

By Mr. SLACK:

H.R. 11197. A bill to amend Public Law 86-184, an act to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the admission of West Virginia into the Union as a State; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. VANIK:

H.R. 11198. A bill to assist cities and States by amending section 5136 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, with respect to the authority of national banks to underwrite and deal in securities issued by State and local governments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BUCKLEY (by request):

H.R. 11199. A bill to authorize appropriations for the fiscal years 1964 and 1965 for the construction of certain highways in accordance with title 23 of the United States Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CAHILL:

H.R. 11200. A bill to amend the act of August 13, 1946, relating to Federal participation in the cost of protecting the shores of the United States and its territories and possessions; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FORD:

H.R. 11201. A bill to authorize free post office service for certain patrons and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MOELLER:

H.R. 11202. A bill to amend the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 and to provide additional choice of health benefits plans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H.R. 11203. A bill to provide for the medical and hospital care of the aged through a system of voluntary health insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 11204. A bill to amend section 502 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to provide for bidding for the building of construction-differential subsidy ships on a regional basis, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HOSMER:

H.J. Res. 685. Joint resolution providing for the establishment of a joint committee of the two Houses of the Congress to study all matters relating to national strategy; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PIRNIE:

H.J. Res. 686. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to provide the right of States to establish their own election districts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAWSON:

H. Res. 592. Resolution providing for the expenses of conducting studies and investigations authorized by rule XI (8) incurred by the Committee on Government Operations; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. FARBSTAIN:

H. Res. 593. Resolution requesting the Secretary of State to furnish to the House of Representatives full and complete information with respect to the reasons underlying the U.S. sponsorship and active support of the censure of Israel by the United Nations Security Council; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SCHWEIKER:

H. Res. 594. Resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives relating to the appointment of professional and clerical staffs of the committees of the House; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

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

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to an international exposition in San Francisco, Calif.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to expressing the confidence of the people of Hawaii in the United Nations and urging its financial support by the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Rhode Island, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the enactment of the President's public welfare program (H.R. 10032); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BAILEY:

H.R. 11205. A bill for the relief of Dr. Fidel Rodriguez Cubas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COHELAN:

H.R. 11206. A bill for the relief of Stephen You (Chun Pal Yu); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 11207. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Sushil K. Mukherjee and son; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINNEGAN:

H.R. 11208. A bill for the relief of Dimitrios and Lola Dimas and daughter, Mary Dimas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GLENN:

H.R. 11209. A bill for the relief of Jorge Shojiro Mukoyama, Misuzu Theresa Mukoyama, and Takumi Frederico Mukoyama; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

H.R. 11210. A bill for the relief of Donato Panella; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLFELD:

H.R. 11211. A bill for the relief of Kee Leung Chin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOELSON:

H.R. 11212. A bill for the relief of Maria Giuseppa Fantauzzi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIBAL:

H.R. 11213. A bill for the relief of Peter Carson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ZELENKO:

H.R. 11214. A bill for the relief of Wang Chen-Yu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

296. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Henry G. Bartsch, executive secretary, Hackers Association of Washington, D.C., relative to the petition of Cabell Daniel Moody, secretary of the Hackers Association of Washington, D.C., relating to the operation of taxicabs in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

297. Also, petition of Roger L. Sarratt, clerk of the council, New Orleans, La., relative to endorsing and requesting the enactment of H.R. 10898 and H.R. 10901; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

298. Also, petition of Gwen Wiesner, city clerk, Garden Grove, Calif., relative to opposing Federal taxation of interest derived

from State and local bonds; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

299. Also, petition of Margery L. Ames, city clerk, Chico, Calif., relative to opposing Federal taxation of interest derived from State and local bonds; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

300. Also, petition of Lucille W. Randolph, city clerk, Gardena, Calif., relative to opposing Federal taxation of interest derived from State and local bonds; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

301. Also, petition of George W. Smith, city clerk, Monterey, Calif., relative to opposing Federal taxation of interest derived from State and local bonds; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

302. Also, petition of Ruth S. Hogan, city clerk, LaVerne, Calif., relative to opposing Federal taxation of interest derived from State and local bonds; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

303. Also, petition of Gladys R. Wallin, city clerk, Petaluma, Calif., relative to opposing Federal taxation of interest derived from State and local bonds; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

304. Also, petition of Takeji Akamine, chairman, Okinawa Prefectural Reversion Council, Okinawa, relative to requesting the return of Okinawa to Japan; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE

TUESDAY, APRIL 10, 1962

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Vice President.

Rev. Richard R. Potter, D.D., pastor, First Presbyterian Church, Staunton, Va., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, our Heavenly Father, who art infinite, eternal, and unchangeable, look upon us with mercy in this fleeting, fragile hour. We know not what a day may bring forth, nor how to handle it when it comes. We haggle over issues of the moment, and jockey for positions of prestige and power; and soon both our day and our way are gone. But deep down we know that Thou art God and we are the people of Thy pasture, the sheep of Thy hand. Without Thee, we stumble and fall; we go astray and are lost. Lead us, we pray, with kindly light, and let Thy rod and Thy staff protect and comfort us. Grant wisdom to the Senate, and let righteousness and peace, justice and honor, freedom and truth, be the products of its deliberations. Bless these Senators, and enable them to know Thee and do Thy will. Let Thy blessings be upon all our land and all our leaders, making us a people acceptable in Thy sight and usable in Thy world. For this we pray in the name of Jesus Christ, through whom Thou didst bless all men, and who is, himself, King of kings and Lord of lords. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, April 9, 1962, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting

nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

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

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Government Operations was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Constitutional Rights Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to ask the majority leader about the business of the Senate for the remainder of the week and, insofar as he can inform the Senate, what proposed legislation may be contemplated for consideration during the following week; and at the same time I should like to ask him about any modification in plans for the Easter recess.

Mr. MANSFIELD. In response to the questions asked by the distinguished minority leader, let me say that the unfinished business is Calendar No. 1279, House bill 9751, the military procurement bill. It is anticipated that we will set aside the consideration of this bill today, and proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1195, S. 4, the Padre Island bill. If action on that bill is not completed by the close of business today, we will return tomorrow to the consideration of the military procurement bill. Following action on that bill, we will again consider the Padre Island bill. When both bills are completed, we expect to take up Calendar No. 1288, Senate bill 2935, the Peace Corps bill. That will be either at the end of this week or at the beginning of next week.

Other bills for consideration prior to Easter are Executive Calendar No. 5, Executive K, 87th Congress, 1st session, the International Convention for the

Safety of Life at Sea, 1960, which was reported unanimously from the Foreign Relations Committee; Calendar No. 1281, House bill 10607, the tariff reclassification bill; and possibly Calendar No. 1043, Senate bill 495, amending the Trading With the Enemy Act.

In addition, other bills may subsequently be scheduled.

It is the expectation of the leadership—and I have discussed this matter with the distinguished minority leader—that the Senate will go out on Thursday evening, April 19, to return on Monday, April 23, for a pro forma meeting.

The regular business of the Senate will commence again on Tuesday, April 24. Members may make their plans accordingly.

We anticipate that in the week following the Easter recess, we shall begin debate on the literacy test proposal.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Merely for clarification, that would mean that the literacy test bill would then be set down as the business of the Senate for Tuesday, April 24, would it?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Tuesday or any subsequent day in that week.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thank the majority leader.

TWENTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF SERVICE OF LYNDON B. JOHNSON

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on April 10, 1937—exactly 25 years ago today—the people of the 10th District of Texas went to the polls to choose a successor to Representative James Buchanan. The campaign had been a vigorous one, to put it mildly. For a while it had been without any clear-cut issue; but when one of the 10 candidates announced that he was offering himself to the voters as a wholehearted supporter of President Roosevelt's New Deal, the issue was made. The other nine candidates simply turned their guns on him, and vied with each other in heaping calumny on him, and on the administration. The result of the election is well known: The object of this calumny was elected, and began an unparalleled career in the American Congress.

LYNDON JOHNSON was, at the time of his first election to Congress, 28 years old. He was, as he is now, a tall, lanky man whose easy stride belied terrific sources of energy. He had been in Washington for several years as secretary to Representative Richard Kleberg, of Texas; he had been speaker of the "Little House," an organization of secretaries and clerks in the other body; and he had returned to Texas as State director of the National Youth Administration—helping to put the young men of the depression years to work on useful projects. Senior members of the administration already had their eyes on him; and upon his election, that April day 25 years ago, the President himself, fishing off the Texas coast, invited his young supporter to return with him on the train to Washington. There began a relationship that LYNDON JOHNSON has often described as father-son. It was mutually beneficial: Representative JOHNSON and his hill-country district in Texas gained im-

measurably from it; and the President received, in that administration and in succeeding ones, the vigorous support of an increasingly influential Representative in Congress.

LYNDON JOHNSON continued to serve his district after President Roosevelt's death, in 1945. In 1948, he won an uphill victory over the incumbent Governor, in a campaign for election to the U.S. Senate. Few adult Americans need to be told about his record of service since that day. In 1953, after 4 years in this body, he was elected Democratic leader—in my opinion, the best leader the Senate has ever had. He held that post for 8 years, with great merit to himself and great benefit to the country. In 1960, he was, by common consent, one of the indispensable architects of Democratic victory. And since that year he has given the country the same high standards of enlightened public service that he provided during his years as a Member of this body.

Today, as Vice President of the United States, as Chairman of the Space Council, as Chairman of the Committee on Equal Employment Opportunities, and as Chairman of the Advisory Council on the Peace Corps, LYNDON JOHNSON looks back over 25 years of elected service to his country. It is a record he can be proud of. It has fully justified the confidence of Franklin Roosevelt, and of his friends in the 10th District of Texas, who, 25 years ago today, sent this highly promising young man to the Congress for the first time.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, if Columbus could return and could see this country, he might fall into the habit of indulging in a cliché, by saying, "How time flies!" But, Mr. President, Columbus would be wrong, because time does not fly. Time is just a motionless medium; and it is we mortals who fly through time. As we make that journey, we make history. So people make history.

And you, sir, have made history. I remember you well—and this has to be personal—when you were secretary to a beloved Representative from Corpus Christi—Dick Kleberg, with whom it was my pleasure to do a long chore of duty in South America, and who, in my judgment, was one of the most gracious and kindly persons ever to be sent to Congress.

