ascent to the moon and a "soft" landing there the best method? Or should two vehicles be put into earth orbit and the moon capsule launched from them? Or should the lunar craft go into temporary orbit around the moon and put off a capsule that could land, then rendezvous later with the space ship for a return to earth? Was the lunar surface a sea of electrostatically charged dust that might engulf the capsule, was it a collapsible crust, or one continually riddled by "shrapnel" from ricocheting meteorites?

Lacking the time to find out because of the frantic speedup, NASA made time the governing consideration and proceeded accordingly. North American was awarded the prime contract for Apollo ($400 million) in November 1961, without even knowing what mode would be chosen for going to the moon. When the lunar-orbit-and-rendezvous method was finally decided upon almost a year later (it was the quickest), the budgeted amount for that contract had to be increased 200 percent ($1.2 billion). Even as late as this year Grumman Aircraft was awarded a $390-million contract to design the lunar landing module without having the foggiest notion what kind of surface it would be required to land on; the hurry-up Ranger probes, five so far, have all failed to bring back this essential information.

Despite the absurdities and inequities of this situation, things were going fine, so far as the public or the average Congressman could see, because of the momentum generated by the old program. Navigation and communication via American satellites were thrilling the world. The secrets of the weather were being unfolded every day by the Tiros meteorological satellites. The Mercury program was a whole series of splendid accomplishments—four men into orbit, four successful missions. Yet at the very time the national enthusiasm for space was at its height, in the months following Col. John Glenn's flight, a secret reappraisal was actually going on—and going on in NASA itself.

The affair surfaced in a climatic battle between Webb and Brainerd Holmes, then Director of Manned Space Flight. The two had been personally at odds for some time—Webb wanting to stay "top dog" in NASA and Holmes aspiring to that spot—but the struggle centered on a $400 million supplemental appropriation Holmes wanted to help speed up the slipping Gemini and Apollo programs. Thus the question at issue was really the pace of the lunar race. Holmes maintains Webb had assured him early in 1962 that he would put in for the $400 million. Webb declares he never made any such commitment. Another member of NASA's top brass describes the contretemps as simply "a case where Brainerd Holmes had to learn that the public expressions of the President did not mean a blank check. He took it to mean encouraging the contractors to go ahead faster."

In any event, when August rolled around, Webb refused to authorize the $400 million supplemental and Holmes found himself in an unpleasant situation. With Apollo's DX priority and beating the Russians always in mind, he had urged the contractors to go for broke; they had put on more people and he had stepped up the spending rate. Now without the supplemental there would not be sufficient funds to maintain the pace and the contractors would have to cut back. Cutbacks, of course, mean layoffs and layoffs set political wires to humming. So a month later, in September, the issue of the supplemental came before the President.

Kennedy had practically invited Holmes to ask for the extra funds during his tour of the space centers earlier that month, according to one Congressman, by asking directly if there were any place money could be put to speed up Apollo. But when the matter of Apollo's pace landed on his desk as an issue, he decided it was worth reconsideration. Webb was dead set against granting the extra funds and made plain his disagreement over the importance and priority given the manned space program. A White House poll of key space people on Capitol Hill, including the late Senator Robert S. Kerr, Chairman GEORGE MILLER, of the House's Science and Astronautics Committee, and Chairman OLIN ("TIGER") TEAGUE, of the House Subcommittee on Manned Space, disclosed them to be as sharply split as Webb and Holmes. The request was quietly shelved. The President, patently, was having some second thoughts too. The extent of Kennedy's subsequent reservations about the pace of the moon race can be read in the fact that in June 1963, when a recrudescence of the Holmes-Webb split gave him another opportunity to back an impatient Holmes or a circumspect Webb, he went along with Webb—and Holmes returned to private industry.

THE CASE AGAINST THE RACE

What had no doubt impressed the President were growing signs of disenchantment with the moon race both inside and outside the NASA enclave. It was no secret in Washington that the White House science adviser, Jerome Wiesner, has been increasingly critical of Apollo, and Wiesner reflected a growing and important sector of the scientific community. New Mexico's Senator CLINTON ANDERSON took note of the situation last June by convening his Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences to hear what a dozen scientists had to say about space goals. To a certain extent the disenchantment was a predictable reaction to the initial moon-race "sell," to a certain extent it represented a victory for the unpersuaded who had never liked space much anyway, but principally it could be explained as the kind of second thought that was bound to come.

The attack on the scientific value of the race has occurred at three levels. On the first level are those unpersuaded scientists who believe that the investment of money and talent in Apollo is out of all proportion to the foreseeable benefits, if weighed against what those resources might accomplish in other fields. The most effective spokesman for this school is Dr. Warren Weaver, vice president of the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation, who has a lively concern about some of the things that might be done with the $20 to $40 billion of the moon race. With $30 billion, he wrote in the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, "we could give a 10-percent raise in salary, over a 10-year period, to every teacher in the United States from kindergarten through universities (about $9.8 billion); give $10 million each to 200 of the best smaller colleges ($2 billion); finance 7-year fellowships (freshman through Ph.D.) at $4,000 per person per year for

50,000 new scientists and engineers ($1.4 billion); contribute $200 million each toward the creation of 10 new medical schools ($2 billion); build and largely endow complete universities with medical, engineering, and agricultural faculties for * * * 53 of the nations which have been added to the United Nations since its original founding ($13.2 billion); create 3 more permanent Rockefeller Foundations ($1.5 billion); and still have $100 million left over to popularize science."

THE THREAT TO THE SATELLITES

The second level of attack on Apollo comes from scientists who are enthusiastic about a major exploratory effort in space but fear that Apollo and other man-in-space programs will swallow all the funds from the really important scientific programs, those that can be effectively accomplished with instruments. These minimally financed unmanned space flights have contributed by far and away the bulk of the scientific information obtained to date. The discovery of the Van Allen Belts, universally regarded as the outstanding accomplishment of the space age, was the result of an initial investment of at most $1 million; the Orbiting Solar Observatory and Nerv experiments have also been conspicuous successes for penny-ante outlays.

The third level of attack on Apollo comes from the growing number of scientists who have reached the conclusion that the race just isn't worth it. Dr. Philip Abelson, director of the Carnegie Institution's Geophysical Laboratory and editor of Science, official journal of the American Association for the Advancement of Science (membership: 76,000), recently conducted an informal straw poll among scientists not connected with NASA. The vote was 110 to 3 against the manned lunar program. "How one views Apollo," he says, "depends on what you think the basic values are. If you figure, as I do, that the yield is going to be awfully darned small, then you're going to be considerably more critical than if you think it's a big deal. I think very little in the way of enduring value is going to come out of putting a man on the moon—two or three television spectaculars—and that's that. If there's no military value—and people admit there isn't—and no scientific value—and no economic return, it'll mean we've put in a lot of engineering talent and research and wound up being the laughingstock of the world."

Dr. Polykarp Kusch of Columbia University, a Nobel laureate in physics, predicted to Senator ANDERSON's committee that the impact of the lunar program on research and development would be "extremely small." "I don't think," he declared, "we are going to get anything of the dimensions of the theory of chemical valence, which has been an enormously productive intellectual construct, or anything as effective as the quantum theory of physics, or anything as effective as the picture which the contemporary biologist has of genetic processes * * * I very much doubt the prospective purely scientific results are reasonably commensurate with the investment. I am commenting not only of the funding but also of the investment of men, which no amount of funding can replace."

THE COST IN BRAINPOWER

This latter aspect of the moon race, the drain of scarce manpower, has led some scientists to the conclusion that the program may actually render a disservice to science. NASA's requirement for men in the physical sciences, even taking the agency's own estimates, will siphon off 7 to 10 percent of the Nation's physicists—enough, some think, to hamstring effort in other fields of research. NASA's Apollo demands will certainly clash head on with the program to educate more scientists. The universities and colleges will need twice the number of Ph. D.'s they formerly retained on their staffs if they are to meet the tremendously expanded college enrollments of the middle sixties. Yet the college requirements for more Ph. D.'s will be reaching a peak just at the time NASA's are too. (The moon program alone is expected to demand the services of 350,000 people, many of them scientists and engineers.)

On the other hand, if NASA were to get the first-rate scientists, which it needs, then the effect might be even more pervasive. For the percentage of really creative and imaginative men in science is not considered to have kept pace with the rapid growth of competent technicians; the former are a very scarce commodity, perhaps numbering no more than 200 to 300, whose diversion to the new field of space would inevitably rob an established discipline of leadership. "We have a limited pool of genius," Dr. Abelson explains. "If we transfer genius in one direction, that genius isn't going to be available elsewhere. These fellows who have genius are transferable. They can learn physics and know all about nuclear physics, and then with a few years of study they can begin making important contributions in biology."

It should be noted that on space, as on practically every other issue, the views of the scientific community are far from monolithic. As critics of the NASA program have found voice, defenders also have spoken up. Last spring Chemists Harold Urey and Willard Libby, and Geneticist Joshua Lederberg, Nobel Prize winners all, joined five equally distinguished scientists in a special press release disputing Dr. Abelson. Man in space, they stated, is essential to the scientific objectives of lunar exploration, and the pace of the program must be geared to the urgencies of the response to the national challenge. But they did not specifically underwrite Apollo as a scientific proposition. And the fact that they felt it necessary to rally behind a program that, a year ago, needed no defenders indicates how severely scientific support for the moon race has eroded.

THE MILITARY'S NEW LOOK

Something of the same reevaluation has been going on in the military areas. In the first burst of space enthusiasm some military pundits seized on the moon as everything from the "high ground" so cherished by infantrymen to an indispensable Gibraltar guarding the portals to the universe. Under closer examination the military theories about the moon have undergone a significant deflation. Prime example: Use of the moon for a missile base. Moon-based missiles—shot on a trajectory of 240,000 miles from a moving launching pad diverging from its earthly target at speeds up to 1,000 miles per hour—have been found wanting when compared to earth-based ICBM's, which are only a few thousand miles from their targets.

The military's prime interest at this time is not the moon but operating capability in "inner space"—the zone up to 500 miles above the earth. Even here, however, its pace is exploratory rather than headlong. Last February, Gen. Curtis E. LeMay, Chief of Staff of the Air Force, told the House Armed Services Committee: "We can't really define an offensive weapon for use in space that will be more efficient and less costly than one we could do the same job with on the ground or in the air."

Dr. Lawrence Kavanau, until recently space specialist with the Defense Department's Office of Defense Research and Engineering, goes one step beyond LeMay to point out that no really new military space missions have been discovered since 1958 and even a few of the 1958 items were described as early as 1946. The emphasis is rather on assembling new technological "building blocks," the broad base on which future systems may be built.

Even the young space colonels of the Air Force never saw much utility in Apollo. The plain fact is that if Apollo and all the other programs that made up NASA's $5.7 billion budget request for 1964 were to be suddenly scrapped, the military (which has a $1.7 billion space program of its own) would have to spend only an additional $500 million to make up for whatever help NASA had been giving.

A MATTER OF THE INNER MAN

The most persistent justification for the moon race, of course, is that of prestige. Those Americans who never will forget the awesome sight of sputnik streaking through the night sky simply feel in their bones that we must beat the Russians to the moon as a global demonstration of the superiority of our system. But has the United States so little to offer the world in other fields than space that our prestige would really be blighted if Russia beat us to the moon? Would the splendor of another American breakthrough like the Salk vaccine go into eclipse because a Soviet spaceship touched down on the lunar surface before we did?

"Everyone especially wants to be sure that the United States is ahead of the Soviet Union," said President Lee DuBridge of the California Institute of Technology, "but the wholly unanswerable question, I fear, is this: How much prestige can we buy for $1 billion, for $5 billion, for $30 billion, or $100 billion? We just do not know. At least I do not know. And even if we did know, we still do not know whether $1 billion will buy more prestige if invested in space or in housing or in education or medicine or military power or foreign aid programs."

Perhaps the only certain thing about the prestige issue is that the pattern of our recent competition with the Soviet should have made it plain, if it has not, that a lunar landing by either side will not be the clear-cut propaganda coup of Sputnik I. Regardless of who gets there first, the other will doubtless have something ready to steal some of the thunder of the feat—e.g., an interplanetary probe.

Even those who put more stock in space prestige than DuBridge raise questions of what kind of space prestige is best. The overriding question is simply whether the spectacular first of a moon shot is as important as a solid second built on space capability. Apollo, it should be remembered, is a tremendous but very narrowly defined engineering effort, strictly designed for the purpose of getting a man to the moon and back. The Saturn V rockets are larger than needed for inner-space use, too slow in launching for regular military use, too expensive for logistical supply, and too small for practical use in manned shots beyond the moon. Moreover, their ever-larger bundles of liquid-fueled engines offer little to the advancement of the state of the art. As Dr. Donald Hornig, a member of the President's Science Advisory Committee, observed, the lunar race has put us in the position of the airplane designers of 1925 who suggested that we put a hundred engines on an airplane to make it carry big loads.

THE COMING SQUEEZE

The logic of events is working powerfully for a formal reappraisal of the moon-race goal. On the one hand, Congress is starting to cut NASA's budgets, on the other NASA sticks by its commitment to the moon race. For various reasons Apollo is falling behind schedule. Gemini, the program that is expected to work out the rendezvous techniques for Apollo in a series of two-man orbits, has already "slipped" some 6 months. The first manned flight around the earth in the Apollo capsule is now 9 to 11 months behind schedule and is not expected to take place before 1966. This has moved the lunar shot itself from 1967 to 1968 at the earliest, but difficulties with the F-1 engines of the

Saturn may make for additional slippage. If NASA is still saddled with Apollo as a top (DX) national priority, it will simply have to pour on more money in an effort to buy back the lost time and thereby stay in the race. Yet if Congress refuses to grant any over-all increase in NASA's total budget, on grounds that $5.7 billion or even $5.1 billion is a big enough commitment of national resources for space, then it is likely that Apollo will encroach on the meager $1.5 billion of NASA's budget for unmanned space applications. Thus, lacking a deliberate change in plan, NASA will be spending less and less on the kind of balanced approach that more and more people want.

There is another reason why the lunar-race question is bound to come into clearer focus in the months ahead: the real impact of Apollo on NASA's wobbly management structure is becoming increasingly evident. Webb tacitly acknowldeged the deepened misgivings about NASA management in a well-publicized reorganization program introduced early last month. But it is doubtful that shifts in the chain of command can cure what ails an Apollo-oriented NASA. For example, the Houston center, which is supposed to coordinate the work of the contractors in bringing Apollo to completion, is itself in urgent need of coordination; its managerial group is one of the weakest within NASA and during the period of explosive growth—the center grew from 800 in 1961 to 3,500 people in 1963—has found little time to set its own house in order. Yet NASA in Washington still lacks the kind of top management that can step in and take over if Houston should bungle this all-important job of coordination.

Dr. George Mueller, Brainerd Holmes' successor as head of the Office of Manned Space Flight, is a technical man, a distinguished one, and a fine teacher as well; yet his gentle, almost diffident temperament and lack of administrative experience hardly suggest that his office will be run even as forcefully as Brainerd Holmes ran it. The latter, in the opinion of many qualified to judge, did a fine job at Manned Space Flight, but he had to do it by joining forces with Houston and the other centers rather than establishing his office's hegemony over them. Now, under the pressure of the final phases of the moon race, effective intervention by Washington would seem even tougher. The greater the urgency to meet the deadlines, the greater will be the temptation for the centers to insist on a completely free hand.

Jim Webb's strength lies in his powerful connections with Congress, constantly reinforced with a judiciously distributed outpouring of space funds. When pressed on his budget he wastes little time in arguing the case for Apollo; instead he tells congressional critics rather baldly that the first effect of budget cutting will be a cutback in contracts already awarded. He has won the enormous gratitude of such powerful Texans as Vice President LYNDON JOHNSON and Congressman ALBERT THOMAS, chairman of the House subcommittee in charge of NASA's appropriations, for his stirring defense of the estimated $250 million Houston center; he carries great weight as well with Senator CLINTON ANDERSON and Congressman GEORGE MILLER. But even these worthies cannot protect Webb on the management front. As will become increasingly clear, NASA's demands have been more than he has been able to cope with, and, under the crushing load of Apollo, perhaps more than anybody is able to cope with.

As Webb's day of reckoning approaches, he will probably get considerable personal support from the companies with large NASA contracts. But the contractors are perhaps more conversant with his management problems than anybody else. They know that they must make their principal connections with the powerful centers. However, much as they would like to deal with Webb, they have discovered the hard way that their livelihood depends on those in the centers who are the most effective challengers to Webb's authority.

THE FAILURE OF FALLOUT

Webb has also lost a substantial amount of support outside the aerospace industry. His lecture-tour promises of a broad industrial fallout from the lunar race have just not panned out. Experience with close tolerances and working with new materials have undoubted value to industry, but the very nature of the moon race militates against their wide usage or inexpensive acquisition. A recent study on "The Commercial Applications of Missile/Space Technology," prepared for NASA by the University of Denver, found it was "too early" to look for commercial byproducts. When would the right time be? About a decade from now.

AN ORDERLY PROGRAM

The 2½ years that have elapsed since the President decreed the moon race have, in short, added perspective to the other elements of an epochal human undertaking. It is inconceivable that Americans, having taken the first steps into space, could ever be dissuaded from going on. But it is more and more doubtful that the orderly approach to an undertaking that—to use Fortune's words of June 1962—is "hitching the economy to the infinite" will be served by a moon race that is hitched to an unrealistic timetable. Even such an Apollo enthusiast as Brainerd Holmes concedes that "the lunar program makes sense only if we go on from there—" to the planets. So let's take our time doing it. The crash timetable should be abandoned in favor of one that places the moon in perspective: i.e., as one way station in the sequential development of space. NASA will then have a chance to shake down and the Nation will be better prepared for the immense costs involved. For make no mistake, the outlays that are so dismayingly big on today's research and development will be dwarfed by tomorrow's costs of maintaining a station in space or on the moon.

Such a revision in goals will, of course, bring a considerable outcry from those who have a large stake in Apollo—principally the NASA centers and the contractors—on grounds that a stretchout will cost more in the long run. But it need not, given some judicious shifting of manpower to other projects, an end to the buildup of Apollo's overhead, and the obvious savings that will result from not having to do everything on a crash basis. To postpone the decision will cost even more because the biggest spending on Apollo is just about to start: during fiscal 1964 and 1965, NASA hopes to sink about $4 billion a year in the moon race and keep this rate in 1966 as well if the program runs into trouble. Instead the present lunar program could be continued through Gemini to determine such useful things as rendezvous techniques. Apollo and the costly hardware phase of the Saturn V's, however, would wait on the more complete explorations of "inner space."

Once the distorting influence of Apollo's high priority is reduced, we could then redefine the goal of developing a broad capability in space. For $2.5 to $3 billion it should be possible to have the sort of program that Caltech's President DuBridge outlined to a congressional committee: sending up many instrumented satellites to measure the Van Allen layers, cosmic rays, magnetic and gravitational fields. Some would observe weather patterns, carry communication systems and optical or radio telescopes for observations unimpeded by the troublesome atmosphere of the earth. The program would move forward at a slower pace than NASA does now in order to allow for the proper assimilation of material. (Data from the weather satellites, for example, is coming in faster than its meaning can be interpreted and applied.) In essence it would be like the present NASA program but with these all-important differences: (1) it would be a balanced effort, free of the dislocation caused by the emphasis on Apollo, (2) it would be free of the pressure of time, which increases costs and reduces benefits, (3) it would be subject to periodic reappraisal, substituting flexibility for the rigidities now characteristic of Apollo.

Whether such a program would get us to the moon ahead of the Russians would seem to be beside the point. The important thing is that when we did touch down on the lunar surface it would not be just a stunt. Behind our achievement would be the kind of deep knowledge that can take 240,000 miles in stride and not even breathe hard. We would have won the only race really worth winning, leading the Russians and the rest of the earth to a broad capability in space.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I also ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD following that article a short excerpt from U.S. News & World Report for November 25, 1963, entitled "Where Billions for Research Go."

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

WHERE BILLIONS FOR RESEARCH GO

"Stop, look—and probably cut back."

That is the sign going up on more and more Government-sponsored projects in research and development in the vast and expanding world of U.S. science.

The reason? Congress is suddenly getting disillusioned by rising costs, evidence of mismanagement, and lack of practical results in many areas.

At the same time Congress is hearing, in investigations just getting underway, that many scientists are also very disturbed about trends in Government-paid research. These scientists fear long-range effects on science itself.

THE $100 BILLION—AND RISING

Figures given to Congress show that about $100 billion has been spent for research and development—public and private—in the past 10 years.

If spending goes on at the present rate of about $20 billion a year, some $200 billion will be poured out in the name of "science" in the next 10 years.

At latest count, more than a million and a quarter scientists, engineers, and technicians were employed in the United States—three out of five on Government projects. Their ranks will have to be more than doubled in 10 years if the present pace is maintained.

No one knows where these additional trained people will come from. There is a shortage of teachers already, and it is getting worse.

Against this background, these questions are being asked: Where are the billions for research and development going? What are taxpayers getting for the 15 billions spent on research and development this year? Is politics being played in the way money for science is distributed around the country? Is it wise to have so much of the scientific community dependent on Government payrolls? What practical use is made of all the research?

On page 74 is an excerpt from a recent speech by a Member of the House of Representatives, who apparently spoke for many Congressmen when he said, "The honeymoon is over" for Federal research and development.

CUTBACKS AND INVESTIGATION

This year, the House already has:

Appointed a special committee to survey research in all its forms.

Cut funds for: the National Institutes of Health, the National Science Foundation, and a project to drill a hole through the crust of the earth.

Included research-and-development funds in the across-the-board cutback in defense appropriations.

The accompanying charts give you facts and figures underlying the growing controversy.

Where the Government put up about $10 billion last year, private industry spent about $4.7 billion. Colleges, universities and private scientific institutes, although they do an important share of the Nation's research, paid for only 3 percent of the national total.

The same pattern of spending is being maintained this year, with the Government paying for, and thus tending to dominate, two-thirds of the country's scientific effort.

More than 90 percent of the Government's projects are concentrated in four fields: defense, space, atomic energy, and health. But the range of research under those headings is so broad that this too has become a source of rising criticism, particularly in Congress.

TOO LITTLE "PURE" SCIENCE?

Most scientists stress this point: Only a tenth of all research-and-development money goes for so-called basic research, which is the source of future progress.

Scientists also see another danger: The glamour of space and atomic energy research is attracting promising men away from fields such as biochemistry where, many believe, the most important discoveries for humans are to be made.

Dr. Richard J. Russell, of the Louisiana Coastal Studies Institute, told the House Subcommittee on Science, Research and Development: "Short-range programs * * * such as placing a man on the moon, are draining talent from our universities at an alarming rate * * *. I feel that our national capability [in science] will decline to a point where we may well become a second- or third-rate nation."

Another aspect of the question was stressed by Dr. H. Guyford Stever, of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, who told Congress: "We have a serious imbalance * * * in the area of engineering, which is pointed to our daily life rather than some of the more glamorous fields."

A very large number of new ideas that are practical from an engineering point of view for industry and consumers, he said, are now originating overseas, where research is not preoccupied with "a large defense activity and * * * a space program."

Many scientists connected with industry, while they agree on the need for more "basic" research, also call for better use of what is already known.

Recently, it is pointed out, a moon shot was held up because a faulty adhesive was used in one small component.

Yet the fact that the adhesive was faulty had been known to some scientists for 2 years or more.

This sort of "knowledge gap" crops up with increasing frequency, scientists in industry say.

UNFAIR DISTRIBUTION?

Under the surface, but potent politically, is the feeling that too much money has gone to the east and west coasts of the United States.

The Midwest and the South, in particular, feel slighted.

So strong is this feeling that the Government's plan to put a multimillion-dollar Environmental Health Center near Washington had to be changed. The new center has been delayed at least a year, site undetermined.

Martin Goland, director of the Southwest Research Institute of San Antonio, Tex., told congressional investigators that technical knowledge "is probably adequate to feed our economy, except that it isn't doing it" because it is being concentrated in too few research-rich areas, remote from the bulk of U.S. industry.

AHEAD: MORE CONTROLS

Apparently Congress intends to watch research spending far more closely in the future. That may increase the problem that some scientists worry most about: Government control, sometime in the future, over science and even control over scientists themselves.

*Federal research funds[1]—soaring Government spending for research—a target for economizers in Congress?*

[In billions]

| Year ended: | |
|---|---|
| June 30, 1947 | $0.7 |
| June 30, 1952 | 2.2 |
| June 30, 1957 | 4.4 |
| June 30, 1962 | 11.2 |
| 1963 (estimate) | 14.7 |

[1] Obligations for all research and development programs.

Source: National Science Foundation.

*Year's total of research spending*

| | Percent |
|---|---|
| Defense, $7.8 billion | 53 |
| Space, $3.7 billion | 25 |
| Atomic energy, $1.5 billion | 10 |
| Health and welfare, $0.8 billion | 5 |
| All other programs (including those in agriculture, commerce, natural resources, etc., and those of the National Science Foundation), $0.9 billion | 7 |

IN AMERICAN SCIENCE, THE GOVERNMENT PUTS UP $2 FOR EVERY $1 THAT PRIVATE SOURCES SPEND

An estimated $15 billion was spent for all types of research development and support of science in the United States in the year ended June 30, 1962, latest on record. Of that sum—

| | Percent |
|---|---|
| Federal Government put up $9.7 billion, or | 65 |
| Private industry put up $4.7 billion, or | 32 |
| Colleges put up $0.3 billion, or | 2 |
| Other groups put up $0.1 billion, or | 1 |

NOT ENOUGH DOLLARS FOR BASIC RESEARCH?—FACTS BEHIND A GROWING ARGUMENT

This has been the approximate splitup of research-and-development money in the United States in recent years, according to the National Science Foundation:

| | Percent |
|---|---|
| Basic research ("pure" science, seeking fundamental new knowledge) | 10 |
| Applied research (projects aimed at producing useful objects or methods from known information) | 22 |
| Tests, and manufacturing operations, involved in research | 68 |

Many scientists feel that a larger share of research money—and scarce scientists—should be devoted to "pure" science, the bedrock for future advances. Others disagree, say it's time to put more effort on using the knowledge already available.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a copy of my letter to Hon. James E. Webb of October 31, 1963, and his answer to me of November 13, 1963, together with certain tables showing the allocation of money in the program relating to the matter under consideration.

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

OCTOBER 31, 1963.

Hon. JAMES E. WEBB,
*Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. WEBB: As you know, it is impossible to determine from the NASA Authorization Act and the committee reports on it, the net amounts for the various aspects of the Apollo project for the 1964 fiscal year. A breakdown of this cost information is, I believe, necessary for proper evaluation by the Congress of the space program. Therefore, I would appreciate it if you would provide me with the following information:

1. The amounts in the research and development section of the NASA Authorization Act that can be attributed directly or indirectly to the Apollo project. A listing of the amounts attributable to the Apollo project in each research category (launch vehicle and propulsions systems, lunar and planetary exploration, etc.) would be the most meaningful way to present this for my purposes.

2. What new facilities are authorized in the 1964 Authorization Act that will be used in direct support of the Apollo program? What are the amounts authorized for each of these projects?

3. What is likely to be the delay in making the first attempt at a manned lunar landing if the funds for Apollo were cut back this year by 10 percent? Twenty-five percent? Fifty percent?

I would appreciate your providing me with this information within the next 2 weeks.

With kind regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

J. W. FULBRIGHT.

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION,
*Washington, D.C., November 13, 1963.*

Hon. J. W. FULBRIGHT,
*U.S. Senate,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR SENATOR FULBRIGHT: We are supplying information that is responsive to two of the three questions you addressed to Mr. Webb concerning funding of the NASA manned lunar landing program in fiscal year 1964. The answer to your third question, relative to the delay in the program that would be incurred if program funding were to be reduced by various amounts, is being prepared in conjunction with a detailed schedule review that is now underway. It is expected that we will be able to furnish the information you requested on that point by about November 30, 1963.

The amounts that are to be used in support of the manned lunar landing program are listed, by subject area, in table I. The facilities that will be used in direct support of the program, and the fiscal year 1964 authorization for each, are listed in table II.

When the information responsive to your third question has been developed, we will send it to you.

Sincerely yours,

RICHARD L. CALLAGHAN,
*Assistant Administrator for Legislative Affairs.*

TABLE I.—*Research and development programs directly and indirectly supporting the manned lunar landing program—fiscal year 1964 authorization*

| | |
|---|---|
| Manned spacecraft system | $1,496,600,000 |
| Launch vehicle and propulsion systems | 1,123,500,000 |
| Aerospace medicine | 11,000,000 |
| Integration and checkout | 125,000,000 |
| Systems engineering | 37,000,000 |
| Lunar and planetary explorations | 154,300,000 |
| Tracking and data acquisition | 108,000,000 |
| Total, research and development | 3,055,400,000 |

TABLE II.—*Facilities in direct support of manned lunar landing program—fiscal year 1964 authorization*

| | |
|---|---|
| **LAUNCH OPERATIONS CENTER** | |
| Advanced Saturn launch complex No. 39 | $191,819 |
| Advanced Saturn supporting facilities | 9,084 |
| Barge lock and channel | 900 |
| Manned spacecraft facilities | 6,287 |
| Modifications to Saturn launch complex No. 34 | 1,310 |
| Modifications to Saturn launch complex No. 37 | 3,435 |
| Range instrumentation sites | 4,798 |
| Utility installations—New area | 23,638 |
| Cafeteria—MILA | 873 |
| Calibration and Standards Laboratory—MILA | 2,867 |
| Central instrumentation facility—MILA | 31,248 |
| Launch equipment shop—MILA | 1,517 |
| Optical and electronic component servicing facility—MILA | 855 |
| Range engineering and administrative building—MILA | 605 |
| Vehicle maintenance and service facilities—MILA | -------- |
| Total, Launch Operations Center | 279,236 |
| **MANNED SPACECRAFT CENTER** | |
| Additions to mission control center | 8,409 |
| Atmospheric reentry materials and structures evaluation facility | 2,695 |
| Launch environment and antenna test facilities | 7,265 |
| Mission simulation and training facility | 2,069 |
| Project engineering facility | 2,761 |
| Ultrahigh vacuum space chamber facility | 2,378 |
| Center support facilities | 3,697 |
| Spacecraft control technology laboratory | 5,828 |
| Total, Manned Spacecraft Center | 35,102 |
| **MARSHALL SPACE FLIGHT CENTER** | |
| Accelerated test and calibration facility | $1,610 |
| Additions to the components test facilities | 3,675 |
| Addition to the test support shop | 1,500 |
| Barge dock and loading facilities | 591 |
| Expansion and modernization of the high-pressure gas and propellant systems | 2,000 |
| Hangar for vehicle components | [1] 3,500 |
| Modernization of instrumentation and control systems in east area | 3,500 |
| Modification to the vehicle assembly building | (1) |
| Extension to load test annex | 3,656 |
| Total | 20,032 |
| **MICHOUD PLANT** | |
| Addition to production facility | 5,220 |
| Park and security improvement | 460 |
| Road and airstrip rehabilitation | 375 |
| Vehicle components supply building | 2,633 |
| Total | 8,688 |
| **MISSISSIPPI TEST FACILITY** | |
| Advanced Saturn first stage (SIC) static test facilities | 35,983 |
| Advanced Saturn second stage (SII) static test facilities | 19,148 |
| Bridge for U.S. Interstate Highway No. 10 | 4,500 |
| Control center and data acquisition and handling facilities | 4,613 |
| Electronic, instrumentation, and materials laboratory | 2,716 |

[1] Projects combined by House committee.

TABLE II.—*Facilities in direct support of manned lunar landing program—fiscal year 1964 authorization*—Continued

| | |
|---|---|
| **MISSISSIPPI TEST FACILITY—Continued** | |
| F-1 engine system test stand | 6,541 |
| Maintenance facilities | 2,280 |
| Navigation lock | 6,604 |
| Sonic measuring facility | 1,760 |
| Transportation and parking facilities | 4,597 |
| Utility additions and extensions | 6,559 |
| Warehouse addition and storage facilities | 936 |
| Waterways and docking facilities | 3,959 |
| Total | 100,196 |
| **VARIOUS LOCATIONS** | |
| Facilities for F-1 engine program | 14,238 |
| Facilities for H-1 engine production | 1,410 |
| Facilities for J-2 engine program | 6,900 |
| Facilities for SIVB stage programs | 5,105 |
| Improvements to the RL-10 A-3 engine test facility | 500 |
| Instrumentation ships | 83,300 |
| Lunar excursion module test facilities | 14,500 |
| Manned space flight data acquisition and tracking facilities | 19,500 |
| Total | 145,453 |
| Total, COF authorization | 588,707 |

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that comments about scheduling, and so forth, not be included as a part of my speech, but follow my speech and come at the end of my remarks.

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

The debate referred to is as follows:

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, we have reached the hour of 5:10 p.m. I have discussed the subject of procedure with several Senators. If we proceed for another 20 minutes and then convene at 11 o'clock tomorrow morning, and at that time if we could then have in effect a unanimous-consent agreement limiting the debate to 1 hour on the amendment and any other amendment, we could make progress on the bill.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the Senator from Wisconsin wished to make a statement.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I would suggest an hour on each amendment.

Mr. CLARK. I am perfectly willing to make my major speech tonight if Senators desire me to do so. Tomorrow, if I could have 5 to 10 minutes to complete my argument, I would be content with whatever arrangement the Senator from Arkansas could work out.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator will have such time tomorrow as he would like.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I am reminded that tomorrow the Committee on Foreign Relations will hold a hearing on the question of foreign agents.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, may I have the attention of the Senator from Washington?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas has the floor.

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

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Perhaps we could come in at 11 a.m. tomorrow and discuss other sections of the bill. Then when the Senator from Arkansas has finished with the meeting of his committee, we might proceed on the so-called Fulbright amendment, with a limitation of 1 hour of debate on each side.

Mr. CLARK. The time is satisfactory. My problem is the same as that of the Senator from Arkansas. The Committee on Banking and Currency is conducting a hearing on the bill related to the sale of wheat to Soviet bloc countries. The hearings start tomorrow morning with the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] coming before the committee. The bill is very important. All members of the committee ought to be present. I expect that the committee will remain in session for a couple of hours. The so-called Fulbright amendment could go over until tomorrow afternoon.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator from Washington expressed agreement to that. He suggested that the Senate consider some other matter in the morning and then take up my amendment in the afternoon after the committee is through with its hearings.

Mr. ANDERSON. Perhaps we might go over until 12 o'clock tomorrow, and at that time the Senate would meet, have what might be called a morning hour, then proceed for an hour or an hour and a half on the amendment, and then go to another subject.

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

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

Mr. ALLOTT. I should like to have the attention of the Senator from Washington. If the Senator wishes to continue his speech, it is perfectly satisfactory to me. But would it not be feasible to come in at 11 a.m. tomorrow, and take up some of the other subjects related to the bill? Several Senators on our side of the aisle have indicated that they would like to say a few words. I should like to be sure that the time is controlled in such a way that they may also make their remarks on the particular subject before the Senate. So why could we not come in at 11 a.m., while the Committee on Banking and Currency and the Committee on Foreign Relations are meeting? The committees would then meet until 12. That arrangement could be a part of the understanding.

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

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. My problem is that I have committed myself to the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] to raise a question on the bill which, as the Senator from Washington knows, has to do with the Securities and Exchange Commission. I am committed to offer two amendments to the bill. I have to be present from 10 to 12 at the hearing of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

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

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. Will the Senator from Washington consider a further suggestion? Could we not return at 11 a.m. tomorrow, and devote the time between 11 a.m. and 12 noon to a morning

hour? At 12 noon the Senate could consider other features of the bill, and at 2 o'clock the Senate could again proceed to consider the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. ALLOTT. I would have to object to that arrangement.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas has the floor.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I was advised in a rather preliminary fashion that the majority leader was detained for a few minutes with some official callers. I anticipate that he will be back in the Chamber in 5 or 10 minutes. We have had tentatively on paper a proposal to convene early tomorrow morning and try to obtain a limitation of debate on the amendment so that consideration of the bill might be concluded.

I respectfully suggest that we abide the return of the majority leader to the Senate; perhaps then an arrangement can be arrived at.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is what we are trying to do.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is what we are trying to do. The Senator from Illinois will recall that tomorrow morning the Committee on Banking and Currency is to consider the so-called Mundt wheat bill. The Committee on Foreign Relations has also scheduled a hearing on the question of foreign agencies, with which the Senator from Illinois is acquainted. Such hearings illustrate one of the problems of coming in early.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, so far as I am concerned, and so far as it lies within my power, I would give assurance to the Senate now that there would be no objection to committee meetings through the period when the Senate is in session, if it comes in early tomorrow.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, to clarify my position, my point was not only that the committees would be meeting, but also that I wished to be present when other questions related to the bill were being considered. There is a conflict. One cannot be in two places at once. The Senator from Illinois knows about the hearings of which we are speaking.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes. Is the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas pending?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I understand that there are a half dozen other amendments.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. My amendment is pending.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That amendment could be set aside.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It could be set aside temporarily and the Senate could return to its consideration at 2 or 3 o'clock tomorrow. I have no objection to that kind of procedure. But since the majority leader is not present, I am merely throwing out that suggestion for the Senator to talk to him about.

Mr. DIRKSEN. However, if there is no prolonged discussion on the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas——

Mr. CLARK. There will be.

Mr. DIRKSEN. There will be beyond, let us say, what might be a stated reasonable hour?

Mr. CLARK. If the Senator will yield——

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I am a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency. Tomorrow the committee will consider the bill related to the sale of wheat. The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] is the first witness.

I have two amendments to the bill before the Senate which I am committed to offer, and another matter which could be handled in colloquy, which I promised the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS], who had to be absent, I would take up with the Senator from Washington. I am perfectly willing to enter into a reasonable unanimous-consent agreement to vote if my rights in that regard can be protected. I do not care about the arrangements in respect to time tomorrow as long as we can arrange the schedule so that I will not have to be in two places at once.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, may we have the regular order?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Is the Senator speaking in relation to the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. CLARK. I will do anything that the Senator from Arkansas wishes to do.