I think, sir, I remember you before that. I think I remember you when you were on duty at a door in the House long ago. You see, that is probably one of the privileges that the older has when he speaks about the younger. But you went from doorkeeper to secretary, and then to Congress, and I believe my esteemed friend from Montana forgot to mention this: I thought I saw you in a Navy uniform at one time. I am sure there was a "hitch" in the interest of your country.

Then I remember the affectionate relationship that developed between you and that great, beloved Speaker, Sam Rayburn. I was one of his pupils, like you, for a long period of time; and deeply was I enriched, and much did I learn. So we walked that way for a long time. Then, in the nature of

things, it was my high privilege to come here and walk with you again.

What a great, and durable contribution you have made to your country.

I think during the debate, or series of debates, Lincoln had with Stephen A. Douglas, at Alton, Ill., he was led to say he was grateful for having had an opportunity to be heard on the durable questions of the age, and while he might sink to obscurity sometime, he hoped he might have made some telling blows in the cause of liberty.

In making a personal assessment, I should say I know of your devotion to your country, and I know of the times when only the two of us, drinking a decaffeinated beverage called Sanka, would let the heart speak in that rather intimate fellowship as we talked of the ideals we cherished and the work we hoped we might consummate before our time came to an end.

I salute you as a great public servant and one whose fidelity to freedom and to the great, moving ideals of the Republic has never, in the quarter century, faltered once.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks made by the distinguished majority leader and the distinguished minority leader with regard to the 25 years of service in the Congress and in his present position of the distinguished Vice President.

I was sworn in as a Member of the House of Representatives in January 1935. Therefore, when the distinguished Vice President arrived at the House in 1937, I was, so to speak, on the reception committee.

I learned to know him at that time. I observed his ability and his dedication to service. One thing the Vice President has been noted for during all of his public service has been his willingness to work hard. That to me was the determining factor in his great success.

As I look back on the early days, I know he did all he could to secure the enactment of legislation that the then President Franklin D. Roosevelt was advocating, some of which was most controversial. I never remember a time when the present distinguished Vice President was not taking a hand and devoting his time and energy toward the enactment of the legislation. When I was sworn in as a Member of the U.S. Senate in November of 1950 I was again privileged to serve with our distinguished Vice President as a Member of this body.

I regard him as one of my choice friends. It is a pleasure always to work with him. I congratulate the distinguished Vice President on his 25 years of service to his country.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I should like to join with other Senators in commendation and congratulation to the Vice President for his 25 years of invaluable dedicated public service to the country as a Member of the House and of the Senate, and now as Vice President of the United States.

Certainly it was a great privilege for all of us to serve with him when he was elected as majority leader of the Senate. Even though he did not have more than a majority of one, he was, nevertheless,

able as the leader of this body, with strong opposition, to get reasonable people together and pass legislation for the good of the country.

We then had a Democratic-controlled Congress with a Republican administration, but I think, because of his leadership and because of the fact that he developed the theme of responsibility in Government, telling Republicans and Democrats alike that we had to go forward with the Nation's business irrespective of party label, much of the credit for what was accomplished, belongs to the majority leader. His task was not an easy one, but through his guidance and unselfish efforts the Nation benefited.

I know the Nation owes him a great debt of gratitude because it was his vision and imagination which made possible the establishment of the committee on space matters, at a time when few persons, if anybody, was thinking much about the problems of space. It was the then Senator from Texas, the majority leader, who had the vision, wisdom, and foresight to see that we had to compete in space accomplishments. It was as a result of his energy and his idea that the space program was created which today our country is so justly proud of. Col. John Glenn could not have gone in orbit, in my judgment, if it had not been for the action of the majority leader, the now Vice President.

Throughout these years, one of the greatest privileges of my life has been to know him, to watch him, and to observe his great contributions to his State and to his Nation. He has carried out his responsibilities of the office of public trust in the highest and noblest traditions of this great Nation.

I know in the job he now holds he will continue to render great public service, not only to his State and the Nation, but to the free world. It has been a great privilege to be able to call him my friend. I congratulate him and wish him well in all future endeavors.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I came into the Senate Chamber practically at the conclusion of the remarks of the distinguished minority leader [Mr. DRKSEN]. I did not hear all the comments but all that was said I am sure was factual, kind, and, what is more, what was said speaks of a life that has meant much to his State, to the Nation, and to the Senate.

I have been a Member of the Senate 23 years. I remember when the distinguished Vice President became majority leader. I marveled at the way he handled the parliamentary situations that confronted him. I marveled at the way he would smile at Republicans and Democrats alike. When matters seemed most difficult, the majority leader, not on the floor, but in associating with Senators, was able to accomplish his purposes.

I am sure, however, that all that he has done has not been accomplished by his own efforts alone, but as a result of encouragement from his very sweet wife and daughters. They have been an inspiration to him. The result has been that he has gone forward and attained the grand results he has accomplished.

So I join with all Senators who have spoken, and trust that the distinguished

Vice President will have at least 25 more years in the service of his country, because he is a humble public servant.

I would ask only one thing of him, that he turn to the request I made some years ago that we have available a loud speaker system, because it is very difficult to hear what he and the minority leader say when they speak. I say in all seriousness, Mr. Vice President, it would be wonderful if you would turn your energy to accomplishing that one thing. Those who are in the galleries cannot hear, and even Senators in the back rows cannot hear what is going on. I understand you do not realize it, but you will pardon me if I take this opportunity, while you are smiling, sir, to suggest that we should get into operation a system which will make it possible so that those in the galleries and the Senators themselves can hear what is said in the front row and at the desk.

Again I join with your countless friends in offering congratulations. I do not know that you have any enemies, because you have a way about you that sort of dissolves enemies. I join with your countless friends, with other Senators, in wishing you good health—that is the big thing, good health—and a continuity of service in your Government.

Mr. MCGEE. Mr. President, I, too, wish to join in this acknowledgment of the brilliant 25 years of service of the distinguished Vice President of the United States, the Presiding Officer of this body.

I could feel free, I suppose, to comment on the way in which I first learned to know you. That was in the pages of a history book, as we studied the articles of the New Deal, the emergence of the philosophies of Franklin Roosevelt, and a courageous young man from Texas who came to the Congress to support those principles. I choose today to stress instead one other point of emphasis, which is my observation in this body in the few years since my arrival after the election of 1958.

LYNDON JOHNSON came to my State in that critical campaign of 1958, under a considerable handicap and with some risk, to strike his blows for what he believed in, in my behalf. I shall always treasure the personal indulgence he made possible for me.

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

Mr. MCGEE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MORSE. I fully understand the deep appreciation of the Senator from Wyoming for the assistance he received from our beloved friend from Texas. I congratulate him.

Does the Senator think I might eventually succeed in getting the Vice President to accept one of my invitations to come to Oregon and to help me in Oregon? I know what a valuable supporter he is. I wish to have the Senator from Wyoming know that I shall make a little speech, shortly, on my own appreciation of the statesmanship of the former Senator from Texas. The comment the Senator made about the great help the Vice President was to the Senator from Wyoming caused me to say I should like to get some of that

help, too, and if the Senator can persuade him to give me some assistance I shall be most grateful.

Mr. McGEE. I am the master only of my own disposition, I say to the Senator from Oregon. I shall be glad to accept an invitation from the Senator from Oregon, in return for the favor the Senator rendered to me when he appeared on my behalf in my campaign.

I hasten to add, Mr. President, that the campaign promise LYNDON JOHNSON made across the country to an unknown number of new Senators was that if they were elected and sent to this body he, as the majority leader, would guarantee to each of them one major committee assignment. That did a great deal not only to raise the morale of the new arrivals, but also to give them added stature. There was a surplus crop from that election of 1958. Fifteen of us came to the Senate in a single political move in our history.

LYNDON JOHNSON changed the traditional operations of this body. He kept his word. He gave to each of us, as freshmen, an important and significant role to fill in this body. As one of those freshmen, I know of no other single move which could have made us a part so quickly of the responsibilities which characterize the Senate of the United States. It is that point in particular which seems to me to loom large in the relationships which many of us have come to enjoy and to respect with the now distinguished Vice President of the United States.

Indeed, as the Senator from Wisconsin intimated, the Vice President has a way of winning the trust, the respect, and the following of all men; even those who disagree with him. I think he is ever mindful of a bit of advice of Abraham Lincoln. When somebody upbraided Lincoln for being willing to talk to his enemies and to be seen with his critics, Lincoln stated: "Well, gentlemen, do I not destroy my enemies when I make them my friends?"

This indeed has been the rich philosophy and the successful conduct of the distinguished Presiding Officer of this body, the Vice President of the United States. I join sincerely in the tributes paid to him.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I wish to say, along with the remarks of the Senator from Wyoming, who has just taken his seat, that when the Vice President was a Senator from Texas he came to Massachusetts to make a political speech. He went into South Boston, which is a stronghold of Democratic votes, and in the 1960 elections I received more votes in South Boston than I ever had received there before. I congratulate him. I hope he will come to Boston many times more.

Mr. President, I am also glad to join with the many friends of the Vice President in congratulating him upon his 25th anniversary as a Member of Congress. In the House he gained practical experience. With that experience, he came to the Senate well informed on domestic and foreign problems. His colleagues on the other side of the aisle made him their

majority leader. He truly was a leader, and succeeded in getting things done. He can be proud of his work as majority leader of the Senate.

I also wish to say a word on the personal side, which also appeals to so many of us. He was friendly, easy to approach, and helpful in many ways. With Mrs. Johnson to assist and guide him at home, with his lovely daughters to make him happy, I know that he will have many more useful years not only as the Presiding Officer in the Senate but also as a Vice President who takes an active part in the affairs of state and, as such, has helped to establish better and more friendly relations with other countries during his tours abroad. I join in congratulating him and wishing him many more years of useful public service.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I join my colleagues in expressing my personal tribute to the Vice President, who is now in the chair, on the 25th anniversary of his arrival in the Congress. His service has been distinguished and devoted to the public interest. He warmly deserves the tribute of the Nation which he is receiving today.

I cut my political teeth in the Senate under the Vice President. From him I have learned much. We have not always agreed, but most of the time we have.

To me he has personified the finest traditions of the Senate and the best traditions of aggressive leadership which results in getting things done. I am happy to join my colleagues in paying tribute to the Vice President—a great public servant who, in his present role, is contributing very much to the peace of the world, the security of our country, and the happiness and advancement of all American citizens.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, I join my colleagues in expressing warm feelings for the Vice President on the occasion of his 25 years' service anniversary. There is nothing that I can add to the tributes paid to him.