Mr. ANDERSON. Would the Senator from Arkansas be willing that the Senate vote on the amendment at 6 o'clock tonight?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. No; not tonight.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the regular order.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I was wondering if the Senator and the Senate would be amenable to a unanimous-consent agreement tomorrow of, say, an hour on each amendment and 2 hours on the bill.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. With the understanding that it will begin at 3 o'clock, in accordance with the previous colloquy?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I understand that the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] has one or two amendments; that the Senator from Pennsylvania has one or two——

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I have a matter I wish to discuss. I do not intend to offer an amendment.

Mr. MAGNUSON. There are several.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is what I am saying. It is being proposed that there be a time limit.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Two hours on the bill. If more time is needed, it will be asked for.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I have a matter to discuss that I think several Senators are interested in.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I have the difficulty that I have a meeting in the morning as does the Senator. I do not know that I can agree to the request. I do not want to be foreclosed. This is an important amendment. This amendment would save as much money as was saved in 3 weeks on foreign aid, that Senators took so much pleasure in doing.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator should not look at me.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It would save almost the same amount.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I assure the Senator that I will not bring up his amendment for discussion or for a vote until he gets here.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator from Wisconsin said to me, "I am going to support the amendment, and I want to say something." We did not contemplate any problem here.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator will have plenty of time.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not think the time suggested is enough. I do not see why the Senator does not proceed in the normal way. Why should it take such a short time to pass a $5 billion bill when it took us 3 weeks to pass a $3½ billion bill on foreign aid? No Senator even requested a limitation of time during those 3 weeks.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I was not handling that bill.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I object, then, for the time being.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I was present long enough to hear a part of the debate. At the risk of being repetitious, I propose to give a very brief history.

Some reference was made in the debate to the military significance of the space program. Avoiding as many personal references as possible, the Senator from Mississippi was a member of the Armed Services Committee when the matter of creating a Space Committee and the Space Administration came up and the bill was introduced. The Senator from Mississippi heard the testimony of military witnesses and others. A short time later the Senator from Mississippi became a member of the Space Committee. The chairman of the committee was the then Senator from Texas, Mr. JOHNSON, now the Vice President. The chairman designated the Senator from Mississippi to hold the first hearing.

Mr. President, I refer to the first major hearings on a program that could be called a real space program, held by the present Space Committee of the Senate. Those hearings were conducted in the Old Senate Office Building, and extended for 3 or 4 or 5 weeks.

One of the main witnesses at those hearings was Dr. Dryden, whose services in this field antedated the Space Committee and the Space Administration. He was head of the old NACA.

Dr. Dryden and other witnesses outlined, with amazing accuracy, the various programs we have since seen coming to pass in the space program.

The weather satellites, the photographic satellites, the telephone satellites, and many others moving into the larger fields, were outlined then in great degree and detail.

From the very beginning this project involved various figures each year, starting with a few thousand dollars. As the Senator from Mississippi recalls, about

the second year it became a billion dollar project. The figures have been projected with reasonable accuracy until now.

Mr. President, I emphasize this and point out that several years ago the program was laid out largely as it is now, and that its progress has been noted for its amazing accuracy. When various projects were outlined to us, frankly, I did not think that we would be able to carry them out, but we have been able to do so, with great success, and with great credit.

I also remember the testimony of our military friends, who were not altogether friendly, in the beginning, to the idea of creating a Space Administration. I know their feelings and their professional viewpoint. They thought they were being left out. They thought so wrongfully, of course. That is no reflection on them. They are very aggressive and militant; and they should be.

I have seen progress made from year to year in the development, with the military aspect coming back into the program. For a while we said publicly that there was no military significance to it. That was a part of the secrecy of the program. We were emphasizing the point that this was merely exploration, that it was a peaceful undertaking. Everyone connected with it knew that it had military significance.

Two or three years ago it came out in the open. The policy was changed, and we began to talk about the program more openly with respect to its military significance.

We had been ahead of the Russians in many things. We still are. However, they had great power, tremendous thrust, mighty engines, and terrible rockets. I know that General Gavin testified to the effect that unless we had a rocket with a million-pound thrust, we would not continue as a nation. That was one of the most dramatic statements I ever heard. This program has progressed, and it is making progress today.

Frankly, I thought the President of the United States used an unfortunate term in his original expression in his message, when he talked about this program being a moon shot, a shot to the moon. That has been a misnomer from the very beginning. Going to the moon is merely an exercise. The program means that we desire to be preeminent in space. The only question is whether we shall be. It is a question of whether we are to master space. That has been the question from the beginning. That is the question now. It is the only question. The matter of landing on the moon is merely an exercise in carrying out a program that will make us masters of space, and preeminent in space.

The question with reference to a reduction in the amount of money is whether or not we shall slow the program down and postpone it, and in that way perhaps let someone else be preeminent in space. It is not a race, as has been said. It is a race only for our own protection. It is a race to that extent only.

We have already pared the program down. I believe the legislative branch has the major responsibility in that regard. The House has worked on the program. The committees have worked on it. I have also, being a member of each of the committees. No Senator knows more about this very complicated subject than does the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON]. When any proposal survives the steamroller that he puts on these questions, and the inquiries he makes, it is bound to have some merit.

From beginning to end this bill was worked on to the utmost degree by the Space Committee. The Senator from Mississippi does not deserve any credit. He was doing other things, and could not be present at all the hearings, but he knows enough about it. Then the Appropriations Committees in both Houses worked on the program. The subcommittee headed by the Senator from Washington dealt with this subject, and has done excellent work.

The amount has been continually pared down. The question now is whether we are to abandon the effort to be preeminent in space.

The Gemini program has been referred to. Very definitely the military has a part in it. There has been general agreement between Mr. Webb and Mr. McNamara with respect to this program.

Gemini is a part of the program. When that is completed, we shall go into the Apollo program. That will involve big rockets, big thrust, and missiles. We must have them if we are to protect ourselves.

I say again that the matter of going to the moon is merely an exercise. It is almost totally a misnomer. The purpose of the space program is the conquest of space. Anyone who has had anything to do with this subject knows that whoever controls outer space will control the earth. We do not want to take a chance. Anything can happen in that field. It is a field in which we cannot possibly afford to be second best. Those of us who are familiar with the subject feel that we know what the program is. The minimum that is necessary is what is represented by the bill; and it should be passed as written. I commend the Senator from Washington and his subcommittee.

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

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. It has been argued today that the project has no military significance, as regards our security, or at least very little such significance.

The Senator has had unique experience as a member of the Armed Services Committee and the Space Committee and Senators have great confidence in his judgment. He states that all the research involved in the program has great military significance, as well as significance for our security. Is that correct?

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is correct. I say that without any qualification, based on the feeling of General Shriver, for one. He is in charge of the scientific programs of all the services and others. I have always favored the military having more and more to do with the space program. They are coming more and more into it.

Mr. COOPER. I believe it is generally considered, by a great many people, that the amount of money included in the bill for this specific project is for the purpose of sending a man to the moon. Is it possible to separate the cost of this specific project from the other funds for all the other types of space research being carried on?

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator from Mississippi cannot separate it. It is a major project in the mastery of space. There are many other things that go with it. This is one of the specific things. When we do this, we are mastering space, and certainly we will be preeminent in it.

Mr. COOPER. The authorization has been reduced by about $500 million, I believe.

Mr. STENNIS. Yes.

Mr. COOPER. The Senator believes that a cut of another half billion dollars would not be wise. Is that correct?

Mr. STENNIS. I believe the Senator has correctly stated that point. It would be too drastic, and would slow the program down. Of course, it costs a great deal of money. This is new ground we are breaking. This is a pioneering effort. It is exploration. That is why it will run into a great deal of money.

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

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. I am deeply appreciative of what the Senator from Mississippi has said. He serves on the Space Committee and also on the Appropriations and Armed Services Committees. He is an expert and one of the great authorities in this field. We should pay attention to him when he talks about the conquest of outer space as compared with the lunar portion of this program.

The Senate should know that only $1.9 billion of the $20 billion in this part of the space program will be used for manned and unmanned lunar exploration.

For that reason we are making a great mistake when we speak of it as being a moon shot. That is misleading.

The moon may not have any particular lesson to give us, but I think the development of the boosters, all the guidance equipment, all the instrumentation, all the capability of putting a man into space, and the ability to rendezvous in space, which is of vital importance in controlling our excursions and inquiries into what is beyond—all these have a vast importance and effect on our military posture. We are now spending, in military research and development, almost as much as we are asking in this bill for the entire space program. For that reason, I feel that we have a sharing with the military, not a duplicate, but a common and concurrent source of knowledge. Furthermore, I know of no bill that has come before us in recent times that has been cut more than half a billion dollars below the budget. The committee bill is $510 million less than the amount asked by the budget. It is $160 million less than the authorization. It has been trimmed down from the budget request by relentless examination of this program. This was not a perfunctory study of what was needed. Everything was gone into with the greatest of care. While the subcommittee was not unanimous in reporting the bill,

it was almost unanimous, restoring $80 million for operations and research and $10 million for facilities—a $90 million increase over the deep cut the House made.

But the cut that the distinguished Senator from Arkansas today seeks to make is another half billion dollars. In the long run, because of the slowdown and a change of plans, and the making of an entirely different schedule from the one that has been carefully programed by the experts, it will cost a great deal more than he would care to see cut. He proposes a reversal, a turning back, and a changing of a green light to red.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator from Oklahoma is correct on every point he has made. I wish to read a quotation from General Power, who is now Commander in Chief of the Strategic Air Command, as quoted by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] at page 9496 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for this year. General Power said:

> We must continue our intensive nonmilitary effort along the entire spectrum of space and space-related sciences. The primary responsibility for this effort rests with the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. Its close cooperation with the Department of Defense will not only further its own objectives of the peaceful conquest of space but also help create the building blocks for the future military systems which may be required, to repeat President Kennedy's words, "to make sure that space is maintained for peaceful purposes."

We always emphasize "peaceful," but it is really a part of the propaganda, so to speak, of this program from the beginning. It is the military's business, as the general says. When we hit the moon, we shall still have rockets and will be rendezvousing.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I think the majority leader wishes to propose a unanimous consent agreement. I shall be quite happy to wait until he has done so.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to propose a unanimous-consent request that there be a limitation of debate of 2 hours on the Fulbright amendment and 1 hour on all other amendments, the time to be equally divided, and 2 hours on the bill.

Mr. CLARK. Starting when, may I ask the majority leader?

ORDER FOR RECESS UNTIL NOON TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business tonight, it recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. There will be no morning hour tomorrow. The time limitation will start at 12 o'clock sharp, if the unanimous-consent request is agreed to.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I wish to ask the distinguished minority leader whether the 2 hours provided for debate on the bill would allow me 10 minutes for a necessary colloquy?



Mr. DIRKSEN. The Senator from New York has that assurance.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I am not quite clear about how the time on my amendment would be allocated.

Mr. MANSFIELD. It is my understanding that the pending amendment would be brought up later in the afternoon tomorrow.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. When?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Whenever the Senator would like to have it taken up.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Specifically, at 2 o'clock?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I cannot set a specific time, because of other time limitations; but as close to that time as the Senator from Arkansas desires.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not understand how that would work. It might be 6 o'clock.

Mr. MANSFIELD. No; at approximately the time the Senator wishes to take it up. We do not know how much time will be taken in allocations. The Senator from Arkansas says 2 o'clock.

Mr. ANDERSON. Would it not be possible for the Senator from Montana to say that if an amendment were pending on which the time might run until 20 minutes past 2, which could not be avoided, that amendment might be set aside and the Senator from Arkansas be recognized?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If the Senator would provide that if my amendment were laid aside now, it would come up at 2 o'clock tomorrow, that would not necessarily cut off the proponent of another amendment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Would the Senator allow me a little leeway, because something not under my control might arise? I should like to make it 2 o'clock, give or take a few minutes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I respect the intentions of the majority leader, but I noticed that after 3 weeks of debate on another bill, he could not get his way on it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Many times. Perhaps I cannot get it tonight. But I am trying to arrange a modus operandi.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I wanted to be certain that my amendment would come up at a reasonable hour.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator can bring it up at 2 o'clock.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. And have 2 hours for the proponents?

Mr. ANDERSON. Why does not the majority leader agree to set aside what is pending at 2 o'clock?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. We can always yield time back.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I shall be glad to do my best to have the Senator's amendment come up at 2 o'clock sharp; I was only asking him to allow me a few minutes leeway.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator can make a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas be taken up at 2 o'clock.

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

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, my understanding is that there would be 2 hours on the amendment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Two hours on the Fulbright amendment.

Mr. ALLOTT. Two hours on each side?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Two hours on the amendment, 1 hour to a side.

Mr. ALLOTT. Two hours equally divided?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. No; 2 hours on the side of the proponents.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thought it was 2 hours on the amendment. Time can be taken on the bill.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator from Arkansas wants 2 hours on his side.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct. I do not care what the other side wants.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The time for the other side can come out of time on the bill. Two hours will be allocated to the Senator from Arkansas, the proponent of the amendment.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct; 2 hours beginning at 2 o'clock.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President——

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President——

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator from Washington will be able to get time from the time on the bill.

Mr. MAGNUSON. But I expect to talk about other items in the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator can get more time from the time on the bill. It was the Senator's idea to arrange some agreement. We are trying to help him.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I thought the Senator said 1 hour on each side.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That was my understanding, but I was mistaken. The Senator can get time from the time on the bill.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I do not know whether I can or not. Why does the Senator from Arkansas get 2 hours on his amendment?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I need it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I amend my request again so as to provide 3 hours on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the request is agreed to.

The unanimous-consent agreement, reduced to writing, is as follows:

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

*Ordered*, That, effective on Wednesday, November 20, 1963, beginning at 12 o'clock noon, during the further consideration of the bill H.R. 8747, the Independent Offices Appropriations Act, 1964, debate on the pending Fulbright amendment (No. 325), which shall begin at 2 p.m., shall be limited to 3 hours, of which 2 hours shall be controlled by Mr. FULBRIGHT and 1 hour by the majority leader; debate on any other 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 the majority leader: *Provided*, That in the event the majority leader 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 3 hours, 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. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, before I yield the floor, I shall yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, before the Senator yields, I should like to ask a question of the majority leader.

In view of the unanimous-consent request, does the majority leader expect that there will be any votes tonight?

Mr. MANSFIELD. No.

Mr. CLARK. I understand the Senator from Mississippi has yielded to me.

Mr. STENNIS. That is correct.

Mr. CLARK. I wish to say to the Senator from Oklahoma that he and the Senator from Mississippi have made a plausible argument in support of the appropriations the committee requests in this bill. The Senator from Oklahoma was quite eloquent in discussing the various huge appropriations recommended by the committee, at the request of the administration, for the space program; and he told us how important they are. I wish to ask him and the Senator from Mississippi—although I think I know the answer they will give—whether they believe the space program is more important than the rebuilding of our cities and the program of urban renewal and slum clearance.

Mr. MONRONEY. No; and I think we must develop the best possible society we can in terms of rehabilitating our cities. But neither do I believe we dare neglect supporting the leadership of this administration in pushing to new developments in science, many of which are associated with outer space, and will pay great dividends to our Nation's safety and economy.

Mr. CLARK. I agree with the Senator from Oklahoma.

On the other hand, I believe the Senator from Arkansas is absolutely correct when he says the space program involves a question of priorities and that there are fiscal limits beyond which we cannot go.

I suggest that the inevitable result of the very great emphasis on military expenditures, in which I know the Senator from Mississippi sincerely believes—although I think he believes in larger expenditures for this purpose than are necessary, and also the inevitable result of the expenditures for space which the Senator from Oklahoma advocates is that not enough money will be devoted to urban renewal or education or the serious problem of chronic and persistent unemployment in Pennsylvania and in many other parts of the country. Therefore, I say we must consider the priorities which necessarily are involved.

Is it not true that if the huge amounts being requested for the space program are provided—and I point out that the appropriations requested this year for the space program are much larger than the amounts provided for it last year or the year before; in fact, they are the largest ever requested for this program—inevitably many Senators who will vote for these appropriations subsequently will say, "We cannot afford to provide support for area redevelopment, which perhaps will cost $30 million or $40 million" or "we cannot afford to have a retraining program" or "we cannot afford to continue the urban renewal program." Does not the Senator from Oklahoma believe that will be the inevitable result of the undue priority—to my way of thinking—being placed on the space program? I ask him this question because I know he is much more experienced than I am.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania for the compliment; but I know of no program that has received a cut of more than half a billion dollars in the amount budgeted for it. That cut has been sustained by this committee. The House voted to make a deep cut in the amount for the space program, and we were asked to restore half of the $1 billion cut the House voted. But our committee voted to restore only $90 million—in an attempt to keep the program on schedule, if we could possibly do so.

Mr. CLARK. How does the budgeted amount for the space program this year compare with the corresponding amount last year?

Mr. MONRONEY. As the Senator from Pennsylvania well knows, the amount this year is much larger.

Mr. ANDERSON. About $2 billion.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator from New Mexico says it is about $2 billion.

Mr. MONRONEY. I think that is correct, because the hardware required must be ordered now, in advance of its use. It will be delivered during the next 2 or 3 years.

Mr. CLARK. Then I advocate that we slow down the space program and devote more of our resources to slum clearance, urban renewal, education, and other essential programs.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, in response to the argument that the amounts proposed to be appropriated for the space program are too large, I point out that last year I handled the appropriation bill which involved the highest percentage reduction carried in of any appropriation bill Congress handled last year. That was the military appropriation bill, and a 17-percent reduction was made in it. I do not boast of that, but that did happen.

In discussing the space program, I point out that there could be no slum clearance program if we were not wise enough to provide adequately for the space program.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WALTERS in the chair). Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator from Pennsylvania has asked about the urban redevelopment program, the slum clearance program, and other programs. Is it not true that the funds spent for the space program are spent in the interest of the safety and security of the United States, and that that program must have top priority, because there cannot be urban redevelopment or slum clearance unless we first provide for the safety and security of the Nation?

Mr. STENNIS. Certainly. I agree with the Senator from Massachusetts, and I thank him for his observation.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield to me?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I wish to state, as other Senators have said, that I appreciate very much the excellent service and the important contributions the Senator from Mississippi has rendered in working in connection with this field. I also know of his outstanding knowledge of military affairs and of the very important contributions he has made in the committee because of that knowledge. He has helped us very greatly in dealing with all these problems.

After listening to his remarks, it seems to me that he wants the United States not necessarily to be the first to place a man on the moon, but to obtain preeminence in space.

Furthermore, I point out that the statement made by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] is of very great importance to me, because he is known throughout the country as the aviation expert of the Senate. I believe he is, and I hope he is; but I notice that he is able to appreciate that there are other important programs; and I thank him for the stanch support he has given us in connection with this program.

I also thank the Senator from Mississippi for his very valuable contributions in connection with it.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from New Mexico.

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

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator spoke of the building blocks for this program. Can he state how much of these funds will be spent in Mississippi?

Mr. STENNIS. A relatively small amount.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Approximately $100 million?

Mr. STENNIS. In Mississippi there is a small ancillary space program which is merely for a missile testing site, not a launching site.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I believe that under this program $100 million will be spent in Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. I do not believe the amount is quite that large. But I was interested in this program a long time before any developments in connection with it occurred in Mississippi. Furthermore, the work in Mississippi is ancillary to the work done in Louisiana.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Louisiana also has very large installations in connection with this program, does it not?

Mr. STENNIS. Yes, very large.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The largest installations under this program are in Mississippi, Texas, Louisiana, Alabama, and Florida, are they not?

Mr. STENNIS. Perhaps so; but certainly the amount spent under this program in Mississippi is not nearly as large as the amounts spent in Arkansas on the aggregate program of flood con-

trol, canalization, and improvement of rivers—all of which, I think, are justified, and I voted for them. However, it is amazing to note the amounts spent in Arkansas in the last 10 years.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I was asking about the space program.

Mr. STENNIS. I understand, and I answered the Senator's question.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. But I did not get a very clear answer to it. I said that I understand that under this 1-year program, $100 million will be spent this year in Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. Since the budget has been made, no definite calculation of that sort has been arrived at, so I cannot state the exact amount. But the latest calculation which has been made since the budget was concluded shows that the contracts for construction work in Mississippi will amount to approximately $80 million.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. On November 13, I received a letter from NASA, in response to my letter to Mr. Webb. I shall submit the letter for the record. On page 2, he refers to the Mississippi test facility and to the other items in Mississippi, and they total $100,196,000.

Mr. STENNIS. Perhaps that figure was taken from the original budget figures. But with the reductions which now have been made, I would think the amount for construction work in Mississippi would be between $75 million and $80 million, or something of that sort. At any rate, this work is necessary; and I have not heard the Senator from Arkansas deny that it is a necessary and essential part of the big rocket testing program.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I realize that the Senator from Mississippi was not in the Chamber when I began to speak. I did not deny the importance of the work to be done in Mississippi or elsewhere, but I disputed the claim that it had to be done in such a short time, and that such large amounts must necessarily be spent in any 1 year.

Mr. STENNIS. The imputation is that I am influenced in my position because of a project of Mississippi. I caught that very clearly and I am sure everyone else did. The Senator is very good at making himself understood.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If it was in my State, I would be greatly influenced by the situation. That would be normal.

Mr. STENNIS. I find that my interest in the program far antedates the establishment of any project of that character in Mississippi. I am interested in the Army, yet there is not a single Army unit in Mississippi. I have been espousing the cause of the Army for 12 to 15 years.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes; I know the Senator from Mississippi has, and very successfully.

Mr. STENNIS. I have favored the cause of the Army, and yet not one single Army unit or single Army man is in Mississippi tonight, unless it is the National Guard.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

ANSWERING THE SOVIET MANPOWER OFFENSIVE

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, I understand that the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania will offer an amendment to restore all the funds requested by the President for the National Science Foundation. The President has assigned to the National Science Foundation the urgent task of meeting our national needs for highly skilled scientific manpower. The Senate committee has proposed $50 million more to close a $94 million difference between the administration request and the House version of H.R. 8747. I would like to ask about the $44 million remaining. I believe our national needs for manpower will become increasingly acute in coming years and urge the Senate to approve the full amount. Why is there an urgent need for a manpower program?

First. The Soviet Union is waging an intense manpower offensive aimed directly at American preeminence in science and engineering. The strength of our national defense depends upon the scientific and engineering talent we can marshal to design new weapons systems and defenses. New reactors for our atomic submarines, new communications systems, and stronger missile systems depend upon the brains that conceive them. The recent DeWitt report and other studies have shown that the Soviets are straining every resource of their educational system in order to overtake the West in technology and basic research. We have 9,000 Ph. D. engineers at work in this country. The U.S.S.R. has 30,000. We ignore the Soviet manpower offensive at our peril.

Second. The Federal Government has itself placed immense demands upon the national scientific community. The Government employed 101,400 scientists and engineers in 1959. This figure is expected to increase to 165,000 in 1970. Moreover, the Government's needs for research and development now require the time of about two-thirds of all the working scientists and engineers in the Nation. A vigorous effort on the Government's part will be necessary to preserve balance in manpower resources.

Third. Too few scientists and engineers receiving their B.S. or B.E. degrees go on to take graduate training. In order to make a significant contribution to modern engineering or scientific progress, an investigator simply must have the skill and knowledge which can be acquired only by having done research himself. Meaningful work in the sciences requires a graduate degree. There is a widespread feeling among the employers of American scientists and engineers that more graduate training is needed in order to enhance the quality of work being done in our laboratories. The report of the President's Science Advisory Committee on "Meeting National Manpower Needs in Science and Technology" stated:

> Apart from adding to the student's substantive knowledge, graduate education and research provide a discipline of mind that fosters objectivity and a capacity to continue the learning process independently. Even 1 year beyond the baccalaureate often virtually doubles a student's exposure to science or engineering, thus greatly strengthening his capacity to contribute in all fields of employment, including science teaching in elementary schools.

In 1960 a paltry, inadequate 2,900 doctorates were awarded in math, physical sciences, and engineering. That amounts to only 8 percent of the 1955 mathematics bachelors, only 16 percent of the 1955 physical sciences bachelors, and a bare 3.6 percent of the 1955 engineering bachelors. The goal of the President's manpower program is 7,500 doctorates in these three critical fields by 1970. That goal is an important element of national policy and I hope it will not be overlooked.

Fourth. A central purpose of the President's manpower program is to expand support geographically, to those schools and areas of the country which are not now receiving it. In northern New England, the Southwest, the Midwest, and South, and the Northwest there are colleges and universities which do not now receive extensive support, but which could be converted to new centers of excellence. The report of the President's Science Advisory Committee recognizes that a center of excellence need not be an immense laboratory building with a very large staff. A center of excellence can be a single department within a university or even a competent investigator who could become the nucleus of a new graduate department. We must start such new graduate departments, to enable all sections of the country to participate more equitably in this century's inspiring march toward technical progress. In studying the allocation of defense contracts and other government procurement, I early discovered that the money goes where the brains are. The purpose of this manpower program is to provide for a more even distribution of talent, taking advantage of every opportunity to increase graduate enrollments in math, the physical sciences, and engineering.

OUTLINES OF THE PROGRAM

The House denied $94 million requested by the President in order to carry out the science manpower program. Of this figure, $45 million was for science education and graduate research facilities. Eighteen million was for the science development program. Three million was to expand the existing fellowship program. Twenty-five million was to be used for traineeships. Three million was for administrative costs. I would like to explain these further.

These programs are in large part familiar National Science Foundation efforts: fellowships and support to colleges and universities. There is already some $93 million in the House version of this bill for these purposes, and that sum was approved by the Senate committee. The President's request for an additional $94 million was unusual. Every element of the request was designed to help meet the Nation's manpower needs. The $45 million for science education and graduate research facilities would go to construct new research facilities, but only in areas where this would help meet manpower needs as well as important research goals.

The $18 million for the science development program would go to improve instruction, help universities create new graduate departments, and expand enrollments. In each case, this would be done with an eye to national manpower goals. The Senate recently passed a higher education facilities bill, but this was aimed primarily at undergraduate education. The National Science Foundation program will be aimed specifically at engineering, mathematics, and physical sciences, and on a graduate level only. The $25 million would be used for a new purpose, the support of graduate students in these three fields in the first year of their work. Three million dollars would be required to conduct examinations, evaluate facility proposals, supply technical advice to universities, and otherwise administer the manpower program.

PROPOSAL TO INCREASE THE DOLLAR AMOUNT OF H.R. 8747

The difference, Mr. President, between the President's proposal and the action of our Senate committee, is $44 million. This is a very large sum. The Senate committee has acted with imaginativeness and generosity in increasing the House version by $50 million, most of which would be spent for purposes of education. Why, then, should we advocate going further at this time? The fiscal year is already partly underway. Could an additional $44 million be used responsibly and well?

Mr. President, an additional $44 million, if provided, would permit support to be extended in order to meet the plans for increasing our resources of scientific manpower. The largest fellowship item in the President's program is $25 million for first-year graduate student traineeships. There is well-grounded fear that House language forbidding new National Science Foundation programs might forestall the traineeship program altogether. And yet it is the very heart of the manpower program. The $25 million appropriation, according to the Comptroller of the National Science Foundation, would permit support for 12,250 first-year graduate students in math, the physical sciences, and engineering, as opposed to the 3,210 who received Federal support in 1960.

Without the traineeships, the usefulness of the rest of the manpower expansion program would be compromised. With the traineeships, which I hope our Senate committee will provide, this Nation could take a long step toward fulfilling the obligations of the decade in which we live. That accounts for $25 million. The $18 million for the science development program would account for almost all of the rest of the funds proposed in this amendment. And the science development program will accomplish the other main purpose of the manpower program, securing better geographical distribution of Government science support.

BETTER GEOGRAPHICAL DISTRIBUTION OF SUPPORT

Mr. President, I have heard of whole graduating classes of engineers leaving the State in which they were trained. I understand that Physical Abstracts and Chemical Abstracts, for one recent year, failed to disclose a single paper written in the universities of an entire State. Our scientists are crowding to Massachusetts, small areas of the Atlantic coast and the Midwest, and to Texas and California. Fully half of our scientists and engineers work in only six States. The science development program of the National Science Foundation will create new centers of excellence where they do not now exist. This is a very important national objective. It can be done step by step, selectively, and with constant attention to quantity. This is the very best kind of support for science, building our universities to a point where they can attract the resources they need from many sources instead of one.

The science development program will help to meet that need as well, and lay the foundation for wider participation by our several States in the technical revolution of our time. As a Senator from a small State, I feel this need very keenly indeed. Programs of this kind will help our University of New Hampshire start whole new graduate faculties and exciting programs to meet the research needs, not just of my State, but of New England as a whole.

MEETING URGENT IN MANPOWER NEEDS

In summary, Mr. President, such funds will help the United States to graduate urgently needed graduate engineers, mathematicians, and physical scientists. This is only the beginning of a long-range manpower program which must look to other areas as well as science and technology. I am not saying that science is all important. But this particular subject has been studied and restudied. We in the Congress have been critical of the President for our national lag in meeting manpower needs. Now the President has offered a program. It must be extended to other areas as well as math, physical science, and engineering. But the report of the science advisers shows the urgency of this particular area. It is an area wherein we are ready to act. The National Science Foundation and Bureau of Labor Statistics issued a report entitled "The Long-Range Demand for Scientific and Technical Personnel." This report stated that while we must graduate 720,000 engineers to meet the need by 1970, only 262,000 engineers received their first degree in the preceding decade, or roughly one-third of the number needed in the next decade. Engineering enrollments dropped 11 percent in 1958 and have not climbed back since. You need only glance at the want-ad section of a Sunday paper in order to realize how immense the needs have become.

Mr. President, the United States stands in some danger of having too few scientists and engineers by the end of this decade. The problem has been studied. A solution has been proposed. The Soviets are outracing us in bringing all their manpower resources to bear on critical military and economic problems. A full restoration of these funds will provide our country with the brains we will need in the years of contest that lie ahead. The amount is responsible. It will help spread support into other States. I submit that such additional funds are a sorely needed necessity for the times in which we live.

---

## COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Finance Committee be authorized to meet while the Senate is in session tomorrow, no matter what time the Senate convenes.

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

---

## EXCESSIVE MEAT IMPORTS

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I am once again called upon to speak about the serious problem of excessive meat imports which has placed America's livestock industry in a precarious position.

In January of this year, I was joined by a distinguished group of Senators in introducing a bill, S. 557, which would curb the extensive beef imports which are depressing cattle prices in this country. Our bill would establish an annual quota equal to the average annual quantity of beef imported during the preceding 5-year period. The beef imports making up this quota would be taxed at the present rate. Imports coming into this country in addition to this quota would be subject to an additional duty.

If this bill were passed, our country would continue to import a reasonable quantity of beef to meet the supplemental beef needs that we do have; and yet, the bill would curtail the excessive imports of beef and veal which pose such a threat to the cattleman.

The Foreign Agriculture Service Division of the Department of Agriculture had informed me that the beef and veal imports had increased 41 percent in 1962 over 1961. Total red meat imports had increased 36 percent in 1962 over 1961. On the other hand, our exports of beef and veal had decreased by 9 percent.

A large portion of these beef imports are of a processing quality. In fact, about one-third of the processing beef consumed in this country is imported from foreign countries. Now over 11 percent of all beef and veal consumed in the United States is imported.

In 1960 the per capita civilian consumption of beef and veal in the United States was 91.4 pounds. It rose to 95.4 pounds in 1962. Over this 2-year period total meat consumption increased 4.3 percent while the consumption of imported beef increased 81.8 percent. I feel that this comparison makes it crystal clear that the growing quantities of beef imports to this country are a serious threat to the cattlemen, producers, and feeders.

I thought that these figures were alarming and corrective action should be taken, and thus, I introduced a bill which would bring relief and curb the excessive imports.

Here it is 10 months later and no relief is in sight. The Economic Research Service of the U.S. Department of Ag-

riculture in its publication for November 1963 says:

Imports during January-August 1963 were 22 percent above the same months of 1962.

Remember 1962 figures were 41 percent above the 1961 figures. There is a direct relationship between the high beef imports and the low prices our cattlemen are now receiving at the marketplace.

As you well know, the cattle industry is free from all governmental controls. Therefore, we have a true market where supply and demand do determine the prices. Consequently, cattle prices are affected by the 1½ billion pounds of meat shipped into this country. When cow beef or processing beef competes with fed beef for the consumer's dollar, cow beef prices have a direct effect on fat cattle prices and vice versa. The fat cattle market recently plummeted and one of the reasons was that imports can be sold here in the States 5 to 10 cents a pound cheaper than beef can be produced. The per capita consumption of imported beef has jumped in the last 2 years 81.8 percent. Thus it is patent that the increased consumption of beef which is imported into this country at prices below our production costs have pulled down the prices received by our livestock men.

Whenever imports change the total supply of beef in a free market prices are pulled down.

There is a drastic need for relief. We have not received it and one reason is that the Kennedy administration is not sympathetic to the livestock man.

If this administration understood the livestock industry or was interested in it there would be no need for legislation because this serious situation could be corrected administratively.

However, it appears as though the President is preparing to reduce or eliminate the existing duties at the GATT negotiation table.

In 1930, Congress established tariffs on beef imports. In 1948, a 50-percent reduction was made on those tariffs. Now our GATT team is preparing to negotiate new agreements and beef and veal are listed as articles which will be considered subject to the further reduction or elimination of duties.

I ask the President to direct his representatives who are at the negotiation table to protect the interests of our livestock industry. All meat products should be removed from the list subject to negotiation by the GATT team.

Senator HRUSKA delivered a very fine speech on September 24 of this year, calling attention to the law which gives President Kennedy complete authority to eliminate the excessive beef imports problem. The authority is contained in section 204 of the Agriculture Act of 1956 which provides:

The President is authorized to negotiate agreements with foreign governments in an effort to limit the export to the United States of agricultural commodities or products.

I appeal to the President to act under the authority which was granted to him by Congress.

Not only do I ask that the President and his advisers consider the interests of the livestock men in their negotiations, but I ask Congress to take action on this matter. The American National Cattlemen's Association and the National Livestock Feeders Association and many other State groups have urged the enactment of our bill which would bring the needed relief. Corrective steps must be taken soon.

I address this body today asking you and President Kennedy to arm yourselves with the facts so that we can give the proper protection to our livestock industry.

---

## REPLY TO FORMER SECRETARY OF STATE DEAN ACHESON

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, today's New York Times published a report of a speech given last night by former Secretary of State Dean Acheson. I ask unanimous consent that the article may be printed in the RECORD preliminary to my replying to it.

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

[From the New York Times, Nov. 19, 1963]

ACHESON BIDS UNITED STATES REMAIN IN EUROPE—ASSAILS THOSE WHO SEEK TO REDUCE COMMITMENTS

WASHINGTON, November 18.—Dean Acheson has joined—and at the same time deplored—what he calls another great debate about the extent of U.S. involvement in Europe.

Contending that the strength of Western conventional forces in Europe is the key to most U.S. objectives there, the former Secretary of State criticized those who, he says, believe that U.S. interests might best be served by reducing American commitment in Europe.

Mr. Acheson's remarks were prepared as the 70 Brien McMahon lecture, delivered at the University of Connecticut in Storrs this evening. He arranged for distribution of the text of the lecture in Washington and it has been widely discussed here in recent days.

The lecture series honors the late Senator Brien McMahon, of Connecticut.

HE ASSAILS EISENHOWER

Mr. Acheson singled out for criticism former President Dwight D. Eisenhower and George F. Kennan, former Ambassador to the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia.

He criticized General Eisenhower for suggesting that the United States might well begin to think of recalling some of its troops from Europe. He criticized Mr. Kennan, himself an outspoken observer of foreign policy, for suggesting a "neutralized Germany possessing only weapons of defense" and accused him of indiscreet Machiavellianism for raising the possibility of an East-West deal over German heads.

Less directly, the former Secretary of State to President Harry S. Truman berated the Kennedy administration for being too timid in its efforts to woo West Germany and work intimately with Chancellor Erhard's government to promote ambitious new Atlantic projects.

Mr. Acheson believes that the debate over the extent of American involvement in Europe is likely to be a repetition of the so-called great debate of the winter of 1950–51.

He detects irony in this because the first "great debate" found General Eisenhower on the other side, arguing against former President Herbert Hoover and the "Fortress America" concept and deciding in the end to run for the Presidency primarily to defeat attempts to disengage the United States from European affairs.

BASES OF CRITICISM

Mr. Acheson's criticism of General Eisenhower refers to views the former President expressed in a recent article in the Saturday Evening Post and in his memoir, "Mandate for Change." The criticism of Mr. Kennan's views refers to a recent article in Look magazine.

Both Mr. Acheson and Mr. Kennan are regarded in Washington as distinguished and experienced students of European affairs. The irony behind their current disagreement is that the vigor with which they have pressed their firm views has eroded the influence of both among their friends and former colleagues in the Kennedy administration.

TALK HELD DAMAGING

While joining the debate, Mr. Acheson seemed to express serious reservations about the act that it was taking place at all. Merely to talk about reducing U.S. fighting strength in Europe, he said, may be only slightly less damaging than actual withdrawal of troops.

He contends that high-level chatter about such a possibility will destroy Allied confidence, and especially German confidence, in American leadership and do more to erode Western unity than French nationalism or the current Soviet peace offensive.

The debate to which Mr. Acheson refers has also raged for some time within the Kennedy administration. Some administration officials have long been tempted by the economies that could be derived from withdrawal of troops from Europe without, they contend, reductions in military effectiveness.

This temptation has been strengthened by revised estimates of Soviet strength in Eastern Europe, now judged at the Pentagon to be no greater than the strength of Western forces on the continent. Mr. Acheson still speaks of the need to match Soviet forces and either does not know of or does not accept the new estimates.

Mr. MORSE. As one who participated in the great debate of 1950–51 to which Mr. Acheson referred, and who shared his view at that time that large-scale American forces were needed in Europe, I am very sorry that Mr. Acheson fails to see that changes have taken place in the intervening 13 years that call for changes, too, in American policy.

The most significant of all these changes is the nature of nuclear warfare that has developed since the days of Mr. Acheson's secretaryship. In 1950, the great threat to the security of Europe was the huge mass of Soviet troops and ground forces that had been built up during World War II. To provide a reasonable assurance that these massive Russian forces would not move across a still-prostrate Europe, it was necessary and desirable that American ground forces of some size also locate in Europe.

But as nuclear forces have grown on both sides, the likelihood of a big conventional war in Europe is becoming infinitesimal. Both the Soviet Union and our NATO allies have recognized and acted on this new fact of the world power arrangement.

We know, for example, that the present administration undertook soon after coming to office to increase conventional forces in Europe as a means of providing an alternative to nuclear war. But it did not get far. It did not prevail with the largest of our allies, with the exception of West Germany, and even West Germany has not completely fulfilled her

commitments to furnish the ground troops she owes to the Alliance.

Great Britain has never put onto the Continent her contingent of ground forces, not even at the time of the Berlin crisis of 1961. France remains the most delinquent of all the NATO members in furnishing her assigned manpower to the Alliance. France, in particular, is assuming that there is no longer any real danger of a Soviet ground attack across Europe, and as a key member of the Alliance, both in size and in geography, her actions must to a large extent determine the actions of the other NATO members.

There must also be added to the changes in the factual situation in the year 1963 the reduction in Soviet ground forces. The extent of this reduction is also reported in today's New York Times. It reports a speech by Defense Secretary McNamara indicating that not only is Russia far behind the United States in nuclear capability, but that its troop strength in Europe is now considerably less than many Americans have been assuming. Secretary McNamara estimates that even including the highly unreliable forces of her eastern satellites, Russian strength in Europe probably does not exceed 3 million men.

For the United States to continue to keep men in Europe when our effort is not matched by our allies in their own defense, and when the menace of Soviet attack is less than at any time since the end of World War II, let me say to Mr. Acheson, is senseless, unless the United States really does have the intention of dominating the policies of Western Europe for the foreseeable future. That is an intention we have always denied having. I certainly do not think that is the American objective in Europe, nor should it ever be.

Having done so much under Mr. Acheson's leadership to restore Western Europe to a strong and healthy physical, economic, and moral state, the United States should now be turning over to the Europeans themselves the responsibility for their own defense. That was our objective in the Marshall plan and in NATO. Neither of these foresaw a permanent American dominance of Western European defenses.

Of course, it is hard for someone who was so bound up in the Marshall plan and in the early days of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization to recognize the impact of the success of these programs upon American policy today. I believe that is what Mr. Dean Acheson is guilty of.

Today, it is former President Eisenhower who has recognized this impact, not Mr. Acheson. I entirely share the view of the former President that the United States could well cut its military manpower in Europe to a single division. Surely the reasons that make it reasonable for France and Britain to ignore their NATO commitments are equally valid for the United States. If we have failed to persuade our allies of the rightness of our views on manpower, then I believe we must accept their view that large-scale ground forces on the spot in Europe are unnecessary.

We cannot possibly justify, on the basis of any argument, maintaining six American divisions in Europe so long as our NATO allies, including West Germany, are refusing to fulfill their manpower commitments to NATO.

Certainly, I do not belittle the evident desire of Mr. Acheson to continue a close American relationship with the Federal Republic of Germany. But I am astonished that he thinks it is in our interest to woo West Germany, or otherwise compete with others for Germany's favors. That kind of relationship is no more sound for long-range purposes than the relationship which for years put the United States in the role of Europe's protector. An alliance of equals requires equal effort, equal responsibility, and an equal desire to seek similar objectives on the part of the members. No useful Atlantic alliance can exist on the basis of an exclusively American desire for Atlantic partnership, nor on the basis of an undue American share of the manpower defending Europe.

It is my own personal view that the United States will have a better friend and ally in Germany if she is primarily responsible for her own defense in both manpower and in financing. The same is true of our other European allies. I do not know of any American objective in Europe other than the one we have sought ever since the end of World War II, and that is to keep its member nations free from Communist domination. The sooner they are able to do that for themselves, the better. I think the evidence is that they are able to do it, except for the highly complex nuclear shield which the United States holds over Europe along with much of the rest of the world.

I welcome the indications that the administration is preparing to reduce the level of American manpower overseas, especially in Europe. The need for them is declining, and our effort to keep them there has not been matched by our allies. It is no "disengagement" from Europe to bring our own efforts into line with those of our partners. We will never be "disengaged" from Europe so long as there is no final German peace treaty, and not even then, because the welfare and security of Western Europe will always be of vital interest to the welfare and security of the United States. This will be true whether we have any NATO-type treaty or not, and it will be true even in the absence of the threat of communism.

We shall always welcome friends in Europe who want to work with the United States in defense, trade, and other matters. But they will be a lot more welcome and our partnership with them will be much more fruitful if they are carrying their own weight and are not leaning on the United States either because we want them to or because they want to.

I say most respectfully that in my judgment Mr. Acheson's recent speech in New York City shows that apparently he has not changed his point of view in 10 years. But the facts have changed. He is 10 years behind the facts. It is time that Mr. Acheson got into this decade and recognized that he really has no justification for making a plea that we squander millions of American taxpayers' dollars on Europe when our NATO allies have served clear notice on us that they have no intention of keeping their NATO commitments.

This administration should not be lulled into an error of judgment on the basis of this point of view expressed by Mr. Acheson. I sincerely hope that Mr. Acheson will face up to the realities as to what is the true position of our NATO allies. I am one who will continue to say to America and to the world, "The time has come to call a halt to the squandering of hundreds and hundreds of millions of American taxpayers' dollars on unjustifiable expenditures in Europe."

Mr. President, in the New York Times of yesterday there was another interesting position taken by one editor of that paper in an editorial entitled "Perils in Cutting Aid," which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD.

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

PERILS IN CUTTING AID

Argentina's oil seizures cast dark new clouds over the Senate-House conference that will set the authorization ceiling for foreign aid. Both Houses already have mauled the aid bill President Kennedy sent to Congress. His original figure of $4.5 billion is expected to come out of conference trimmed down to $3.6 billion, the lowest figure authorized since the Marshall plan.

And that will not be the end of the emasculation process. A Congress, angered by the frustrations of American foreign policy in Latin America and other trouble spots, plans even deeper cuts when it comes to actual appropriations. Representative PASSMAN, archenemy of foreign aid and chief custodian of its pursestrings in the House, has his ax whetted for a slash to $2.7 billion. Senator MORSE wants to end the whole program next year unless the administration changes it drastically.

Hamstringing foreign aid with too little money and too many restrictions is dangerous and irresponsible. The program helps keep 3,500,000 allied soldiers in the front lines of defense against Communist expansionism. It is a bulwark against poverty, disease, and economic underdevelopment in a dangerous and untidy world, vulnerable to Communist subversion. It has been a potent instrument for advancing our foreign policy, and it will continue to be—unless Congress persists in loading it with detailed prohibitions that strip the President of the freedom of maneuver so essential in a period when international relationships are highly volatile.

Our aid will not buy us the allegiance of any nation. It will not cause them to jettison their own nationalistic drives. We are not dealing with satellites, nor do we want them. That is why Mr. Kennedy is right in holding that any disputes with countries we help—whether over Latin-American oil seizures or Nasser's Arab imperialism or Indonesia's hostility to Malaysia—must be dealt with by diplomatic negotiations and legal procedures. The President should have latitude to decide when aid should be given and when withheld. For Congress to tie his hands on how aid is administered is to cripple the United States in the conduct of its foreign policy.

Mr. MORSE. This is an interesting attempt at a rationalization of the administration's unsound position on foreign aid.

I pay little heed, Mr. President, to the comment in the editorial about the senior Senator from Oregon:

Senator MORSE wants to end the whole program next year unless the administration changes it drastically.

I do not ask for fairness from the New York Times, because I will never get it, but at least in fairness to the readers of the New York Times the editors should have reported the true position I have taken on foreign aid. Even the Committee on Foreign Relations did a better job in its report on the position taken by me than did the New York Times editor, for the committee report pointed out that the committee gave great attention, thought, and consideration to my amendment, which would have brought to an end foreign aid as it now operates at the end of fiscal year 1965, but would have reinstituted foreign aid on the basis of very clear conditions and guidelines for 50 countries.

There is not a word about that in the New York Times editorial.

The New York Times editorial also says that those of us who opposed the program apparently were guilty of the following:

Hamstringing foreign aid with too little money and too many restrictions is dangerous and irresponsible.

It is too bad that the New York Times was not fair enough to its readers to point out the facts that we presented as the basis for our criticisms of foreign aid. I described at some length a pile of critical reports, made by the Comptroller General, which stood 18 inches high. Those were devastating reports, showing hundreds and hundreds of millions of dollars of waste of the American taxpayers' money. Those reports showed in many instances how the waste and inefficiency had led to much corruption in the administration of foreign aid abroad, not by the United States but by recipients of foreign aid to whom we turned over these millions of dollars without the necessary checks and restrictions upon expenditures.

There was not a word about that in the New York Times editorial, because the printing of the facts would never have sustained the thesis of the editorial. That is typical of the editorial policy of the New York Times, because it cannot reconcile much of its editorial policy on many issues with the facts.

For the benefit of the New York Times, I give only one little piece of evidence that we can offer by legion. I wish to read a letter dated November 15, 1963, which I have received from one who can speak with knowledge of what has happened in the administration of foreign aid. It is as follows:

POMPANO BEACH, FLA.,
*November 15, 1963.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
*U.S. Senate,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am writing in my present capacity as a private citizen to commend you for the courageous fight which you have led to reduce our foreign aid expenditures where they are no longer needed or are misused and to congratulate you on your success in winning a modest cut in your amendment to reduce military aid to Western Europe.

You may not recall me. I had the privilege of meeting with you in a briefing session with Ambassador Sparks when I was in Venezuela as agricultural attaché and later accompanied you on the trip throughout the countryside west of Caracas where we visited some farms.

I spent about 10 years in foreign service, first as agricultural adviser to the European Headquarters (OSR-ECA) for 3 years during the Marshall plan where it was my responsibility to advise and help further agricultural aspects of the plan as well as keep informed our American farmers' organizations and European farmers' organizations of the progress of this plan and enlist their cooperation. I traveled throughout Europe and was instrumental in helping to enlist support of European farm leaders for the objective of the European Community idea and the NATO. For this purpose I arranged for a luncheon and briefing conference with General Eisenhower, then supreme commander of SHAPE with a very representative group of European agricultural leaders. In addition since World War II, I traveled to Europe almost every year attending various international conferences, serving as a member of the U.S. delegations to FAO meetings in Copenhagen, Geneva, Stockholm, and Rome, and other conferences in Italy, Mexico City, and Nairobi. I also promoted the sending of the first agricultural trade missions by President Eisenhower to Europe, Asia and Latin America, and Middle East, and served on one of them. I served later as agricultural attaché in Rome, Caracas, and Brussels. I cite these things not to boast at all but simply to point up the fact that I have had considerable opportunity to observe at first hand our foreign aid, and especially in Europe.

What you have been advocating with respect to discontinuing our present type of military aid to Europe has been long overdue. I was one of the enthusiastic supporters of the Marshall plan and NATO and still regard them as great achievements, but the sad fact is that our allies in Europe for many years have failed to do their part in raising their own troops and paying their proper part of the military defense of their own countries. At the beginning they were not able to pay the cost of building up necessary forces.

They have failed to keep their commitments to NATO while we have kept ours—at terrific cost to our taxpayers. They have been coasting on our leniency and overgenerosity. It is unnecessary and unfair to our taxpayers for us to keep large military forces in Europe.

Europe is able to build up and maintain the necessary forces, as Europe is not poor but prosperous. When their countries were devastated and their balance-of-payments was in desperate condition, we generously came to their aid. Now when we are running a dangerously heavy balance-of-payments deficit (which would be no longer any danger were it not for the excessive funds we are pouring out for foreign aid) our allies are unwilling to assume their proper share of the burden of defending their own countries.

As you are well aware, the real deterrent to Russian aggression against Western Europe or elsewhere is our overwhelming superiority of atomic power; it is not our ground forces and air forces in Europe. The combined military power of NATO actually available in Europe would do no more than delay the Russians in overrunning Europe by its great superiority of land forces aided by air and missile power. Our troops' presence there is mainly furnishing some temporary muscle power and a psychological deterrent.

I think we are fully justified in saying to our allies now and back it up with action, that it is their responsibility to furnish the necessary troops needed by NATO and a major part of their equipment, so long as we are guaranteeing to come to their aid against aggression immediately (as we are now prepared to do with our missile power, our Polaris power, and our airlifting power for moving our troops there). It is ridiculous that they are not willing to support sufficient troops for the defense of their own countries and peoples and that we have to keep large military forces there at enormous expense. France, I believe, agreed to supply about 20 divisions to NATO and has only about 3. Only Germany has anything like done its part in this respect, and she could do much more, but our other allies there should awake to the danger to themselves if they continue to furnish only small token military forces while Germany, because of her front-line position, is forced to build greater and greater armed forces. If a new Hitler should come to power in the future, they would be in a perilous position.

It would be foolish, of course, to withdraw all our forces at once, but we should serve notice that they are going to be withdrawn progressively and rapidly, and then we should back this up with progressive reduction of military aid to support a continued high level of U.S. forces in Europe. We have proved in two World Wars our readiness to save Europe. We have expended 100 billion in foreign aid since the war, but we simply have got to curtail our foreign aid program, not only in Europe, but we need a complete reassessment and reduction of our entire worldwide foreign-aid program on a realistic basis that will safeguard the security of our own country as well as giving needed aid to worthy underdeveloped countries.

We should stop giving aid to our potential enemies who are allied with Communist Russia or dominated by communism, because we surely have learned by now that no Communist-dominated country is our real friend. They are out to destroy all that we hold dear—freedom of the individual, the capitalistic system of free choice and opportunity, and are instead building policy states that are keeping their peoples in a state of tyranny and fear.

Therefore, I feel deeply and I believe great numbers of fellow Americans regardless of party affiliations are convinced that we should stop aiding such countries as Yugoslavia, Poland, Indonesia, Algeria, Egypt and all other countries that are under a Communist totalitarian dictatorship. We profess on the one hand to abhor dictatorships, yet we tolerate the building up of one of the most oppressive dictatorships right at our own shores, in defiance of the Monroe Doctrine and the Rio Pact and still continue to allow Castro to export trained sabateurs and arms throughout Latin America and even now to Algeria, despite President Kennedy's assurance to our people and to Latin America that he would not allow this to be done any longer (at time of Cuban crisis).

Please pardon me for writing you at such length, Senator, but I feel that we citizens have a duty to perform to give our support to efforts to correct these longstanding abuses of our generosity and which threaten our fiscal security.

I hope that you will be successful in this effort and that Congress will go on from there to bring about a complete overhauling of our entire foreign aid program by next year.

Sincerely yours,

W. RAYMOND OGG.

P.S.—I neglected to inform you that I retired voluntarily in June 1962 for reasons of health and am living here now. Although I am not from your State, I thought perhaps you might be interested in having my views. You are at liberty to make any use of them you see fit, if you find them of value, of course.

Also I hope you will not be disturbed by President Kennedy's bitter attack on Congress for not accepting his program. The

slogan that "Foreign aid is essential to our own security" was true in the Marshall plan days but in recent years it has become an outworn formula to get money out of Congress. The excessive waste and misuse of foreign aid is endangering our security instead of protecting it.

In these three pages he has made the case I tried to make in 3 weeks here on the floor of the Senate. That is my case, on three pages. I have buttressed that case by presenting for the RECORD the evidence that supports it.

The fight on foreign aid is not over. It has only started. And it is not going to be over, so far as the senior Senator from Oregon is concerned, until reforms are brought about in it that will protect the American taxpayers from just the kind of criticism brought out by Mr. Ogg, who worked in this field for some 10 years, and as to which he is a competent witness to testify.

I want to publicly thank Mr. Ogg for his courage as a citizen statesman, for bringing out in the broad daylight of public exposure his findings in regard to what he knows to be the facts based upon his work in the field of foreign aid. I thank him from the bottom of my heart.

---

## ADDRESS BY SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE FREEMAN TO NATIONAL GRANGE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, Secretary Freeman, on November 12, 1963, addressed the 97th annual session of the National Grange, during which he made public a recently completed study made by the National Agricultural Advisory Commission on the subject of the "Family Farm in American Agriculture."

I found the Secretary's comments most interesting and I feel sure that they will be informative to a great many Americans, both those engaged in agriculture and those in other pursuits.

I ask unanimous consent, therefore, that this speech, together with the report, be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the speech and report were ordered to printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE ORVILLE L. FREEMAN, AT THE 97TH ANNUAL SESSION OF THE NATIONAL GRANGE, HOTEL MULTNOMAH, PORTLAND, OREG., NOVEMBER 12, 1963

I am grateful for this opportunity to once again join you at your national session. You received me very kindly in Fort Wayne a year ago, and your hospitality here in Portland makes this a most pleasant visit for me.

A Grange session is an important occasion for many reasons. One is that as the oldest of farm organizations, you signify the importance of unity and organized effort among farmers and the fact that it is more important today than ever before that farmers speak with one clear voice. I have chosen this important occasion to make public a very important study recently submitted to me by the National Agricultural Advisory Commission, on which your own Harry Caldwell gives outstanding leadership as Chairman. And further on the basis of that study, I want to set down here a very important statement of administration farm policy.

The study, entitled the "Family Farm in American Agriculture," is a clear and simply written document of great importance to you and to all Americans. I hope you will read and discuss it in your local granges. I would like to see this study become a subject of discussion and debate in rural and urban areas from one end of the country to the other, so that the air could be cleared of misunderstandings about the family farm. We hear much talk these days that the family farm is done. I suspect the majority of the American people consider the family farm a carryover of the past. But the Commission study, based on unromantic logic and hard economics, makes totally different findings. It concludes that the family farm is one of the main supporting beams of our high standard of living, and the key to our unchallenged world leadership in agriculture. Family farms have met the requirements of a technological age as well as they once met the needs of settling a new country.

The important statement of policy I want to make here is that the family farm is the keystone of the agricultural policy of the Kennedy administration. Just as the amazing productivity of American agriculture is the solid foundation for our unparalleled standard of living, so the family farm is the rock upon which we have built the achievement of American agriculture. We believe the family farm is essential to the strength and well-being of our Nation. We are determined that in the total national interest the family farm will continue to grow in efficiency and effectiveness. National farm policies have been and will in the years ahead be shaped to enable the efficient family farm to maintain its independence so that it can continue to meet our basic needs for food and fiber.

Nothing would please me more than to see the Commission study become the center of controversy and debate. It subjects the family farm to a test as to its worth as a commercial enterprise. It does not measure its social and moral values, although it recognizes that these, too, are of critical importance. There is no question that the family farm, as an institution, contributes enormously to the social fabric of our Nation and its moral virtues of hard work and emphasis on family are essential parts of our national heritage.

But the debates and doubts we hear today as to the worth of the family farm do not question its moral and social values, they question only its contribution to the Nation as an efficient commercial enterprise.

Let me, for a moment, then renew in more depth those phases of the study which deal with the economic value of the family farm and with the implication of those findings.

The Commission defines the family farm as one that does not hire more labor than the family provides, or about 1.5 man-years. The family farmer also has a substantial equity in land, equipment, or livestock, for unless he has such an investment, it is unlikely he will have managerial control or security.

It should be apparent by this definition that the size of a farm, or the amount of capital invested, or the value of farm output are only indicators, for the family farm can be big or little in these terms. The distinguishing feature of the family farm is the incentive that ownership and management of a farming operation vests in the family that does most of the work.

First of all the Commission report makes it clear that as of now the family farm is not fading away. Instead it is growing both in relation to the number of farms and to its share of production.

Taking only the measure of hired labor as a criterion, a clear picture of the dominance of the family farm emerges. In 1944, farms employing less than 1.5 man-years of hired labor accounted for 94.5 percent of all farms and they marketed 66.5 percent of all farm products sold. In 1959, these farms accounted for 95.7 percent of all farms and for 70.1 percent of all marketings.

The Commission also considered another important question. They asked what dollar volume of output, as it relates to the size of the farm, would be necessary to bring a decent living for family farmers. Here the Commission concluded that in order for the family farm to be of an adequate size—to provide the family with a standard of living on par with most other Americans—sales of $10,000 or more on the average are required, under today's conditions. Some farms grossing less than $10,000 will actually be more profitable than some which gross $20,000, but on the average the $10,000 figure is a useful guide.

Here again the Commission study shows that the trend in recent years has been strongly in this direction. Between 1949 and 1959 the number of farms with sales of $10,000 or more—and hiring less than 1.5 man-years of work—increased 95 percent. In comparison, farms selling less than $2,500 worth of farm products declined 43 percent (excluding farms omitted by change of census definition). At the same time the Commission noted that the number of farms with sales above $10,000 and hiring more than 1.5 man-years of work—the larger than family farms—also declined in number, decreasing some 3 percent in that decade.

We all recognize there is a substantial number of family farms which are not adequate in terms of gross marketings. Our goal is to enable them to become adequate, efficient family farms or to help the families who live on them to find either adequate nonfarm employment, to combine farming and off-farm jobs or, if they choose, to find jobs outside their present communities. To do otherwise would be unfair, if not cruel, to those who cannot obtain an adequate income or decent life on an inadequate farm.

The Commission findings that the family farm is a going commercial enterprise growing stronger—not weaker—seem to me to be based on solid fact. Rather than a dying vestige of a past era, the family farm continues to be the most efficient means of producing food and fiber that has ever been devised. There is no other system of farming which provides its customers with food at so low a cost in relation to total income. In no other country does the consumer eat for less than 19 percent of the average family's spendable income, or have so nutritional and diversified a diet. This, then, is the measure of the success of our American family farm.

The achievements of the family farm system contrast dramatically with the troubles so evident today in Russia and other Communist nations. Agriculture, for the most part, cannot be treated like a factory—particularly in producing the more specialized foods which people want as their incomes improve. There are too many variables to consider in agriculture, and they cannot be engineered so as to be performed simultaneously by specialized labor and machinery. There can be no efficient assembly line for agriculture. In fact, the effort to apply factory principles to farming is the weakness of Russian agriculture, and the basic reason they will never equal the family farm in productivity and efficiency.

Let me emphasize, however, that neither history nor the conditions of natural advantage necessarily guarantees the future of the family farm in the United States. I would alert you that there are forces unrelated to the efficiency of family farming which work constantly to erode its economic strength, to compress and control its markets and to alter its independent position. Concern for this danger is highlighted by the Commission study, and I would like to quote what they have said:

"The investment required in a well-organized family farm has grown to the point

where acquisition of ownership by the succeeding generation of farmers is even more difficult than it has been in the past. The net income of farm families has become a smaller proportion of income from marketings as purchased supplies and machinery have played a larger part in production; family incomes are more vulnerable than formerly to the effects of sharp price declines or crop losses resulting from adverse weather.

"Mass merchandising methods in food distribution have created markets in which buyers demand large volumes of uniformly good quality from producers. Some marketing functions once performed on the farm have been moved beyond the farm gates to processing and distribution industries. In some instances, processors are integrating entire production operations with their nonfarm operations. In others, suppliers are performing a large part of the production function under contractual arrangements. Possible future developments in this area will take the form of close working relationships between independent farmers and business firms, but disappearance of farm production as a distinct and separate operation is conceivable in some cases."

In other words, vertical integration, contract farming, and the growing dominance of the retail end of the food process—all unrelated to efficiency of the family farm—may well endanger family farm agriculture.

The Commission study also makes it clear that commodity programs have been a key influence in the growth of the adequate family farm and that these programs must continue in some form.

The study reports that, "The root of the farm problem is the inability of the ordinary economic adjustment processes to carry the extraordinary burden placed upon them by rapid technological advances in agriculture." The problem then, is overproduction, or the ability to produce far beyond our capacity to consume, sell, or give away.

The Commission study points out that the disappearance of many inadequate farms will not materially alter the overproduction problem confronting the more productive farms, just as price supports favorable to adequate family farms will not solve the income problems on the smallest farms.

Thus, the Commission concludes, "programs to support farm income have contributed, directly or indirectly, to such income and financial solvency as the more successful competitors enjoy."

The Commission report makes it clear that commodity programs, rather than being relief or social welfare programs, have been and are necessary for the efficient farms which require heavy capital investment. They are helpful to the small, inadequate size farm, but they are not designed for that purpose.

But the questions repeatedly asked and the violent criticism directed toward commodity programs, even as American agriculture is acknowledged to be supremely successful in accomplishing its prime purpose of feeding our people effectively and well, are an indication of the searching examination of agriculture now underway. As in other parts of our economy, many changes are taking place, and we are trying to understand them better.

The Commission study, for example, is one of the signs of ferment which indicate we are approaching a decisive period in American agriculture. It is a time when the people as a whole and farmers in particular are in the process of enunciating a new agricultural policy that gives meaning and direction to what seems at times to be a confused picture with unanswerable questions. We have been moving in the direction of clarification for some time, although the efforts to test the limits of the new agricultural policy are often obscured by the noise and rhetoric of the debate.

We have, for example, subjected the family farm to the most rigorous kinds of tests under the most severe conditions, and it has emerged stronger and more vigorous than before. We have tested various types of commodity programs, as well as efforts designed to eliminate them, and have found they will continue to be necessary if adequate family farms are to receive reasonable returns during a period of rapid and massive technological change.

The new agricultural policy that is gradually emerging is much broader than commodity programs alone. It recognizes that we must make full use of our resources, both natural and human, in rural America—and commodity programs alone do not provide the full range of opportunities necessary to broaden the rural economic base.

In this respect, the commodity programs of the Grange are a phase of the testing process of the nature of a new agricultural policy. I commend you for the Grange community service program, and I only wish that I could be here to congratulate the winner of your community service contest.

We are developing within the USDA a series of programs and services designed to assist the rural community and the farmer to expand the range of job and income opportunities. You have heard me talk about rural areas development before, and you will hear me talk about it in the future, for it is an essential part of a dynamic and expanding rural economy. We seek to use land, not idle it. We seek to encourage community growth, not its stagnation and decline. We seek to make use of rural resources to meet the needs of the city for outdoor recreation—for space and green land—and to provide the rural community with new income opportunities. We oppose the philosophy which would drive people off the land when there is so much need for all the goods and services which land and people can provide.

Another area where we have been testing and probing to enlarge the scope of our farm policy is in the relationship between agricultural trade and aid. This administration, as you know, has taken strong and vigorous action to protect and expand world markets for the products of our farms. I leave from here tomorrow, in fact, to attend a symposium in Amsterdam where a discussion of agricultural trade with the Common Market is now underway among government leaders, businessmen, and private citizens from both sides of the Atlantic. The USDA is sponsoring this trade conference as an effort to enlarge the peaceful dialog on ways to encourage liberal trade policies for farm products.

The President has fought hard and will continue to insist that the fair and legitimate interests of American agricultural trade be recognized by the Common Market. We are competing more and more effectively all over the world for agricultural markets. We now maintain two permanent exhibits in Western Europe and in Japan, and we join with more than 40 commodity groups in various promotion efforts. We anticipate a record export volume this fiscal year, possibly as much as $6 billion in sales as compared to $5 billion last fiscal year.

But a concern for ways to enlarge present commercial trading opportunities is not enough. Herschel Newsom recognized this clearly in his address when he said that agriculture "must achieve a climate which will give reasonable prospect * * * to its ability to meet the incredible food demands of an exploding population everywhere." He strikes to the heart of our opportunity when he said that "those who are recipients of our abundance and benevolence today will be customers of our productive plant tomorrow."

He is right. The potential expansion of our productive capacity in the United States, if it is to find markets, depends in large measure on the development throughout the world of standards of living high enough so that a growing number of people will be able to buy the products of our farms and factories. This is especially true in Latin America and the Far East. Our own continued enjoyment of abundance thus depends upon the extent to which underdeveloped peoples of the world can be helped to achieve their potential for abundance so they can buy.

There are of course many questions which remain to be answered, and I can see many difficult problems ahead as we build a new agricultural policy. But there is emerging today a much fuller appreciation of the role of agriculture and rural America in the modern world in which we live. We should encourage and stimulate this appreciation to the maximum extent possible, for out of it can come new and unprecedented growth and opportunity. It will require that we do many new things, not the least of which is to begin thinking in terms of a world of science and technology and potential abundance for all—not in terms of yesterday's world of scarcity and hunger.

After many years' intimate association with the problems of agriculture, I am increasingly convinced that the key to peace and plenty in the world of the future is agriculture. It promises a new dimension of living for all Americans, and it can provide the means of achieving adequate food and fiber in a world which even today is still two-thirds hungry.

Perhaps you will say it is a dream. But it is not an impossible dream, and I ask you to share it with me, and to work with me to make it a reality.

---

THE FAMILY FARM IN AMERICAN AGRICULTURE

(A report of the National Agricultural Advisory Commission, November 12, 1963)

The family farm remains the backbone of American agriculture because it has shown remarkable capacity to adapt to new methods and markets in a dynamic economy. The very changes that have enabled it to remain efficient, however, have so transformed it in some respects that an erroneous impression sometimes exists that the family farm has disappeared.

The essential feature of a family farm is not its acreage or its technological progressiveness but the degree to which productive effort and its rewards are vested in the family. The family farm is an agricultural business in which the operator is a risk-taking manager, has a substantial investment, and, with his family, supplies a large part of the labor. Under this arrangement, the incentive to produce efficiently becomes especially dominant.

The boundary between family farms and the larger-than-family farms is necessarily indistinct. Employment of two or three men is not now inconsistent with the family farm, nor was it 50 years ago. For statistical purposes, however, we may say that the amount of hired labor does not exceed the amount of family labor, which on the average farm is about 1.5 man-years. Substantial equity in land, equipment, or livestock is involved also in the concept of the family farm. Unless the operator has a significant investment, he is not likely to have much managerial control or security.

TECHNOLOGY AND CHANGES IN FARMING

Mechanization and other technological advances have greatly increased the amount of farm products a family can produce. The desire for more income provides the motive, while mechanization and other technology provide the means, for family farmers to enlarge the size of their farm businesses. These developments—in many ways paralleling automation in industry—mean that fewer resources, including labor, are needed in agriculture. Opportunities for young men to get started on adequate family farms are

necessarily much curtailed because of substitution of capital for labor.

Adequate family farms today are commercial enterprises in which the operator's technical know-how and managerial skill are more important than his physical prowess. Credit and leasing arrangements frequently are the means by which the family brings under its control sufficient resources for an efficient unit. The level of living possible on a semi-subsistence farm, while perhaps no lower now than generations ago, is no longer acceptable to farm people who wish to share in the rising incomes characteristic of the American economy.

THE FARM PROBLEM AND THE FAMILY FARM

The farm problem is a problem of persistent income disadvantages for farm people. One aspect is low income on farms having far too few resources for an adequate producing unit. Another aspect is low earnings, compared with returns outside of agriculture, on labor and investment on the productive farms that produce the great bulk of our agricultural products. The latter grows out of a persistent tendency to overproduce as a result of advancing farm technology. It is intensified by shrinkage of some markets as other technology develops substitutes for farm products—for example, manmade fibers for natural fibers.

When improved production methods become available, individual farmers adopt them, increase output, strive to expand, and bid up the price of land. Production rises faster than the market grows; prices and incomes are driven down. The numbers of farms and of farmworkers decline, but the rate of adjustment required to hold farm incomes at reasonable levels exceeds the feasible rate. The age of many farmers (50.5 was the average age in 1959), their lack of skill for nonfarm work, distance from industrial centers, and unemployment in the economy at large are practical obstacles to more rapid adjustment. The basic difficulties of agriculture as this process unfolds would exist whether the same farm resources were divided among half as many farms or twice as many. Family farms by far predominate in our efficient agriculture, but they do not create the circumstances in which downward pressure on farm incomes is generated.

Policy to maintain reasonable incomes in American agriculture is not an attempt to preserve an inefficient or anachronistic institution. The root of the farm problem is the inability of ordinary economic adjustment processes to carry the extraordinary burden placed upon them by rapid technological advance in agriculture. The difficulty is intensified by the high efficiency of U.S. agriculture, the speed with which it translates innovations into more production, and its inability voluntarily to hold excess capacity idle.

Economic adversity has fallen most heavily on operators of small farms who, because of age, inadequate resources, or other reasons, have not been able either to keep up in the race to expand or to find remunerative nonfarm employment. But the cost-price squeeze has been general throughout agriculture. In most of farming, programs to support farm income have contributed, directly or indirectly, to such income and financial solvency as the more successful competitors have enjoyed.

DEVELOPMENT AND CONTRIBUTIONS OF THE FAMILY FARM SYSTEM

At the time of the establishment of the thirteen American Colonies, feudalism was the dominant pattern in European farming. But though attempts were made, the system was not easily exported to the New World. Europeans escaping the oppressions of feudalism demanded assurance that they would become farmowners if they came to the Colonies. In some instances, headrights to small amounts of land were offered to those who could get transportation to America—a forerunner of the homestead movement. Over a long period, settlers resisted and eventually abolished the entail system, primogeniture, quitrents, and other restrictions on opportunity to own, operate, or develop land.

Owner-operation of land was admirably suited to the requirements of settling a new country. It was, moreover, consistent with early Americans' beliefs in equal opportunity for individuals, their equal rights as citizens, and identification of praiseworthy character with proficient work. The family farm became a symbol of such virtues in a predominantly agricultural society.

The land policy by which the West was opened up reflected strong attachment to the family farm ideal. After several anticipatory measures, the Homestead Act of 1862 made homesteading the established national policy. Also in that year, the land-grant college system and the U.S. Department of Agriculture were created. These became the basis for the research and educational work that farmers could not do for themselves but which was essential for a progressive agriculture. A century later, systems patterned after the American model were to be established in remote countries of the world in an effort to stimulate agricultural development.

By 1920, the long period in which agriculture supplied the Nation's food and fiber by increasing the crop acreage and labor force had come to an end. Thereafter, production was increased by mechanization, improved plant varieties, better cultural practices, and all the other advances lumped under the heading "Technology." The economic pressures constituting the present farm problem began then and strengthened in the following decades, though the depression of the 1930's and wartime conditions at times masked their effects. Both agriculture's technological performance and the resulting economic pressures have been especially high in the past decade, as described in preceding pages of this report.

The rising efficiency of family farm agriculture over the decades has enabled the United States to shift gradually to a highly industrialized economy producing the world's highest level of living—including more and better food per person than when 90 percent of the population was agricultural. The American people are better fed, and for a smaller proportion of their income, than any other nation. Family farmers have demonstrated their ability to meet the requirements of a technological age as well as they once met the needs of settling a new country. The land ownership system on which the family farm is based has proved clearly superior to collectivist arrangements or to feudalism as transplanted to countries now struggling to develop economically.

THE CURRENT POSITION OF THE FAMILY FARM

Though the character and size of the family farm are changing, as an institution it has held its own in American agriculture. In 1944, farms employing less than 1.5 man-years of hired labor comprised 94.5 percent of all farms and marketed 66.5 percent of all farm products sold. In 1959, such farms accounted for 95.7 percent of all farms and for 70.1 percent of all marketings.[1]

The basic economic influence on the farm size toward which agriculture is moving at any one time is the relation of production costs per unit of output to size of operation. Farms too small to employ family labor productively, using modern methods, have high production costs if family labor is valued at moderate annual wages. Since the high unit costs are not compensated for by correspondingly high prices, the earnings of the family for its labor and investment on such a farm are in fact low.

Production costs per unit in most types of farming fall as size of farm increases up to the point where available family labor and a full complement of equipment are utilized effectively. Beyond that point, costs per unit typically do not change much. Exceptions exist in certain types of farming and marketing as well as production economies sometimes are obtained by larger-than-family farms. But in most of agriculture the well-organized family farm is as efficient as any unit. Indeed, the managerial flexibility and the profit incentive of the family farm often give it an advantage over larger farms depending on salaried employees for management and labor.

The drive for proficiency and the increase in the size of farm a family can operate are reflected in the rapid reduction in the number of the smallest farms. Between 1949 and 1959, the number of farms selling less than $2,500 worth of farm products declined 43 percent (excluding farms omitted by change of census definition). The number of farms with sales between $2,500 and $10,000 dropped 21 percent. The number with sales exceeding $10,000 but hiring less than 1.5 man-years of labor increased 95 percent. Thus the tendency was to move toward efficient, family-size farms. In contrast, the number of farms with sales in excess of $10,000 and hiring 1.5 or more man-years of labor declined 3 percent.

Changes in the farm labor force suggest similar conclusions. In 1910, 3.4 million hired workers (USDA series) comprised 24.9 percent of the farm labor force. In 1952, 2.1 million hired workers were only 23.4 percent of the total. Hired workers declined in absolute numbers to 1.8 million in 1962 but rose to 27.3 percent of the farm labor force. The increase in the proportion reflected the rapid decline in the smallest farms rather than an increasing importance of larger-than-family farms relative to efficient family farms.

Tenancy in American agriculture has fallen steadily since 1930. In that year, 42.4 percent of all farms were operated by tenants; in 1959, the percentage was 19.8. Only about one-half of 1 percent of all farms are operated my managers. Sharecropping in the South has been falling rapidly. Such changes point to increasing managerial control and financial equity on the part of operators.

In contrast, contract farming has curtailed the range of decisions left to some farm operators, especially in poultry farming. Developed in a proper way, contract farming can be a means by which family farms gain access to capital or establish desirable market outlets for their products. Such results are particularly likely to be obtained if farmer-controlled cooperatives make the contractual arrangements. Experience has shown, however, that contract farming can also put the operator of a farm nearly in the position of a hired farm laborer with no assurance that the arrangement into which he has entered will be continued. On balance, the decline of tenancy probably has outweighed operators' loss of managerial control under contracts, but efforts should be made to steer the development of contract farming in directions conducive to maintaining independent family farms.