I have known him during all of those 25 remarkable years—22 years we have served together. We were elected to the Senate in the same year. We served on the Naval Affairs and Armed Services Committees in the House together. When he left the Senate to become Vice President, we were serving on the same committees together—Appropriations, Armed Services, and Space—and the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee. In fact, with Senators Bridges and STENNIS, we were the only Senators to have all four of these committee and subcommittee assignments.

So I think I probably know LYNDON JOHNSON as well as does any Member of Congress. And what I think of him is probably best summed up in what he has said about me repeatedly—that when in 1948 he won the Democratic nomination for U.S. Senator in Texas, by the thin margin of only 85 votes out of a million votes cast, and when there were threats to keep him from being seated in the Senate, he said he was sure of one Republican Senator who would vote to seat him, MARGARET CHASE SMITH.

In like manner I observed in 1954 and 1960 that I was sure of one Democratic Senator who would not come into Maine and seek my defeat, and that was LYNDON JOHNSON.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I, too, wish to join with Senators in congratulations to the Vice President on 25 years of public service. He is a man of inspiration to us all for his boundless energy, his great enthusiasm, and his profound convictions. He has fought in many battles—some with me—but they have always been a joy because I knew I was dealing with a good sport and an outstandingly fine American, as sincere as I was, in everything that he attempted. It is one of the great ornaments of American public life that, without any derogation in the intensity of our views or our adherence to our own parties, we can close ranks, as we often do on questions of foreign policy and domestic policy, in wishing all happiness and good health, and giving all due praise to so distinguished an American as our Vice President.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I join with other Senators in saluting and congratulating the man who, as of today, has given 9,131 days, or 25 years, in the service of his own Government of the United States, having served in the legislative and executive branches of that Government.

When the history of this century is written, the name of LYNDON JOHNSON will rank high among the honor roll of Americans who have made substantial contributions to the political, social, and economic progress of our country. His work in the House of Representatives, in the U.S. Senate, and as Vice President of the United States has been singularly marked by soundness of judgment, honesty of heart, and humility of spirit.

Carlyle once said:

Great men are the commissioned guides of mankind.

Certainly, the refining aspects of LYNDON JOHNSON's political leadership in the Senate have been a guide and an inspiration to all of us. The flow of his energies, united by commonsense and enhanced by a warmth of personality, have made his influence upon this legislative body a brilliant achievement in the conduct of parliamentary government.

LYNDON JOHNSON has been my good friend, and I feel enriched by his friendship, just as the people of the United States have been enriched by his 25 years of service in their behalf.

As I think of LYNDON JOHNSON I think of William Wordsworth's question, "Who is the happy warrior?" Wordsworth might well have been thinking of a man like LYNDON JOHNSON when he penned "The Character of the Happy Warrior." I like to think of our Vice President, the capable presiding officer of the Senate, as epitomizing the spirit of Wordsworth's lines:

CHARACTER OF THE HAPPY WARRIOR

(By William Wordsworth)

Who is the happy warrior? Who is he
That every man in arms should wish to be?

—It is the generous Spirit, who, when brought
Among the tasks of real life, hath wrought
Upon the plan that pleased his boyish thought:
Whose high endeavours are an inward light
That makes the path before him always bright:
Who, with a natural instinct to discern
What knowledge can perform, is diligent to learn:
Abides by this resolve, and stops not there,
But makes his moral being his prime care;
Who, doomed to go in company with Pain,
And Fear, and Bloodshed, miserable train!
Turns his necessity to glorious gain;
In face of these doth exercise a power
Which is our human nature's highest dower;
Controls them and subdues, transmutes, bereaves
Of their bad influence, and their good receives:
By objects, which might force the soul to abate
Her feeling, rendered more compassionate;
Is placable—because occasions rise
So often that demand such sacrifice;
More skilful in self-knowledge, even more pure,
As tempted more; more able to endure,
As more exposed to suffering and distress;
Thence, also, more alive to tenderness.
—'Tis he whose law is reason; who depends
Upon that law as on the best of friends;
Whence, in a stage where men are tempted still
To evil for a guard against worse ill,
And what in quality or act is best
Doth seldom on a right foundation rest,
He labours good on good to fix, and owes
To virtue every triumph that he knows:
—Who, if he rises to station of command,
Rises by open means; and there will stand
On honourable terms, or else retire,
And in himself possess his own desire;
Who comprehends his trust, and to the same
Keeps faithful with a singleness of aim;
And therefore does not stoop, nor lie in wait
For wealth, or honours, or for worldly state;
Whom they must follow, on whose head must fall,
Like showers of manna, if they come at all:
Whose power shed round him in the common strife,
Or mild concerns of ordinary life,
A constant influence, a peculiar grace;
But who, if he be called upon to face
Some awful moment to which Heaven has joined
Great issues, good or bad for human kind,
Is happy as a Lover; and attired
With sudden brightness, like a Man inspired;
And through the heat of conflict, keeps the law
In calmness made, and sees what he foresaw;
Or if an unexpected call succeed,
Come when it will, is equal to the need:
—He who, though thus endued as with a sense
And faculty for storm and turbulence,
Is yet a Soul whose master-bias leans
To homefelt pleasures and to gentle scenes;
Sweet images! which, wheresoe'er he be,
Are at his heart; and such fidelity
It is his darling passion to approve;
More brave for this, that he hath much to love:—
'Tis finally, the Man, who, lifted high,
Conspicuous object in a Nation's eye,
Or left unthought-of in obscurity,—
Who, with a toward or untoward lot,
Prosperous or adverse, to his wish or not—
Plays in the many games of life, that one
Where what he most doth value must be won:
Whom neither shape or danger can dismay,
Nor thought of tender happiness betray;
Who, not content that former worth stand fast,
Looks forward, persevering to the last,

CVIII—391

From well to better, daily self-surpass:
Who, whether praise of him must walk the earth
For ever, and to noble deeds give birth,
Or he must fall, to sleep without his fame,
And leave a dead unprofitable name—
Finds comfort in himself and in his cause;
And, while the mortal mist is gathering,
draws
His breath in confidence of Heaven's
applause:
This is the happy Warrior; this is He
That every Man in arms should wish to be.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I wish to add a few words to pay my deference and devotion and to manifest my sincere and real affection for the Vice President of the United States, LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

I regard him as one of the truly great men of our time. He has always worked for the welfare of the people and as a legislator over the years worked untiringly to help them attain security and contentment. I foresee for him an even greater future as a public servant, in addition to the fact that for 25 years LYNDON B. JOHNSON has outstandingly served his country in both a legislative and an executive capacity. All Americans in every part of the Nation should reflect upon the service of this great public servant. I am sure they wish to join with us today in paying our simple respect and manifesting our great affection for our great Vice President, LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

As I recall—and my recollection is very distinct on this subject—I first came in contact with our great Vice President back in late 1940. I have served four terms as Congressman at Large in the House of Representatives; 1940 was not a good year for our candidates in Ohio for statewide offices from the Governor down, and they were defeated by majorities of approximately 200,000 in favor of members of the Grand Old Party, of which the Vice President and I do not happen to be members.

In that year Ohio elected two Congressmen at Large. My running mate was defeated. However, I happened to squeak through, due to the generosity of the Ohio voters.

I received a fine telegram, followed by a fine letter, from Representative LYNDON B. JOHNSON, of Texas, asking what service he could offer me. I am sure the Vice President does not remember it, but I recall it very distinctly. I responded by saying that I was so happy to be reelected as a Representative at Large, I would ask him to please help me get an office in the Old House Office Building, and that any office would be satisfactory, even one beside the furnace room. The Vice President, then a Texas Congressman, secured for me a good office—not one next to the furnace room.

For the 2 years in which I served in the 77th Congress, he was my friend and adviser. We came to know each other well. In 1950, I met with defeat and returned to Cleveland to practice law. When, in 1958, I was elected to the U.S. Senate, and in early December, came to Washington, I was a freshman Senator; although, to paraphrase language I have heard on occasion from the lips of the Vice President himself, I was not so

young as I used to be or so old as I hope to be, still, I was a freshman Senator. When Senator JOHNSON, as the majority leader of the Senate, asked me what he could do for me, he also said a very fine and gracious thing, which I shall always remember: "You are the youngest looking 69-year-old man I have ever seen." I said, "There is just one thing I would like: I would like to be appointed to membership on the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences." The majority leader, who is now the Vice President of the United States, said, "You'll be assigned to that committee." I was, and I have served on that committee since that time.

On this occasion, when we are congratulating the Vice President and in reality we are also congratulating the people of the United States for having had the services of this great legislator and executive for a period of 25 years—I wish to say that as a member of that committee I have tried not to let the Vice President down. I have attended every meeting of the committee.

Mr. President, in joining with other Senators as we speak of our genuine affection and respect for our great Vice President, I shall end my remarks by reading an item of a newsletter which I send to Ohio, and which, it just happens, reached every newspaper office in Ohio and about 30,000 citizens of Ohio yesterday morning. The newsletter which I myself write is entitled "Straight From Washington." I have sometimes tried to add a light touch to it, because we are living in a grim period of international anarchy, and if a light touch can be added here and there, it seems to me that that is helpful. The next to the concluding paragraph of the newsletter is entitled "Troubles." It reads as follows:

Vice President LYNDON JOHNSON is proving to be a strong right arm of our Chief Executive. He is entrusted with tremendous responsibilities in connection with our space and missile effort. Also, he is frequently sent abroad on short notice for important missions for our President. Washington gossip has it that the Vice President goes out to Andrews Air Base and tells the pilot, "Go anywhere—we got troubles all over."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, first, I wish to thank the distinguished senior Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT] for deferring to me, so that I may speak at this time.

It is a genuine personal pleasure and privilege for me to add words of tribute, respect, and admiration for the Vice President of the United States, the Presiding Officer of the U.S. Senate, who is also a very dear and close friend.