PROSPECTS FOR THE FAMILY FARM

The ability of the family farm to hold its own despite dramatic changes in agriculture in recent decades indicates its competitive vigor. The average size of farm will increase and the number of farms will decline as farmers continue to adjust to technological advance, but the family farm promises to dominate agriculture indefinitely if a favorable economic environment is provided. Positive programs will be needed if family farms are to be assured of sharing equitably

[1] Sources of information and elaboration of the main points contained in this report are contained in the accompanying supplement.

in the rising incomes of the American economy. A great challenge for farm policy is to keep the high productivity of a family farm agriculture from resulting in chronic depression of the income of farm people.

The relation of production costs to size of farm continues to permit well-organized family farms to be as efficient as larger operations in most types of production. Especially in crop farming, it is not possible to break the production process down into many steps to be performed simultaneously by specialized labor and machinery. Thus an important advantage of large-scale factory production is not available in much of agriculture.

The present geographic distribution of family-size and larger-than-family farms seems highly stable. Each type shows a strong tendency to persist in the areas where it has been long established. There is little prospect that large farms will become less important in California, the Southwest, the Mississippi Delta, or Florida. Elsewhere, the family farm has great staying power.

Despite the vigor of the family farm, certain developments do pose problems for its future and for its continuing contribution to the Nation. The investment required in a well-organized family farm has grown to the point where acquisition of ownership by the succeeding generation of farmers is even more difficult than it has been in the past. The net income of farm families has become a smaller proportion of income from marketings as purchased supplies and machinery have played a larger part in production; family incomes are more vulnerable than formerly to the effects of sharp price declines or crop losses resulting from adverse weather.

Mass merchandising methods in food distribution have created markets in which buyers demand large volumes of uniformly good quality from producers. As a result, marketing advantages for large producers of some products are appearing that formerly did not exist or were of little importance. Some marketing functions once performed on the farm have been moved beyond the farm gate to processing and distribution industries. This shift has reduced the economic services to be provided by farmers and has presented them with new kinds of marketing problems. In some instances, processors are integrating entire production operations with their nonfarm operations. In others, suppliers are performing a large part of the production function under contractual arrangements. Possibly future developments in this area will take the form of close working relationships between independent farmers and business firms, but disappearance of farm production as a distinct and separate operation is conceivable in some cases.

The self-employed farmer competes with others like himself and with hired farm labor. The farm family will not earn favorable returns on its own labor when hired labor is chronically cheap. Farm wages vary widely among areas and type of work, but average farm wages are low compared with industrial wages. The reasons are complex and include the lack of skill and low productivity of part of the hired labor force. An abrupt advance in the cost of hired labor would severely squeeze many farm employers. Over the long run, however, the opportunity for family farmers to compete and to earn satisfactory returns for their labor will be enhanced if wages and working conditions for hired farm labor compare favorably with those in industry.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR A HEALTHY FAMILY FARM AGRICULTURE

1. Public understanding: One of the primary needs for achieving a healthy family farm structure is a broad public understanding of how family farming, the high productivity of agriculture, and the farm problem are related to each other. Misconceptions lead to beliefs that the farm problem would be solved if family farms were eliminated, that farm programs are intended to preserve an institution of sentimental but no economic value, or that farmers could readily solve their own problems if they only would. We recommended, therefore, that a concerted and continuing effort be made by farmers themselves and by public agencies serving agriculture to inform the people of the country about the economic position of farming and of the place of family farms in it, so that realistic and effective policy can be forthcoming.

2. Education and related services for farmers: Continued public support of agricultural research, extension, education, soil conservation, and similar services will contribute to a favorable environment for family farms. Such services have helped family farmers to be as technologically progressive as the largest farm operations. In other circumstances, giant units capable of hiring technical experts and even of developing their own trade secrets would have had an important advantage. Redirection of research, extension, and related activities is necessary from time to time to meet new problems of agriculture and of rural areas. We recommend a policy of combining (a) technical services for individual farmers with (b) programs to permit orderly adjustment to technological change as being in the best interests both of family farms and of the economy at large.

3. Strengthening and broadening the role of farmer-controlled cooperatives: Encouragement of agricultural cooperatives assists family farmers to realize economies of large-scale purchasing and marketing. The greater emphasis on volume and uniformity by buyers in some commodity markets has increased the need for cooperative marketing by individual farmers. Beyond these long-established functions, cooperatives are increasingly challenged to develop bargaining power more nearly commensurate with that of the giant firms with which they often deal. We recommend examination of the legal framework within which cooperatives operate, credit policies, and the USDA's work on problems of cooperatives, followed by action to put into effect such changes as seem capable of strengthening and extending the role of farmer cooperatives.

4. Ownership of land by farm operators: Family farmers may come to have a serious disadvantage in competing for land not because they cannot operate it efficiently but because of limited financial resources. We recommend reducing the competition for farmland by nonfarmers by changes in income tax provisions now favorable to such bidders. We urge that more adequate information be obtained on the ownership of farmland, on the influence of demand from outside of agriculture, on the effects of inheritance taxes, and on the technical means by which demand for land might be confined more largely to farm operators. We also recommend that State and local governments base taxation of farmland on its agricultural value while it is being farmed.

5. Special needs for credit: Existing programs to extend credit to farmers with reasonable prospects for success but with limited financial resources have had a good repayment record and have demonstrated their usefulness. Care should be taken to direct these efforts toward farms of sufficient size to permit efficient operation. We recommend that special attention be given to (a) credit for combining small units into adequate family farms under potentially good managers, and (b) modification of credit instruments and practices to permit more readily the carrying of a stable level of debt once the operator has acquired a reasonable equity.

6. Minimum wages and working conditions for hired agricultural labor: Better employment conditions and wages for hired farm labor will improve the competitive position of family farms relative to that of larger-than-family farms. Concern about the welfare of farm people surely includes, in a democratic society, the welfare of families who work for farmers. Farm wages and other conditions of employment are at or above industrial minimums in important parts of agriculture but not in all. We recommend that minimum wages and improved working conditions, in terms adapted to agricultural production, be extended, by stages, to hired farmworkers on a national basis until comparability with industrial minimums is attained.[2]

7. Equal application of price support programs to all farms: A recurring question is whether farm programs should be designed to give special advantages to small farms. Small minimum allotments often are necessary for administrative feasibility. Proposals for more significant advantages for small farms frequently distinguish between small and economically adequate farms rather than between family and large-scale farms. Such provisions might operate to tenants' disadvantage in areas where tenant-operated farms are larger and more productive than the average. Proficient production is highly valued in the American economy; program concessions to inefficiency are not likely to endure. We recommend the application of price support programs equally to all farms, with modifications for administrative effectiveness and flexibility of farm operations, as the policy most likely to preserve the good name of the family farm and to be consistent with effective operation of farm programs.

8. The inadequate farm unit: Despite the large decline in numbers of the smallest farms in the past two decades, it must be recognized that many uneconomic units remain on which family incomes will be low even if price-cost relationships are favorable for the family farms that produce the bulk of all farm products. The size of farm required for an adequate unit is likely to increase as technology advances. The earning power of some operators of small farms is low because of their advanced age or inability to acquire other skills; the resulting income problem should be treated as a general social problem rather than as a farm problem. Little real good will be done by somehow forcing families out of unfavorable farm situations into unemployment in cities, though statistically the farm situation would be made to look better. This difficult problem must be approached from many directions: Development of rural nonfarm resources, training for adults with potential earning power in industry, employment information, education and counseling of rural youth for nonfarm careers, and consolidation of small farms. A high level of employment in the economy at large is absolutely vital for long-range solution of the problem. We commend the sympathetic frankness with which this situation has been recognized in the establishment of rural development and other programs, and we recommend continued efforts on all fronts to alleviate it.

9. Farm price and income programs: Farm programs will continue to be necessary if families on adequate farms are to receive reasonable returns for their labor and investment. The disappearance of many inadequate farms will not materially alter the overproduction problem confronting the more productive farms, just as prices favorable to adequate family farms will not solve the income problems on the smallest farms. We recommend continued efforts to develop farm programs to create earnings on adequate family farms comparable with those outside of agriculture and to promote the long-run interests of the general public. Such programs properly include measures to

[2] For three dissenting views on minimum wages, see following page.

put agricultural products to such useful purposes as aid to underdeveloped countries and domestic food distribution to needy people. Almost surely some means of restraining production, whether by so-called voluntary or mandatory means, will be required. It is not reasonable to expect to have precisely enough farm capacity so that full production just clears the market at satisfactory prices in normal times; and it would not be prudent national policy to attempt it. It will also be desirable to carry reserve stocks for emergencies as a national security measure and to level out consumers' supplies rather than as a strictly farm program. Farming operates in an economy in which substantial power to maintain prices and wages exists for other groups. Farming will need the stabilizing influence of price programs for key commodities if it is to share equitably in the product of the total economy to which it contributes so much.

STATEMENT OF CHARLES R. SAYRE REGARDING RECOMMENDATION NO. 6

In this report the proposal for mandatory minimum wages and upgrading of farm working conditions is coupled with a specific objective, to "improve the competitive position of family farms relative to that of larger-than-family farms."

A much broader perspective is required to preappraise fully the problems which would be involved.

Several probable effects—some good and some bad—are obvious. Added rural unemployment would be a direct result of a rigid farm wage structure. Accelerated labor-reduction technologies would cut heavily into future farm-community job opportunities.

In many areas where hand labor is a seasonal need there are numerous off-season benefits that accrue to farmworkers, making their returns on a year-around basis greater than is indicated by statistical measures. Minimum wage scales would eliminate such arrangements.

A bit less obvious, but of serious consequence, these impacts would hit mainly the least trainable parts of the Nation's wage earners.

The pattern of farm production in the United States has evolved following the principles of comparative advantage and specialization with high volumes of interregional trade. Elimination of wage differential would tend to disrupt mobility and other relationships which would increase selling prices for food and fiber. This would lessen further the competitive strength of U.S. farm products in markets highly sensitive to price adjustments.

Additionally, with the imposition of minimum wages some production areas would be helped economically; others would be damaged. Family farms and farm-based enterprises would be hurt alongside the larger-than-family farms in the areas forcefully shifted in their comparative relationships to a disadvantageous position.

The competitive climate for labor, capital, managerial capacity, and land within production areas and between production areas must be taken into account, along with industrial wages for adequate considerations of labor returns as a part of general farm policy.

The further development of the family farm is one of the American ideals which should be fostered. New entry into family farm status should be made as easy as possible. The ambitious and prudent rural family farm unit of their own needs the freedom of job choices, of selling their labor —all of it—to best advantage. That is the usual way in which families, who operate farms, seek to push for increased size of business, either vertically or by taking on more land.

Restrictions upon job opportunities for the "landless" rural family wanting to achieve family farm status would often limit their income to that of the head of the family. It would tend to promote various types of "moonlighting" and other evasions. It would give a competitive advantage to the rural family operating land versus landless rural family residents. The family farm household could "use and sell" all of its labor. The nonfarm family would be hobbled by statute.

It is my view that thorough studies should be made of the full implications of mandatory minimum wages and their likely economic and social effects to provide more adequate grounds for farm policy determinations. Proposals for minimum wages in relation to a single target could lead to serious distortions in the rural economy.

STATEMENT OF WILLIAM V. RAWLINGS REGARDING RECOMMENDATION NO. 6

I wish to disassociate myself from concurrence in this recommendation.

I recognize that employment conditions and wages for hired farm labor are a matter of concern, but I cannot agree that the solution lies in this recommendation.

I view this problem as a social problem and I do not agree that the economic condition of agriculture is such that will permit agriculture to bear the entire burden of correcting this social problem.

It may be that the recommendation for hired farm labor will improve the competitive position of family farms relative to that of larger-than-family farms. The fact remains that the accomplishment of the recommendation would involve a substantial increase in overhead for family farms without any prospect of comparable increases in income and the result would be a further shrinkage in the already low, net income of family farms. I cannot reason that although the shrinkage in net income for family farms may be less than the shrinkage in net income for larger-than-family farms, that such a result would be in the interest of family farms, nor consistent with the objective of parity of income for risktaking farm operators.

Further, it is my feeling that the necessary working hours during rush periods, the fact that much farm labor is paid a steady wage even through periods of unemployment and partial employment, the wide variance of fringe benefits to many farm laborers such as housing, etc., all add up to a most difficult, if not impossible problem in enforcing such legislation should the objectives of this recommendation be enacted into law.

STATEMENT OF C. D. DOSKER REGARDING RECOMMENDATION NO. 6

I am not a bit sure that the imposition of minimum wages is going to improve the competitive position of family farms in relation to that of larger-than-family farms.

In many cases there are conditions other than that of wages alone which affect the hired employees of the family farm. This has to do with housing, the furnishing of food in the form of home-slaughtered meats, vegetables, poultry, fuel, and many things that enter into the cost of living as against the wage earner on the larger-than-family farm.

I am concerned that the imposition of minimum wages may eliminate from employment many people who due to physical handicaps can now find some employment in agriculture when they are no longer able to work in industry and thus take a load off the public relief rolls.

The application of minimum wages to farm help is going to impose an additional bookkeeping problem upon the family farmer.

I am certainly an advocate of the highest wages possible, but I have seen in industry what happens to the physically handicapped, and I think these people are entitled to employment, and no regulation should make it impossible for these people to be self-sufficient.

I think it is rather wishful thinking to talk about the wage level of farm help attaining that of industrial minimums. The law of supply and demand is just as effective in agriculture as it is in industry, but we must remember that there will continue to be a large number of subsistence farmers. The same must apply on the farm as in industry. There must be an exemption on the number of employees that a farmer could have before coming under the effects of a regulation of this kind. You will always have the need of migratory labor at harvest time. Many schoolchildren now find some source of income in this type of work.

As I stated at the meeting, I think section 6 needs a great deal of study before any outright recommendations are made in regard to minimum wages and working conditions for hired agricultural labor.

STATISTICAL SUPPLEMENT

The following pages contain additional information, mostly statistical, relating to the position of the family farm in American agriculture. The first four tables were prepared by Radoje Nikolitch of the Farm Production Economics Division, Economic Research Service, USDA. "Abnormal" farms, sometimes omitted from the tables, are institutional farms, Indian reservations, agricultural experiment stations, grazing associations, and the like. They comprised less than 0.1 percent of all farms in 1959.

The information given by tables 1–3 has been summarized in the main body of this report. Table 4 gives additional detail on the largest farms; some of the farms with sales of farm products exceeding $100,000 in 1959 employed less than 1.5 man-years of hired labor.

Table 5 records the decline in the importance of tenants, including croppers, since 1930. Both the proportion of farms operated and the proportion of cropland harvested have declined steeply. Part owners have increased in importance as owners have expanded by renting additional land and as some tenants have purchased land.

As table 6 shows, full and part owners together operate about 75 percent of the farms in all value-of-sales classes above $2,500. The percentage of full ownership is greatest on farms having sales of less than $2,500. Table 7 shows the large variation in sales per "commercial" farm, by tenure class, among the major regions of the country. In some areas—Illinois and Iowa—the tenant-operated farms are distinctly larger, on the average, than those operated by full owners; in others—Alabama, Mississippi—the reverse is true.

Changes in the numbers of hired and family farmworkers are given in table 8. The peak in total farm employment was reached in 1916, at 13,632,000 workers.

Tables 9 and 10 give data on farm real estate sales. Transfers of a single farm from a buyer to a seller who will operate it as a single farm are less frequent than sales of real estate to become part of a farm. Tenants have become less important as buyers of farms as their numbers have declined; owner-operators have become more important as buyers. The principal change on the selling side has been an increase in the importance of miscellaneous sellers other than active or retired farmers, estates, or lending agencies.

The inability of the smallest farms to provide an adequate living for the family has led to more off-farm work as well as to larger farms. In 1934, only 11.2 percent of farm operators worked off the farm 100 or more days (partly due to high industrial unemployment). The percentage rose to 23.3 in 1949 and to 29.9 in 1959. As table 11 shows, off-farm work was most important on the smallest farms in 1959. Five out of eight farm operators selling less than $2,500 worth of farm products had other income exceeding the value of products sold.

TABLE 1.—*Number of farms by value of farm marketings and proportions of all farm marketings* [1]

| Value of marketings [2] | Farms: Number 1949 | Farms: Number 1959 | Farms: Change from 1949 to 1959 | Proportion of all farms 1949 | Proportion of all farms 1959 | Proportion of all farm marketings 1949 | Proportion of all farm marketings 1959 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | *Thousands* | *Thousands* | *Percent* | *Percent* | *Percent* | *Percent* | *Percent* |
| $20,000 and over | [3] 229 | 312 | +36 | 4.3 | 8.4 | 34.3 | 50.1 |
| $10,000 to $19,999 | [3] 255 | 482 | +89 | 4.7 | 13.0 | 16.7 | 22.0 |
| $5,000 to $9,999 | 721 | 653 | −9 | 13.4 | 17.7 | 22.8 | 15.5 |
| $2,500 to $4,999 | 882 | 617 | −30 | 16.4 | 16.7 | 14.4 | 7.4 |
| $2,500 and over | 2,087 | 2,064 | −1 | 38.8 | 55.8 | 88.2 | 95.0 |
| Under $2,500 | 3,287 | 1,634 | −50 | 61.2 | 44.2 | 11.8 | 5.0 |
| All | 5,374 | 3,698 | −31 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |

[1] Abnormal farms excluded.
[2] Prices received by farmers decreased 3 percent. This change is too small to have a bearing on change in the number of farms by value of marketings.
[3] Preliminary estimates.

Source: Derived from U.S. censuses of agriculture.

TABLE 2.—*Number and marketings of farms with specified man-years of hired labor as percentage of all farms, United States, 1944 and 1959* [1]

| Man-years of hired labor | Farms 1944 Number [3] | Farms 1944 Percent of total | Farms 1959 Number | Farms 1959 Percent of total | Marketings [2] 1944 Value | Marketings 1944 Percent of total | Marketings 1959 Value | Marketings 1959 Percent of total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | *Thousands* | | *Thousands* | | *Millions* | | *Millions* | |
| Farms with less than 1.5 man-years | 4,925 | 94.5 | 3,542 | 95.7 | $13,318 | 66.5 | $21,359 | 70.1 |
| Farms with 1.5 man-years or over | 284 | 5.5 | 159 | 4.3 | 6,693 | 33.5 | 9,110 | 29.9 |
| Total | 5,209 | 100.0 | 3,701 | 100.0 | 20,011 | 100.0 | 30,469 | 100.0 |

[1] Alaska and Hawaii not included.
[2] Valued at 1959 prices received by farmers.
[3] Adjusted to 1959 definition of farm.

Source: 1945 Census of Agriculture and data derived from special tabulation by the census of a sample of farms for the 1959 Census of Agriculture.

TABLE 3.—*Number and percentage change in number of farms with specified man-years of hired labor and value of marketings, and percentage of all farms, United States, 1949 and 1959* [1]

| Man-years of hired labor and value of marketings | Number of farms 1949 | Number of farms 1959 | Percent change Increase | Percent change Decrease | Proportion of all farms 1949 | Proportion of all farms 1959 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | *Thousands* | *Thousands* | *Percent* | *Percent* | *Percent* | *Percent* |
| Less than 1.5 man-years: | | | | | | |
| $10,000 or more marketings | 334 | 650 | 95 | -------- | 16 | 31 |
| $2,500 to $9,999 marketings | 1,529 | 1,257 | -------- | 18 | 73 | 61 |
| Total | 1,863 | 1,907 | 2 | -------- | 89 | 92 |
| 1.5 or more man-years: | | | | | | |
| $10,000 or more marketings | 150 | 144 | -------- | 4 | 7 | 7 |
| $2,500 to $9,999 marketings | 74 | 13 | -------- | 82 | 14 | 1 |
| Total | 224 | 157 | -------- | 30 | 11 | 8 |
| All farms with $2,500 or more | 2,087 | 2,064 | -------- | 1 | 100 | 100 |

[1] Alaska and Hawaii not included.

Source: Derived from U.S. Census of Agriculture, and data derived from special tabulation by the Bureau of the Census of a sample of farms for the 1959 Census of Agriculture.

TABLE 4.—*Numbers of farms and farm marketings by size of farms in value of sales and by specified man-years of hired labor, United States, 1959* [1]

| Size of farm in value of sales | Number of farms: Total | Proportion with— Less than 1.5 man-years of hired labor | Proportion with— More than 1.5 man-years of hired labor | Value of marketings: Total | Proportion of farms with— Less than 1.5 man-years of hired labor | Proportion of farms with— More than 1.5 man-years of hired labor |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | *Number* | *Percent* | *Percent* | *Thousand dollars* | *Percent* | *Percent* |
| $100,000 or more | 19,861 | 11.3 | 88.7 | 4,862,959 | 7.6 | 92.4 |
| $40,000 to $99,999 | 81,974 | 46.6 | 53.4 | 4,658,830 | 44.0 | 56.0 |
| $40,000 or more | 101,835 | 39.4 | 60.6 | 9,521,789 | 25.4 | 74.6 |
| Less than $40,000 | 3,599,529 | 97.3 | 2.7 | 19,788,474 | 90.6 | 9.4 |
| Total, all farms | 3,701,364 | 95.7 | 4.3 | 29,310,263 | 70.1 | 29.9 |

[1] Does not include Alaska and Hawaii.

Source: Data derived from special tabulation by the Bureau of the Census of a sample of farms for the 1959 Census of Agriculture.

TABLE 5.—*Changes in importance of different forms of tenure, United States, 1920–59*

| Year | Full owners | Part owners | Managers | All tenants | Croppers [1] | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Percent of farm operators: | | | | | | |
| 1920 | 52.2 | 8.7 | 1.1 | 38.1 | 8.7 | 100 |
| 1930 | 46.3 | 10.4 | .9 | 42.4 | 12.3 | 100 |
| 1940 | 50.6 | 10.1 | .6 | 38.8 | 8.9 | 100 |
| 1950 | 57.4 | 15.3 | .4 | 26.9 | 6.4 | 100 |
| 1959 | 57.1 | 22.5 | .6 | 19.8 | 3.3 | 100 |
| Percent of cropland harvested: | | | | | | |
| 1929 | 34.6 | 21.6 | 1.9 | 41.9 | 5.4 | 100 |
| 1939 | 35.9 | 22.1 | 2.0 | 40.0 | 4.0 | 100 |
| 1949 | 35.2 | 33.0 | 2.1 | 29.7 | 2.4 | 100 |
| 1959 | 30.4 | 42.7 | 2.0 | 24.9 | .9 | 100 |

[1] South only. Included in "All tenants."

Source: Census of Agriculture.

TABLE 6.—*Distribution of farms among tenure classes, by value of products sold, United States, 1959*

[Percent of farms in class]

| Value of products sold per farm | Full owners | Part owners | Managers | All tenants | Croppers [1] | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| $40,000 or more | 31.4 | 44.0 | 5.6 | 19.1 | 0.2 | 100 |
| $20,000 to $39,999 | 32.4 | 41.2 | 1.6 | 24.8 | .3 | 100 |
| $10,000 to $19,999 | 35.6 | 37.2 | .7 | 26.6 | .6 | 100 |
| $5,000 to $9,999 | 44.5 | 30.6 | .4 | 24.5 | 2.8 | 100 |
| $2,500 to $4,999 | 54.1 | 22.8 | .3 | 22.8 | 6.4 | 100 |
| Less than $2,500 [2] | 74.4 | 11.2 | .1 | 14.3 | 3.7 | 100 |
| All farms [3] | 57.1 | 22.5 | .6 | 19.8 | 3.3 | 100 |

[1] South only. Included in "All tenants."
[2] Includes part-time and part-retirement farms but not "abnormal" farms.
[3] Includes "abnormal" farms.

Source: 1959 Census of Agriculture, vol. II, ch. X.

TABLE 7.—*Average sales per commercial farm* [1] *in different tenure classes, by regions, 1959*

| Area or region | Full owners | Part owners | Managers | All tenants | Croppers | All farms |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| The North | $9,226 | $13,922 | $61,163 | $12,865 | -------- | $11,703 |
| Illinois, Iowa | 11,120 | 16,928 | 66,560 | 15,855 | -------- | 14,496 |
| The South | 7,659 | 12,581 | 67,291 | 6,519 | $3,794 | 9,147 |
| Alabama, Mississippi | 6,964 | 10,922 | 51,194 | [2] 3,511 | 2,751 | 6,796 |
| The West | 17,427 | 33,435 | 186,053 | 26,070 | -------- | 26,884 |
| California | 24,261 | 64,738 | 227,226 | 45,017 | -------- | 42,267 |
| United States | 9,549 | 15,533 | 89,277 | 10,726 | -------- | 12,147 |

[1] Census definition. All farms with value of sales of $2,500 or more plus farms with sales between $50 and $2,499 and not part time, part retirement, or abnormal.
[2] $4,207 for tenants other than croppers.

Source: From tabulations for a sample of farms, 1959 Census of Agriculture, vol. II, ch. X.

TABLE 8.—*Average annual number of farmworkers, United States*

| Year | Family workers | Hired workers | Total workers | Hired as percent of total |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | *Thousands* | *Thousands* | *Thousands* | |
| 1910 | 10,174 | 3,381 | 13,555 | 24.9 |
| 1920 | 10,041 | 3,391 | 13,432 | 25.2 |
| 1930 | 9,307 | 3,190 | 12,407 | 25.5 |
| 1940 | 8,300 | 2,679 | 10,979 | 24.4 |
| 1950 | 7,597 | 2,329 | 9,926 | 23.5 |
| 1951 | 7,310 | 2,236 | 9,546 | 23.4 |
| 1952 | 7,005 | 2,144 | 9,149 | 23.4 |
| 1953 | 6,775 | 2,089 | 8,864 | 23.6 |
| 1954 | 6,579 | 2,060 | 8,639 | 23.8 |
| 1955 | 6,347 | 2,017 | 8,364 | 24.1 |
| 1956 | 5,899 | 1,921 | 7,820 | 24.6 |
| 1957 | 5,682 | 1,895 | 7,577 | 25.0 |
| 1958 | 5,570 | 1,955 | 7,525 | 26.0 |
| 1959 | 5,390 | 1,952 | 7,342 | 26.6 |
| 1960 | 5,172 | 1,885 | 7,057 | 26.7 |
| 1961 | 5,029 | 1,890 | 6,919 | 27.3 |
| 1962 | 4,873 | 1,827 | 6,700 | 27.3 |

Source: U.S. Department of Agriculture.

TABLE 9.—*Percentage of sales of rural real estate by type of intended use*

| Item | 1957 | 1958 | 1959 | 1960 | 1961 | 1962 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Single farm bought as— | | | | | | |
| Single farm | 48 | 45 | 43 | 42 | 40 | 39 |
| Part of farm | 18 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 20 |
| Part-time farm | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| Total | 69 | 66 | 65 | 65 | 64 | 62 |
| Part of farm bought as— | | | | | | |
| Single farm | 6 | 7 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 6 |
| Part of farm | 19 | 20 | 22 | 23 | 24 | 24 |
| Part-time farm | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Total | 26 | 28 | 29 | 30 | 31 | 32 |

Source: Farm Production Economics Division, Economic Research Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture.

TABLE 10.—*Farm real estate transfers: Percentage distribution by type of buyer and seller, United States, years ended Mar. 1*

[In percent]

TYPE OF BUYER

| Year | Tenant | Owner-operator | Retired farmer | Non-farmer | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1944 | 32.8 | 33.3 | 2.8 | 31.1 | 100 |
| 1945 | 28.6 | 34.4 | 3.3 | 33.7 | 100 |
| 1946 | 29.2 | 34.6 | 3.5 | 32.7 | 100 |
| 1947 | 30.1 | 33.9 | 3.8 | 32.2 | 100 |
| 1948 | 32.3 | 35.5 | 4.0 | 28.2 | 100 |
| 1949 | 31.0 | 36.5 | 4.6 | 27.9 | 100 |
| 1950 | 30.6 | 36.5 | 4.5 | 28.4 | 100 |
| 1951 | 25.7 | 37.5 | 4.7 | 32.1 | 100 |
| 1952 | 24.8 | 38.3 | 4.7 | 32.2 | 100 |
| 1953 | 23.7 | 38.3 | 4.3 | 33.7 | 100 |
| 1954 | 23.7 | 38.1 | 4.3 | 33.9 | 100 |
| 1955 | 24.1 | 38.7 | 4.4 | 32.8 | 100 |
| 1956 | 21.7 | 37.9 | 4.9 | 35.5 | 100 |
| 1957 | 19.9 | 39.9 | 4.2 | 35.9 | 100 |
| 1958 | 20.0 | 39.8 | 5.2 | 35.0 | 100 |
| 1959 | 18.4 | 41.4 | 4.0 | 36.2 | 100 |
| 1960 | 16.2 | 46.9 | 3.1 | 33.8 | 100 |
| 1961 | 16.6 | 48.1 | 3.2 | 32.1 | 100 |

TABLE 10.—*Farm real estate transfers: Percentage distribution by type of buyer and seller, United States, years ended Mar. 1*—Continued

[In percent]

TYPE OF SELLER

| Year | Active farmer | Retired farmer | Estate | Lending agency and county, State or Federal Government | Other | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1944 | 43.5 | 19.3 | 12.7 | 16.5 | 9.0 | 100 |
| 1945 | 49.3 | 14.7 | 16.0 | 7.6 | 12.4 | 100 |
| 1946 | 52.2 | 16.3 | 15.2 | 5.8 | 10.5 | 100 |
| 1947 | 46.5 | 15.4 | 15.5 | 4.2 | 18.4 | 100 |
| 1948 | 50.1 | 15.0 | 14.9 | 3.0 | 17.0 | 100 |
| 1949 | 52.9 | 16.9 | 16.1 | 2.2 | 11.9 | 100 |
| 1950 | 51.9 | 15.9 | 15.3 | 1.6 | 15.3 | 100 |
| 1951 | 52.5 | 16.3 | 14.4 | 1.3 | 15.5 | 100 |
| 1952 | 55.2 | 15.0 | 14.1 | 1.2 | 14.5 | 100 |
| 1953 | 54.3 | 14.4 | 15.5 | 1.2 | 14.6 | 100 |
| 1954 | 51.6 | 15.0 | 16.4 | 1.1 | 15.9 | 100 |
| 1955 | 53.9 | 15.8 | 14.9 | .8 | 14.6 | 100 |
| 1956 | 51.6 | 17.0 | 16.0 | 1.1 | 14.2 | 100 |
| 1957 | 50.7 | 18.2 | 15.3 | .7 | 15.0 | 100 |
| 1958 | 47.1 | 19.7 | 17.0 | 1.0 | 15.2 | 100 |
| 1959 | 38.1 | 19.7 | 15.6 | .5 | 26.1 | 100 |
| 1960 | 49.8 | 12.8 | 10.8 | .6 | 26.0 | 100 |
| 1961 | 49.4 | 14.1 | 12.0 | .4 | 24.1 | 100 |

Source: October 1961, "Current Developments in the Farm Real Estate Market," and earlier issues. Estimates for 1944–51 not strictly comparable with later years because of method of weighting. Prepared in Farm Production Economics Division, Economic Research Service.

TABLE 11.—*Proportions of farm operators reporting specified amounts of off-farm work and other income, by value of farm products sold, United States, 1959*

| Value of farm products sold per farm | Percent of all farms | Percent of farm operators working off farm, 100 days or more | Percent of farm operators reporting other income exceeding value of farm products sold |
|---|---|---|---|
| $40,000 or more | 2.8 | 9.5 | 5.7 |
| $20,000 to $39,999 | 5.7 | 9.0 | 5.9 |
| $10,000 to $19,999 | 13.0 | 10.4 | 6.9 |
| $5,000 to $9,999 | 17.6 | 16.2 | 12.6 |
| $2,500 to $4,999 | 16.7 | 26.7 | 27.3 |
| $2,500 or more | 55.8 | 17.0 | 14.6 |
| Less than $2,500 | 44.2 | 46.1 | 62.5 |
| All farms | 100.0 | 29.9 | 35.8 |

Source: From a tabulation of a sample of farms from the 1959 Census of Agriculture, vol. II, ch. II.

## SECRETARY FREEMAN ON LUMBER PROBLEMS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish there had been in manuscript form another great speech the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Freeman, made a few days ago at the Congressional Hotel. It took place at a breakfast that was arranged by the National Lumbermen's Manufacturing Association. The Secretary of Agriculture was on the spot, so to speak. It was supposed to be a meeting in which the Association was going to file, and in which it did file, a series of complaints against the administration of certain forest policies, or, according to them, a lack of administration of forest policies.

I am sure the Secretary of Agriculture won the respect and high regard of every Member of Congress who had been invited to attend that breakfast to hear what the Secretary might say after the bill of particulars had been presented to him by a series of spokesmen for the association.

I want to go on record as expressing my great admiration for the courage, the objectivity, and the factual knowledge of the Secretary of Agriculture.

I come from a great lumbering State. We have our lumber problems. There is no question that we need some changes in certain of the policies of the Forest Service.

I do not know of anyone who recognizes that fact and appreciates it more than the Secretary of Agriculture himself. I think it was good that the National Lumbermen's Association had the breakfast. It is quite befitting our system of democracy that cabinet officials be put on the spot, and that complaints be presented to them. Some of the com-

plaints needed to be made. The Secretary of Agriculture recognized this.

He gave us a report on what had been done already in respect to some of the complaints. He gave assurance that the other complaints would all be considered. He stood his ground however, in respect to his rights and his duties as head of the Department of Agriculture with jurisdiction over the Forest Service, when he indicated changes recommended by any advisory committee would have to be justified on the facts.

Although the particular advisory committee about which there was discussion at the breakfast had made a report, and much of the report, in the opinion of the Secretary of Agriculture, is sound, he nonetheless, filed his caveat as to certain reservations that he had concerning it.

Now it is up to the National Lumbermen's Association to come forward with additional evidence which will justify the changes that they seek from the Secretary of Agriculture. I am satisfied if they do so, they will get the support of the Secretary of Agriculture. If they present the evidence, the senior Senator from Oregon will urge upon the Secretary of Agriculture that their justified complaints be met. I know they will be.

Mr. President, I take this moment to extend my compliments to the Secretary of Agriculture for his very fine statement and sound position that he took at that breakfast.

## BEEF IMPORTS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, Oregon cattlemen, as well as the livestock producers in many areas of our country, have noted with great concern that there seems to be no end to the recurring price difficulties in the fed-cattle market in recent years.

As this domestic price situation deteriorated, imports into this country of beef and veal from abroad have been increasing. In 1962 imports of beef and veal reached 1,455 million pounds carcass weight. During January to August of 1963 imports were 22 percent higher than the equivalent period of 1962.

Our cattlemen cannot help but note that beef and veal imports plus the meat equivalent of feeder cattle imports have risen in recent years at a faster rate than U.S. production. In 1962 these imports equaled 10.6 percent of our domestic production as compared with 7.9 percent in 1961.

Mr. President, at this point in my remarks I ask unanimous consent that there be printed a series of tables prepared by the U.S. Department of Agriculture which deal with this situation.

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

TABLE 1.—*U.S. imports of cattle and beef, lambs, and lamb and mutton compared with production, 1950–63*

CATTLE AND CALVES AND BEEF AND VEAL

| Year | Imports | | | | Meat production [3] | Imports as a percentage of production |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Live animals | | Meat | Total [2] | | |
| | Number | Meat equivalent [1] | | | | |
| | *Thousand head* | *Million pounds* | *Million pounds* | *Million pounds* | *Million pounds* | *Percent* |
| 1950 | 438 | 157 | 348 | 505 | 10,764 | 4.7 |
| 1951 | 220 | 91 | 484 | 575 | 9,896 | 5.8 |
| 1952 | 138 | 47 | 429 | 476 | 10,819 | 4.4 |
| 1953 | 177 | 62 | 271 | 333 | 13,953 | 2.4 |
| 1954 | 71 | 35 | 232 | 267 | 14,610 | 1.8 |
| 1955 | 296 | 93 | 229 | 322 | 15,147 | 2.1 |
| 1956 | 141 | 43 | 211 | 254 | 16,094 | 1.6 |
| 1957 | 703 | 221 | 395 | 616 | 15,728 | 3.9 |
| 1958 | 1,126 | 340 | 909 | 1,249 | 14,516 | 8.6 |
| 1959 | 688 | 191 | 1,063 | 1,254 | 14,588 | 8.6 |
| 1960 | 645 | 163 | 775 | 938 | 15,835 | 5.9 |
| 1961 | 1,023 | 250 | 1,037 | 1,287 | 16,341 | 7.9 |
| 1962 | 1,232 | 280 | 1,445 | 1,725 | 16,311 | 10.6 |
| January–August 1962 | 583 | 132 | 893 | 1,025 | 10,895 | 9.4 |
| January–August 1963 | 555 | 118 | 1,086 | 1,204 | 11,386 | 10.6 |

LAMBS AND LAMB AND MUTTON

| Year | Imports | | | | Meat production [3] | Imports as a percentage of production |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Live animals | | Meat | Total [2] | | |
| | Number | Meat equivalent [1] | | | | |
| | *Thousand head* | *Million pounds* | *Million pounds* | *Million pounds* | *Million pounds* | *Percent* |
| 1950 | 97 | 3 | 3 | 6 | 597 | 1.0 |
| 1951 | 14 | (5) | 7 | 7 | 521 | 1.3 |
| 1952 | (4) | (5) | 6 | 6 | 648 | .9 |
| 1953 | 1 | (5) | 3 | 3 | 729 | .4 |
| 1954 | 1 | (5) | 2 | 2 | 734 | .3 |
| 1955 | 8 | (5) | 2 | 2 | 758 | .3 |
| 1956 | 3 | (5) | 1 | 1 | 741 | .1 |
| 1957 | 18 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 707 | .7 |
| 1958 | 40 | 1 | 41 | 42 | 688 | 6.1 |
| 1959 | 76 | 2 | 104 | 106 | 738 | 14.4 |
| 1960 | 50 | 1 | 8 | 88 | 768 | 11.5 |
| 1961 | 1 | (5) | 101 | 101 | 832 | 12.1 |
| 1962 | 21 | 1 | 143 | 144 | 809 | 17.8 |
| January–August 1962 | 3 | (5) | 95 | 95 | 533 | 17.8 |
| January–August 1963 | 1 | (5) | 115 | 115 | 503 | 22.9 |

[1] Estimated at 53 percent of the live weight of all dutiable imports of cattle and for lambs an average 30-pound carcass.
[2] Canned and other processed meats have been converted to their carcass weight equivalent.
[3] Total production (including an estimate for farm slaughter).
[4] Less than 500 head.
[5] Less than 500,000 pounds.

TABLE 2.—*U.S. beef and veal imports, carcass weight equivalent*

[In thousands of pounds]

| Year | Beef | | | | | | | | Total veal | Total beef and veal |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Fresh and frozen | Pickled and cured | Canned | Sausage | Other beef | Other canned n.s.p.f. | Boneless | Total beef | | |
| 1954 | 7,520 | 27,416 | 168,784 | 398 | 8,187 | 5,766 | 12,537 | 230,608 | 1,048 | 231,656 |
| 1955 | 6,112 | 6,172 | 172,498 | 371 | 8,305 | 6,629 | 28,674 | 228,761 | 275 | 229,036 |
| 1956 | 5,140 | 9,799 | 143,999 | 468 | 7,338 | 6,915 | 36,894 | 210,553 | 245 | 210,798 |
| 1957 | 32,863 | 12,794 | 188,624 | 586 | 7,976 | 18,975 | 128,520 | 390,338 | 4,873 | 395,216 |
| 1958 | 58,880 | 7,250 | 224,606 | 874 | 12,691 | 176,753 | 414,488 | 895,542 | 13,506 | 909,048 |
| 1959 | 39,136 | 8,407 | 187,441 | 1,230 | 10,439 | 120,083 | 680,317 | 1,047,053 | 16,138 | 1,063,191 |
| 1960 | 14,685 | 1,107 | 151,538 | 1,135 | 8,369 | 26,636 | 556,765 | 760,235 | 15,275 | 775,510 |
| 1961 | 25,096 | 1,115 | 188,563 | 1,128 | 10,010 | 29,833 | 764,905 | 1,020,650 | 16,474 | 1,037,124 |
| 1962 | 18,767 | 620 | 166,238 | 1,159 | 16,223 | 28,908 | 1,187,632 | 1,419,547 | 25,511 | 1,445,058 |
| 1963 (January–August) | 12,255 | 533 | 148,626 | 669 | 12,123 | 22,461 | 876,756 | 1,073,423 | 12,100 | 1,085,523 |

TABLE 3.—*Imports of cattle from Canada and Mexico, excluding breeding animals, 1952 to date*

FROM CANADA

| Year | Dutiable cattle (head) | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 700 pounds and over | | Under 200 pounds | 200 to 699 pounds | Total dutiable cattle |
| | Cows for dairy purposes | Other | | | |
| 1952 [1] | 4,636 | 4,244 | 714 | 968 | 10,562 |
| 1953 [2] | 21,811 | 22,931 | 3,515 | 896 | 49,153 |
| 1954 | 17,633 | 46,798 | 2,872 | 3,377 | 70,680 |
| 1955 | 25,252 | 17,543 | 3,256 | 2,218 | 48,269 |
| 1956 | 22,678 | 2,914 | 3,571 | 1,390 | 30,553 |
| 1957 | 18,857 | 186,036 | 10,486 | 151,059 | 366,438 |
| 1958 | 19,586 | 230,025 | 13,580 | 373,671 | 636,862 |
| 1959 | 14,998 | 90,259 | 30,738 | 186,630 | 322,625 |
| 1960 | 20,247 | 60,865 | 32,079 | 140,471 | 253,662 |
| 1961 | 24,972 | 88,660 | 28,605 | 337,452 | 479,689 |
| 1962 | 15,481 | 72,205 | 41,315 | 351,336 | 480,337 |
| 1963 (January-July) | 6,776 | 34,899 | 35,471 | 30,324 | 107,470 |

FROM MEXICO

| Year | Dutiable cattle (head) | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 700 pounds and over | | Under 200 pounds | 200 to 699 pounds | Total dutiable cattle |
| | Cows for dairy purposes | Other | | | |
| 1952 [3] | 2,381 | 43,617 | 96 | 81,185 | 127,279 |
| 1953 [4] | 175 | 25,364 | 485 | 101,901 | 127,925 |
| 1954 | | | | | |
| 1955 [5] | 1,424 | 56,153 | 539 | 189,631 | 247,747 |
| 1956 | 1,684 | 11,124 | 848 | 96,594 | 110,250 |
| 1957 | 480 | 44,236 | 7,914 | 283,842 | 336,472 |
| 1958 | 1,255 | 80,589 | 3,231 | 403,166 | 488,241 |
| 1959 | 1,597 | 45,697 | 1,037 | 317,095 | 365,426 |
| 1960 | 371 | 19,631 | 1,773 | 369,113 | 390,888 |
| 1961 | 46 | 36,410 | 8,655 | 497,999 | 543,110 |
| 1962 | 34 | 36,732 | 24,925 | 690,228 | 751,919 |
| 1963 (January-July) | 7 | 16,078 | 23,408 | 391,004 | 430,497 |

[1] Imports prohibited beginning Feb. 25, 1962, due to foot-and-mouth disease.
[2] Embargo removed Mar. 1, 1953.
[3] Embargo removed Sept. 1, 1952.
[4] Imports prohibited beginning May 23, 1953.
[5] Embargo removed Jan. 1, 1955.

Source: Compiled from official records of the Bureau of the Census.

TABLE 4.—*U.S. imports of cattle and beef compared with U.S. production, by months, 1958–63*

CATTLE AND CALVES AND BEEF AND VEAL

[In millions of pounds]

| | January | February | March | April | May | June | July | August | September | October | November | December | Year |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **1958** | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Imports [1] | 86 | 90 | 79 | 94 | 96 | 95 | 123 | 112 | 123 | 121 | 111 | 120 | 1,249 |
| Domestic production [2] | 1,317 | 1,046 | 1,0.6 | 1,113 | 1,152 | 1,169 | 1,244 | 1,171 | 1,242 | 1,323 | 1,059 | 1,174 | 14,086 |
| Imports: Percent of domestic production | 6.5 | 8.6 | 7.3 | 8.4 | 8.3 | 8.1 | 9.9 | 9.6 | 9.9 | 9.1 | 10.5 | 10.2 | 8.9 |
| **1959** | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Imports [1] | 103 | 88 | 79 | 108 | 115 | 131 | 108 | 114 | 143 | 86 | 73 | 106 | 1,254 |
| Domestic production [2] | 1,202 | 1,013 | 1,102 | 1,172 | 1,141 | 1,185 | 1,246 | 1,159 | 1,264 | 1,278 | 1,160 | 1,240 | 14,162 |
| Imports: Percent of domestic production | 8.6 | 8.7 | 7.2 | 9.3 | 10.1 | 11.1 | 8.7 | 9.8 | 11.3 | 6.8 | 6.3 | 8.5 | 8.9 |
| **1960** | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Imports [1] | 73 | 72 | 74 | 90 | 72 | 76 | 85 | 113 | 81 | 64 | 62 | 76 | 938 |
| Domestic production [2] | 1,275 | 1,162 | 1,284 | 1,141 | 1,279 | 1,332 | 1,251 | 1,406 | 1,399 | 1,360 | 1,281 | 1,229 | 15,399 |
| Imports: Percent of domestic production | 5.7 | 6.2 | 5.8 | 7.9 | 5.6 | 5.7 | 6.8 | 8.0 | 5.8 | 4.7 | 4.8 | 6.2 | 6.1 |
| **1961** | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Imports [1] | 75 | 66 | 80 | 99 | 78 | 111 | 117 | 153 | 111 | 134 | 151 | 112 | 1,287 |
| Domestic production [2] | 1,316 | 1,159 | 1,324 | 1,209 | 1,400 | 1,412 | 1,279 | 1,433 | 1,352 | 1,427 | 1,321 | 1,240 | 15,890 |
| Imports: Percent of domestic production | 5.7 | 5.7 | 6.0 | 8.2 | 5.6 | 7.9 | 9.1 | 10.7 | 8.2 | 9.4 | 11.4 | 9.0 | 8.1 |
| **1962** | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Imports [1] | 121 | 98 | 170 | 119 | 99 | 119 | 118 | 182 | 168 | 165 | 191 | 176 | 1,725 |
| Domestic production [2] | 1,409 | 1,180 | 1,310 | 1,212 | 1,391 | 1,348 | 1,360 | 1,429 | 1,275 | 1,450 | 1,288 | 1,215 | 15,867 |
| Imports: Percent of domestic production | 8.6 | 8.3 | 13.0 | 9.8 | 7.1 | 8.8 | 8.7 | 12.7 | 13.2 | 11.4 | 14.8 | 14.5 | 10.9 |
| **1963 [3]** | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Imports [1] | 121 | 175 | 158 | 119 | 149 | 125 | | | | | | | [3] 847 |
| Domestic production [2] | 1,424 | 1,230 | 1,344 | 1,369 | 1,470 | 1,373 | | | | | | | [3] 8,216 |
| Imports: Percent of domestic production | 8.5 | 14.2 | 11.8 | 8.7 | 10.1 | 9.1 | | | | | | | [3] 10.3 |

[1] Beef, veal, and meat equivalent of live cattle and calf imports.
[2] Commercial beef and veal production (does not include farm slaughter, which is included in table 1).
[3] 6 months.

TABLE 5.—*U.S. production of beef by major classes, imports and prices, 1947–62*

| Year | Production of steer and heifer beef, and veal [1] | | Production of cow and bull beef [1] | | Imports of beef and veal [2] | | Cow and bull beef production plus imports | | Prices at Chicago | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Actual | Per capita | Actual | Per capita | Actual | Per capita | Actual | Per capita | Utility cows | Choice steers |
| | *Million pounds* | *Pounds* | *Million pounds* | *Pounds* | *Million pounds* | *Pounds* | *Million pounds* | *Pounds* | *Dollars* | *Dollars* |
| 1947 | 7,564 | 53.0 | 4,025 | 28.5 | 64 | 0.4 | 4,089 | 28.7 | 14.26 | 26.22 |
| 1948 | 6,495 | 44.7 | 3,594 | 24.8 | 356 | 2.4 | 3,950 | 27.2 | 19.49 | 30.96 |
| 1949 | 7,412 | 50.2 | 2,970 | 20.1 | 254 | 1.7 | 3,224 | 21.8 | 16.33 | 26.07 |
| 1950 | 7,235 | 48.2 | 3,150 | 21.0 | 505 | 3.4 | 3,655 | 24.3 | 19.36 | 29.68 |
| 1951 | 6,543 | 43.3 | 2,978 | 19.7 | 575 | 3.8 | 3,553 | 23.5 | 24.48 | 35.96 |
| 1952 | 7,482 | 48.8 | 2,935 | 19.1 | 476 | 3.1 | 3,411 | 22.2 | 19.53 | 33.18 |
| 1953 | 9,760 | 62.6 | 3,746 | 24.0 | 333 | 2.1 | 4,079 | 26.1 | 12.41 | 24.14 |
| 1954 | 10,031 | 63.0 | 4,121 | 25.9 | 267 | 1.7 | 4,449 | 28.0 | 11.46 | 24.66 |
| 1955 | 10,251 | 63.2 | 4,449 | 27.4 | 322 | 2.1 | 4,771 | 29.4 | 11.52 | 23.16 |
| 1956 | 11,262 | 68.1 | 4,369 | 26.4 | 254 | 1.5 | 4,623 | 28.0 | 11.37 | 22.30 |
| 1957 | 11,208 | 66.6 | 4,086 | 24.3 | 616 | 3.7 | 4,702 | 27.9 | 13.61 | 23.83 |
| 1958 | 10,894 | 63.6 | 3,192 | 18.6 | 1,249 | 7.3 | 4,441 | 25.9 | 18.41 | 27.42 |
| 1959 | 11,278 | 64.6 | 2,884 | 16.5 | 1,254 | 7.2 | 4,138 | 23.7 | 17.79 | 27.83 |
| 1960 | 12,387 | 69.8 | 3,012 | 17.0 | 938 | 5.3 | 3,950 | 22.3 | 15.68 | 26.24 |
| 1961 | 13,137 | 72.8 | 2,753 | 15.3 | 1,287 | 7.1 | 4,040 | 22.4 | 15.66 | 24.65 |
| 1962 | 12,945 | 70.8 | 2,922 | 16.0 | 1,725 | 9.4 | 4,677 | 25.6 | 15.50 | 27.67 |

[1] Estimated from total commercial slaughter.
[2] Includes meat equivalent of live animals imported.

TABLE 6.—*Meat imports: United States, by country of origin, 1958 to date*

[In millions of pounds]

| Product and year | Imports, by country of origin, product weight | | | | | | | | | | | | Total imports | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Canada | Mexico | Argentina | Brazil | Denmark | West Germany | Poland | Netherlands | Ireland | Australia | New Zealand | All other | Product weight | Carcass weight equivalent |
| Beef and veal: [1] | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1958 | 53.6 | 75.0 | 216.7 | 13.6 | 2.5 | 0.3 | ---------- | 0.3 | 23.8 | 17.7 | 183.7 | 32.0 | 619.2 | 909 |
| 1959 | 22.6 | 48.9 | 128.6 | 36.0 | 3.4 | .3 | ---------- | .3 | 42.0 | 224.0 | 161.6 | 54.6 | 722.3 | 1,063 |
| 1960 | 18.9 | 39.1 | 52.7 | 9.0 | 4.5 | .3 | (2) | .1 | 52.8 | 144.7 | 130.7 | 39.3 | 512.6 | 775 |
| 1961 | 32.3 | 53.4 | 65.2 | 16.3 | 6.5 | .3 | 0.1 | .1 | 64.4 | 233.9 | 154.4 | 33.5 | 689.2 | 1,037 |
| 1962 | 19.4 | 59.3 | 55.9 | 17.2 | 7.7 | .4 | .4 | .1 | 70.7 | 444.9 | 213.6 | 49.8 | 970.9 | 1,445 |
| 1963 (January-July) | 11.1 | 39.8 | 53.5 | 3.3 | .6 | .2 | 1.0 | (2) | 40.0 | 253.0 | 138.3 | 62.9 | 603.7 | 907 |
| Lamb and mutton: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1958 | 1.2 | ---------- | ---------- | ---------- | ---------- | ---------- | ---------- | ---------- | ---------- | 14.6 | 7.0 | 1.2 | 24.0 | 24 |
| 1959 | .8 | ---------- | ---------- | ---------- | ---------- | ---------- | ---------- | ---------- | ---------- | 40.6 | 12.8 | 2.6 | 56.8 | 57 |
| 1960 | .1 | ---------- | ---------- | ---------- | ---------- | ---------- | ---------- | ---------- | ---------- | 38.5 | 9.1 | 2.0 | 49.7 | 87 |
| 1961 | .1 | (1) | ---------- | ---------- | ---------- | ---------- | ---------- | ---------- | (2) | 44.6 | 10.8 | .2 | 55.8 | 101 |
| 1962 | .5 | ---------- | .1 | ---------- | ---------- | ---------- | ---------- | ---------- | .2 | 65.9 | 11.1 | .3 | 78.2 | 143 |
| 1963 (January-July) | (2) | ---------- | ---------- | ---------- | ---------- | ---------- | ---------- | ---------- | ---------- | 50.1 | 9.2 | .2 | 59.5 | 107 |
| Pork: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1958 | 61.9 | (2) | (2) | ---------- | 38.7 | 7.0 | 27.0 | 44.7 | .1 | ---------- | .1 | 3.3 | 182.8 | 193 |
| 1959 | 59.1 | (2) | (2) | ---------- | 37.3 | 4.7 | 26.9 | 43.4 | .2 | ---------- | .2 | 3.1 | 174.9 | 186 |
| 1960 | 47.3 | (2) | (2) | ---------- | 40.7 | 2.7 | 35.1 | 42.0 | .2 | ---------- | .1 | 5.9 | 171.3 | 186 |
| 1961 | 44.7 | .1 | ---------- | ---------- | 46.2 | 1.7 | 34.7 | 42.0 | .2 | ---------- | (2) | 5.8 | 173.7 | 187 |
| 1962 | 46.8 | (2) | ---------- | ---------- | 63.8 | 1.3 | 39.8 | 43.4 | 2.0 | (2) | .1 | 7.9 | 203.8 | 216 |
| 1963 (January-July) | 25.7 | ---------- | ---------- | ---------- | 44.2 | .4 | 25.3 | 26.4 | 1.1 | ---------- | (2) | 4.3 | 127.4 | 135 |
| Total: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1958 | 116.7 | 75.0 | 216.7 | 13.6 | 41.2 | 7.3 | 27.0 | 45.0 | 23.9 | 32.3 | 190.8 | 36.5 | 826.0 | 1,126 |
| 1959 | 82.5 | 49.0 | 128.6 | 36.0 | 40.7 | 5.0 | 26.9 | 43.7 | 42.2 | 264.6 | 174.6 | 60.3 | 954.1 | 1,306 |
| 1960 | 66.3 | 39.2 | 52.7 | 9.0 | 45.2 | 3.0 | 35.1 | 42.2 | 52.9 | 183.2 | 139.9 | 47.2 | 733.7 | 1,048 |
| 1961 | 77.1 | 53.5 | 65.2 | 16.3 | 52.7 | 2.0 | 34.8 | 42.1 | 64.6 | 278.5 | 165.2 | 39.5 | 918.7 | 1,325 |
| 1962 | 66.7 | 59.3 | 56.0 | 17.2 | 71.5 | 1.7 | 40.2 | 43.5 | 72.9 | 510.8 | 224.8 | 58.0 | 1,252.9 | 1,804 |
| 1963 (January-July) | 36.8 | 39.8 | 53.5 | 3.3 | 44.8 | .6 | 26.3 | 26.4 | 41.1 | 303.1 | 147.5 | 67.4 | 790.6 | 1,149 |

[1] Includes quantities of other canned, prepared, or preserved meat not elsewhere specified. Assumed to be mostly beef.

[2] Less than 50,000 pounds.

Source: Compiled from official records of the Bureau of the Census.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, George W. Johnson, executive secretary of the Oregon Cattlemen's Association, recently brought to my attention a resolution adopted at the 50th annual convention of the Oregon Cattlemen's Association expressing the deep concern of this important segment of Oregon's agricultural industry with respect to the ever-increasing imports of cattle and beef. I have told my constituents that I shall do everything in my power to seek a sound solution to this difficult problem.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter of November 12 to which I have alluded together with the resolution attached thereto, including the signatures, be printed at this point in my remarks, together with a letter dated November 14 from Mr. F. A. Phillips, of the Baker Production Credit Association, commenting upon the situation.

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

PRINEVILLE, OREG.,
*November 12, 1963.*

Senator WAYNE L. MORSE,
*Senate Office Building,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We submit for your consideration resolution No. 1 passed by the Oregon Cattlemen's Association during its 50th annual convention held in Baker, Oreg., November 6–8, 1963.

Attached to the resolution are the signatures of 428 cattlemen and other registered voters of this State who favor the resolution as passed. We hope you will make this the No. 1 order of business for your State and do everything within your power to carry out the wishes of these people.

We are certain you are fully cognizant of how important the cattle industry is to Oregon and to the entire United States. The cattle business is the lifeblood of many of our rural communities. The economic stability of many small business firms throughout the State will rise and fall depending on the stability of the cattle producer.

The past year and a half the imports of beef and veal increased to such an extent that it is now having a depressing effect on cattle prices. If these excessive imports of meat from foreign nations continue without restrictions it will be real detrimental to the cattle industry and to the total economy of Oregon.

May we emphasize that we do not ask that the imports of meat be eliminated or that the cattlemen are asking for a Government subsidy. We only ask for reasonable protection against the large importation of cheap meat that will have a depressing effect on our own market. We ask that our rights not be bartered away but that we have reasonable protection under the Constitution of the United States so that we may continue to have a reasonable income somewhat commensurate with other phases of society.

Thank you for any assistance you may render.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE W. JOHNSON,
*Executive Secretary, Oregon Cattlemen's Association.*

RESOLUTION 1

"Whereas cattle and beef imports are arriving in the United States in ever-increasing quantities and depressing beef cattle prices; and

"Whereas these depressed cattle prices represent a tremendous loss to the economy of Oregon and the Nation and jeopardize the future success of the beef cattle industry in the Nation: Be it

"*Resolved,* That the Oregon Cattlemens' Association ask Congress and/or the executive branch of the Federal Government to provide the beef cattle industry with realistic protection against excessive cattle and beef imports through a system of higher tariffs or quotas or both; be it further

"*Resolved,* That all efforts be made to delete cattle and beef from the list of commodities on which tariff concessions are to be granted at the forthcoming Geneva Trade Negotiations."

We the undersigned cattle people of Oregon strongly urge you support the above resolution:

C. M. Otler, Diamond, Oreg., rancher; Larry H. Davis, Portland Oreg., restaurant; John A. Marshall, Klamath Falls, rancher; Clarence Dallas, Lakeview, rancher; Virginia Dallas, Lakeview, rancher-housewife; Mrs. J. E. Simmons, cattleman; Mr. and Mrs. Norman Hansen, ranchers; J. E. Herburger, Northwest Livestcok P.C.A.; Larry Walterman, rancher; Samuel Sokol, rancher; Mr. and Mrs. Patrick C. Morrissy, rancher; Mr. and Mrs. Dale Ellis, traders; Candael E. Cook, nutritionist; C. C. McDonald, Lakeview, Oreg.; Eloise McKettrick, Baker, Oreg.; Betty Hardman, Baker, Oreg.; Wallace E. Hardman, Baker, Oreg.; Oran McKettrick, Baker, Oreg.; Roger Fuen, SCS Keating treasurer; Fred Jay Wans, RR., Baker, Oreg.; Leil Hahan, rancher; Tom Boyd, N. Powder.

Henry E. Rooper, Wasco Co.; Sellah F. Rooper, The Dalles; Bert W. Hawkins, rancher; Helen T. Hawkins, rancher; Eugene B. Perkins, rancher; Chas. M. Carlton & Sons, rancher; Mark Binkmiaier, Enterprise; Mrs. Marian Binkmiaier, Enterprise; Roscoe E. Duncan, Baker; Gaylord Monda, Baker; Bert Gagler, rancher; Geo. W. Gross, Durkee; Dorothy E. Gross, Durkee; Hanluss H. Wendt, Baker, Oreg.; John S. Leffert, Baker, Oreg.; Morm Kolb, Baker, Oreg.; Mrs. Harlan H. Wendt, Baker, Oreg.; Mrs. John Hawkins, Baker, Oreg.; Bert Hart, Heppner; Charles R. Kopp, cattleman; Mrs. Charles R. Kopp, housewife; H. L. Smith, First Nat'l Bank of Oreg.; Fred Offenbacher, cattleman; C. C. Jones, G.E. Co.; J. Offenbacher, U.S. Nat'l Bank; Rod Wright, cattleman; Norman Jacobs, cattleman, Klamath; Glenn Troglan, cattleman, Klamath; Thomas G. Kelly, John S. Osborn.

Juan Breaks, rancher; Roxie Cutting; Helen M. Langley, rancher; Harland E. Langley, rancher; Morton Naylor, Milton Meander, Morton Davis, Union, Farmer; Fred Lemcke, John Day, rancher; Edith Lemcke, John Day, rancher; Charles Locey, Ironside, Oreg.; W. R. Sanilan, Baker, Oreg.; H. L. Wellman, Baker, Oreg.; John A. Payton, Baker, Oreg.; J. W. Freeman, Baker, Oreg.; Luoni E. Bermhoff, Baker, Oreg.;

Robert McMunn, Pocatello, Idaho; Clinton L. Kuhl, Jr., John Day, Oreg.; Lowell Hirsch, Huntington, Oreg.; Jerry Breese, rancher; Doug Breese, rancher; Ira Stewart, Brownsville, Oreg.; Crystock, Brownsville, Oreg.; Annie Williams, Canyon City, Oreg.; S. L. Williams, Canyon City, Oreg.; Blanche and Everett L. Miller, Jordan Valley, Oreg.; Mrs. Clyde Ward, Baker, Oreg.; Clyde Ward, Baker, Oreg.; Bruce Boos, Hereford; Helene Kelly, Angus; Herb Kelly, Hereford.

D. C. Benton, mayor of Baker; Charlotte Ward, Clyde Ward & Sons; Bill Frinstt, Baker; Norma Elliott, Bridgeport, Oreg.; Marianne G. Shurtliff, Baker, Oreg.; J. W. Richardson, Madras rancher; W. J. McNult, Ontario, Oreg.; Estel B. Moser, Jamison, Oreg.; Harvey Jacobs, Baker; Alice Norton, Baker; John M. Young, Redmond, Oreg.; Dorothy Mackenzie, Pendleton, Oreg.; Mrs. Henry Lazinka, Ukiah, Oreg.; Mrs. Bob Lazinka, Ukiah, Oreg.; Conant J. Paxton, Baker, Oreg.; Mr. and Mrs. Myron Miles, Baker, Oreg.; Daniel Llendy, Richland, Oreg.; M. J. Galliger, North Powder; Ralph M. Carlburgh, Haines, Oreg.; George V. Nigolesen, Richland, Oreg.; James Passman, Baker, Oreg., P.C.A.; Chas. C. Duby, Keating, Oreg.; Tom Collyn, Ritter, Oreg.; Daniel A. Withers, Paisley, Oreg.; Tom Colvier Jr., Ritter, Oreg.; Irving Shanbro, Prairie City; Mrs. James Teater, Post; Wm. McCormack, Prineville; Donna McCormack, Prineville.

Eve Colton, Medicine Springs Route, Baker, Oreg.; Herb B. Deneret, Myrtle Point, Oreg., Cowbeelee; Jane Harper, Route 1, Box 161, Brooks, Oreg.; Mr. James Burke, Keating, Oreg.; Blossom Burke, Keating, Oreg.; Wayne Troy, Pleasant Valley, Oreg.; Helen Troy, Pleasant Valley, Oreg.; Bob Ciesiel, Baker, Oreg.; Manbeben Ciesiel, Baker, Oreg.

Mr. and Mrs. Ted Arnoldus, North Powder, Oreg.; Mr. and Mrs. Bernal Coles, Haines, Oreg.; Mr. and Mrs. Lew Robbins, Baker; Mr. and Mrs. W. B. Hall, Baker; Mary G. Otley, Diamond, Oreg.; Edyth Bohnert, Central Point, Oreg.; Mr. and Mrs. Carl D. Anderson, Condon, Oreg.; Vernon Z. Jacobson, Baker, Oreg.; Lela A. Jacobson, Baker, Oreg.; Kathryn Nelson, Hereford, Oreg.; Hazel Warner, Baker; Sylvia Warner, Harrisburg, Nebr.; Ed J. Warner, Baker, Oreg.; Blanche S. Miller, Jordan Valley, Oreg.; Lorraine S. Woodridge, Maupin, Oreg.; Ed R. Jackmore, Corvalles, Oreg.; Rod McCullough, Baker, Oreg.; Joann B. Boyer, Haines, Oreg.; Mrs. Syd Johnson, Baker, Oreg.; Robert J. Steward, Baker, Oreg.

Mr. and Mrs. Jack Raburn, Madras, Oreg.; Mr. and Mrs. Bill Johns, Athens, Oreg.; Mr. and Mrs. Frank E. Widman, Baker, Oreg.; Mr. and Mrs. Wm. Schaan, Baker; Mr. and Mrs. L. H. Schilky, Baker, Oreg; Mr. and Mrs. H. P. Glenn, North Powder, Oreg.; G. Ann Smith, Mitchell, Oreg.; Mr. and Mrs. F. C. Cherry, Mitchell, Oreg.; Lucile Thompson, Diamond, Oreg.; Joe Beach, Enterprise, Oreg.; Lillian Beach, Enterprise, Oreg.; Mr. and Mrs. Donald Sullivan, Hereford, Oreg.; Mr. and Mrs. Joe Logsdon, Hereford, Oreg.; Elizabeth Campbell, Klamath Falls; Olive H. Marshall, Klamath Falls, Oreg.; J. E. Simmons, Redmond, Oreg.; Mrs. J. E. Simmons, Redmond, Oreg.; Bill M. Russell, Lake Oswego; Pat Russell, Lake Oswego, Oreg.; J. S. Vincent, Portland, Oreg.; Mrs. Ermire Davis, North Powder, Oreg.; Rita Jackson, North Powder, Oreg.; Jean Sheffert, Baker, Oreg.; Mr. and Mrs. Mell Tingle, Madras, Oreg.; Mrs. Paul Schoen, Madras, Oreg.

O. D. Hotchkiss, rancher and stockraiser; Roy N. Andotrom, stockman; Jack E. Johns, rancher and stockman; Gene Officer, rancher; Joe W. Officer, rancher and stockman; Mrs. Jack Officer, rancher and stockman; Wm. F. Peitz, farmer; D. E. Jones and son, stockman; Annie Perkins, stockwoman; Mrs. Harry Elliott, stockwoman; Harry Elliott, stockman; Mrs. H. B. Daniels; George A. Johnson, heating; Mr. and Mrs. John Chohlis, editor; Don Tippett, stockman; Geo. W. Johnson, see OCA; Mr. and Mrs. Marvin Darby, ranchers; Mr. and Mrs. T. G. Barnard, State land board; R. C. Holloway, taxpayer; Bill Bird, Halfway; Duane Bunch Durher, rancher; Frank J. Gardner, rancher; Paul Schoen, Madras, Oreg.; Dan Warnock, Baker; Millie Perrini, Sumpter Valley; Clyde Perrini, Sumpter Valley; Dornn Furman; Mrs. Floyd Vaughan, Durkee, Oreg.

Mr. and Mrs. Tom Demley, Baker, Oreg.; Celia Titus, Durkee, rancher; Mrs. R. H. Becker, Cove, rancher; R. H. Becker, Cove, rancher; Lester Robinson, Union, rancher; Bernice Staggs, Baker, rancher; Jim L. Staggs, Eleanor H. Davis, Union, rancher; Theron King, Pendleton, farmer; Mrs. Theron King, Pendleton, housewife; Mrs. Rives Waller, Baker; Rives Waller, Baker, Oreg.; Lanita Lacey, Ironside, rancher; Jo Ellen Sinclair, Effie Wellman, Baker; Florence Pavton, Baker; Nilens R. Freeman, Baker, Sutton Creek; Mrs. Bill Kuhl, Baker; Mrs. Bob Thomas, Baker; Bob Thomas, Baker; Mrs. Robert McMinn, Pocatella, Idaho; Henry M. Heyden, La Grande, Oreg.; Margaret Kuhl, John Day, Oreg.; Mrs. Lowell Hursh, Huntington, Oreg.; Doris Boren, Prineville, Oreg.; Edna Heyden, La Grande, Oreg.; Tom Cline, Milton, Freewater; Sadie Rich, Hubbard, Oreg.; Priday B. Holmes.

Virgil Elliott, Bridgeport, Oreg.; Norma A. Richardson, rancher; Mr. and Mrs. J. C. Cecil, retired; Mr. and Mrs. Carl Mazo, Riley, Oreg.; Mr. and Mrs. Walt Sehrock, Bend, Oreg.; Harry Burkhardt, Vale, Oreg.; Thomas B. Joyce, Juntura, Oreg., cattleman; Rodney Rosebrook, Bend, Oreg., cattleman; Bill Chastain, Baker, Oreg.; Estel Powers, Travis I. Powers, Harold Bryan, Hermiston, Oreg.; Vian Hotchkiss, Baker, Oreg.; Al Cheney, Deora, Colo.; Robert Nelson, Hereford, Oreg.; Mr. and Mrs. Wallace Ragsdale, Eagle Point, Oreg.; J. F. Walton, Long Creek; O. F. Hutton, Keating; Harry C. Gerher, Klamath Falls, livestock; Bob Lemcke, Seneca, Oreg.; Florence Lemcke, Seneca, Oreg.; Mr. and Mrs. Dan Forsea; Mr. and Mrs. Emery Cox, Haines, stockman; Mr. and Mrs. W. H. Govern, Haines; Florence Fenamormee, Medford; Walter S. Swikers, Jr., Richland; Willard Bunche, Baker, Oreg; Mary C. Ridstrom, rancher; Pauline Yancey, rancher, Prineville, Oreg.; Dorothy A. Peetz, farmer's wife.

Lanta M. Burnside, Richland, Oreg.; Mary Skorus, Richland, Oreg.; Paul Lorning, Haines, Oreg.; Orville Fisher, Haines, Oreg.; George F. Bilber, Baker, Oreg.; Brookit Tyyne Hawley, Sumpter Valley, Oreg.; M. L. Jackson, Mitchell, Oreg.; Oscar Lee Jacobson, Haines, Oreg.; Elmer Jackson, Mitchell, Oreg.; Geo. B. Russell, Vale, Oreg.; Mr. and Mrs. Tom McElroy, Vale, Oreg.; Mr. and Mrs. Paul Stewart, Caldwell, Oreg.; Mr. and Mrs. D. E. Clark, Baker, Oreg.; Mr. and Mrs. Herbert Chandla, Baker, Oreg.; Mr. and Mrs. Harvey Winedt, Baker, Oreg.; Mr. and Mrs. Carroll Lacey, Ironside, Oreg.; Mr. and Mrs. Kenneth Grabner, Baker, Oreg.; Mr. and Mrs. W. E. Justus, Haines, Oreg.; Mr. and Mrs. Andrew J. Monrow, Madras, Oreg.; J. A. Macy, Madras, Oreg.; Mr. and Mrs. E. Brent Perkins, Baker, Oreg.; Mr. and Mrs. Earl Heize, Baker; Earl Heize, Baker, Oreg.; Helen M. King, Baker, Oreg.

Mrs. M. S. Hanan, Paisley, Oreg.; M. S. Hanan, Paisley, Oreg.; Dave Clark, Jr.; Walter Jacobson, North Paisley, Oreg.; C. E. Davis, North Paisley, Oreg.; Paul Miller, Cutters Bend, Oreg.; Mrs. Paul Miller, Cutters Bend, Oreg.; Bob Fletcher; Walde Markgraf, rancher; Mrs. Walde Markgraf, rancher; Mr. and Mrs. Virgin Puquet, ranchers, Carl Warner, rancher, Baker, Oreg.; Gladys Clark, rancher, Paisley; Lloyd T. Woodside, Maupin, Oreg.; Edw. Sullivan and Sons; Arleta Turner, rancher, Medical Springs, Oreg.; Bob and Janet Teppett, Mortgage Ins. Corp.; Mr. and Mrs. Jack Wilson, North Powder; Mrs. Dan Tiphett; Mrs. Wilfred Daggett; Wilfred Daggett, Enterprise, Oreg.

Mr. and Mrs. Bill Duff, Adams, Oreg., cattlemen and rancher, wheat; Hallie Daniels, livestock; Mr. and Mrs. Ted Ryan, Trumaterials, Inc.; Earl Smith, Mitchell, Oreg.; Alice Warnock, in care of Sumpter Stag; Mr. and Mrs. Dan Warnock, Jr., rancher and banker; J. Q. Freeman, Baker; F. A. Phillips Baking Co.; B. D. Kuhl, Dom, Baker, Oreg.; Robert Warner, Harrisburg, Nebr.; Dorro C. Sokol, Prairie City, Oreg.; Earl J. Charton, Baker, Oreg., Baker Lumber Mills, Inc.; Melvin E. Tingle, Madras, Oreg.; Bill A. Mazer, McNary, Oreg.; Grace K. Williams, Canyon City; Betty Ellis, Richland; Margaret Stewart, Keating; Palma Rouse, Baker; Jack Rouse, Baker; A. E. Anderson, Lakeview; Fred Anderson, Lakeview; C. J. Croghan, Lakeview; Mrs. C. J. Croghan, Lakeview; M. R. Tidmore, Richland; Bettie Anne Warner, Baker; Mr. Bonnie Graham, Rancher.

Carrie Hoke Lester, president, Cunningham Sheep Co.; Robert Lister, Pendleton, Oreg.; Mau Roughnock, Burns Star-Rob Bend; Roland Ebell, rancher; Grady Romans, rancher; James Cummings, Sr., rancher; Dick Hotchkiss, rancher; Kenneth Ramon, rancher; Bernard Allen, rancher; John Bohmert, rancher; Maude T. Johnson, Bates, Oreg.; Katherine Walton, Long Creek; Dean Forth, Reeth, Oreg.; Ray O. Peterson, Klamath Falls; Myron Harper, Brooks, Oreg.; M. O. Galligin, North Paradox; Mr. and Mrs. Charles C. Ebell, Baker; Jack Travis, Hood River; Donald S. Yancey, cattle; Daniel T. Murphy; Margorie Hankins, Baker, Oreg.; Vi Gouldin, livestock; Alvin Bishman, stockman; John Colton, Jr., farmer; Gene Duncan; Boyd Smith, Leslie Salt Co., Leslie; Ted Hyde, Klamath Falls; Dose Campbell, Klamath Falls; George N. Holcomb, Richland, Oreg.; Wadian Holcomb, Richland, Oreg.

Jack L. McClellan, cattleman; Dr. A. M. Morgan, veterinarian; J. W. McClaran, cattleman; James D. Aleppell, cattleman; John Harkins, cattleman; Eugene Choal, Sr., cattleman; Wayne Ryan, cattleman; Leon Thompson, cattleman; Harold Otley, rancher; Gordon Stanley, rancher; Howard W. Smith, rancher; Fred B. Pistrar, fossil; Grace Toby; August Tobey; D. Seger, baker; Joseph V. Worthman, Creswolf; Sharon Kaye, Klamath Falls; Yarusky Laudt Cattle Co., Klamath Falls; Stiner Kasby, Durtee; Richard L. Offenbarke, Zackgrinelle; Wallace B. Demen, Myrtle Point, Oreg., cattleman; Don Holehfers, cattleman; Wade Office, Seneca, Oreg., cattleman; Joe Olivee, cattleman; Bob White, Jr., Larson, Oreg.; R. L. Weir, cattleman; W. Marshall, cattleman; Charles Jones, cattleman; Jack E. Jones, cattleman.