Twenty-five years ago a young man came from the hill country of Texas to the Congress of the United States. He was well acquainted with Congress because of his service in Washington in other areas of the Government, and indeed in congressional secretarial or clerical service. The young man who came to Washington became a friend and staunch supporter of one of the truly great men of America—Franklin Delano Roosevelt. I have felt that if one wanted a character reference for public service, he could not have a better one

than to be known as a friend, confidant, and supporter of the late and beloved President Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

Those were critical, crucial days; days of depression, days of war, days of recovery, days dedicated to the achievement of peace. LYNDON B. JOHNSON, then Representative JOHNSON, was deeply involved in all those troubles and achievements. As an administrator in the National Youth Administration, he carried out one of the vital policies of our Government. As a Representative in Congress, he supported the President in his efforts to build a program of economic recovery and to strengthen the Nation for the trials which were to come in the war years. This is a remarkable record.

As a U.S. Senator, LYNDON B. JOHNSON came to this body in the same year that I did—1949. I shall never forget the hand of friendship and fellowship which he extended to me. We come from different backgrounds and different parts of the country. Yet I think we are kindred souls in the sense that both of us work for the people, believe in the people, and strongly believe in our institutions of representative government.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON, now our Vice President, taught every new Member of the Senate to look upon the Senate as an honored and respected body. I remember the numerous times when, as majority leader of the Senate, he stood at this desk and called upon the Democratic Party to be a responsible party—constructive, progressive, responsible. I believe that that measure of progressive responsibility, or responsibility with a progressive philosophy, stood us well in the elections of 1954, 1956, 1958, and 1960, as the Democratic Party built majorities in the Senate.

The former majority leader—as is true of our present majority leader—revealed to us that we can fight hard for our programs, never sacrifice our convictions or principles, and still act without demagoguery; we can act with responsibility. During these trying days, the American people want responsibility from their public officials. They are perfectly willing to have each of us express his views as we wish. The American people expect that to be done in this Chamber. There will be a diversity of opinion and even of philosophy. But, above all, the people expect us to act responsibly toward one another and responsibly in our role of rendering public service toward influencing the people of the country.

I could go on, and I should like to. However, I shall mention only one or two other things.

First, the family of the Vice President has been a source of pride and inspiration to him. I knew his beloved mother; I know his wife, to whom we affectionately refer as Lady Bird; his daughters; and the other members of his intimate, personal family. They have all been sources of encouragement, inspiration, and comfort to the Vice President, and he has honored them at all times by his personal and his public actions. And I have had the privilege—and Mrs.

Humphrey, likewise—of knowing this family. We love them dearly.

I should like to add that the young Congressman to whom I referred, who came to the House of Representatives 25 years ago, came with convictions about people that have stood him well. There is not a grain of prejudice or intolerance in the makeup of LYNDON JOHNSON, and I am glad I can say this to him publicly. This sense of respect for people has placed him in a unique position in American public life. The greatest achievements in the field of civil rights were written in Congress while LYNDON JOHNSON was the majority leader of the Senate. Here is a Texan, a southerner, an American, who led the fight for achievement in the field of civil rights. Here is a great Texan and a great American who, as Vice President, is now giving genuine and effective leadership to the cause of equality of opportunity. In this particular instance it is in the field of employment; but it goes deeper than that; it goes throughout the whole fabric of our society. And he stands, as the Senator from Ohio has stated, as the strong right arm of the President, in carrying out the commitments of the Democratic platform, and more than that, in carrying out the commitments of democratic philosophy—and I mean both the philosophy of the Democratic Party and democratic philosophy generally—human, real equality, and the realization of equality of opportunity.

I salute the Vice President for his acts of courage and conviction and character, because today America needs in high places people who are tall and great and big in their convictions, particularly as they touch the fields of equality and respect for human dignity.

So I salute the Vice President. I thank him for his 25 years of service. I hope he will have 25 years more of public service, because America needs him; the world needs him; and, besides that, his friends need him, too, and like him.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, 25 years ago this day the newspapers of the country informed the people that on the eve of his 75th birthday, Chief Justice Charles Evans Hughes, of the U.S. Supreme Court, declined to make any statement with reference to retirement, although he had been expected to do so.

Twenty-five years ago this day the Supreme Court of the United States concluded its hearing of arguments challenging the constitutionality of the Social Security Act.

Twenty-five years ago this day, Mr. President, there were many rumors, reported by the newspapers, that President Roosevelt intended to reduce the price of gold.

The headlines on that day, Mr. President, in the Washington newspapers, told of the sitdown strikes in the automobile industry, and of the civil war which then was raging in Spain.

The Washington Star published this story, too:

Youthful LYNDON B. JOHNSON, from a hospital where he was operated on for appendicitis, 2 days ago, happily received reports of an emphatic victory over seven opponents,

and said he considered the result a vote of confidence in Mr. Roosevelt and his programs.

Mr. President, I would join the Senator from Ohio in extending congratulations more to the people of the United States than to the Vice President himself, upon the attainment of his 25th anniversary of public service, because the people of the Nation have benefited greatly from and have profited from his work in the Congress—both in the House of Representatives and in the Senate—and from his service now as Vice President of the United States, where his career is in flower. You will note, Mr. President, that I did not say “in full flower,” because so long as you are in public life, sir, you will continue to mature, to grow, and to give greater and more beneficial service to the people of this Nation.

Mr. President, a while ago the Senator from Wyoming told us how it was that you came into his State, in the 1958 campaign, and gave him and his backers added impetus and more cause to campaign harder, when you gave assurance that if he were elected—as happily was the case—you would see to it that he received one important committee assignment. And you did that, of course, in your role then of majority leader of the U.S. Senate.

Unhappily, in that year you did not have an opportunity to come to my own State of Alaska. But let me assure you, sir, that you will be welcome there either during a campaign year or at any other time. The people of Alaska would like to have you visit them.

So no assurance beforehand was given me that if I were elected to the Senate I would receive at least one important committee assignment. However, the fact is that LYNDON B. JOHNSON, as majority leader of the U.S. Senate, saw to it, after I was sworn in as U.S. Senator, that I received not one but two important committee assignments—in fact, I should say three, because I consider assignment to the Select Committee on Small Business, of which the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], who now is in the Chamber, is chairman, to be a vitally important committee assignment.

I believe all this points up, as perhaps nothing else could, the interest which the then majority leader of the Senate, who today is Vice President of the United States, took in each of the new Members of the Senate and in the areas, the States, and the regions they represented.

I have—perhaps more than most—reason to salute the Vice President upon this day—first, because our association was commenced a long while back. Last November, he completed 30 years of service to the people of the Nation, because in November 1931, he came to Washington as a congressional secretary. During some of those years—from 1933 to 1934—I was serving in a like capacity.

During all this time it has been my privilege to take, as it were, an objective position in evaluating LYNDON B. JOHNSON and in watching him grow and become a greater and a more effective leader.

Mr. President, there is another and an even more important reason why I should pay tribute on this day to Vice President LYNDON B. JOHNSON. It is because, in all truth, if it were not for him and if it had not been for the late great Speaker of the House of Representatives, Sam Rayburn, I would not be here today. More important, Mr. President, if it had not been for you and for Speaker Rayburn, Alaska would not now be a State, because either of you or both of you could, without any difficulty whatever, have said "no" instead of having said, as you did, "yes" to the proposals to bring the Alaska statehood bill before the House of Representatives and to the floor of the Senate in 1958. If you had said "no" instead of having said "yes," as you did—you would not have suffered any political inconvenience whatever.

So I have, as I have noted, a special reason to rise with my colleagues and give my evaluation of the Vice President on this day.

Mr. President, during the time I have been a Member of Congress, some persons have criticized me for being what they have termed too pro-JOHNSON. Others have criticized me for being what they have considered too anti-JOHNSON. I think this is oversimplification. It is not easy or proper to place one in one of these two camps. But if I had to bear a label, it would gladly be that of being in the Johnson camp, because in my time of service here, and even before, I came to realize that the then majority leader, now Vice President, was striving for the best interests of the entire Nation. As the Senator from Minnesota noted, some of the most progressive, the most progressive, and the only legislation for ever so long on the subject of civil rights, was initiated and pushed through to a successful conclusion by LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

I think it is a happy conjunction that the man to whom we pay our respects today can be Vice President and at the same time maintain this association with a body which he led for so long, and which he loves so dearly, by being President of the Senate.

All of us know the magnificent and massive contribution he has made in these perilous days to the welfare of our country. By his actions, deeds, intelligence, the force of his personality, and his leadership. Because of these qualities our Nation is becoming all the stronger all over the world.

In conclusion, I merely wish to note again and refer to the newspapers of 25 years ago this day. The book which then led the best seller lists had a title which I think has a peculiar, particular, and appropriate connection with what we are saying here today. The title of that book was "How To Win Friends and Influence People."

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I shall be very brief. I realize other Senators wish to speak. I did not want this opportunity to pass, however, without extending my congratulations to the Vice President upon his completion of a quarter century in the Congress and as Vice President of the United States.

I have been interested in hearing the Senator from Alaska tell us some of the

things that were in the newspapers and the headlines and what the best seller was 25 years ago. I was sitting here, trying to remember what happened at that time.

I remember that I had come to the House only 3 months or a little more before the election was held in Texas. I knew the predecessor of my friend, the Vice President, Mr. Buchanan, who was chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives. Representative Buchanan died. This young man in Texas, who was NYA Administrator, and who had served here on the Hill as a secretary to Representative Kleberg, got into the race. We began hearing something about the race down there and about the large number of candidates who were running.

Just prior to that time, I believe it was on the 5th day of February 1937, President Roosevelt had proposed to the Congress of the United States a provision to make some changes in the Supreme Court. We were right in the midst of the Supreme Court fight. The fight carried on in the Senate was very bitter. Fortunately for a good many of us in the House, the Senate decided to take the brunt of the fight, and not throw it to the House. I listened to many of the debates in the Senate. Joe Robinson sat in this seat near me as majority leader of the Senate, and he was actively engaged in the fight. I remember the part Joe O'Mahoney took in it. It was a tremendous fight. It is hard for many of us to realize today what a tremendous struggle it was.

After it had run quite a long time, the majority leader, Senator Robinson, unfortunately, died. Following his death, Senators and the President of the United States were able to get together and work out a settlement of the dispute, and the bill was enacted which is the law today.

Right in the midst of that fight the campaign in Texas was going on. The word went out over the country that this young man down there was coming out flatfooted for the program of the President of the United States, even such a controversial matter as I have mentioned. It made quite an impression on Congress and on people throughout the country. Then, on election day, news came that he had defeated all the candidates, he had led the field, he had won the race. Somehow or other, it had a tonic effect.