---

BAKER PRODUCTION CREDIT ASSOCIATION,
*Baker, Oreg., November 14, 1963.*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
*Senate Office Building,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR SENATOR: The Oregon cattlemen held their 50th annual conference here in Baker, November 6, 7, 8, 1963. They passed a resolution on the meat imports with over 300 individual signatures attached to the resolution. I think you have received a copy by this time.

If we do not get stiff duties and low quotas on imported meat right away, we will soon be in the position we were in in 1932 when Jesse Jones of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation called a group of cattlemen and cornbelt operators and bankers together. Out of this meeting came the setting up of the Regional Agiculture Credit Corporation to loan money to the farmers and cattlemen to get wheels rolling again.

The fat cattle market has declined steadily the past 6 months and is now selling 6 to 7 cents below what it was 6 months ago. This decline in fat cattle prices has caused the feedlot people who finish cattle for the market to lose anywhere from $40 to $50 per head on their operation, and these losses are reflected back to the producers who grow

the feeder cattle. If this condition continues very long, the entire economy of the country will be wrecked.

The Baker PCA has loaned ranchers and stockmen this year in excess of $20 million. We furnish them with all their operating expenses and in turn get all the receipts of their sales, so we know what their losses are. The income from the ranchers and farmers of Baker County over 85 percent comes from livestock so a loss to those farmers is very depressing to our economy.

* * * * *

We are hoping that our delegation in Congress will get behind this Simpson bill or some other bill that will give us relief from this Australian and New Zealand beef.

Thanking you in advance for anything you may be able to do for us in this matter, I am,

Respectfully yours,

F. A. PHILLIPS.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in bringing these points to the attention of the Senate, I think I have an obligation to direct to the attention of the Department of State the fact that there is serious concern lest in our GATT negotiations the interests of American agriculture be sacrificed.

In my judgment, our negotiators at the GATT conference should keep in mind that the best interests of the United States are served if American agriculture is maintained in a strong and solvent condition. If the economic situation of American agriculture deteriorates as the result of concessions made by the State Department, I feel sure that there are a great many American citizens who will be demanding an explanation from Congress.

## THE PROPOSED APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION IN THE PENDING INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to have the attention of the acting majority leader for a moment. I may not be here and I may not return in time for a vote tomorrow on the pending business, although I think I probably shall. The Senator from Minnesota has been at meetings such as the one I am going to attend, in which we have been rushed for time. He knows that I do not hesitate to ask my host to have me speak either before the meal or during the meal. I shall do that in New York City tomorrow noon, so that if possible I can get back in time for the vote and discussion tomorrow afternoon on the pending matter.

My speech tomorrow will be on foreign policy. It will be before a citizens group which I believe is entitled to hear a discussion of that subject matter. In my judgment it is very much in the interest of my administration to give the speech. I am going for that purpose.

Because the Senators in charge of the bill are not on the floor, I wish to make this statement. Then I would appreciate it, in my absence, if the majority leader would call the attention of the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] to the statement I am now making for the record, so that he may answer it tomorrow afternoon, in case I do not get back in time to call it to his attention myself.

A number of Oregon scientists have expressed to me their concern over the language in the House report, page 16, concerning the National Science Foundation, which states:

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

The committee is concerned at the rapidly rising cost of Government support of research. The only increase recommended for the Foundation in 1964 is for the cost of pay act increases. Funds are not recommended for any of the new programs proposed in the 1964 budget estimate. The committee requests that no new programs be started. The amount approved in the bill for 1964 is $323,200,000. This is $265,800,000 below the amount requested.

I note that the Senate committee report on page 21 states with respect to the restored $50 million:

The amount restored is recommended for addition to the educational programs.

Am I correct in my interpretation that by this language the committee intends that the $50 million can be used to fund new starts contained in the budget estimates?

I wish the Senator from Minnesota would get an answer for me in my absence, for legislative history purposes, because I am very much concerned about the inadequacy of funds for fundamental research in the sciences. Basic research is needed if we are to solve the problems which confront the welfare of the American people in the fields other than military security. It is so easy to come before the Senate with the old scare argument "We need these millions and billions of dollars for security and research." What about heart research? What about research in arthritis and cancer? What about inadequate support for research in the whole field of health? What about basic physical, chemical, and biological research? We ought to do a much better job. The bill worries me from the standpoint that so much is proposed for so-called security research but so little for human welfare.

I want the Senator from Minnesota to know what prompts this question that seeks to make a legislative history on this subject. There is at the University of Oregon a great scientist in chemistry, Dr. Novak. He has been in Washington for a week. He has expressed to me his deep concern about the restrictions of the bill in the field about which I am speaking. He is an objective man, a dedicated scientist. He lives and moves and has his being in the intellectual world. I am sure the Senator from Minnesota will understand that I pay him no disrespect when I say that Dr. Novak lives in a world that the Senator and I really cannot begin to comprehend, for our world is so different from his. He good naturedly said:

Senator, I am no politician. I haven't any idea about political matters. I am sure there must be some reason, politically, for the bill being in its present form, but I cannot understand that. However, I know what we need if we are to do a job in the research divisions of universities that the American people are entitled to have their Government help us do.

Listening to a man such as that, one knows he is humble, because he is acting completely in the realm of idealism and of dedication to finding the facts. He opened new vistas to me, as we discussed the bill. I do not think that in the hurly-burly of tomorrow, when we come to vote on the bill, we can justify the oversight of not pausing long enough to make this legislative record to give some assurance that this rather sweeping language in the House version will not prevent the agencies of our Government, which otherwise would cooperate with this scientist and his colleagues, from making available money that could be used in new projects, programs that he has in mind, including the building of the necessary facilities, because research cannot go on without properly equipped laboratories.

That is why I am speaking at this rather late hour. I apologize to the Senator from Minnesota for keeping him here this long, but he and I, whether others may fully appreciate it, are working for a great cause these minutes, for if he and I can make a contribution to the legislative history of the bill, a history which will result in the interpretation I am making of our own Senate committee's language—I think it is a fair interpretation—then at least we will not have slammed the door in the faces of the doctors Novak, who are dedicated scientists, devoted to trying to do something for human welfare in their various research laboratories, by working on projects not connected with security, but connected, in the last analysis, with human understanding and happiness.

I will appreciate it if the Senator will help me in this endeavor during my absence tomorrow.

I yield the floor.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I welcome the request of the Senator from Oregon. I assure him that it will be honored. I will ask the cooperation of the officers of the Majority Policy Committee to communicate with the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] promptly tomorrow morning, so that this portion of the record, as outlined by the Senator from Oregon, may be brought to Senator MAGNUSON's attention. I am confident that the response by the Senator from Washington will be along the lines of the interpretation of the Senator from Oregon concerning the additional $50 million that was provided by the Senate committee.

I am a member of the Committee on Appropriations. My recollection of the addition of $50 million is that it was to permit the National Science Foundation to engage in new programs and also in the construction of new facilities that are necessary for upgrading the graduate study programs in the great universities.

The Senator from Oregon is exactly correct when he says that the best facilities and the extra moneys are needed for the graduate study programs themselves. I for one am much discouraged by the action of the Senate committee. I had proposed in committee that we restore up to $500 million. The administration asked for $500 million in its budget request. I had asked that at least

$500 million be provided, since the programs of the National Science Foundation are so basic to the long-term national interest.

It is the National Science Foundation that really provides the seed-bed money, so to speak, for intellectual attainment and scientific progress. The Senator from Oregon will have my enthusiastic cooperation.

I understand the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] intends to offer an amendment tomorrow to increase the amount of funds for the National Science Foundation; in other words, to bring the amount somewhat closer to the administration's request. The House figure leaves us exactly where we were, except a little worse off. In the meantime, some costs have risen. This is particularly true of scientific equipment. There has been an increase in the cost of certain kinds of necessary equipment, especially laboratory equipment. Therefore, the action of the other body with respect to the National Science Foundation is not one that puts us ahead but, at best, holds us still or holds us on the same course as last year. I think it permits a retreat.

So when we go to conference, we ought to have more than the $50 million added by the Senate committee as a part of the increase. I know that the Senator from Oregon will agree with me in that observation.

Mr. MORSE. I agree completely with the Senator from Minnesota. I thank him for his interest.

## MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

## DR. JAMES T. MADDUX—VETO MESSAGE (S. DOC. NO. 43)

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate a veto message from the President of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WALTERS in the chair). The Chair lays before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, returning, without his approval, S. 1201 for the relief of Dr. James T. Maddux, which, without objection, will be printed in the RECORD without being read, and, with the accompanying bill, will be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and will be printed:

*To the U.S. Senate:*

I return herewith, without my approval, S. 1201, "for the relief of Dr. James T. Maddux."

Dr. Maddux is an employee in the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration. The bill would direct payment to him of the difference in salary between that which he received for the period July 9, 1961, through February 17, 1962, as a physician in the associate grade and that which he would have received had his promotion to full-grade physician been made effective on the earlier date, which was the date he first became eligible for this advancement. The records of the Veterans' Administration show that promotion of Dr. Maddux was not administratively approved until February 18, 1962, because of an inadvertent misfiling of his papers.

While this occurrence was unfortunate, the promotion which was thereby delayed was not owing to Dr. Maddux as a matter of right. No employee of the Veterans' Administration's Department of Medicine and Surgery has an absolute right to a promotion at any given time or according to a given schedule. The regulations which provided for Dr. Maddux's eligibility did not of themselves confer a promotion, but provided only for orderly consideration of the question of his advancement. To approve this bill would be to encourage employees to make a contrary assumption concerning regulations of this character, and it would lead to claims for retroactive compensation on the basis of details in the handling of promotion documents. Such undesirable results would be all the more likely because the bill suggests that a promotion should be effective on the very first day an individual becomes eligible for it, a rule which is not practical in a vast number of cases.

In these circumstances, I find myself unable to approve S. 1201.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *November 19, 1963.*

## ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS—SPEECH BY PRESIDENT KENNEDY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I call to the attention of the Senate the important address the President made in Miami, last night. The President was speaking before the Inter-American Press Association; and in his speech on the Alliance for Progress and the problems confronting this hemisphere, he spoke frankly and from great knowledge.

The President did not minimize the problems facing the Alianza, nor did he yield to the temptation to seek easy solutions. It often seems that people view Latin America in only two ways: either they think Castro is the sole problem; or they despair and say that nothing can be done—that it is just too great a problem. The President, being knowledgeable and deeply committed to the advancement of hemispheric relations—the traditional policy of Democratic administrations—took a more intelligent and detached view of the situation.

So far as Castro and Cuba are concerned, the President enunciated a solution for the people of that unfortunate island. The problem, the President said, is not Cuba; it is Castro and Communism. He continued:

> Once this barrier is removed we will be ready and anxious to work with the Cuban people in pursuit of those progressive goals which a few short years ago stirred the sympathy of many people throughout the hemisphere.

This should allay any doubts which any citizen of Latin America might have had about the source of irritation in Cuba. We are not against progress or against reform. We are its advocates and proponents. We are against those who enforce tyranny on their people and try to export to their neighbors this evil commodity.

In the more complex area of positive action for the future, the President divided his approach into four fronts: First, the front of social justice; second, the front of economic welfare; third, the front of political democracy and stability; and fourth, the front of international responsibility. In each of these areas he offered his view on what constructive steps could be taken to improve the situation. His thought-provoking statements should be read and studied by anyone who wishes to be informed on this vital program.

It is very advantageous that our President can speak with such knowledge and compassion to members of the inter-American press. Not only does he demonstrate his grasp and interest in problems which are extremely important to the citizens of these countries, but he also admirably represents the intentions and interest of the citizens of the United States. We are fortunate to have such representation.

I ask unanimous consent that the President's speech be made a part of the RECORD.

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

### TEXT OF PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS TO PRESS ASSOCIATION

I'm very proud to be here tonight. I'm particularly interested in the fact that two of our distinguished guests this evening are former Prime Ministers of Peru and are now publishers of newspapers. It does suggest to those who hold office that when the time comes that if, as they say in the United States, if you can't beat them, join them—and

This association and its members carry a very large responsibility for the defense of freedom in the hemisphere. Through the press, you create the vital public awareness of our responsibility and appreciation of our dangers.

Your work to fulfill this responsibility, and the courageous fight of your association for freedom of the press and the liberty of the citizens make me very proud to come to this meeting.

I want to commend the American publishers who are here for their interest in the Inter-American Association. And I want to express a very warm welcome to those of you who have come from our sister republics to visit our country on this important occasion.

I think it's appropriate that this meeting should take place as the annual review of the Alliance for Progress at São Paulo has ended. That Congress and Conference has reviewed our progress, examined our defects—on occasion, applauded our achievement. It has been a forum for discussion and critical analysis.

### A COMMON DEDICATION

And if one fact emerges from that meeting it is, despite differences on specific problems, there is a common dedication to a common belief in the fundamental principles of the Charter of Punta del Este, in the soundness, the urgency and I believe the inevitability of the Alianza Para el Progreso.

Indeed, it could not be otherwise. For those principles, the goals and the methods of the Alliance, represent the only hope whereby men of good will can obtain progress without despotism, social justice with-

out social terror. And it is on the Alliance for Progress that we base our common hope for the future. That hope is for a hemisphere where every man has enough to eat and a chance to work; where every child can learn and every family can find decent shelter. It is for a hemisphere where every man, from the American Negro to the Indian of the Altiplano, can be liberated from the bonds of social injustice, free to pursue his talents as far as they will take him.

It is a hope for a hemisphere of nations, each confident in the strength of its own independence, devoted to the liberty of its citizens, and joined with all the nations of the West in an association based on national strength and a common dedication to freedom. For we all share in this hemisphere a common heritage. And if the idea of Atlantic community is to have full meaning it must include the nations of Latin America.

The fulfillment of these hopes is not an easy task.

It is important that the people of the United States, on whom much responsibility rests, realize how enormous that task is.

They can see its dimensions in the fact that Latin America is the fastest growing continent in the world. Its population has increased 10 percent in the past 10 years. Its almost 200 million people will be 400 million people by the 1980's.

They can see its dimensions in the fact that tens of millions of their neighbors in the south exist in poverty with annual incomes of less than $100—that life expectancy in almost half the countries of Latin America is less than 50 years—that half of the children have no schools to attend—that almost half the adults can neither read nor write—that tens of millions of city dwellers live in unbearable slums—millions more live in rural areas and suffer from easily curable diseases yet without hope of treatment—that in vast areas men and women are crippled by hunger while we possess in the United States the scientific tools necessary to grow all the food we need.

These problems—the hard reality of life in much of Latin America—will not be solved simply by complaining about Castro, by blaming all problems on communism or generals or nationalism. The harsh facts of poverty and social injustice will not yield easily to promises or good will. The task we have set for ourselves in the Alliance for Progress, the development of an entire continent, is a far greater task than any we have ever undertaken in our history. It will require difficult and painful labor over a long period of time. Despite the enormity of these problems and our heavy responsibility, the people of the United States have been asked to sacrifice relatively little.

Less than 1 percent of our Federal budget is allocated to assist half a hemisphere. It is the people of Latin America who must undergo the agonizing process of reshaping institutions, not the people of the United States.

It is the people of Latin America who must draw up development programs and mobilize their total resources to finance those programs, not the people of the United States.

It is the people of Latin America whose cities and farms, homes and halls of government will bear the shockwaves of rapid change and progress, not the people of the United States.

It is the people of Latin America who will have to modify the traditions of centuries—not the people of the United States. Certainly we in the United States cannot fail to do so little when so much is at stake for so many.

The last 2½ years have been a time of trial and experiment. We have labored to build a structure of cooperation and common effort for years to come. No nation in the Americas can deny that much more must be done to strengthen and speed our efforts; that there have not been setbacks and disappointments. That is why we intend to support strongly the leadership of the new inter-American Committee for the Alliance for Progress and why we are working to clear away unnecessary obstacles to the swift administration of U.S. contributions.

But necessary concentration on obstacles and improvements should not obscure the fact that the Alianza Para el Progreso has also made important progress. We have created new machinery for inter-American cooperation.

The United States has committed $2.3 billion to the Alianza and the Latin American nations have committed billions more. In many countries there have been new efforts at land reforms and tax reforms, education and agriculture.

The basic issues of progress and reform, long ignored, have become the battleground of the political forces of the hemisphere. And on the economic front, last year 10 of the 19 Latin American countries exceeded the per capita growth of 2.5 percent established by the Charter of Punta del Este.

CALL FOR STABILITY

Nor can the failure of some to meet the goals of the charter be placed wholly on the shortcomings of the Alliance. No amount of external resources, no stabilization of commodity prices, no new inter-American institutions can bring progress to nations which do not have political stability and determined leadership.

No series of hemispheric agreements or elaborate machinery can help those who lack internal discipline, who are unwilling to make sacrifices and renounce privileges. No one who sends his money abroad, who is unwilling to invest in the future of his country, can blame others for the deluge which threatens to overcome and overwhelm him. For the Alianza Para el Progreso is not an external aid program. It is more than a cooperative effort to finance development plans. It is a battle for the progress and freedom of all of our nations.

And it must be fought on every front of national interest and national need. First is the front of social justice. It is impossible to have real progress as long as millions are shut out from opportunity and others forgiven obligations. In my own country we have prepared legislation and mobilized the strength of the Federal Government to insure to American Negroes and all other minorities access to the benefits of American society. Others must also do the same for the landless campesino, the underprivileged slum dweller, the oppressed Indian.

Privilege is not easily yielded up. But until the interests of a few yield to the interest of the nation, the promise and modernization of our society will remain a mockery to millions of our citizens.

The second front is the front of economic welfare; the principle that every American has the right to a decent life for himself and a better life for his children.

This means we must continue to perfect national development plans; to improve financing machinery and institutions. It means that every nation must be willing to make sacrifices and mobilize its own resources for development.

It also means that the United States of America must live up to the full its commitment to provide continuing help. I have pledged the full energies of this Government to insure that commitment will be met. And it's my hope that the Congress of the United States and the people of the United States will recognize not only the obligation that lies upon them but also the opportunity.

ALLIANCE DOES NOT DICTATE

In pursuit of economic welfare the Alianza does not dictate to any nation how to organize its economic life. Every nation is free to shape its own economic institutions, in accordance with its own national needs and will. However, just as no country can tell another how it must order its economy, no nation should act within its own borders so as to violate the rights of others under accepted principles of international law.

Private enterprise also has an important place in the Alliance for Progress. There is not enough available public capital either in the United States or Latin America to carry development forward at the pace that is demanded. Yet the net flow of foreign capital alone was almost $250 million less this year than last—a third as much as the entire request to the U.S. Congress for assistance funds in this hemisphere.

If encouraged, private investment, responsive to the needs, the laws and the interest of the nation, can cooperate with public activity to provide the vital margin of success as it did in the development of all the nations of the West and most especially in the development of the United States of America.

This country would not have achieved its present growth rate if it had not been for the development capital—the private development capital—that came to this country, especially in the years prior to World War I, when the United States was an underdeveloped country.

If we are to have the growth essential to the requirements of our people in this hemisphere, then an atmosphere must be developed and maintained that will encourage the flow of capital in response to opportunity. Today that capital is moving into growth here in the United States and into Western Europe. Together we must provide the environment that will encourage its flow to Latin America.

And third, is the front of political democracy and stability. This is at the core of our hopes for the future.

There can be no progress and stability if people do not have hope for a better life tomorrow. That faith is undermined when men seek the reins of power and ignore the restraints of constitutional procedures. They may even do so out of a sincere desire to benefit their own country. But democratic governments demand that those in opposition accept the defects of today and work toward remedying them within the machinery of peaceful change. Otherwise, in return for momentary satisfaction, we tear apart the fabric and the hope of lasting democracy.

The Charter of the Organization of American States calls for, and I quote, "the consolidation on this continent, within the framework of democratic institutions, a system of individual liberty and social justice based on respect for the essential rights of man."

URGES PEACEFUL SETTLEMENTS

The United States is committed to this proposition.

Whatever may be the case in other parts of the world, this is a hemisphere of free men capable of self-government. It is in accordance with this belief that the United States will continue to support the efforts of those seeking to establish and maintain constitutional democracy.

And fourth is the front of international responsibility.

We must honor our commitment to the peaceful settlement of disputes, the principle of collective action and the strengthening of the inter-American system.

We must also continue to invite and urge the participation of other Western nations in development programs. And the United States will continue to urge upon its allies the necessity of expanding the markets for Latin American products.

But just as we have friends abroad, we also have enemies. Communism is struggling to subvert and destroy the process of

democratic development, to extend its rule to other nations of this hemisphere.

If the Alliance is to succeed, we must continue to support measures to halt Communist infiltration and subversion and to assist governments menaced from abroad. The American States must be ready to come to the aid of any government requesting aid to prevent a takeover linked to the policies of foreign communism rather than to an internal desire for change.

My own country is prepared to do this.

We in this hemisphere must also use every resource at our command to prevent the establishment of another Cuba in this hemisphere, for if there is one principle which has run through the long history of this hemisphere it is a common determination to prevent the rule of foreign systems or nations in the Americas.

We have ultimately won this battle against every great power in the past. We will continue to wage it and win it. And as we gain momentum and strength the appeal and force of communism will greatly diminish. This has already begun to happen. Castroism, which a few years ago commanded the allegiance of thousands in almost every country, today has far fewer followers scattered across the continent. Experience in China, the Soviet Union, and in Cuba itself has revealed that the promises of abundance under tyranny are false. We ourselves can prove that democratic progress is the surest answer to the promises of the totalitarian.

These are the many fronts of the Alliance for Progress. The conduct of those fronts, the steady conquest of the surely yielding enemies of misery and hopelessness, hunger and injustice is the central task of the Americas in our time. No sense of confidence, of optimism in the future of the hemisphere as a whole can conceal our feelings at the self-inflicted exile of Cuba from the society of American Republics.

The genuine Cuban revolution, because it was against the tyranny and corruption of the past, had the support of many whose aims and concepts were democratic. But that hope for freedom and progress was destroyed.

The goals proclaimed in the Sierra Maestra were betrayed in Havana.

It is important to restate what now divides Cuba from my country and from the other countries of this hemisphere. It is the fact that a small band of conspirators has stripped the Cuban people of their freedom and handed over the independence and sovereignty of the Cuban Nation to forces beyond the hemisphere. They have made Cuba a victim of foreign imperialism, an instrument of the policy of others, a weapon in an effort dictated by external powers to subvert the other American republics.

This, and this alone, divides us.

As long as this is true, nothing is possible. Without it everything is possible.

Once this barrier is removed we will be ready and anxious to work with the Cuban people in pursuit of those progressive goals which a few short years ago stirred their hopes and the sympathy of many people throughout the hemisphere.

No Cuban need feel trapped between dependence on the broken promises of foreign communism and the hostility of the rest of the hemisphere. For, once Cuban sovereignty has been restored, we will extend the hand of friendship and assistance to a Cuba whose political and economic institutions have been shaped by the will of the Cuban people.

But our—but our pursuit of the goals of the Alianza Para el Progreso does not wait on that day. In 1961 the American nations signed the Charter of Punta del Este. Today, more than 2 years later, despite dangers and difficulties, I support and believe in the Alliance for Progress more strongly than ever before.

With the Alliance, the inter-American system, the American nations can look forward to a decade of growing hope and liberty.

Without it the people of this hemisphere would be left to a life of misery with independence finally gone and freedom a futile dream.

SAYS SOME FEAR OBSTACLES

I am well aware that there are some who, fearing the size of the obstacles, the resistance to progress, the pace of achievement, despair of the Alliance.

But that same note of despair has been sounded before. In 1948, a distinguished Senator rose on the floor of the American Congress and said of the Marshall plan:

"If I believe there were any good chance of accomplishing these purposes I should support the bill, but in the light of history, in the light of the history of this very Congress and its predecessors, we cannot say there's a chance of success. All the evidence points to failure."

Despite this we pressed ahead. The result is modern Europe.

I do not discount the difficulties of the Alliance for Progress—difficulties far greater than those confronted by the Marshall plan. Then we helped rebuild a shattered economy whose human and social foundations remained. Today we're trying to create a basic new foundation capable of reshaping the centuries-old societies and economies of half a hemisphere.

But those who know our hemisphere, like those who knew Europe in 1948, have little doubt that if we do not lose heart the gloomy prophecies of today can once again fade, in the achievements of tomorrow, although the problems are huge.

The greatest danger is not in our circumstances or in our enemies but in our own doubts and fears. Robert Frost wrote 50 years ago: "Nothing is true except a man or men adhere to it, to live for it, to spend themselves on it, to die for it."

We need this spirit even more than money, or institutions, or agreements. With it we can make the Alianza Para el Progreso a reality for generations who are coming in this hemisphere. And ultimately we will hold a continent where more than 20 strong nations live in peace, their people in hope and liberty and believing strongly in a free future.

---

## AN OLYMPIC VICTORY PROGRAM

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I have long been interested, both as a citizen and as a Senator of the United States, in our country's great Olympic teams.

In 11 months, this Nation faces another great challenge in international competition. I refer to the October 1964 Olympics in Tokyo.

Today, I offer a brief program for America's sports efforts—not just in 1964, but also in 1968; and not just in the Olympics, but also in future pan-American games and in other international athletic contests.

I wish to enlist the cooperation of the Congress in this effort. At this late hour, this evening, I speak for the record, of course; but if the United States is to live up to its high standards of performance in connection with all other areas of life, certainly it needs cooperation and participation by Congress in connection with the participation of Americans in sports.

The program I now propose is not just for the purpose of winning gold medals of victory; it is a program to do our best and to send our best—win, lose, or draw.

It is a program, too, to broaden the base of U.S. sports—to get spectators out of the stands and onto the playing fields. It is a program to enlist millions, where there are now only thousands of participants in many sports; and to enlist thousands in some so-called minor sports where there are now only hundreds.

PAST MEETING OF OLYMPIC COMMITTEE

First, however, let me say that during the weekend, November 9–10, there was held here in Washington an important meeting of the U.S. Olympic Committee.

Since the meeting, the sports pages of newspapers throughout the country have featured many articles interpreting what happened. The interpretations vary. I was not there, so I could not venture a judgment. Even if I had been there, I would not do so, because my interest is, not in how this or that private group fares, but in how the public interest fares.

I wish well to all interested private sports groups—to the AAU, the NCAA, and the emerging third force of independents. Frankly, their differences with one another have become so complex that it seems next to impossible for an outsider to fathom who is right or what is right.

An outsider does get to feel, I say in all frankness, that there is a little too much institutionalization at work. There is too much of a tendency to get so lost in the fight for one's own organization, that all other fights—the big fight for U.S. sports victories—get lost in the shuffle.

I note, for example, that Kenneth L. (Tug) Wilson, USOC president, is quoted as saying at the meeting's conclusion:

> I leave here with a heavy heart. I think there is a lot of soul searching ahead for all of us. We have spent 2 days bickering over little things instead of working on ways to have better Olympic teams in 1964.
>
> But I still have hope. Maybe things have got to hit bottom before they reach the top.

Before and after the meeting, many groups and individuals got in touch with me.

Several have since told me that some of the public reports of the disputes were overstated. They contended that many constructive steps which were taken by the Olympic Committee tended to be obscured by the noise of some of the quarrels on a few specifics—for example, over baseball and gymnastics.

It is, as I have said, next to impossible for an outsider to judge. What I do know is that the other great powers in the world, and many of the small powers, are working as a unit, without internal dissension, to win top honors in 1964 at the Innsbruck, Austria, games and at Tokyo.

So the time is long overdue for the United States to get its eye "back on the ball."

SEVEN-POINT PROGRAM

What specifically should be done?

First. This Nation needs a U.S. sports foundation. This foundation should help foster local, State, regional, and national athletic competitions, in conjunc-

tion with existing private sports organizations.

It should get our youngsters, in particular, during the school year, during the recess periods, and both before and after graduation into the habit of sports participation and athletic excellence.

Junior Olympic efforts exist here and there, but on an irregular, catch-as-catch-can, spotty basis.

Second. This Nation needs a massive Olympic development program for the youngsters who are championship material.

Everything possible must be done to train them, encourage them to remain amateur, and to train their coaches.

Some few clinics at present receive support from the U.S. Olympic Committee. The tiny size of this program can be judged by the fact that the whole USOC Olympic development effort is budgeted at $500,000.

By contrast, other nations spend tens of millions of dollars for their Olympic development programs. That includes programs in so-called minor sports that this country has hardly heard of, and in which our participants invariably do poorly.

Third. This Nation needs Olympic-type facilities to train our athletes under Olympic-type rules.

Mr. President, I digress to point out that the richest Nation in the world, which says it believes in competition rather than collectivism, has the worst Olympic-type facilities of any major nation. Apparently, because we cannot make any money out of these activities, we downgrade them.

Fourth. This Nation needs to increase its budget for international athletic exchange under the Humphrey-Thompson law. Unfortunately, the outlay for all oversea exchanges of all types—cultural and other—has not increased a nickel since we wrote the first authorization in 1956.

Fifth. The President and his administration should continue their close interest in the problem. One of the most encouraging factors during this past year has been the personal attention which has been given by our Chief Executive and by the Attorney General of the United States, despite their other enormous burdens, as well as by other Federal officials.

They have been careful not to interfere in any private aspects of amateur athletics; but at all times they have lent their good offices toward resolving problems within the sports family.

It is my hope and expectation that President Kennedy will further demonstrate his deep personal interest in America's Olympic effort. I hope and believe that if the President's busy schedule will permit, he will meet with as many of the members of our team as possible before it journeys to Tokyo.

Further, it is my hope that a token of the gratitude of the American people will be expressed to our athletes after their return, through an appropriate Presidential symbol, perhaps an "Olympic Participation Medal."

It is an ironic fact that the American Olympic participant does not receive from his or her own government any tangible expression whatsoever as a permanent memento of having represented us in the Olympics.

Sixth. Every American should contribute to the United States Olympic Committee for the 1964 games. Each should give what he or she can—a dime from youngsters, a dollar, a hundred dollars, or a thousand dollars or more from businesses or other organizations.

Seventh. More State, regional, and national civic events should be staged, at which the Nation gets to see and know our top amateur athletes.

There ought to be in every American city an Olympic ball at which funds are raised, with closed-circuit television and with our highest officials and stars of the entertainment world participating.

These are but a few of the necessary steps we should take.

Meanwhile, Federal agencies should continue their efforts to achieve the greatest possible results under the President's Council on Fitness.

INTEREST OF SENATE REORGANIZATION SUBCOMMITTEE

I have expressed my views as an individual Member of the Senate and as chairman of a Senate Government Operations Subcommittee which is interested in interagency coordination.

One of the principal achievements of our subcommittee's interest was the issuance, in August 1963, of Executive Order 11117, establishing a new Inter-Agency Committee on International Athletics. This Federal committee is going to be an active group. It will help to assure a sound governmentwide policy in the international sphere of sports.

PAST STATEMENT AND EXECUTIVE ORDER

Prior to last weekend's meeting, I was asked for comment on the USOC meeting by one of America's distinguished sports writers, Mr. Edward Schoenfeld, of the Oakland Tribune. I was happy to make available to him a statement which, I understand, has been widely used—both in that noted newspaper and elsewhere.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my comments this statement, together with a helpful letter from the Department of State, enclosing the text of the President's Executive order.

There being no objection, the statement, letter, and Executive order were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR HUMPHREY URGES GREATER UNITY IN AMATEUR SPORTS AT HISTORIC MEETING OF U.S. OLYMPIC COMMITTEE THIS WEEKEND

The meeting of the U.S. Olympic Committee this weekend can be a great turning-point in the history of amateur athletics in the United States. It can set this country on the path to unity in amateur sports and to victory in international athletic competition. Or the meeting can prove to be a tragic step backward or merely result in a further impasse.

I earnestly hope that the hopes of tens of millions of sports enthusiasts throughout our country will be realized through this meeting.

I know that I speak for great numbers of Americans in stating these points very frankly:

1. We have been disappointed at the continued "family quarrel" which has split amateur sports wide open.

2. The quarrel has needlessly undermined America's showing and prestige in international athletics.

3. In this country, athletics are overwhelmingly nongovernmental in nature; that's the way they should be kept. None of us wants the U.S. Government to intervene, if it doesn't have to. The Government has enough of its own problems to attend to.

4. Nevertheless, the U.S. Government does have a legitimate interest in fostering a sound solution. The U.S. Olympic Committee was chartered by the U.S. Congress. If the goal of Public Law 805 is not being achieved, then, the Congress has little alternative but to review that law and make whatever changes are necessary in it.

5. The American people do not propose to see the Communist world make further propaganda "hay" out of American sports defeats.

6. The American people will insist that the U.S. Congress assert itself in this matter if the U.S. Olympic Committee, as presently constituted, demonstrates that it is unable to solve its own problems without further delay.

7. The U.S. Attorney General's office, the State Department's Bureau of Educational and Cultural Exchange, the President's Council on Fitness have done whatever is feasible under the circumstances in careful cooperation with private groups. I commend these Federal agencies and their officials for lending their good offices to heal the split among amateur sports organizations.

The "ball" is now in the hands of the organizations representing the amateur athlete. These organizations have the talent and the ability to run with the ball to an American touchdown. Or they can fumble it so badly, that the Congress will be forced to pick up the ball.

---

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE,
*Washington, August 22, 1963.*

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
*Chairman, Subcommittee on Reorganization and International Organizations, U.S. Senate.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is with further reference to your letter of March 26, 1963 concerning the position of the United States in the Olympic games and other international amateur athletic competitions. There has been quite a bit of activity in this field during the past few months. Mr. Nicholas Rodis of my staff has been the Government official most concerned with these matters, and he has kept Mr. Julius Cahn completely informed. I wish at this time to bring to your personal attention the following major development which I am sure will be of interest to you.

1. There has been established by Executive order an interagency committee to assure continuity and coordination in the Federal Government's attention in the field of international amateur athletics. The State Department (Mr. Rodis) chairs the committee. This committee will act as a permanent clearinghouse in Government of current information on international athletic matters and a focal point for liaison with appropriate bodies in the amateur athletic field.

2. The U.S. Olympic Committee has been quite active in recent months. The officers and executive committee of the USOC have been exploring ways and means to provide a more strongly organized United States effort in international athletic amateur competitions. I understand that later this fall the full membership of the U.S. Olympic Committee will meet to discuss the proposals developed by the officers and the executive committee.

I wish to express the appreciation of the Department of State for your welcome interest in this very important field. All of us concerned with the subject matter are quite encouraged by the recent initiatives taken by the appropriate domestic amateur athletic leaders. I will keep your office informed of significant new developments in this field as they occur and we become aware of them.

Sincerely yours,

LUCIUS D. BATTLE.

[From the Aug. 16, 1963, Federal Register]

PRESIDENTIAL DOCUMENTS: TITLE 3—

THE PRESIDENT

EXECUTIVE ORDER 11117

Establishing an Interagency Committee on International Athletics

Whereas it is vital that the United States be constantly informed concerning all events, activities, and conditions that might have a potential effect upon the foreign relations of this Nation and the well-being of its people; and

Whereas international amateur athletic competitions and related activities conducted by private individuals and organizations free from Government sponsorship, interference, or control frequently make significant contributions to international good will and elevate standards of physical welfare throughout the world; and

Whereas these activities merit sympathetic attention and encouragement by the United States; and

Whereas it would be advantageous for the Department of State to have the advice and assistance of other departments and agencies in discharging its responsibilities in this regard:

Now, therefore, by virtue of the authority vested in me as President of the United States, it is hereby ordered as follows:

Section 1(a). There is hereby established the Interagency Committee on International Athletics. The committee shall collect, exchange, and review information concerning amateur athletic matters that might tend to affect the foreign relations or general welfare of the United States. The committee shall be composed of representatives to be designated by the Secretary of State, the Attorney General, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare (in his capacity as Chairman of the President's Council on Physical Fitness), and the heads of such other departments and agencies as the President may from time to time designate, or as may be invited to participate in the activities of the committee upon its request. The head of each department or agency represented on the committee shall designate one or more alternates. The representative of the Department of State shall serve as chairman of the committee.

(b) As deemed necessary to facilitate its work, the committee may request any executive department or agency whose activities have significant implications for the work of the committee to designate a liaison officer to consult with and advise the committee.

(c) The departments and agencies represented on the committee shall, in accordance with law, furnish such assistance as may be required for the work of the committee, in conformity with section 214 of the act of May 3, 1945 (59 Stat. 134, 31 U.S.C. 691).

SEC. 2. To facilitate the collection, coordination, and review of information by the committee, the committee may request information and views from Federal departments and agencies and from such organizations and individuals as may be willing and able to provide information pertaining to its work. The committee shall, from time to time, submit reports and recommendations, as appropriate, to the President and to the Secretary of State, and shall keep officials of the departments and agencies represented on the committee currently informed of its activities.

SEC. 3. The representative of the Department of State, in addition to serving as chairman, shall have primary responsibility for the collection of comprehensive information on current and impending developments pertaining to amateur athletics, and he shall make such information available to the committee.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 13, 1963.*

## "A SENATOR'S WIFE"

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, a Senator's lot is not always a happy one. There are long hours of work, difficult legislative problems to solve, the needs of constituents to satisfy.

But, as I can personally testify, all the problems of a Senator's public life fall into an acceptable pattern when he has as his partner in life a devoted, able, intelligent, and understanding wife.

The senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] is fortunately blessed with a most attractive, intelligent, charming, creative wife who has not only cared for their fine family, but also participated constructively and enthusiastically in the civic life of Washington.

Ellen Proxmire is in her own right a woman of great political ability and experience. She has successfully managed two senatorial campaigns, she has written extensively on political matters, and she continues to be a most helpful volunteer in her husband's office.

Now, Ellen Proxmire, a truly lovely lady, has just written a book about her life as a Senator's wife. And, as a result, others have been writing about Ellen. Katherine Evans in a recent article beautifully describes her as the "answer to any politician's prayer." I agree, and I think everyone will who reads the article.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

ANSWER TO ANY POLITICIAN'S PRAYER

(By Katherine Evans)

WASHINGTON.—Pity the poor bachelor politician. He has no wife to ring doorbells, raise money, and make speeches when he campaigns—no wife to slave in his office if he wins or hold his hand if he loses.