Mr. President, it is so easy to find fault with a President of the United States, whoever he may be. It is so easy to find fault with his program. It is so easy to become critical of his program and of the President of the United States. It takes something to stand up and fight for the program and not be discouraged because the whole program is not achieved overnight.

I had a young political science college group in my office earlier. They were asking me questions. One of the questions was, "How do you feel about President Kennedy's administration? Do you feel he has accomplished what he said he would back in his campaign?" I said, "No, and I suppose he never will."

Browning, I think it was, said:

Ah, but a man's reach should exceed his grasp,
Or what's a heaven for?

Emerson, I believe it was, said we should hitch our wagon to a star. In other words, goals should always be out there, whether they are immediately attainable or not.

LYNDON JOHNSON was a young man who dared to stand up for the program of the President of the United States and of the party of which he was a part.

I could go on and say many things, but I merely desire to indicate that I personally appreciate the extraordinary service he has rendered his country over the 25 years. I congratulate him for it.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, 25 years of service to one's country in the arena of political action is a distinction that comes to very few men. When the service begins in the ranks and then is rewarded by successive elevation to offices of ever higher responsibility, the man so chosen is entitled to an exceptional recognition.

Our Vice President was first elected to the House of Representatives, where his record won him subsequent election to the Senate. His first term as Senator from Texas had not yet expired before his Democratic colleagues, recognizing his singular qualities of leadership, designated him as their minority leader. Two years later victory for the Democratic Party at the polls opened the way for LYNDON JOHNSON to become majority leader of the Senate.

When I came to the Senate, in January of 1957, LYNDON JOHNSON had already been acknowledged as one of the most effective majority leaders in recent times. That year, with the hazardous, thankless, but nonetheless necessary and courageous role he played in moving through to enactment the first civil rights bill in some 80 years, LYNDON JOHNSON proved himself to be one of the great Senators of all times. It is fitting that he should now occupy the second highest office in this land. He has earned it by 25 years of sterling silver service to his country, rendered always in faithful conformity to his own standard of values, which he once expressed in this way: "I am a free man, an American, a U.S. Senator, and a Democrat—in that order."

I am only sorry that the dimensions of my tribute fail to match the dimensions of the man to whom it is directed, but I sincerely salute the Vice President on his silver anniversary. The country has reason to be proud of him, even as he has given me so much reason to be proud to call myself his friend.

LYNDON BAINES JOHNSON: A QUARTER CENTURY OF ACHIEVEMENT

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, 25 years ago a slender young man, known in National Youth Administration circles and in Washington, D.C., but virtually unknown in Texas, announced for Congress in my home district, the Austin district, the 10th Congressional District of Texas. It was a special election, high man take all. LYNDON BAINES JOHNSON boldly ran as an avowed supporter of President Franklin D. Roosevelt. None

of his numerous opponents would so declare himself.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON led the ticket; he won. And Texas Gov. James V. Allred introduced the newest Congressman to President Franklin D. Roosevelt, then on a fishing trip off Galveston. LYNDON B. JOHNSON became a staunch New Deal Congressman, a staunch Democratic Congressman.

We all know of his growing prestige and influence in the Government from the day he first came to Congress. Always the confidant of Presidents, he was never more influential than today.

In this rise to power and to success, to influence, and to fame, LYNDON B. JOHNSON's family played a notable role, and I believe that he would want each of them to have his or her share of the honor and the credit that goes to him today. I say to the occupant of the chair, I not only believe it, but I know he wants his family to have its share of the credit and the honor. I have heard him pay tribute to them often.

His father, Samuel Johnson, long a member of the Texas Legislature, was a wise political counselor. The Vice President grew up in a home in which government and politics were part of the daily living; as everyday a subject as the weather is in a farm family. He learned at an early age to forecast political climate.

His mother, Rebekah Baines Johnson, descendant of Baptist preachers and teachers in Texas, and a grand lady by all our Texas traditions, honored by all Texans whatever their political party or religious affiliations, was a devout Christian and loved her Bible as LYNDON's father loved his politics.

In Washington, the brightest stars in LYNDON B. JOHNSON's crown are his devoted wife and daughters. Mrs. Lyndon Baines Johnson, "Lady Bird," has been at his side in every contest, with all her mind and soul. Their charming daughters, Lynda Bird and Lucy Baines, complete the family circle. Their charm and graciousness add much to the overall good will that the Vice President and his family have won as a family, in the exacting life of the second highest office in the land.

Only one other Texan, John Nance Garner, ever reached so high an office; none has gone higher.

Upon checking the Congressional Directory, I learned that only five of our colleagues in the Senate have served in the Senate for as long as 25 years. Only 28 Members of the House of Representatives have served there a quarter of a century. Only a handful more, combining service in the House and Senate, have attained a total of 25 years' service in the Congress of the United States.

At the beginning of his second quarter century of service since his first election to the Congress, Vice President LYNDON B. JOHNSON displays all the energy and drive of that first race in 1937, which I saw him make in the 10th Congressional District, where I was serving as a State court judge at that time.

This is so true that writers now are speculating on the extent of additional

accomplishments in the coming second quarter of a century. All are certain that more high public service lies in store for him.

Mr. LONG of Hawaii. Mr. President, it is my privilege to join my distinguished colleagues and friends in paying tribute to a great Texan, a great leader, a great American, a great citizen of the world. I think the people of Hawaii, the Aloha State, have some reasons for being a little more aware of his distinguished career and his contributions different from those of the people of many other States, because the Vice President was intimately associated with helping Hawaii to attain two very great ambitions.

The first was statehood. Though a great many people had worked toward that end and had made their contributions, the fact remains that when statehood for Hawaii became an accomplished fact it was due very largely—I will say overwhelmingly—to the driving interest and purpose of the Vice President. We shall never forget it.

We in Hawaii had another great ambition. We wished to see established in the middle of the Pacific, in Hawaii, a great international institution. Again, a great many people had a part, but there came a day when the then majority leader of the Senate turned his interest toward it, with the result that we have it.

In Hawaii there is something else with which we associate the Vice President. Hawaii will never be a great State from the standpoint of wealth, in the sense many of the States are wealthy, but we have something there that we treasure—what we call the spirit of aloha, of friendliness.

I assure the Vice President we include him in that circle. In the future, when he visits Hawaii he will be greeted by the loveliest leis that can be made from our beautiful Hawaiian flowers, by our magnificent ocean beaches, by our majestic mountains—and we have them, of course—but, above all, he will be welcomed into our homes and our hearts.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, the career of the Honorable LYNDON B. JOHNSON is a unique and remarkable one. Its duration, which is marked today with these well-deserved tributes, is but the least important or noteworthy facet of that career. Even so, as the junior Senator from Idaho said, 25 years of service in the Halls of the U.S. Congress is an achievement given to only a few men.

The political talent of the young Representative from Texas was soon recognized. The political talent of the new Senator JOHNSON from Texas was even more quickly recognized, both because of his more mature administration, which naturally came from his experience and training in the House of Representatives, and also because of his desire for service and the driving force of his personality. I think our distinguished Vice President reached the zenith of his service as majority leader, though the position which he now is honored to hold is the more exalted one. As majority leader, Senator JOHNSON achieved a greater niche in the Hall of Fame than any other lead-

er of the Senate has ever attained. He served his State well. He served his party well. He helped to forge the sinews of victory in the presidential and congressional campaigns of 1960. Still a young man, still filled with vigor, enthusiasm, and political talents, his service of the country will yet be great. I offer my sincere congratulations to him.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I extend my congratulations to the distinguished Vice President from my State for his 25 years of service to his country. As the successor to his seat in this august body, I acknowledge that he has set a standard of ability and skill that some aim to equal, and some may reach for, but very few can ever achieve.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, it is by happy prerogative that we, the Members of the Senate, address the arbiter of our oratory as "Mr. President." It is a title that never seemed more fitting than when the people of America decided that it would be an honor that belonged to LYNDON JOHNSON.

I venture to say that both sides of the aisle felt that this was a part of a victory in which all of us in the Senate could share. I venture to say that it would be something of a loss for all of us in the Senate—that the Senate would be something less than we had known—if the figure of LYNDON JOHNSON did not regularly lend itself to the deliberations of this body.

Here we saw the growth of our colleague to greatness. We here saw his response to responsibility. It was the responsibility of the leadership of the majority when the Presidency of the Nation was vested in another political party. His was a leadership to conceive, to coordinate, and to compromise, if you will, two schools of thought with yet one common task, the security of our country in the dimensions of equity, prosperity, and peace.

LYNDON JOHNSON here displayed the talents which gave him the right—yes, the duty—to offer them to the service of his countrymen at their free election, their choice for the challenge of the Presidency, to advance from the leadership of the Senate to the supreme leadership of our great country.

Within his political party—my party, too—the choice was between good men. LYNDON JOHNSON was a man to compete without rancor and to concede without bitterness. He could proudly accept second place as proof of the sacrificing service that was his goal in the first place.

LYNDON JOHNSON has given new distinction and new dimension to the Office of Vice President. He has been Ambassador Extraordinary for America everywhere on earth. He has made a beginning of extending our influence into the realms of space, but he himself has remained the self-same, down-to-earth LYNDON JOHNSON who has earned from us a response that began in respect and culminates in affection.

He can walk with kings, and will talk with the lowliest. Everybody everywhere accepts him in the image of an American where all men are equal—kings and camel drivers and Congressmen.

This is no new LYNDON JOHNSON—not different from the man who moved among us with direction, discussion, debate, diplomacy. He is the same LYNDON JOHNSON—master of the spoken word, keeper of his given word.

No one of us has a proprietary right to monopolize any eulogy of LYNDON JOHNSON. But each of us has his special right of recollection. Each has some prized personal connection of affection in which we know this great American in his simplest and sincerest character as a treasured friend.

These occasions, perhaps, are too personal to be recited here for the record. But they will be forever treasured in the humble hearts captivated by the natural gallantry of LYNDON JOHNSON and the sincere graciousness of his lovely lady.

It is easy to understand the delightful impress they make for themselves and for our land in places high and low, in places far and wide.

In this family of the Senate it gives us a sense of personal possession that we can claim her because of our claim upon him. It is a sweet privilege to say today that we know them, love them, and honor them both as we mark LYNDON JOHNSON's silver anniversary in the Halls of the Congress.

To LYNDON JOHNSON and his lovely lady I extend my sincere congratulations.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, while we remember the 25 years that LYNDON JOHNSON has spent in the Congress of the United States, I wish to recall a time a little earlier than 1937. I wish to go back to a time 30 years ago. I did not then know him well. I merely knew of him when Representative Dick Kleberg brought him here to work with him in 1932. It was perfectly typical of the man who was to be our great leader in this body that, after he had been a while with Representative Kleberg, LYNDON JOHNSON changed his mind and wanted to be a doorkeeper so he could come to know all Representatives who were in the Congress.

My acquaintance with the Vice President began in 1935, when he returned to Texas to become the head of the National Youth Administration in that State. At the same time it was my privilege to be the National Youth administrator in the neighboring State of New Mexico. Every time there was any sort of regional meeting or national gathering I had an opportunity to watch the then administrator of NYA in Texas and to become appreciative of his many talents.

Not long after that time a vacancy occurred in the House of Representatives. With characteristic drive, LYNDON JOHNSON decided to make a try for the office. That drive was successful, and so 25 years ago he came here to succeed Representative Buchanan.

The story of his 25 years of service is indeed an inspired one. He had been in the House of Representatives for some time when I came into it in 1941. But I then learned that Members of the House of Representatives had appraised him correctly, not only as a powerful leader, but also as a great future leader.

The great longtime Speaker of the House of Representatives, Sam Rayburn, once said to me that the House of Representatives was the fairest jury before which a man could be tried, and in 99 cases out of 100 would render an absolutely correct verdict. The House of Representatives tried LYNDON JOHNSON and found him well qualified for leadership. It gave him every opportunity for influence in that great body.

Subsequently, we entered a great war, and LYNDON JOHNSON decided he could best serve the country outside of the House of Representatives. He spent some time in uniform, and after a short time the insistence came that he return to Congress.

We were glad to have him come back, after he had done his military duty, and also, certainly, to have the benefit of his experience in the work connected with military affairs, then being handled by the Congress.

It is strange how these things continue to come along. I recognized that we had a great contest in 1948. I was a candidate for election to the Senate, and so was he. Again I was pleased to see the great work which he did in his campaign and as a Member of the Senate after he assumed his responsibilities.

Then came a period when we had some rough times in the Senate. The majority control in the Senate was extremely close, and the situation required an individual who knew how to handle people and who knew how to work with people, and who was a master in the work of the science of politics. The Democratic Party turned to LYNDON JOHNSON and placed its responsibilities with him. It was when he was majority leader that we really began to realize the talents which this able man possessed. We knew how he was able to work out what political writers call political miracles. As someone has said, a man who wakes to find himself famous was never asleep in the first place; LYNDON JOHNSON was working all the time.

Of course, all this did not suddenly happen. I recall one time when I was doing some work late in an evening, around 11:30, and the telephone rang. I recognized the voice on the line as that of Senator LYNDON JOHNSON. He said, "I have something that I think you should do tomorrow." We discussed the matter. Then I said, "LYNDON, you should not have things like this on your mind before you go to bed."

He said, "Where do you think I am?"

I said, "I hope you are at home."

He said, "I am in the office."

I had complained about having to work at 11:30 at night. He was not complaining. He was still in his office. What he was doing was not for the benefit or welfare of LYNDON B. JOHNSON. It concerned the progress of the Democratic Party and its situation in the Senate.

Now we are glad to see that these passing years have been pleasant to him and have been made pleasant for us by the Vice President as the Presiding Officer of the Senate. I can only say to him now, as I have said on many occasions, that he makes us proud of that association by the fine way he is

doing his job and by the excellent way in which he cooperates with the President of the United States and by the way he expresses his feelings toward the other Members of the Senate who are connected with him in this body.

These have been 25 fine years. I cannot look forward to another 25 years, but I shall look forward to as many of them as I shall have here for a continuation of this fine association with the Vice President.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I am pleased to join so many colleagues in paying tribute to Vice President JOHNSON on the 25th anniversary of his election to the Congress.

I first met LYNDON JOHNSON 28 years ago, when he was the Director of the National Youth Administration in Texas and I held the same post in Connecticut. As I have watched his career since then, my admiration and respect for him has steadily grown. I have been proud to have him as a friend, in good times and in difficult times, and, like so many others who have spoken today, I wish to voice not only my admiration for a great political leader, but also my personal affection for a good friend.

It was given to LYNDON JOHNSON to lead the Democratic majority in the Senate during a Republican administration.

This divided system, under which the people reposed the executive power in one party and the legislative power in the other, posed a serious threat to effective government during a critical period of our history.

It was to be LYNDON JOHNSON's task to mediate the differences within his own party; to compromise the disputes between Democrats and Republicans; to resolve the differences between the Congress and the administration; and somehow to achieve out of all this potential chaos a program of accomplishment and advance for the American people.

To this great task he brought a faith in the American political system; a rare insight into the human personality; an infinite capacity for hard work; an enduring patience; a vast experience in life; an essential patriotism; and, above all, a towering strength of character.

He accomplished the seemingly impossible task laid upon him. Under his leadership the Democratic majority was able to lay before the American people its views, its goals, its differences with the opposing party, and yet the Democratic Congress was able to cooperate with the Republican administration in enacting those measures on which both parties could find some common ground.

For years LYNDON JOHNSON was under the steady sniping attack of those in the country who preferred to create political issues rather than pass responsible legislation, and from those who wished to see the Senate used, not as a deliberative body to govern the Nation, but as a propaganda forum to set the stage for the next campaign.

Always he pursued the path which placed the national interest first, and which placed the larger interests of his party above the temporary gain of the hour. For this he will be remembered as one of the great men of our history,

who performed an indispensable service to the Nation.

We may say confidently that his greatest honors are in the future; his greatest achievements are still to come; and his greatest contributions to the Nation he has served so well are yet ahead.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to join with my colleagues in expressing to the Vice President my sincere congratulations for his brilliant and magnificent record of statesmanship. The history of our country will always be greatly indebted to him.

My first close association with the Vice President was when he served in this body as chairman of the Preparedness Subcommittee of the Senate. We were then both members of the Armed Services Committee.

I would have the RECORD show, as I have said in so many places in the United States over the years, that the security of the United States is much stronger because of the great, dedicated service LYNDON JOHNSON performed for the people of this country, when, objectively, impartially, and judiciously, he investigated each one of the issues that came before our subcommittee.

He did not hesitate, when strong action was needed to be taken with regard to some failure on the part of the Pentagon to live up to its full responsibility; but he did it in a manner so constructive that he won the respect and cooperation of the Pentagon in accomplishing what all of us had in mind toward strengthening the security of our country.

There are many fields of activity in which the Vice President has made great contributions. I particularly wish to point out the contribution he has made in the field of civil rights. How well I know the fairness with which he always tackled that subject during his service as majority leader in the Senate, a subject which at best is a difficult one and always one that stirs up a great controversy.

I heard him say many times that, after all, when we bring about a situation in this country where the privilege of voting is made available to all the people, we will have in a large measure solved most of our civil rights problems. I still think he is right about it.

The President has placed him in charge of a very important assignment, to see to it that there shall not be, as far as the Government and Congress are concerned, any discrimination because of race, color, or creed. Here again, judiciously and fairly, he has worked with the great business concerns of the country which seek contracts with the Federal Government, and has been making magnificent forward strides in bringing an end to discrimination, in connection with the awarding of Government contracts, in the field of civil rights.

I had a little fun with the Vice President earlier this afternoon, when I interrupted the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE] and asked him, when he was thanking the Vice President for the assistance he had been to the Senator from Wyoming in his election a few years ago, if he thought

there was any hope that the Senator from Oregon might have such assistance in the future.

So that no one may misjudge the record, let me say that the Vice President of the United States has been of great assistance to the Senator from Oregon, time and time again, in making clear to the people of Oregon, through various media, the very close association that exists between us.

I can assure you, Mr. Vice President, that a warm, cordial welcome awaits you in the State of Oregon, in the months ahead, when you yourself select the time which will give us an opportunity to welcome you to my State.

As I close, I offer hearty congratulations to you upon your 25 years of service in the Federal Government. It is my hope and prayer that you will have many more years of such dedicated service and statesmanship for the benefit of the people of your country.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, there are many reasons why I have been grateful for the opportunity to be in the Senate, but in a personal sense none more than the privilege given me now to join with other Senators in expressing congratulations to the Vice President of the United States, our Presiding Officer, on the occasion of this anniversary.

On such occasions as this, there is an understandable tendency to stress personal relationships and experiences. "Reminiscing" would be the adjective or description. This is always interesting and pleasant and appropriate; but it suffers—if that is the word—from the emotion which is friendship; and it reflects the responses to a personality. Especially is this the case on an anniversary occasion of one of the most colorful men of our time. With other Members of this body, I could recount exciting personal experiences, experiences that will live with me always; reasons that I have to be grateful and appreciative for personal kindnesses.

But history and those who write it treat such matters as just footnotes. More important to history are the public actions of the man. In the case of the remarkable American whom we honor today, they will chronicle his understanding of the role which the legislative branch must play at midcentury and his skill in devising means whereby this role may be filled. Certainly they will identify LYNDON B. JOHNSON as one who first saw and persuaded Congress to see that this earth has become just a tiny star in the vastness of conquerable space; who now guides our steps into space—giant and peaceful steps.

The complete selflessness of his service to the President of the United States earns the admiration of all observers. History will acknowledge this and many other constructive public acts. If not greater than each of these, surely no less will be history's report on this man who energized, directed, and made effective the efforts of the Federal Government to insure equality of opportunity for all of its citizens. It will note that it was a Texan, proud and sensitive of the traditions of his great State, who success-

fully appealed to the pride and sensitivity of all Americans to insure that this free society practice what long it had preached.

Few men in American life have shown a greater concern for the problems of human and civil rights than LYNDON B. JOHNSON. His regional origin, his youthful experiences during the deprivations of the great depression, the many levels of his public responsibility in Congress and now as Vice President of the United States, his leadership at the national level and on the world scene, have contributed each in their special way to his special understanding. When President Kennedy issued his Executive order prohibiting discrimination in Federal employment and by Federal contractors, he asked the Vice President to serve as chairman of a high-level committee of Cabinet officers and prominent citizens from industry, labor, religious and civic life. The record of the President's Committee during its first year of activity has been an outstanding one. It has been deeply encouraging to all of us who have been seeking to make our economy a modern economy—one that fairly and fully utilizes the talents and the skills of all Americans without regard to race, religion, or ancestry. Shortly after accepting this assignment from the President, the Vice President called together the presidents of 50 leading corporations of America. The following day he called together the presidents of our great labor organizations. He asked and he got pledges from them that our Government would have their cooperation in overcoming the remaining barriers to equal job opportunity that we have been working on since the days that President Roosevelt first created a Fair Employment Practices Committee during World War II. In the field of Federal employment, Cabinet officers have told me that the Vice President has personally worked with each of them, urging them and helping them to make sure that their internal operations are such that Federal employees can move into promotions and new jobs commensurate with their skill. They have told me that he has encouraged them to go out into the community to give leadership to the development of new attitudes that would encourage qualified people to apply for and make their skills available to the public service. I have had members of the President's Committee tell me that the Vice President has made this assignment a matter of personal interest to all of them.