We've just had a long talk with Ellen Proxmire, who is the answer to any politician's prayer (in this case the politician is her husband, Senator WILLIAM PROXMIRE, of Wisconsin), but we wonder how candidates without wives ever make the grade.

Ellen Proxmire has just finished a book about her life as a political wife called "One Foot in Washington," which will be published by Luce & McKay after Christmas. It's recommended reading for any wife who is urging her husband to run for the Senate, the House of Representatives, or dogcatcher. Little does she know how hard she'll have to work.

Ellen Proxmire is the best example we know of the hardworking political wife who is indispensable to her husband's career. She's done all the usual things like ringing doorbells and licking envelopes in campaigns, pinchhitting for her husband as a speaker, and being nice to constituents. But she is also:

A star television performer (she often appears with her husband on his weekly television show); an honest-to-goodness political pro (she was executive secretary of the Wisconsin Democratic Party when they first met); a veteran campaign manager (she ran both his successful campaigns for the Senate); a crackerjack officeworker (until her youngest child was born, she worked fulltime in her husband's office—now she's there 2 days a week); and experienced writer (she temporarily canceled a biweekly newspaper column while writing her book).

The fact is that Ellen Proxmire has done just about everything there is to do in her husband's office—except go on the payroll. That's where she draws the line.

"No matter how hard a congressional wife works or how invaluable she is to her husband, putting her on the payroll is a mistake. You just can't justify it to constituents."

In addition to young Douglas, the Proxmire family has four teenagers, two here in Washington and two away at boarding school. At home, Ellen Proxmire does most of the housework and all of the cooking. In her spare time (believe it or not, there is some) she reads six daily papers, the news magazines, and a great deal of the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Having a Senator in the family is not all beer and skittles.

"It's hardest on the children," says Ellen Proxmire, "because a politician's family life is plagued by uncertainty. We can seldom spend holidays together, or take family vacations, or even eat meals together. Christmas is the only time we can count on being together."

But Ellen Proxmire's not complaining. She's always been fascinated by politics and, if having one foot in Washington and the other foot in Wisconsin makes for a rather precarious balancing act, she still finds it exciting and fun.

What's the biggest asset a politician's wife can have, we wanted to know.

"The ability to accept any situation," she said, serenely.

And a politician? A wife, we think, like Ellen Proxmire.

## RECESS TO TOMORROW AT NOON

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in accordance with the order previously entered, I now move that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 7 minutes p.m.) the Senate took a recess, under the order previously entered, to tomorrow, Wednesday, November 20, 1963, at 12 o'clock meridian.

## CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate November 19 (legislative day of October 22), 1963:

U.S. ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT AGENCY

Dr. Herbert Scoville, Jr., of Connecticut, to be an Assistant Director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Benson E. L. Timmons III, of Florida, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Haiti.

# EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

## The 470th Anniversary of the Discovery of Puerto Rico by Christopher Columbus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. A. FERNÓS-ISERN

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER FROM PUERTO RICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, November 19, 1963*

Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN. Mr. Speaker, 470 years ago, on November 19, 1493, Christopher Columbus, during his second voyage to the New World, discovered the island of Puerto Rico. He landed on the west coast of the island and took possession of it in the name of the Crown of Castille. For 15 years, the island was bypassed by the early Spanish colonizers, but in 1508, a young soldier, one of the companions of Columbus in the discovery of Puerto Rico, came back from Old Hispaniola, with 40 arms companions, to conquer and to settle. He was Juan Ponce de León. He founded the city of San Juan and organized it in accordance with the laws of Castille. Such was the beginning of the history of the Puerto Rican people.

For four centuries following the discovery, a stream of settlers continued to come to Puerto Rico from the Spanish peninsula. African slavery, established in the early days, existed until March 27, 1873, when all slaves, 33,000 of them, were set free amidst the rejoicing of all Puerto Ricans, including the slave masters. The aboriginal Indian disappeared, not as a result of warfare, but because of the diseases of the white man to which the Indian had no immunity; because of their early migration to neighboring islands to escape serving the newcomers, or because they were absorbed into the bloodstream of the new races which had come to the island. By the end of the 18th century, 100,000 inhabitants occupied the island.

Puerto Rico entered the 19th century with about 100,000 inhabitants but at the end of that century, it had 1 million people. This demographic development was not the result of natural increase alone, but of the continuous migration from the Iberian Peninsula to the Caribbean island. In addition, in the early years of the 19th century, the Spanish loyalists from Venezuela, as they fled from the wars of independence in the Spanish main, found a haven in Puerto Rico. This historic occurrence was parallel to the settlement of American loyalists in the Canadian Maritime Provinces as a result of the American War of Independence.

The purpose of this brief résumé of the 470-year history of the Puerto Rican people is to recall that today marks the date when the island of Puerto Rico was incorporated into the Western civilization; that this happened 470 years ago, and that because of those centuries of history, Puerto Rico is today the oldest community under the U.S. flag.

It was because Columbus discovered the island, it was because Columbus incorporated it into the Crown of Castille, that a historical process began, whereby the Puerto Rican people have attained their present station.

At the end of the 19th century, the old ties with Spain dissolved. In 1917, Puerto Rico became a community of U.S. citizens. There are today 2½ million U.S. citizens in Puerto Rico. It is a showcase of freedom, democracy, modern life and high ideals and endeavors. Puerto Rico is a leader of thought and action in the Caribbean. It is also a haven for those who are fortunate enough to have escaped from despotism and oppression which unfortunately has showed its head in less fortunate lands in the Caribbean area.

Today is a holiday in Puerto Rico and I think it is proper that the people of Puerto Rico are paying tribute to the great explorer who made their existence possible; to that strong figure who so influenced the history of the world; to Christopher Columbus, the Admiral of the Ocean Sea, who offered mankind a new world for Western civilization to develop. As the representative of the people of Puerto Rico, I feel honored in paying tribute to his towering historical figure.

## Tribute to John Michael Carmody

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. W. R. POAGE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, November 19, 1963*

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, many of us lost a friend in the death of John Michael Carmody, November 10. Friends of Rural Electrification, family farmers, labor, in fact the entire Nation, lost a dedicated servant. A servant who stood the test at a time when the need for his leadership was greatest—the dread thirties.

As the second Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration, John Carmody, more than any other individual, stimulated the organization of rural electric cooperatives which brought electricity to the farmers. Aggressive in his defense of co-ops, he valiantly withstood the attacks of the private power companies.

As President Franklin D. Roosevelt's Coordinator of the Government's major work relief agencies and a member of the National Labor Relations Board, John Carmody also proved to be a true friend of labor from the beginning and continued to be throughout his entire life.

We who are concerned with the welfare of rural America feel deeply the void left by this man to whom we owe a great deal. A man whose fruits of labor we will continue to harvest for many, many years.

Of John Carmody it can be said; he was a dedicated public servant, a distinguished citizen devoted to the welfare of people—a truly great man.

## Charles R. Hook

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, November 19, 1963*

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend and revise my own remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in memory of Charles R. Hook, I include the following:

In the recent passing of Charles R. Hook of Middletown, Ohio has lost one of her outstanding citizens, and America has lost an internationally known industrialist—a man who served his Government, his State and his country in many ways. For 58 years Mr. Hook served in important executive positions with the Armco Steel Corp. of Middletown. He had the profound conviction men are more important than machines and applied a philosophy of simple humanity in the building of Armco Steel, which demonstrated the human side of business could be its most important aspect.

Mr. Hook accepted vital and important assignments as adviser and assistant to the two Hoover Commissions and served as Chairman of the Task Force on Business Organization of the Defense Department. Through his service and that of his task force, Federal taxpayers have been saved many millions of dollars annually in defense operational costs.

In April of 1962, Mr. Hook, as Chairman of the continuing Committee of the Hoover Commission Task Force Members, was presented with a special citation for his devotion to principle and his great contribution toward bettering our governmental structure, by former President Herbert Hoover at the annual meeting of the Committee in his suite at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel in New York.

How Mr. Hook rose from a $2-a-week office boy in a Cincinnati steel plant to become an internationally known industrialist is one of the most interesting success stories that can be written. Wishing to learn from the ground up, he asked to be sent into one of the plants as a laborer. Promotions and recognition followed in quick succession until he became president of the Armco Co. of Middletown, Ohio. During his career he still found time to take an active part in a long list of national business organizations. Besides his work with the Hoover Commissions, our Government frequently made use of Mr. Hook's knowledge and experience. In 1938 he was appointed by President Roosevelt as a

member of an American mission to study labor conditions in England and Sweden. Again in World War II he was asked to undertake another important mission when the war effort was hampered by a serious shortage of steel. President Truman also called upon him for assignments on several occasions, and under the Truman administration he was made a member of the Joint Labor-Management Conference. In 1952 he was appointed to the Government mission headed by Charles Sawyer and again went overseas to study Europe's economy. He was made Chairman of an Advisory Commission on Service Pay for the Armed Forces in 1947.

In spite of his many responsibilities, which were time consuming, Mr. Hook still found time to help American youth. For many years he was active in Boy Scout work, both locally and as a member of the National Boy Scout Council. Probably the award he prized the most highly was the Silver Buffalo—the highest honor the Boy Scouts of America can bestow upon anyone. He has frequently been honored for contributions to public service. He was given the Gary Medal by the steel industry for outstanding achievements in the field of human relations in industry. He was named Man of the Year by the National Association of Manufacturers in 1955. In 1957 he received the Governor's Award, the highest honor Ohio can confer upon a native son.

## Latvian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, November 19, 1963*

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, all nations subjected to alien regimes suffer under discriminations and a series of legal disabilities, and some suffer endless hardships and persecutions. Still others are deprived of all forms of freedom and are prisoners in their homeland. Such has been the lot of the people of Latvia for more than two decades. As a matter of fact, theirs has been an unenviable lot since they were brought under the ruthless rule of Russian czars late in the 18th century, except during the two decades of interwar years.

At the end of the First World War many nations in Europe attained their freedom and independence. The Latvians were one of these liberated peoples. After attaining their fredom and the establishment of the Latvian Republic they managed to live in peace and prosperity and also in relative safety for a little more than two decades. But as the clouds of war began to thicken late in 1930, they became apprehensive of their national safety. Soon their worst fears turned out to be true. Early in the war their freedom and independence became a casualty of the war. In mid-1940 Latvia was overrun by the Red army, then the country was annexed to the Soviet Union, and the unhappy Latvians became subjects of the Kremlin.

During the war there was a change in their status, though not for the better. For about 2 years they were subjected to Hitler's Nazi regime, and toward the end of the war, when the Red army returned once more, the Kremlin's agents again flooded the country. These ruthless Communists have been ruling over Latvia since then. During all these years helpless Latvians are hoping and praying for their delivery from Soviet tyranny. On the 45th anniversary of their independence day we all join them in their prayer and hope that soon they will be free in their homeland.

## Kennedy Administration's Deliberate Sabotage of Kerr-Mills Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, November 19, 1963*

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, before my Committee on Ways and Means, this morning, Senator KARL E. MUNDT, Republican, of South Dakota, laid bare for every citizen of the United States to see, not only the sabotage being perpetrated on the Kerr-Mills program by some in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, but also the violations of the law. I am pleased to include his testimony, which should be read by every American:

KENNEDY ADMINISTRATION'S DELIBERATE SABOTAGE OF KERR-MILLS PROGRAM

(Statement of Senator KARL E. MUNDT, Republican, of South Dakota, to be presented to House Ways and Means Committee, Tuesday, November 19, as part of hearings by committee on medical care for the aged.)

My primary purpose in testifying today is to call to the attention of the Ways and Means Committee barriers and obstacles which have been placed in the path of implementing the Kerr-Mills program, Public Law 86-778, in my State of South Dakota and in other areas as well. I think your contemplation of this situation is vital because of the testimony that will likely be presented during these hearings that Kerr-Mills has not met the problem of providing medical assistance to the older citizens of this country who have need for such assistance. I am convinced that when full implementation of Kerr-Mills is completed and each of the several States has had the experience of several years of administering and improving their programs with the full and vigorous assistance of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, which agency is charged with the execution of the act, then and only then can the final determination of success or failure be applied. Any such judgment before that time, is highly premature.

South Dakota's Legislature began studying the possibility of implementing the Federal law in its 1961 session only a few months after the enactment of the Federal act. The legislature initiated a study through its legislative research council to determine the need and scope for the program in the State. This cautious approach proved particularly valid because of experiences in other predominately rural States which initiated extensive programs only to face difficulty later in working out scope and financial support.

I was pleased to cooperate with the South Dakota Legislature in 1963 when they decided to adopt their rather unique approach in solving the problem of providing medical assistance to our elder citizens. The implementing legislation provided for a "pilot" program to determine within a short time, the number of needy persons, the extent of their need, and a more accurate determination of the cost of the full program. The State department of public welfare was empowered to enter into a contract for the purchase of prepaid health coverage for eligible individuals. The law includes a provision that their insurance carrier must operate without profit or loss. The prepayment aspect of the plan and the pilot program will curtail high administrative costs of this medical assistance plan. The State legislature acted on the belief that it is conforming with the Kerr-Mills Act, Public Law 87-778 as amended by section 122 of Public Law 87-543.

The high regard I have for the Kerr-Mills approach in solving the problem brings me to the recent report of the Subcommittee on Health of the Elderly to the Senate Special Committee on Aging. Frankly, gentlemen, I am disturbed at what I consider the erroneous conclusions drawn by the majority in that report. For just a few minutes, I should like to dwell on several points in that report.

The Senate Special Committee report acknowledges and admits that the Department of HEW should attempt to help in the successful implementation of Kerr-Mills program at the State level. In fact, on page 17, section 3, it is stated, "The Department clearly has responsibility to assist the States in implementing the enabling legislation." It goes on to state, "All evidence available indicates that the Department has accepted and fulfilled that responsibility to the extent possible.

Gentlemen, it is my contention that this last statement is inaccurate. It is my intention to point out that while the Congress clearly obligated the Department of HEW in administering this public law, to provide constructive assistance to the States, the exact opposite was attempted in many instances by various members of Department staff.

The Senate Committee report accuses the States of "distortion of Congressional intent" in some of the MAA programs which have been implemented. I say the Department is guilty of failing to carry out Congressional intent by a program of deliberate sabotage of an act passed by this Congress and signed by the President.

First, instead of disseminating helpful and constructive information to the public about this law, staff members of the Department have, on many occasions, made public statements and written articles in which the Kerr-Mills law was maligned, ridiculed, and described in half-truths and false generalities.

For instance, Donald Kent, Ph. D., of the Department staff made the following statements in a meeting in Springfield, Ill., on April 7, 1962. "Kerr-Mills is just the same old relief program. * * * Relief is too expensive. * * * I believe we are facing the same tired old proposition that some people are more important than others and that we shouldn't worry too much about the less important ones."

On April 17, 1962, Mr. Ivan Nestingen, Under Secretary of the Department, told the Nashville, Tenn., Sertoma Club that the Kerr-Mills program was not working; it could not do the job, but could only supplement the King bill. He said "90 percent

of the funds being spent are being spent in the three States with smallest population."

In Madison, Wis., on March 31, 1962, Mr. Wilbur Cohen stated at a meeting of the Wisconsin Committee on Health Insurance for the Aged Through Social Security: "There is a great deal more to fear from the Kerr-Mills bill because by definition it is socialized medicine with a vengeance."

Mr. Phillip H. DesMarais, Deputy Assistant Secretary of HEW, addressed a group in Hartford, Conn., on March 26, 1962, and passed out literature which stated, "Kerr-Mills does not adequately take care of the near needy or even many of the very needy."

"Means test medicine in many cases does not let you choose your own hospital and doctor."

"Means test medicine can mean danger to health and safety."

Mr. DesMarais also spoke to at least one other group on the same subject. That was in Chapel Hill, N.C., on April 13, 1962.

On March 19, in Houston, Tex., Mr. Nicholas Zumas, Assistant Under Secretary, held a similar meeting.

In my own State, in Sioux Falls, S. Dak., a workshop conference was held on April 6, 1962, at which Mr. Dean Coston, Special Assistant to the Assistant Secretary was the featured speaker. The important feature of this meeting, which drew only about 30 people, was that it was open only to persons who opposed Kerr-Mills and supported King-Anderson. Although Mr. Coston was appearing at taxpayers' expense, the chairman of the conference stated in a letter dated April 2, 1962, that no organization could send a representative unless the organization supported King-Anderson.

And on April 25, 1963, Mr. Ivan Nestingen spent approximately 6 or 8 minutes of a 20- to 25-minute talk before the Chattanooga, Tenn., Rotary Club deriding Kerr-Mills using such phrases as "administrative monstrosity" "optical illusions," "not a program which a great Nation like ours can be proud of."

Gentlemen, in these stated instances, we have public servants, paid with public funds, traveling at public expense, going about the country trying to destroy public confidence in a law enacted by this committee and the Congress. Not only do I question the legality of such use of Government funds, but I believe they have deliberately distorted the intent of this committee and this Congress.

Now, let me turn to more specific attempts by HEW personnel to sabotage Kerr-Mills. This is at the State legislative level and one instance occurred in my neighboring State of Iowa.

Iowa has had enabling legislation for MAA since 1961, but at the time the bill passed, no funds were appropriated. In 1963, a new bill was introduced in the legislature providing that those eligible for OAA benefits would not be eligible for MAA. Before this bill could be acted upon, HEW wired the Governor's office saying the provision to exclude OAA recipients "is not acceptable."

Gentlemen, I call your attention again to the section of the Senate special committee report which accuses the States of "distortion of congressional intent" by transferring OAA recipients to MAA. How can the majority report of the Senate committee condemn this practice and HEW at the same time uphold it by refusing to accept an MAA program which seeks to prevent the action? In fact, HEW in a later telegram to the Iowa Legislature again stated that approval could not be given to a program which denied assistance to persons because they had received OAA benefits.

The story of HEW's contradictory statements to Iowa is a long one and many other examples such as the ones just mentioned can be documented for this committee if it wishes. Suffice it to say that HEW has not carried out its responsibility of assisting in the implementation of Kerr-Mills in Iowa.

This brings me to a similar set of circumstances in my own States.

The story of HEW delay in South Dakota's case is most distressing. The plan submitted by the South Dakota Department of Public Welfare provided that the State would purchase insurance contracts for persons over age 65 who were eligible under the standards established by State law. The purpose of the insurance approach is to provide for eligible recipients a program most similar to what person with greater income would secure for themselves. Public Law 86-778 provides for the insurance mechanism but it becomes obvious that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has been most reluctant to see it used.

Chronologically, the South Dakota story goes like this:

During both the 1961 and the 1963 legislative sessions, Mr. Alfred Poe, Kansas City regional office, HEW, met with State welfare department officials, legislators, and representatives of the vendors of health services. He was appraised of every draft of the bill, its amendments, and its final wording. On February 11, he sat in on a joint meeting of the State senate and house committees on health and welfare, the welfare commission, and the Governor, and made statements to the effect that major changes would have to be made in the program before Federal approval would be forthcoming.[1] Under questioning by Governor Gubbrud, he admitted that there was actually nothing in the South Dakota law that would cause it to be turned down but there were questionable areas that would require elaboration.

The bill was signed into law March 11, 1963, and a plan submitted by the State welfare department to the regional HEW office on June 10. According to a statement made by the State director of public welfare at a welfare commission meeting in Yankton, S. Dak., on August 29, the plan was mailed from Kansas City to Washington on June 17. On June 28, a representative of the South Dakota State Medical Association was told at a meeting of HEW personnel that the plan had not as yet been seen in Washington.

In August, a letter was transmitted from the Washington office of HEW to Kansas City, indicating that the questions posed by Mr. Poe in his letter of transmittal of the plan to Washington should be answered before the plan was approved. The questions put to the South Dakota department were basically the same points already discussed on the previous occasion. After the questions were answered by the State department of public welfare in early September, no further word of plan approval or disapproval was evidenced by HEW.

On October 18, a representative of the South Dakota State Medical Association and the State director of public welfare met with HEW officials in Washington at which time they were told that one more statement was needed from the South Dakota Attorney General before approval could be given. This information was secured and relayed to proper personnel in the Bureau of Family Affairs, HEW on October 24, at which time the medical association representative was told that the plan would go to the Commissioner for decision without delay. It seemed that this timetable would be followed when information was given to Congressman Ben Reifel on October 25 that the plan would receive a decision "this week."[2] On November 6, Mr. Reifel's office was told that the material was in the hands of general counsel and would go to the Commissioner soon for a decision. To date, no decision has been made.

[1] Associated Press Dispatch, Feb. 12, 1963.

[2] Associated Press story dated Oct. 29, 1963.

To the elderly in South Dakota who may have need of such a program, the Department of HEW has withheld care for a period of 6 months which, in fact, will mean a longer delay because of the time involved in setting up the mechanics of the program after approval.

Can any other conclusion be reached than that the Department has been deliberately delaying approval because the program might well prove a workable design for the rest of the Nation to emulate thereby weakening the argument for H.R. 3920?

ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS

I would also like to refer to a portion of the report of the subcommittee that charges excessive administrative costs in the operation of some of the Kerr-Mills programs.

The point may be well taken that government administrative costs are high. This does not exclude Federal Government administrative costs as contemplated in the social security approach. This is precisely the reason that the South Dakota Legislature wanted the claims paying function, the statistical function, and liaison with the vendors of care maintained by nongovernmental agencies trained and equipped to do such administration. The State welfare department's contract with Blue Cross and Blue Shield obtains the services of two organizations which have combined administrative costs in acting as fiscal agents for South Dakota's old-age assistance program of less than 3 percent.

It is my understanding that Kansas Blue Cross and Blue Shield offered to administer that State's OAA and MAA programs at one-half of 1 percent. This is a striking illustration of the need to give the South Dakota plan an opportunity to prove itself.

CONCLUSION

It has been said before this committee and in countless other places that Kerr-Mills is not a perfect program for providing the Nation's elderly with health care. I have attempted to show why. It is the victim of a planned program of interference on the part of the Department of HEW, King-Anderson supporters in the Congress, and welfare workers and officials at the State and county level. These people, many in places of immense power, have used every means at their disposal to discredit Kerr-Mills in the eyes of the public, to confuse State legislatures in their attempts to enact proper programs, and to demean potential recipients of MAA benefits with meaningless redtape used under the guise of the means test. How could any program work perfectly with this kind of hamstringing at every turn?

Given a reasonable chance Kerr-Mills can and will develop into a mechanism which will answer the health care problem for every needy aged person in this country. But time must be allowed. Since the act was passed in 1960, only 3 years ago, 28 States and 3 other jurisdictions have implemented the act and have it in operation. Ten other States have enacted laws which will become effective shortly or which are awaiting approval of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Of the 12 States which have not passed cooperating legislation, 5 will meet in regular session early next year with the opportunity of acting. In the State of Texas, the electorate voted on the 9th of this month to remove constitutional barriers so the legislature can act in its next session to implement Kerr-Mills in that State. As a matter of record, only 3 of the 50 States have done nothing at all. This is a highly enviable record when it is realized that since 1960 Congress has always had legislation pending which would establish the social security oriented program and the possibility has thus existed that any State medical assistance program with its committed State funds might quickly be superseded.

I urge the committee to consider this problem carefully before enacting a compulsory program of compulsory health insurance attached to the social security program. "Medicare" is a gross misnomer for this approach because it provides no medical care at all. It is simply a very inadequate and partial program of hospital insurance and certain other limited services and does not give the aged or the needy the kind of care that they require. The Kerr-Mills Act, on the other hand, recognizes that after retirement one may have a variety of ailments and so it provides for doctors and surgeons and hospitalization and nursing and drugs and dental benefits.

The reason Kerr-Mills can give a more adequate protection against a compulsory universal program is simple. This medicare program, being compulsory, requires that it be available to everybody so it is available to the wealthy as well as to those who don't need it at all instead of limiting to those people who require assistance at the time of an ailment in old age.

Another reason the compulsory medicare concept is wrong is that it does nothing whatsoever to protect the young family during its working years. It requires them to pay a tax sometimes as long as 45 years on the gamble that maybe after age 65 they will need some health benefits and on the improbable hope that nothing will happen to the family until that time.

In addition, past history assures us that social security taxes will continue to rise sharply. No one can foretell with any degree of accuracy the upper limits of that increase.

Originally, the social security tax was set at 1 percent each on the employer and the employee on the first $3,000 of annual wages. Now it is 3⅝ percent each on income up to $4,800. The tax on the self-employed has risen during the same period from 2¼ percent of the first $3,600 of income to 5.4 percent on the first $4,800. For many taxpayers, the social security tax already takes a bigger bite out of income than the Federal income tax. Even without the enactment of medicare, the tax rate must be increased to provide for an actuarially sound trust account. By 1968, the employee-employer total tax will be 9.25 percent. Estimates based on actual claim experience of insurance companies indicate that within 6 years the estimated cost of the program will require a joint tax on a $5,000 income of 11 percent. This estimate is based on present benefits provided by the pending legislation. Once enacted there is little question that pressures would be engendered to expand the scope of the program, increase the benefits, provide for longer periods of time, and to lower the age limit. All this would, of course, substantially increase the wage tax and the employers tax for all American workers.

There is another feature of the compulsory wage tax and the corresponding tax upon employers for the limited health services proposed by the King-Anderson bill which I strongly dislike. That is the fact that this would be a system of regressive taxation for health purposes entirely violating the concepts of progressive taxation which have so long served us so well in the field of income taxes. In short, the health tax would entirely ignore and violate the ability-to-pay concept of taxation. It would in fact tax the very poor and the very rich at precisely the same tax rates on that first important segment of their annual income which serves as the tax base. For some Americans, for example, their entire income would be subject to this new tax grab while for the wealthy and the well-to-do by far the larger percentage of their income would be exempt from any health tax assessments or payments. In many ways this proposed Federal health tax is far more unjust to those with marginal incomes than would be a Federal sales tax which some are now proposing in lieu of Federal income taxes.

Another important consideration which seems to me to argue against the compulsory social security approach is that in establishing such a program we are taking an irreversible step. I say "irreversible" because we will be requiring people to pay taxes to a program from which they cannot benefit until age 65 so, once started, it would be exceedingly difficult to discontinue. To take such a step at this stage strikes me as very unwise. We are venturing into an entirely new area so far as the Government is concerned. We cannot predict with accuracy at this point what problems and difficulties will be encountered. This being the case it seems to me that any program established should be highly flexible so that it can be easily modified to meet unexpected problems which are bound to arise. From this standpoint the pending proposal would be most unsatisfactory.

I urge the committee to ponder well this extremely important and far-reaching and irreversible decision and I strongly urge sufficient time for the Kerr-Mills Act to be tested in the laboratory of life so that its true worth can be examined and evaluated. Until that is done, I strongly urge this committee and the Congress not to take the irreversible step of approving the King-Anderson bill.

---

## Forty-fifth Anniversary of Latvian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, November 19, 1963*

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, this week marks the 45th anniversary of the declaration of independence of our former sister republic, the Republic of Latvia. It is appropriate that all true Americans should pause once again to pay tribute to the valor, gallantry, and spirit of the Latvian people.

It is an occasion also for all of us to rededicate our purpose with vigorous determination to the liberation of Latvia and the other small, helpless nations that have been dragged behind the Iron Curtain by a combination of bestial violence, unconscionable diplomacy and subversive infiltration.

Latvia was one of the three Baltic Republics overrun by the Red Army invasion of 1940. For many years Latvia struggled against discouraging odds to establish and maintain her freedom. First, it was czarist Russia, which oppressed Latvia until 1918. It is the declaration of independence after the czarist collapse that we remember today. Then the well-known Soviet methods of force and subversion were used to temporarily impose a puppet Latvian Government, for 5 months in 1919. But the Latvian people heroically rejected this farcical regime. During this time also Latvia had to defeat the remnants of German imperialism in the Baltic.

Then for a too short 20 years Latvians guided their own destiny. And they did an admirable job of it. Latvia became a respected, dedicated member of the League of Nations in 1921. She made great advances in manufacturing and agriculture. Ninety-five percent of Latvian trade was with Western Europe and the United States during the thirties. The Constitution of Latvia was founded on the latest constitutional principles of Western thought. In the Latvian Parliament, the Saeima, party government of the kind we know was the modus operandi.

On August 11, 1920, the defeated Bolsheviki had agreed to final and irrevocable independence for Latvia. And for a few years, while Stalin consolidated his power, Latvia was not unduly molested. On February 5, 1932, Latvia and the Soviet Union signed a treaty of nonaggression which absolutely forbade the Soviet Union to meddle in Latvia affairs. But if anyone took hope from this, it was false hope, as so often before and since. Because, soon thereafter, in violation of their spoken and written word, the Communists began the careful, militant subversion of free Latvia. The pace was notably increased in 1935, and Latvia's fate was assured by the infamous treaty with Hitler in 1939. It took Stalin very little time to concentrate 16 divisions on Latvia's border and, this time, force capitulation.

The decline and terrible repression of Latvia after that are well known. Fortunately, a few Latvians have been able to reach freedom and to continue the fight against the Soviet Union. There is no doubt the majority of Latvians, whether at home or abroad, desire self-determination.

As I have stated so many times, there can be no compromise on the great human questions of the destiny of free peoples. Foremost among these is the right of nations desiring it to be free, the right of each individual to be free, the right of the human soul to find expression in free institutions, to achieve that measure of freedom bestowed by the Creator, the right of the lowly and the weak to be protected in their choice of life and in their desire and intention to walk humbly in the ways of the Lord seeking and enjoying the privilege that can come only from free government to order their own lives and to be liberated from the bondage and the slavery which selfish, rapacious tyrants impose upon them.

Let us be true to our own glorious heritage of freedom. This heritage was not won through fear and trembling, appeasement and cowardice. It was won through bitter sacrifices, bloodshed, and suffering by millions of people, past and present, who were willing to give everything they had—their honor, their possessions, their material resources, and their lives to protect and sustain our liberties. This heritage was won through determination, through strength, through courage, through fearlessness, and it can only be preserved and protected by the same means.

It is fitting that on this 45th anniversary of Latvian independence we should pledge anew to all small nations under the yoke of Soviet tyranny and oppression our determination to work for the restoration of freedom to these unhappy lands.

Let it be known by the great freedom-loving Latvian people and all oppressed peoples the fight for freedom is our fight because it is the fight for liberty, democracy, justice, morality, and human decency.

Let us express our determination and hopes for a free Latvia to take her rightful place among the free nations of the world.

## Remarks of Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson at Douglas Space Center Dedication in Huntington Beach, Calif.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, November 19, 1963*

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday in Huntington Beach, Calif., the Vice President of the United States, LYNDON B. JOHNSON, honored us by delivering the principal address at the dedication of America's newest and most modern center for space research and development. This space center was designed and built by Douglas Aircraft, Inc., a leader in this, the age of space.

Vice President JOHNSON's excellent speech outlined this Nation's commitment to, and stake in "mankind's last and greatest frontier—the frontier of space."

Mr. Speaker, I include the text of the Vice President's speech at this point in the RECORD.

REMARKS BY VICE PRESIDENT LYNDON B. JOHNSON AT THE SPACE CENTER DEDICATION, HUNTINGTON BEACH, CALIF., NOVEMBER 14, 1963

This is a day of great and justified pride for all associated with the building of this outstanding center of research and development for the age of space.

It is a credit and honor to our system that a private organization begun in the back of a barber shop could within a lifetime grow in size, talent, and vision to participate in the pioneering of our Nation's search for peace out in mankind's last and greatest frontier—the frontier of space.

This center is not dedicated today as a monument to past achievement. It is dedicated, rather, as a testament to our American faith in the future and in our own national resourcefulness for achieving and realizing the potential of that future.

If there has been a single characteristic responsible for our success over the past 200 years, it has been the characteristic American confidence in the future. It was that same confidence which brought other generations westward across the continent to build what has been built in such a short time here on the shores of the Pacific.

Today, in our land—and in the world—there are those who argue for the view that we should not push forward into new realms or new enterprises unless this is clear and compelling evidence of competition from other nations and other systems. I believe the American people reject the concept that their future—or the future of freemen everywhere shall be defaulted to the vision and ambition of the totalitarians.

We refuse to accept so negative a doctrine that we are not to interest ourselves in space unless the Communists are interested in space. We cannot live as freemen if for the sake of our own comfort, convenience and complacency, we permit ourselves to become slaves to the limitations, the deceptions or the guile of the Communist system and its leadership.

Those who say—as some are inclined to do—that our purposes and the purposes of communism in space exploration are the same misread and misunderstand the history and meaning of our times. In 1957 when the Soviets placed the first sputnik in orbit, the Communist rulers of Russia refused to consider sharing the fruits of space research with other nations—refused to consider committing themselves to developing space for peaceful purposes alone. In that same year, we of the United States clearly stated our own national policy and purpose. We committed and dedicated ourselves to sharing the fruits of space research with all mankind—and to the sole objective of developing the uses of space for peaceful purposes.

It is significant that while the Communist efforts are conducted behind a curtain of secrecy, we of the United States enjoy the cooperation, support and alliance of more than 60 nations for our space program. It is significant that while we of the United States can and do propose joint endeavors for peaceful purposes, the Soviet both rejects our proposals and devotes itself to attempts to dissuade us from continuing on the programs we have established.

America's commitment to the exploration of space for peaceful purposes—and for the good of all mankind—is a firm commitment. We will not retreat from our national purpose. We will not be turned aside in our national effort by the transparent maneuvers of those who would attempt to divert us.

Our national purpose in space is peace—not prestige.

Our foremost objective is not to send a man to the moon but to bring a greater measure of sunlight into the lives of men on earth.

Our space technology and research have moved forward rapidly and dramatically since the early days of the age of space barely half a decade ago. But our achievements and accomplishments in this field remain in their infancy. It is imperative that at this critical point of development and progress we keep our space technology and science free of the control and misdirection of arbitrary policy changes.

The history of science is a history of unending service to the betterment of life for man. The same has not always been so true for the history of political science. We must not fasten down upon the scientific potential of this new age the limited vision of passing political causes and conveniences.

We have the country we have—our cause of freedom has the strength it has—because we have always maintained faith and confidence in the future and in our own ability to control it for the good of man.

Today the full complex of our society—business, labor, education, and government—are working together in resolute and determined commitment to realize the potential of the space frontier. Our objective must be to continue on this sure course, laying aside petty rivalries, idle jealousies and momentary discomforts to bring the full strength of our remarkable capabilities to bear on achieving the potential opening now before us—and before all the world.

A failure in space would be the costliest failure of our national history—a failure ultimately fatal to the cause we have championed at such great sacrifice and with such great devotion throughout this 20th century. On the other hand, success in space—the success we shall eventually win—may well be the greatest economy of our history if, by that success, we succeed in bringing closer to reality a world without war, a world of universal peace, freedom and justice.

Thus, today, with great pride and greater expectations, we dedicate this center to the service of the future and the cause of freedom which is our country's cause and the highest cause of man on earth.

## Crossing the Broadcast Rubicon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, November 19, 1963*

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, now that the 1964 TV season is in full swing, the onslaught of the TV rating services has begun. As the time for each periodic rating report draws near, TV executives and actors shudder and feverishly await the fate of their standing. Executives wonder whether their companies are going to rank first, second, or third, and ponder what that actually means since the companies are only separated by a few percentage points. Actors, directors, and producers worry that their meal tickets may possibly be arbitrarily cut off. Why should these fears that exist in one of America's largest industries be based on the apprehension of unreliable surveys and ratings? This injustice is one that is still evident, even after a full congressional hearing by the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Subcommittee on Investigations.

It has been hoped that the National Association of Broadcasters and the rating services could work out a sound plan of cleaning up this numbers racket. If the industry itself cannot work out the gross inequities being fostered by the rating services, then the Congress must take the initiative to see that a reliable system of television ratings is established if they are to continue.

At this point in the RECORD I would like to insert a speech by the Honorable OREN HARRIS, chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee before the Association of Broadcast Executives of Texas last week. He dealt with two threats facing the broadcasting industry: first, the stranglehold which the audience measurement services appear to have over most of the industry; and, second, the so-called fairness doctrine of the FCC which he said, in his judgment, threatens to inject the Commission into the day-to-day programing decision of the licensee:

SPEECH OF HON. OREN HARRIS, CHAIRMAN, COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE BEFORE THE ASSOCIATION OF BROADCAST EXECUTIVES OF TEXAS, NOVEMBER 14, 1963, DALLAS, TEX.

Your association—ABET—is to be commended for your farsightedness, vision and recognition that to run a broadcast business and get the greatest utilization out of this resource in rendering a public service requires the efforts, cooperation and coexistence of any number of allied interests in this field. There is no other system like ours in the world. It is truly a hybrid organization. In a way it is similar in its total operation to a great bureaucracy, difficult sometimes to find the true head or source.

Even so, in its infancy the broadcast industry has emerged through a maze of difficulties and is providing service to our people beyond imagination. It is truly an American enterprise. I salute the executives in the industry who obviously have provided guidance, organization and stability.

Even so, the broadcasting industry of today has become the melting pot of confusion in a stew of pronouncements, interpretations and rulemaking proposals which has resulted in greater frustration, fear, and uncertainty than I have yet to see with a regulated industry.

Why is this so? I think there are a number of reasons for it.

First, the very nature of the industry itself—highly competitive, the service it performs to the public, dissemination of ideas in a free society and limitation of available frequencies in the spectrum.

In the second place, the origin of the industry as a necessary, partially regulated industry, as a private enterprise profitmaking business and as an industry under this system destined to influence the lives and fortunes of our people.

In the third place, this situation prevails to some extent because of the enthusiasm for freedom and opportunity for the industry to take its place in our business community without unnecessary interference except to serve the public interest.

In the fourth place, it is partially due to varying opinions and views of those charged with the responsibility of regulation from time to time as how best they can carry out their duties as they think the Congress intended.

And, finally, in the fifth place, this condition exists in part due to the failure of so many of you engaged in this business to realize the industry has yet to cross the Rubicon.