It is this personal determination that is so characteristic of the Vice President. In the past year he has been combining his personal conviction in the equality of men with the development of a new vigor in our national policy. The pieces of progress on which this new policy is being built are beginning to show. Job opportunities are expanding and racial segregation is being eliminated. LYNDON JOHNSON's Committee has already acted upon more complaints in one year than his predecessors did in 6 years. His committee, under his leadership, is beginning to do something about these problems when they are

brought to the fore. It is this vigor which is giving new hope that we can make the kind of progress that our space age demands. LYNDON JOHNSON understands this and is bringing his full experience to bear to help our Nation understand it and benefit from it.

I can only add, as have other Senators, that we hope the years allotted to you will be many and full. We know that this Nation in the future will have great need for your talents.

As the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] has said with respect to his State, you will be welcome in Michigan, also, and we hope your visits will be many.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, this is Vice President JOHNSON's silver anniversary as an elected public official. As all of us know, silver adds to its luster through constant use. Our distinguished Vice President comes to this anniversary untarnished, and with a special gleam brought out by years of hard work and service on behalf of his native State and country.

I have served under him during his terms as majority leader in the Senate, and it is a pleasure to continue my service during his term as Vice President.

It gives me great pleasure to be able to join with my colleagues in saluting him on this happy occasion.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, early in his career LYNDON JOHNSON won the love and respect of two great men: Franklin Delano Roosevelt and Sam Rayburn. President Roosevelt left the scene too soon to see the full realization of his faith in LYNDON JOHNSON. But Sam Rayburn had the pleasure of seeing him grow into a statesman of great distinction. Sam Rayburn had an uncanny instinct about men. No one proved that better than did LYNDON JOHNSON.

James Reston once wrote in the *New York Times*:

Other Senate leaders with large majorities and powerful Presidents have pushed through more legislation but it has seldom, if ever, happened that so much controversial legislation has gone through a divided Government with so few cuts and bruises.

This sums up in a few words the masterly job that LYNDON JOHNSON did for his country. It explains also why Senators on both sides of the aisle felt such a deep sense of loss and emptiness when LYNDON JOHNSON closed his desk in the Senate last year. The people of the country had the same feeling. Whatever their political persuasion, they knew that when the chips were down LYNDON JOHNSON had never let personal ambition or partisanship preempt what was good for the country. The poet Robert Frost put LYNDON JOHNSON's philosophy very simply recently when he said:

I think people should be more patriotic than partisan.

LYNDON JOHNSON will go down in history as one of our greatest majority leaders. He will also go down in history as the first man to prove that a Vice President can do as much for his country as a majority leader can.

I cherish the opportunity of having served in the House and in the Senate with LYNDON JOHNSON. My congratu-

lations and good wishes and my deepest affection to LYNDON on this occasion.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I rise to pay tribute to one of our greatest living Americans. It was a great day for me when I met LYNDON JOHNSON and became one of his friends. His record of service to his country in these 25 years now just past is one of the most outstanding ever made by one man.

We came to the Senate together in January 1949. His record here for 12 years was unexcelled by any Senator in history.

He became the greatest majority leader in history.

His service in the all important field of national defense was impressive indeed.

He was a foremost leader in soil and water conservation.

More than any other Senator he recognized the imperative need for our country to excel and lead in the exploration and conquest of space both for peaceful purposes and the national defense.

He was the father of the Nation's present program for peaceful utilization of space.

He is a great Vice President, loyal to his Chief, devoted to his country, and dedicated to its greatest social and economic progress and to its complete preparedness both to insure its own defense and to meet its responsibilities as the leader of the free world.

Mr. President, I join my colleagues in saluting and paying tribute to my cherished friend, the Honorable LYNDON B. JOHNSON, Vice President of the United States.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, it is with great pleasure that I join with my colleagues and all the friends and admirers of LYNDON JOHNSON in expressing to him heartiest congratulations and best wishes upon the observance of his 25th anniversary of service to his State and Nation.

As a Congressman, as a U.S. Senator, as Senate majority leader and now as Vice President, LYNDON JOHNSON has given unselfish devotion to his duty as a public servant. No man in modern American history has been more instrumental in influencing the policies of Government than he.

LYNDON JOHNSON has set a new high standard of public service and it is my earnest hope that this Nation and the world will have the benefit of his wise counsel and dynamic leadership for many years to come.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, 25 years ago today, the esteemed Vice President of the United States was elected to Congress at a special election in his native State of Texas. In the last quarter of a century of service to his State and his Nation, LYNDON JOHNSON has rung up a list of achievements that gives eloquent testimony to the caliber of this most remarkable man.

Actually, his service in Washington commenced 30 years ago when he served as secretary to Representative Richard Kleberg. Later he became Texas Administrator of the National Youth Administration, and in 1937 he won his seat from the 10th Texas Congressional Dis-

trict over a field of nine other candidates. LYNDON JOHNSON ran as a New Deal Democrat, and early caught the eye of President Franklin D. Roosevelt. He remained a staunch and true friend of that great leader through the ensuing years.

Immediately after voting for the declaration of war on Germany and Japan in December 1941, he was in the uniform of his country as the first Member of Congress to enter the armed services. For his outstanding contributions as a fighting man he received the Silver Star for gallantry in action on a flight over New Guinea.

LYNDON JOHNSON continued in the House until his election to the Senate in 1948. He was promptly recognized as a man of unlimited talents and energy.

In 1951 his Democratic colleagues unanimously elected him party whip, and 2 years later he was chosen minority leader—the youngest in party history. When the Democrats gained control of the Senate after the 1954 elections, Senator JOHNSON became the majority leader, and how he performed in that capacity is a matter of record that cannot be embellished by mere descriptive phrases. He was a leader in every sense of the word and has left an indelible mark upon the annals of this body.

Through all his political career he has had at his side his lovely Lady Bird. Mrs. Johnson is not only gracious and charming, but has rare perception and insight. The couple are doubly blessed with their active teenage daughters, Lynda Bird and Lucy Baines.

As I said earlier, Mr. President, LYNDON JOHNSON's qualities of leadership are well known. Less known but of equal importance is his great capacity for friendship and human understanding. His warmth, his genuine respect for the opinions of others and his deep sense of loyalty all combine to endow LYNDON JOHNSON with a mantle of greatness. I have learned much from this man, but most of all I have learned to appreciate his strength of character, his abiding sense of justice, and his fierce dedication to those principles that keep alive the spirit of democracy in this greatest of all nations.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, this is a great and significant day. It marks 25 years since LYNDON BAINES JOHNSON came to this Capitol as an elected official.

My personal acquaintance with this distinguished statesman covers but a fraction of that time. But I feel I know the Vice President well. There are few things I would deny him if he were to ask. And I like to think there are few things he would deny me if I asked. This is true for the present and the future because it was true in the past and because the Vice President is, essentially, the man who came here 25 years ago.

It was 4 years ago that the then Senator JOHNSON came to my State to help me in my race for the Senate. I drank from his cup of wisdom and drew sustenance during those lean days. And many times have I returned to the well of wisdom and sustenance.

When I came to the Senate, our party was the majority, yet we did not control the Presidency. For 6 years it was so. Only the wisdom and understanding of

a man like our Vice President could make this Government work under such trying conditions. There was no obstructionism. There was no vindictiveness. There were no impediments. There were alternatives and compromises.

Compromise, I learned from this great American, is not retreating from principle. It is the art of the possible. It is making two divergent sides—each with principle and sincerity—come together on some common ground.

When our Vice President went around the world on behalf of the President a year ago, even his most hard working detractors admitted that he was one of our best ambassadors of good will. For Vice President JOHNSON has the essential element of greatness so often missing from the men who are otherwise learned, skillful, and important. He is human and humble. He is no stuffed shirt. If he is not typically American, he is typical of true American greatness.

Sometimes, when we are away from the telephones and the business of Washington and we reflect upon the history of this Republic, some of us delve into supposition. What is it the framers of the Constitution really meant? How can a cumbersome and complicated Government such as ours work? How can we divide authority and responsibility and splinter it among parties, places and peoples? How can we take both sides of our aisle and multiply our problems by both sides of the aisle of the other House and multiply again by the executive and judicial branches and again by 50 States and get an answer to it?

It takes a man like LYNDON JOHNSON.

When I indulge in these thoughts, I come to the conclusion that the Founding Fathers—if they foresaw the complications—must have known that there would be a LYNDON JOHNSON among us. One of the most important and powerful men in the world, he never lets us forget that he was a frontier boy, a poor lad, a schoolteacher, a congressional staff member and a true tall-in-the-saddle son of the Southwest. He is truly American. I am proud to know him, proud to serve with him.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, it is a happy privilege to associate myself with the timely, eloquent, and sincere comments of the Senators who praised the achievements, the devotion to duty, and the superb leadership of LYNDON JOHNSON.

I was a Member of the U.S. House of Representatives when the people of the 10th District of Texas exercised excellent judgment in sending LYNDON JOHNSON to that body as successor to Representative James Buchanan. We recognized immediately his many talents and appreciated his friendly and persuasive characteristics. It was readily apparent that we had a colleague with outstanding ability and a knowledge of the legislative processes acquired as a diligent student and as secretary to former Representative Richard Kleberg of Texas.

My service in the House with Representative LYNDON JOHNSON, as with many other present Senate colleagues who were then in the other body, was a privilege and a responsibility which I en-

joyed and shall always hold in cherished memory.

When, in 1958, West Virginians elected me to the Senate to complete the unexpired term of the late distinguished M. M. Neely, I was aware of the responsibilities involved. But I was happy in the knowledge that I would again be serving at the side of my friend and former colleague who had come to be recognized as one of the Senate's all-time superior majority leaders.