With this preface I would like to discuss briefly what I regard as two serious threats to the exercise of your responsibilities as licensees. As you know so well, your privilege to operate a broadcast facility is conditioned by your obligation to serve the public interest. The discharge of that obligation, as I see it, becomes more difficult than it might be otherwise by a combination of circumstances.

First, our system of broadcasting is financed not by you, the licensees, but by advertisers who may or may not share your feeling of obligation to serve the public interest. For the advertiser, broadcasting is but a *means to his end*—larger sales and bigger profits. I do not disparage that goal, for the healthy growth of our economy depends on its achievement. But I am mindful that the advertiser's efforts to reach the largest possible audience with his commercial messages may be an obstacle to the attainment of your statutory goal.

Unlike for the advertiser, broadcasting is for the licensee an end in itself. The law places on you the sole responsibility for carrying out your obligation to serve the public. Licensees may not delegate the discharge of their statutory obligation to anyone—advertisers, advertising agencies, network organizations, rating services—anyone. I will return to this theme in a moment.

Another difficulty you must live with is that you operate under the constant watchful eye of a Federal regulatory agency, the Federal Communications Commission. The broadcasting industry is, under the law, not a public utility. Yet because the broadcast media use the limited public airwaves, and because of the tremendous impact these media have on the listening and viewing public, it is necessary that some degree of regulation be imposed.

But the fact of the FCC's regulatory authority in no way changes the fact that the day-to-day responsibility for transmitting programs that serve the public interest is that of the licensee alone. Just as licensees may not delegate their responsibilities to advertisers or others, nor may this responsibility be usurped by the Commission—at least as I think that Communications Act stands today. (And I don't think Congress is in any mood to shift that licensee responsibility to anyone else.)

Having said this, I would now like to focus more closely on two facets of the total problem as examples of the "melting pot of confusion" previously referred to.

First, the stranglehold which the audience measurement services appear to have over most of the industry.

Second, the so-called fairness doctrine of the FCC which, in my judgment—at least insofar as I am able to understand what it means—threatens to inject the Commission into the day-to-day programing decisions of the licensee.

I have been asked by a good many people why our committee saw fit to make an investigation of the rating services which lasted some 18 months and culminated in 5½ weeks of public hearings. The rating companies are, after all, private businesses, I am reminded, and not now subject to FCC licensing or other regulation.

The answer is twofold. First, the committee wanted to find out the extent, if any, to which rating reports influenced licensees' decisions on programing, the purchase and sale of time, and the like. We were concerned, and I am still concerned (particularly when I read of the anxiousness with which the industry has awaited the October Nielsen reports), about the abdication of sound judgment by broadcasters in favor of numbers purporting to show sheer audience size.

Secondly, once the committee had become aware of the pervasiveness of the influence of the rating figures on licensee decisions, we thought it important to learn whether the figures merited the great faith placed in them by so many. While some statistical studies of the ratings had been made, none of these had attempted to go beyond the public claims of the rating companies. We felt we had to know more about sample design, field work, and tabulating and editing procedures than had been known before.

What we found out was hardly reassuring. The committee staff interviewed hundreds of people and retabulated several surveys, using the original field materials—interview sheets, diaries, and the like, supplied by the rating companies. The staff attempted to discover from the rating companies the techniques they used in editing the raw data. When they tried to apply the techniques the companies said they used, they often got results dramatically different from those published by the survey companies. While the committee recognizes the logic and legitimacy of many editing and weighting techniques, it was clear to us that some used were not at all appropriate. The eminent statistician engaged by the committee as a consultant characterized one such weighting scheme as—

"Nothing more or less than an excuse for doctoring the figures which were developed in the survey to perhaps bring out the personal opinion of whoever does the weighting."

The president of another rating company admitted that the figures circulated to his subscribers amount to little more than a calculated guess.

Still another survey company, in its promotional material, invited stations to say what they wanted about their delivery of the spendable dollar, and then document it with a report put out by that company.

In addition, there were many admissions during the hearings of carelessness and lax supervision. And there were unexplained instances of inconsistency within the same company in the use of editing techniques.

We do not claim or even pretend to be statisticians. But you don't have to be a statistician to see that the rating companies often have been doing one thing while they said they were doing something else.

You don't have to be a statistician to know that something is wrong when a survey firm does interviewing for a local report in counties where the local stations' signals don't even reach. Or when no interviewing is done in counties admittedly within the metropolitan area.

You don't have to be a statistician to understand that, in view of all the sources of bias and error disclosed during the hearings, the rating services have been claiming much greater precision for their figures than the facts can justify. And when the life and death of programs, the economic fortunes of producers and performers, even the existence of stations themselves may depend on differences of tenths of rating points, I think you can appreciate the committee's concern.

One thing that has been disconcerting is the attitude of some broadcasters and advertisers that nothing can or should be done to improve audience research. Many broadcasters seem satisfied with the ratings as they have been. Or at least they have been resigned to the present system on the ground that ratings are the only audience indicator that exists. The feeling seems to be that no one can do without comparative figures.

I submit that this is the outlook of the man with a crutch. If the crutch is known to be defective, he should want a better crutch. But his ideal is to be restored to health so that he will be strong enough to throw the crutch away.

I would like to make it perfectly clear that I am not a crusader, the committee has not been crusading. We did not start out on a witch hunt; we knew what we were doing from innumerable reports and we have been serious in our efforts toward correcting a bad situation and one which, if permitted to continue, would result in dire consequences.

Segments of your industry are now and have been working diligently to improve the quality of audience research. If you are going to have to continue to rely on ratings you should insist on the best research existing knowledge and techniques can produce.

I believe, with a few broadcasters, that your ideal should be to make your stations and your industry strong so that you will not need audience numbers in order to raise your revenue. But I am fearful most of you still feel the need for some kind of statistical crutch.

You may very well then ask—"how can you pay for it?" In view of the enormous sums of money, upward of $1 billion, that hang in the balance each year, it should not be difficult to meet the cost for sufficient sample sizes, better supervision and quality controls, as well as other improvements.

It was contended during the course of the hearings that the results of a statistical survey can be at best no more reliable than the raw data underlying them. I might also remind you that we had expert testimony which expressed the view that if you feed "garbage" into a computer, you will get "garbage" out.

Your National Association of Broadcasters proposes to do something about it in a three-point program that would assure ratings to be "valid, reliable, effective, and economically viable." It proposes:

1. The establishment of minimum standards and criteria in the field of broadcast audience measurement, and a system of accreditation of rating companies based on such standards and criteria:

2. The organization and supervision of Rating Audit Service; and

3. The projection of a continuing, effective program of research in audience measurement methodologies.

Unless you recover your own responsible decisionmaking functions, you will have no one but yourselves to blame, should the Federal Government on behalf of the public undertake to do something about it.

This brings me to the second principal point of focus in this discussion—the fairness doctrine.

FAIRNESS DOCTRINE

The fairness doctrine is undoubtedly a well-intentioned attempt by the FCC to reconcile the spirit of fairness as contained in section 315 of the Communications Act, dealing with political candidates, with the right of broadcasters to editorialize on controversial subjects.

Before attempting to analyze some of the problems I see in the considered fairness doctrine, let me undertake to put it in its proper perspective.

The equal-time provision of section 315, the right to editorialize, and the fairness doctrine are analytically separable subjects for discussion. Yet in much of the recent debate on these subjects they have become terribly confused.

It seems to me there is a need for clarification, at which I will now make a modest attempt.

First, let us consider the intent and requirements of section 315. By itself, the section does not require that a licensee allow air time to any legally qualified candidates for political office. But once a licensee has allowed a candidate to use its facilities to advance his cause, section 315 requires the licensee, if requested, to grant the opponent or opponents equal time under comparable conditions to advance his or their side of the story. It further denies to the licensee any power of censorship.

Despite persistent efforts on the part of broadcasters, particularly the networks, to abolish the equal time rule, Congress has never seen fit to do so. The closest we have come is to vote, this year as in 1960, to suspend the operation of the rule so as to permit the so-called great debates between candidates of the two major parties for the Presidency and the Vice Presidency.

The FCC has over the years, as we all know, blown hot and cold on the subject of editorializing by broadcasters. Since the overturn by the Commission of the Mayflower rule, licensees have been free to express editorial opinions—in the same manner generally that newspapers do. But many licensees have been and still are reluctant to program editorials on a regular basis, for fear they will run into trouble—either from advertisers fearful of any controversy, or from the Commission, especially since the enunciation by the Commission in 1949 of the fairness doctrine.

As early as 1958 I advocated the practice of editorializing by broadcasters. My views have not changed. It seems to me contrary to our traditions of free expression to forbid broadcasters to speak out on controversial issues of importance to their communities—as the FCC did in the old Mayflower case.

But when the Commission reversed itself in 1949 in order to permit broadcast editorials, it may have opened a Pandora's box of troubles, both for itself and for broadcasters. For at that time, it set forth the fairness doctrine.

The fairness doctrine, as I understand it, imposes on any licensee which editorializes on political campaigns or other controversial matters, an affirmative obligation to seek out spokesmen for viewpoints contrasting with those expressed by the licensee. Now that, on the face of it, seems simple and fair enough. But its simplicity is, I think, deceptive. For it seems to assume issues of a two-sided nature; for example, "We should get out of the United Nations; we should stay in the United Nations." Or, "We should not cut Federal taxes; we should cut Federal taxes."

But, what of the many side issues raised by such controversies? Take the tax-cut issue, on which there are many shades of opinion. Many responsible persons believe there should be no tax cut until the Federal budget is balanced. Others believe that only with "planned deficits" can our economy continue to grow at a satisfactory rate under present conditions. (And what, parenthetically, is a "satisfactory" rate?) Many people believe, quite sincerely, that a tax cut, unaccompanied by reforms in our tax structure, is unthinkable. But they disagree heatedly over which specific reforms are needed. Others feel that we should cut taxes now and worry about reforms later when there may be more agreement on the subject of "which reforms."

I think this brief excursion into the tax cut issue will give you some idea of the problems raised by the fairness doctrine.

Let us say that a station broadcasts an editorial simply favoring a tax cut now—reforms or no reforms. Must the licensee mail to various spokesmen for all these and other different viewpoints transcripts of the editorial? Must he solicit them to use his facilities to express their various attitudes?

If he must—and I see nothing in the fairness doctrine that says he need not—he would be taking on an intolerable burden. I submit that the logical result of the fairness doctrine would be that the licensee would broadcast no editorials at all.

And this is precisely the opposite of what the FCC says it wants to encourage.

My feeling is that the judgment as to what "contrasting" viewpoints a broadcaster should permit to be aired over his facilities should be left with the licensee, where the Communications Act put it in the first place.

To these burdens that a concentrated effort to enforce the fairness doctrine would impose on licensees should be added the additional administrative burdens on the Commission itself. If we are to believe the Commission spokesmen who appear before the House Appropriations Committee, the Commissioners and staff are plenty busy as it is. The kind of effort that would be required for a thoroughgoing enforcement program in this field would divert much Commission manpower from tasks to which the Congress has assigned higher priority.

I cannot but conclude that the net result would be a setback to the public interest.

I have offered for your consideration what I consider two real threats to broadcasting in the public interest. Our committee is keenly aware of them, and you may be sure we are closely watching every development. Our primarily objective, as I see it, is to remove whatever obstacles we can that stand in the way of the freedom of a responsible broadcasting industry. I hope that through our studies and our hearings the committee has made some headway toward that goal.

But, in closing, I remind you again the key to a flourishing and improving system of free American broadcasting lies largely with you, the licensees. If the full potentialities of our system can be achieved and our people can realize the advantages of this vast resource, we will have "crossed the Rubicon."

## Life Expectancy Greater in Hawaii

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, November 19, 1963*

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, life is not only more enjoyable in Hawaii; it is also longer. Statistics appearing on page 12 of Parade magazine of Sunday, November 17, 1963, point to the fact that the average life expectancy for men living in Hawaii is 3 years longer than others of his specie living elsewhere in the United States—the average life expectancy for men in Hawaii being 69.5 years and those in other parts of the United States being 66.5 years. For some reason or other, women living in Hawaii have just about the same life expectancy as women living on the mainland. The average woman in Hawaii may expect to live to be 73.3 years of age, while those on the mainland may expect 73 years of living.

The reason for the longer life of the male specie in Hawaii may be that in the Aloha State men have more to live for. The eternal springtime climate, the beautiful scenery colored by Mother Nature, the swaying palm trees in tropical moonlit nights, and of course the lovely maidens with their tantalizing hula hands may in part account for this increased life expectancy in our paradise isles. In any event, Mr. Speaker, a man should look forward to living in Hawaii if he hopes to live longer than the average male. Hawaii welcomes you even for a short visit to find out the real reason why its men can expect to live longer.

## In Recognition of Miss Debbie Reynolds and Her Work With Emotionally Disturbed Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, November 19, 1963*

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, since its founding in 1955, the Thalians, an organization for emotionally disturbed children, has had as its most ardent supporter, film star Miss Debbie Reynolds, a valued constituent of mine. Miss Reynolds has been instrumental in raising funds for the organization, which is a nonprofit, tax-exempt corporation chartered by the State of California.

In the beginning, its fundraising efforts benefited the Reiss-Davis Guidance Child Clinic in West Los Angeles. As the group became larger and its income increased, Miss Reynolds spearheaded the group's dream by organizing a clinic of its own. This clinic was dedicated in 1959 on the grounds of the Mount Sinai Hospital and is called the Thalians Clinic for Children. At the present moment the clinic is operating at peak level, with more than 125 children under regular observation.

In 1961, when the Cedars of Lebanon and Mount Sinai Hospitals merged, the combined organization began to raise funds for a $50 million medical center for Los Angeles. As part of the center's building fund, the Thalians pledged themselves to raise $1 million to construct and maintain a Thalians building to contain an expanded clinic for

children. Miss Reynolds, again, is the vital force behind this drive.

Miss Debbie Reynolds, film star and mother, with so many other pressing duties, should most certainly be applauded for her invaluable service to this group.

---

## Congressman Harold R. Collier Reports to the People of the 10th District of Illinois

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, November 19, 1963*

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit herewith a report to the residents of the 10th Congressional District of Illinois summarizing the major legislation and my activities as their Representative during the 1st session of the 88th Congress.

In reporting annually to my constituents in past years, I had always done so following sine die adjournment. The 1963 session, however, is not likely to come to a close until shortly before Christmas—and there is even the possibility that the record-breaking duration of the current session may run through the end of December.

Looking back to my first term as a Member of Congress, it is difficult to understand why a legislative body which was able to complete its work and adjourn in August must now drag through a 12-month session. What is more significant is the fact that less has been accomplished in the way of legislative action this year than was achieved when the sessions were shorter. The fact of the matter is that indecision and indirection have plagued both the House of Representatives and the Senate, especially, on the prime political issues of this administration.

Less than 3 years ago the liberals in the Federal administration charged that Congress was moving too slowly because the House Rules Committee impeded the process of legislation. This committee was admittedly inclined to be conservative in recent years. It is the committee, as you know, which determines which legislation shall be reported to the floor of the House and prescribes the conditions of debate on various bills.

"Enlarge the Rules Committee," said the liberals, "and we shall get legislation moving." And, thus, Congress packed the Rules Committee by adding three members. Again during this session of Congress, the expansion of the Rules Committee was continued through majority action. It is indeed ironical that the expansion of the Rules Committee not only failed to do what the liberals claimed—but the record reflects contradictory results. Previously, the Rules Committee was used as a buffer for other committees which felt it politically expedient on other occasions to move bills which were known to be generally unpopular or which would become political "hot potatoes" if they ever got to the floor. Thus they were frequently tabled presumably en route to the floor of the House.

We have a prime example of this in the controversial Federal aid to education bill because the several proposals to provide Federal funds for primary and secondary schools have become completely entangled in politics and religion. Many of the proponents of this type of legislation are content to see it resting quietly for if such a bill was ever reported many Representatives would find themselves in the difficult position of having to deal with the aid to private and parochial school programs. This is a situation packed with political dynamite in many areas.

With approximately a month remaining before the 1964 session gets underway, there are still important items of unfinished business.

The foreign aid appropriation bill is in serious trouble. The House slashed $582 million from the authorization bill—and the Senate is apparently in no mood this year to restore it as it did in the past. The ardent proponents of the multibillion-dollar foreign aid program of yesteryear are now coming around to supporting the position of the conservatives that have been trying to cut back during the past decade. The sad fact of the matter is that more governments have been overthrown or seized by coups around the world in the past 15 years than in the previous 75 years. Our position in the world today is admittedly no better and in many cases worse than it was when we embarked upon our foreign aid program. Certainly in some areas U.S. aid was necessary but, for the most part, the program has lost its appeal and has directly affected our critical imbalance of payments. Furthermore, our Western European allies have failed to meet their commitments and obligations in the cold war which continues with new eruptions and fluctuating tensions in the Far East and Latin America.

On the home front there is obviously deep public concern over Government fiscal policies. Three times during the past year Congress was obliged to raise the national debt because the Nation continues along a course of deficit spending. I have opposed Federal spending increases at every level as well as voting against increasing the public debt because of the frightening implications of pursuing policies which I consider fiscally irresponsible.

Aside from the fiscally sick condition of the Treasury, Government expansion into one area after another in our national life creates a consistently mushrooming bureaucracy. It appears to me that the American people are becoming more and more skeptical of Government programs as a panacea for every problem which develops in our economic and social system.

The House-passed tax reduction bill written by the Ways and Means Committee, of which I am a member, is stalled in the Senate and may not get to the Senate floor before the turn of the year. While I personally feel a tax reduction across the board is necessary and desirable, I opposed final passage after an amendment to tie a curb on Federal spending to the tax bill failed. It is my understanding that many Members of the Senate feel that a tax reduction on borrowed money will only compound the Nation's fiscal problem in the months ahead.

The Ways and Means Committee began hearings on the various medicare proposals for the Nation's elder citizens 2 weeks ago. There is practically no chance for any such bill being reported this year—and there are grave doubts that such legislation will be passed in 1964 despite it being a presidential election year with the usual political pressures being present.

The fate of civil rights legislation is at present unpredictable and may well depend upon how successful Members of both legislative bodies are in amending titles II and III of the measure during floor action.

Significant in the pattern of this year's legislative activity was the defeat of the area redevelopment program which, after 2 years, failed to do the job which its sponsors predicted.

American farmers soundly defeated the wheat referendum—an action which can only be construed as disappointment and disgust with Government controls of the Nation's agricultural economy.

And now for a more personal report on this past year's session. Because of the fact that this has been the longest session in peacetime history, congressional mail has been unusually heavy and has not tapered off during the months of September, October, and November, as it did in previous years. Needless to say, the length of the session has also made it impossible for me to spend the time in my district office that I did in the past.

LEGISLATION WHICH REPRESENTATIVE COLLIER INTRODUCED DURING THE 88TH CONGRESS

H.R. 1904: 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 60 years.

H.R. 3286: A bill to establish a Commission on Aircraft Noise Abatement to study means for abating aircraft noise and to recommend corrective measures.

H.R. 3927: A bill to provide for medical hospital care for the aged through a system of voluntary health insurance, and for other purposes.

House Joint Resolution 268: Constitutional Amendment—Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex.

House Resolution 265: A House resolution to amend the Rules of the House to further restrict action on bills providing for the withdrawal of money from the Treasury.

House Resolution 279: A House resolution to establish a Special Committee on the Captive Nations.

H.R. 4775: A bill to allow deduction for expenses incurred by taxpayer for education of a dependent.

House Concurrent Resolution 133: A House concurrent resolution requesting the President to initiate action in the United Nations calling for the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia and the return of exiles from these nations from slave-labor camps in the Soviet Union.

H.R. 5986: A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 with respect to the rate of duty on brooms made of broom corn.

H.R. 5987: A bill to terminate the retailers' excise tax on cosmetics and other toilet preparations.

H.R. 5988: A bill to reduce excise tax on all-channel television sets to 5 percent.

H.R. 6409: A bill to amend the Anti-Dumping Act of 1921.

H.R. 6490: A bill to repeal the excise tax on communications.

House Concurrent Resolution 166: A House concurrent resolution to revise and simplify the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

H.R. 6635: A bill to amend sections 162 and 274 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to deductibility of certain business, entertainment, and so forth, expenses.

H.R. 6911: A bill to prohibit the use of the term "mahogany" in interstate commerce in connection with woods which are not in fact mahogany.

H.R. 6926: A bill to increase the amount of outside earnings permitted without deductions from social security benefits.

H.R. 8204: A bill to amend the Federal Employees Compensation Act to remove certain inequities in rates of pay.

H.R. 8535: A bill to provide for the right of persons to be represented by attorneys in matters before Federal agencies.

H.R. 9077: A bill to amend tariff schedules on aluminum products, TV picture tubes and for other purposes.

More than 500 residents of my congressional district visited in my Washington office during 1963. In almost every instance my staff arranged for visits to the White House, provided gallery passes for both the House and Senate for visitors, and arranged for tours of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Bureau of Engraving, and other places of historical interest in the Nation's Capital.

Early this year, as in the past, we conducted a public opinion poll throughout the district. This was done by selecting families at random and mailing a questionnaire to get the grassroot sentiments of my constituents on the major legislative issues. Nearly 20,000 people in the 10th district participated in this poll, the results of which were published in the last issue of my newsletter.

Our congressional district is the largest in Illinois and one of the largest in the Nation with nearly 600,000 population. It is understandable, therefore, that the workload in an office such as mine is perhaps heavier than most of those where Representatives' districts average about 420,000 constituents.

In addition, my new committee assignment, which resulted in my being appointed to fill the one minority vacancy on the House Ways and Means Committee, was far more consuming in time and effort than I had experienced previously. This was primarily because our committee wrote the tax bill and revised 34 of the 37 recommendations for structural changes in the existing tax law. No committee in the Congress met more frequently or conducted the number of hearings on a single bill than our committee did on the tax legislation this year.

The longer sessions have resulted in sharply increased living and travel expenses for Members of Congress who previously maintain two homes only 7 or 8 months of the year instead of the full year. The number of essential trips back and forth from Washington to the Member's congressional district to fulfill the usual commitments nearly doubled notwithstanding the fact that each Member is allowed only three round trips from Washington to his district in a single congressional session. This, together with the associated problems of a 12-month session, resulted in demands by many Members for sharp increases in compensation—particularly since the Congress, by the established rules of the House, should adjourn by midnight on July 31 of each year. It is permitted to stay beyond this date only because the Korean war emergency declared by President Truman back in 1950 was never rescinded by either President Eisenhower or President Kennedy thus technically leaving the Congress in a state of national emergency. Aside from the merits of the salary issue, it is my personal feeling that such action should be deferred until we get our fiscal house in order and reduce the ever-increasing Federal Treasury deficits.

In conclusion let me say that while the length of the long duration of this session is not conducive to the best legislative process or the enjoyment of the Congressman's work, I am honored and privileged in being able to represent the 10th District of Illinois in the U.S. Congress. The first session of the 88th Congress has been marked with certain achievements and more than its share of failures but this must be expected in the light of the seething world situation on one hand and the many controversial domestic issues on the other.

I have not had the opportunity to become as well acquainted with the residents of the new area of my congressional district as I would like. Under normal conditions, if Congress had completed its business and adjourned as it should around Labor Day, I would have had the opportunity to fulfill more of my commitments in the Maine, Leyden, and Cicero Township areas which were added to the 10th District in the legislative reapportionment in 1962.

I welcome the opinions and views of the people in my district on the many important issues with which our Nation is faced today. Staff members in my district office (Pioneer 9-4115) are available daily to assist constituents who may have problems pending with the various agencies of Government such as the Veterans' Administration, Immigration and Naturalization Service, and so forth. Matters concerning legislation should be directed to my Washington office at room 1622, Longworth House Office Building in the Nation's Capital.



---

## The Negro Revolt: A Challenge to American Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, November 19, 1963*

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, last month I was invited by the Intergroup Education Project of the Berkeley Unified School District to make the opening address at the annual Berkeley Community Enlightenment Series.

The subject which I was asked to present, "The Negro Revolt: A Challenge to American Education"—is both a current and a critical national problem.

I believe our colleagues may find this inquiry into a complex social issue to be of interest.

The address follows:

THE NEGRO REVOLT: A CHALLENGE TO AMERICAN EDUCATION

Ladies and gentlemen, I am deeply honored to be with you this evening as we begin this second annual community enlightenment series. Public participation and discussion are the backbone of our democracy—they are the lifeblood of a free and open society—and in a very real sense this series is in the great tradition of our American heritage.

On a personal basis, let me add, that Mrs. Cohelan and I are both very pleased to be home. This has already been a long session of Congress, and there is no question that we certainly have much left to do.

The subject before us tonight is a formidable one, but it is one in which I have had a long and a deep interest, and I welcome the opportunity to discuss it.

THE PROBLEM AND PROGRESS

This year of 1963 marks the 100th anniversary of the Emancipation Proclamation—an act which declared in unmistaken ringing terms that all men shall be free—and of the Gettysburg Address which reaffirmed that all men are created equal.

This month of October in 1963 marks the 10th anniversary of still another historic event; of a Supreme Court term which struck down discrimination in our public schools, under the guise of separate but equal, as a violation of the 14th amendment to our Constitution, as a denial of equal educational opportunity for all.

In those 100 years, and more particularly in the last 10, grudging progress has been made. The Commission on Civil Rights has reported that more Americans than ever before are exercising more fully their rights as citizens. Today slightly over half of the 6,200 school districts in the 17 Southern and border States have both white and Negro students; 113 districts were desegregated for the first time this fall—18 of them by Court order—and in 2 States—South Carolina and Alabama—the previous all-white color line was broken.

But across our land Negro children are continuing to attend segregated schools.

Ninety-four percent of the 265,000 Negro students who attend school with whites in the South do so in the border States. In the South, schools are generally segregated by official policy, notwithstanding the Supreme Court's finding that segregation on the basis of race cannot constitutionally be enforced. And, school segregation is not limited to this area alone. In the North and West de facto segregation continues; segregation because of existing housing patterns, and the practice of assigning pupils to neighborhood schools. As the Commission on Civil Rights has stated: Concentration of colored Americans in restricted areas of most major cities produces a high degree of school segregation, even in communities accepting the Supreme Court's decision.

THE PROBLEM IN GRAPHIC TERMS

The story of school segregation, however—of its heavy cost to the individual and the Nation—cannot be told in terms of statistics alone.

Education is the keystone of our democracy—it is the centerpiece in the arch of freedom and progress. It is required in the performance of our most basic public responsibilities. It is a principle instrument in awakening the child to cultural values, in preparing him for later professional training, and in helping him to adjust normally to his environment. It is the very foundation of good citizenship.

For the Nation, increasing the quality and availability of education is vital to our national security and domestic well-being. But availability and quality cannot be meaningful when minority groups are denied equal opportunity—a denial which the Court has ruled inherent where discrimination is practiced.

For the individual, open doors to the schoolhouse, to the library and to the college are vital in achieving the richest treasures of our open society: the power of knowledge—the training and skills necessary for productive employment—and the wisdom and understanding needed for good citizenship in today's changing and challenging world. The Supreme Court, in its 1954 decision declared in fact: "It is doubtful that any child may reasonably be expected to succeed in life if he is denied the opportunity of an education."

But the fact remains that many Negro children who entered grade schools in 1954 have entered segregated high schools this year, suffering a loss which can never be regained. The lack of equal educational opportunity deprives the individual of equal economic opportunity; it restricts his contribution as a citizen and a community leader; it encourages him to drop out of school; and it imposes a heavy burden on the effort to eliminate discriminatory practices from our way of life.

It is startling, but the Negro in America today has half as much chance of completing high schools and a third as much chance of completing college. He has a third as much chance of being a professional man and half as much chance of owning his own home. He has twice as much chance of being unemployed and the prospects of earning only half as much.

This, of course, is the real story of school segregation. This is what a rising tide of Negro discontent against the complacency of our time—the Negro revolt, if you will—has revealed. And although the Horatio Alger legend is a well-established article of our country's folklore, few Americans, today, I think, would agree that the typical Alger hero would have made it had his skin been of a darker shade.

DEPRIVED AND DISADVANTAGED

The temptation is certainly strong to say that the Negro child should be seen merely as any other child, respected as an individual, and provided with an educational program that will best meet his particular needs.

The answer is, of course, that the Negro child, like every other child, is entitled to be treated as an individual. Such treatment is the only sound basis for carrying on his or any other child's education, but this easy generalization does not completely come to grips with the whole truth.

The American Negro youngster and his fellow minority members are part of a group that for a long time have been the object of special political, legal, and social action. This is not a question of what should have been, or might be tomorrow, but an undeniable and inescapable fact of today.

As the very able and distinguished president of Teachers College, Columbia University, Dr. John Fischer, has stated:

"Every Negro child is the victim of the history of his race in this country. On the day he enters kindergarten he carries a burden no white man can ever know, no matter what other handicaps or disabilities he may suffer. When all the variability is conceded, it cannot be denied that every American Negro child must expect to encounter certain problems which none of our other children face in quite the same way."

Elaborating on this point, the Educational Policies Commission in a recent statement has emphasized that a substantial minority of Americans have grown up in cultures which are not compatible with much of modern life. This minority consists by no means only of Negroes, nor are all Negroes culturally disadvantaged. But vast numbers of them are disadvantaged as a direct consequence of legal, social, and I would add, economic segregation.

Many of the Negro children who come to school today are victims of their parents' lack of knowledge and of schooling—parents who in turn are victims of a situation over which they frequently had little or no control.

Teaching reading, for example, to a first grade child who has never seen an adult with a book requires an approach quite different from one appropriate to a child in whose home books are as normal as food. Similarly, a child who has never known sustained conversation with his parents must first learn the skills of continuing discussion before he can learn much else in school.

Pilot projects in California, New York and elsewhere have repeatedly shown that a tremendous, but unlocked potential exists. And the Civil Rights Commission, on the basis of numerous studies, has stated that a gap exists between the average starting white and Negro student—a gap which may represent as much as 1½ to 2 school years by the time the child reaches the high school grades.

A PROGRAM EXPLORED

What then does this mean for our schools today? In light of our democratic values, what guidelines for policy and practice are implied?

The first thought follows quite naturally from what has already been said—that the assessment of each student, and the release of his potentialities, must be approached on an individual basis. Each student's education must be peculiarly his own. Its success cannot be achieved unless seen against the history from which he has come, and in terms of the environment in which he currently lives.

With this as a start we can move to a second thought—the thought that equality of opportunity should mean more than a schoolroom desk for every child. It should mean that every student may rightfully expect to find himself in fair competition and on an even footing with his classmates.

Today, of course, this situation does not exist. Many Americans, and the Negro in particular, have been systematically deprived of the conditions which would make this ideal a reality. Progress has been made, but much more is required.

Again quoting from Dr. Fisher of Columbia—a man with long experience in this field:

"Is it not a reasonable contention—and a just one—that to compensate for past injustices, we should offer these children educational services beyond the level of what might be called standard equality? Could it be that to achieve total equality of opportunity in America we may have to modify currently accepted ideas about equality of opportunity in education itself?"

The answer, I think, must be a resounding yes, and the precedent, of course, is already well established.

COMPENSATORY OPPORTUNITY

Thousands of mentally and physically handicapped children today regularly receive teaching service above the norm. They benefit from physical facilities and supporting services which are more extensive and more costly than those furnished to children considered physically and mentally normal. No one, I am sure, would dispute the justness and wisdom of this approach, but it inevitably leads us to the suggestion that the generalization should apply to other underprivileged groups as well—that we may need to substitute for our traditional concept of equal educational opportunity a new concept of compensatory opportunity.

I doubt that anyone could say precisely what compensatory opportunity should mean in every case. But it could very well include some of the following:

Lower student-teacher ratios in certain schools;

Additional guidance services and special physical facilities;

Enlistment of teachers especially prepared to serve disadvantaged or deprived youngsters;

Development of curriculum particularly relevant to present life and the interests of pupils;

Encouragement of peer group support;

Parental involvement in school activities; and

Combinations of work and study programs.

California, as many of you know, initiated a 2-year pilot program of compensatory education for culturally deprived children this year—a program in which Berkeley is one of the first 24 participants. Berkeley has also been a pioneer in drawing on a great local resource—the University of California—for teacher trainees to work in classrooms of particular need.

Unfortunately, programs of this type today are few and far between. Their expansion needs to be encouraged and new ideas need constantly to be sought and tested. Berkeley can take pride in what it has done, but the need is so great, and the horizon so broad, that humbleness, perseverance, and an inquiring mind should be our constant guides.

EDUCATIONAL EXCELLENCE

A third and final thought might best be described as a striving for quality; as the quest for educational excellence.

Certainly one of the truly knotty problems in the North and West today is the matter of attendance lines which are drawn so that one race predominates in a school.

James Conant, in his excellent book, "Slums and Suburbs," has made a clear distinction between de jure and de facto segregation. He has indicated his belief that there is nothing wrong with socially unbalanced schools, provided they reflect the neighbor-

hood; are not the result of assignment because of race, and offer an equivalent quality of education.

Others disagree quite radically with Conant, arguing that present concentrations of Negroes and other minority groups have been artificially achieved and that artificial means must be followed to break the pattern. And the case can certainly be made that the real issue is how to lead all of the communities' children into meaningful encounters with each other, to the end that they develop skills of citizenship commensurate with the demanding times in which they live.

The Supreme Court, of course, has not yet ruled on this question, but several lower courts have. In *Clemons* v. *The Hillsboro Board of Education* and in *Taylor* v. *New Rochelle*, Federal courts have stated that gerrymandering of school attendance boundaries for the purpose of confining Negroes to one school violates the 14th amendment. And in *Goss* v. *The Knoxville Board of Education*, the Court ruled that "no official transfer plan or provision of which racial segregation is the inevitable consequence, may stand under the 14th amendment."

It is well to note, however, that the Commission on Civil Rights, in its latest report, has found that the open enrollment plans studied had little effect on the racial composition of schools, even when transportation was provided.

In spite of all efforts to achieve racially heterogeneous schools, it seems evident, the Commission stated, that many, particularly in the large cities, will retain a large degree of racial imbalance until discrimination in housing and employment are things of the past.

It seems to me, therefore, that while our efforts on other fronts should not slacken, that we should be concerned with insuring the highest standard of educational excellence in all of our schools, regardless of their racial composition.

President Kennedy stated in a message to Congress last year that:

"Our progress as a nation can be no swifter than our progress in education. Our requirements for world leadership, our hope for economic growth and the demands of citizenship itself, all require the maximum development of every young American's capacity."

The simple truth is that a free nation can rise no higher than the standard of excellence set in its schools and colleges. Ignorance and illiteracy, unskilled workers and school dropouts, breed failures in our social and economic system. They are the seedbed of delinquency and unemployment, of a loss of productive power, and a furtherance of chronic dependence. Failure to improve educational performance is not only a moral laxity, it is a poor social policy, and poor economics.

CONCLUSION

The steps to improved quality, of course, are not simple—they require time, and they require support. But the difficulties of operating schools which can cope successfully and simultaneously with both racial and educational issues are among the most puzzling and difficult facing the American people today.

They in turn require patience and perseverance, and a willingness to being. As the story goes, Marshall Lyautey, a great French general of the twenties, went out one day and asked his gardener to plant a tree. But, the gardener complained, this tree won't flower for 100 years. "Well then," responded the marshal, "We have no time to lose. Plant it this afternoon."

Our tree—the tree of true equality and excellence of educational opportunity—a tree which is the challenge for American education today, should and must flower before another 100 years have passed. But we too must begin today, and we too must be able to say with the poet:

"Give me men to match our mountains,
Give me men to match our plains,
Men with empires in their purpose,
and new eras in their brains."

## Statement Re the 45th Anniversary of Latvian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, November 19, 1963*

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, on this 45th anniversary of Latvia's rebirth as a free and independent state, Americans remain strongly convinced that Latvia, like all other nations, is entitled to freedom and national self-determination.

Though Latvian independence has been suppressed by forced incorporation into the Soviet Union, the Latvian people have displayed a determination to maintain their ideals and preserve their national heritage. The American Government, by refusing to recognize the illegal Soviet annexation of Latvia, registers its support for Latvia's cause and confidence that the Latvian nation will endure.

# SENATE

## WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 20, 1963

*(Legislative day of Tuesday, October 22, 1963)*

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

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

Our Father, God, as once more in this chamber of deliberation there sounds the summons to prayer in a tense time, when so much for so many depends on what these servants of the people's will do and say here, save us, we beseech Thee, from turning just from dull habit and with unexpectant hearts to the reality in which we live and move.

We would that this daily moment of devotion shall make each of us more vividly aware of Thee, not only as a help in ages past, but as a quickening presence, a sustaining power, a refuge from the tumult and confusion of the world.

Like a lark rising on morning wings to sing its rapturous song at heaven's gate, so may we rise above all sham and drudgery, hopes deferred and broken dreams, with undaunted spirits to lift our own paean of faith above the common ground:

"This is my Father's world,
So let me ne'er forget
That though the wrong seems oft so strong
God is the Ruler yet."

Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, November 19, 1963, was dispensed with.

### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

### REPORT ON U.S. PARTICIPATION IN THE UNITED NATIONS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. 167)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

Pursuant to the provisions of the United Nations Participation Act, I transmit herewith the 17th annual report covering U.S. participation in the United Nations during 1962.

This record tells the story of deep United Nations engagement in the great issues of the 1960's. It demonstrates that, despite the financial irresponsibility of some of its members, the organization has, through executive action and parliamentary diplomacy, played an indispensable role in dealing with an impressive number of the world's problems.

The United Nations political relevance—and its developing capacity for effective action—is indicated by a brief look at several major aspects of world affairs and at what the United Nations did about them in 1962.

GREAT POWER CONFRONTATION

When the Soviet Union sought to alter the balance of nuclear power by installing missile bases in Cuba, the United Nations—as well as the Organization of American States—proved an important instrument in resolving the most dangerous crisis of the nuclear era. The Security Council served as a forum in which the U.S. Government made clear to the world that its actions, taken in