As my colleagues who have served in the other body know, there is a considerable readjustment and reorientation necessary when one assumes the duties of membership in the U.S. Senate. But this task was made all the easier by the tall, friendly, patient, and persuasive Texan whose leadership it was a pleasure to follow.

It seems appropriate to make note of the fact that when the other party was in the majority in 1953, Senator LYNDON JOHNSON was elected minority leader. Despite some dire predictions from a high level in the elections of 1954 that a Democratic Congress under a Republican President would bring on virtually a political war, our party was returned to majority status. To the lasting benefit of the country and to the credit of our party, the dire predictions were proven unalterably wrong by the philosophy of constructive and responsible leadership of Senate Majority Leader LYNDON JOHNSON and the Speaker of the House, the late Sam Rayburn.

The record of the Senate under the Johnson leadership has been one of a steady achievement.

As the youngest majority leader in the history of the Senate when first elected to that post, and as leader during the longest period of divided government in our country's history, LYNDON JOHNSON met and conquered a range of difficult and complex problems seldom experienced by any prior legislative leader.

The record of his accomplishment is, in large measure, the basis on which our majority in the Senate has continued to grow in strength during these past difficult years. It has been the basis on which the Democratic Party was victorious in 1960 with LYNDON JOHNSON at the side of John F. Kennedy.

The VICE PRESIDENT. With the indulgence of the Senate, the Chair wishes to say that he does not deserve the generous statements made by his associates, led by the majority leader and the minority leader, but should like very much to be worthy of them. The Chair appreciates them greatly and will do all in his power to deserve what has been said.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following communication and letters, which were referred as indicated:

EXTENSION OF TEMPORARY EXTENDED UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION PROGRAM

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to extend the temporary

extended unemployment compensation program, to increase the rate of the Federal unemployment tax for taxable year 1964, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Finance.

REPORT ON LAND ACQUISITION PROGRAM AT CAPE CANAVERAL, FLA.

A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, on the land acquisition program for the expansion of launch facilities at Cape Canaveral, Fla.; to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

REPORT ON MODIFICATION OF CYCLOTRON AT UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, on the proposed modification of the Atomic Energy Commission's 88-inch cyclotron, and modification of the University of California's 184-inch cyclotron; to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

CONTINUATION OF AUTHORITY FOR REGULATION OF EXPORTS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for continuation of authority for regulation of exports, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT ON MISASSIGNMENT AND INEFFECTIVE UTILIZATION OF READY RESERVE PERSONNEL IN THE XV CORPS, 6TH U.S. ARMY

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the misassignment and ineffective utilization of ready reserve personnel in the XV Corps, 6th U.S. Army, dated April 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

GUARANTEE TO ELECTRIC CONSUMERS IN PACIFIC NORTHWEST OF FIRST CALL ON ELECTRIC ENERGY GENERATED AT FEDERAL PLANTS IN THAT REGION

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to guarantee electric consumers in the Pacific Northwest first call on electric energy generated at Federal plants in that region and to guarantee electric consumers in other regions reciprocal priority, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

APPLICATIONS FOR ENTRY UNDER PUBLIC LAND AGRICULTURAL LAWS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to permit applications for entry under the public land agricultural laws to be filed only for lands designated as open to such application, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

LAWS ENACTED BY LEGISLATURE OF VIRGIN ISLANDS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of laws enacted by the Legislature of the Virgin Islands in its 1961 regular and special sessions (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

DISPOSAL OF FEDERALLY OWNED PROPERTIES AT LOS ALAMOS, N. MEX.

A letter from the General Manager, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Atomic Energy Community Act of 1955, as amended, to provide for the disposal of federally owned properties

at Los Alamos, N. Mex., and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

Two joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"JOINT RESOLUTION

"Assembly Joint Resolution 6—relative to the control of European starlings

"Whereas the European starling (aptly named *Sturnus vulgaris*) is not only a bird of most disagreeable habits in his noisy, unmelodic call and messy roosting habits, but is also a serious agricultural pest; and

"Whereas this bird represents a serious danger to agriculture, particularly as to grains, cherries and grapes, and quite seriously with regard to figs, olives, pears, apples, peaches and all types of bush berries; and

"Whereas this obnoxious bird also, on the basis of all available evidence, appears to be a carrier of disease, including foot-and-mouth disease, histoplasmosis, toxoplasmosis and psittacosis; and

"Whereas until recently the populations of starlings in California were merely migrating populations, which, although creating seasonal problems, are of minor importance compared to resident breeding population and the tremendous damage and problems that can be created by the latter; and

"Whereas such a breeding population would now seem to be established in California to the extent that large winter flocks of up to 50,000 birds have been observed with a virtual explosion in this population imminent due to the more favorable climatic condition in California: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the President and the Congress of the United States to take all immediate steps possible, including dissemination of information, which will aid in preventing further damage by starlings, not only to the agricultural economy of California but also to the agricultural economy of adjoining States in which the starling is likely to migrate; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly is hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

"ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION 10

"Joint resolution relative to price support of milk

"Whereas milk is one of the most vital of all food products to the health and welfare of the citizens of this country; and

"Whereas the many problems in the production and marketing of milk are such that in order to insure an adequate supply governmental assurance of an adequate price for such milk is necessary; and

"Whereas the producers of milk subject to price support in California and throughout the Nation are presently experiencing extreme economic difficulty; and

"Whereas any reduction in the present support price would undoubtedly result in many producers who are presently forced to sell at less than production cost having to cease production and leave the business; and

"Whereas any reduction in the present support price could also drastically affect those producers of grade A milk who are also supplying milk the price of which is directly related to such support price; and

"Whereas unless immediate action is taken the price support level will drop from \$3.40 to \$3.11 per hundredweight on April 1, 1962: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the U.S. Secretary of Agriculture and the Congress of the United States are hereby respectfully requested to take all action possible to maintain the present price support level of milk for manufacturing purposes at its present level for at least so long as is necessary to properly study and evaluate all factors relevant to providing adequate protection to the suppliers of this vital commodity; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly be hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States, and the U.S. Secretary of Agriculture."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Commerce:

"ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION 11

"Joint resolution relating to the hunting of mourning doves

"Whereas the mourning dove is one of the most important and most numerous of all migratory game birds in the United States; and

"Whereas legislation amending the Migratory Bird Treaty Act has been submitted in Congress to prohibit the hunting of mourning doves; and

"Whereas there is no evidence that the mourning dove population has been reduced by hunting anywhere in California and in fact there is evidence that mourning doves are more widespread and numerous than in past years, with an estimated average population on September 1, annually, of 18 million birds, of which 6 million could safely be harvested although only about 2 million are actually taken; and

"Whereas doves are taken each year in California and provide a hunting sport that is available to many hunters, with almost 200,000 persons annually engaging in this activity; and

"Whereas present Federal and State laws and regulations provide adequate protection for mourning doves, as evidenced by their increased numbers over previous years: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the Congress of the United States is respectfully requested not to amend the Migratory Bird Treaty Act to prohibit hunting of mourning doves; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Finance:

"ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION 2

"Joint resolution relative to pensions for veterans of World War I

"Whereas Congressman DENTON has introduced H.R. 3745 which would provide a pension for World War I veterans whose income is under \$2,400 annually, if they are single, and \$3,600 annually, if they have dependents; and

"Whereas one of the principal domestic problems in all areas of the Nation is the care of the aged, the importance of which is emphasized by the fact that there are now approximately 16 million men and women over the age of 65 years; and

"Whereas of this number, about 2 million are those who served in the armed forces of the United States during the first World War, and whose present circumstances are below the average for the Nation, which fact may be traced in part to the service rendered their country during that war; and

"Whereas these veterans have not enjoyed the extensive benefits accorded their younger brethren who served during World War II and who were given the opportunity for training at Government expense and assistance in securing home and business loans; and

"Whereas the Government of the United States has not given any general pension to the veterans of World War I: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the Congress of the United States is urged to enact H.R. 3745 to alleviate the dire conditions in which those who made the sacrifices for this country, in their youth, now find themselves; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly is directed to send copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the President pro tempore of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and each member of the California delegation in the Congress of the United States."

Two joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION 4

"Joint resolution relative to an international exposition in San Francisco

"Whereas 1965 will be the 50th anniversary of the Panama-Pacific International Exposition held in San Francisco in 1915; and

"Whereas San Francisco has grown and enhanced its position as a gateway to the Pacific and Latin America in those 50 years; and

"Whereas 1969 will be the 30th anniversary of the holding of the San Francisco International Exposition; and

"Whereas no more auspicious time and site could be selected for emphasizing our historic ties with the free countries of the Orient and of Latin America; and

"Whereas the consummation of an international exposition in San Francisco will be dramatic enough in scope to fix world interest on the State of California and San Francisco in particular: now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and the Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the President and the Congress of the United States to designate the city and county of San Francisco as the site of an international exposition in the period between 1965 and 1970; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly is hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

"ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION 13

"Joint resolution relative to the international exposition

"Whereas for the first time a full-scale international exposition will be held in the dynamic, progressive and world-known city of Long Beach; and

"Whereas this World's Fair to be held at Long Beach will present a major departure from the traditional format of international expositions by putting cardinal emphasis upon the talents, attainments and aspirations of the people of all participating nations, rather than simply exhibiting the mechanical developments of various countries; and

"Whereas the exposition will encompass the five phases of man's life in the realms of living, learning, working, moving, and playing, and the exposition will exhibit the various cultures of the nations of this planet earth; and

"Whereas the international exposition shall have as its foundation the dignity of man, and portray to all the world the advantages enjoyed by a people living under a government which derives its powers from and with the consent of the governed; and

"Whereas the international exposition for southern California to be held at Long Beach in the year 1966 will depict the role of arts and sciences, commerce and industry as it applies to the life of mankind on the planet of earth; and

"Whereas pier J will be the spectacular site of this international exposition: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly and the Senate of the State of California (jointly). That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the President and the Congress of the United States to designate the World's Fair, to be held at pier J in Long Beach, Calif., in 1966, as an international exposition; and be it further

Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly is hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A resolution of the Assembly of the State of California; to the Committee on Finance:

"HOUSE RESOLUTION 26

"Resolution relating to memorializing Congress to enact legislation providing for medical care for the aged under the social security system

"Whereas the President of the United States has asked Congress for legislation establishing a system of medical insurance for our aged citizens financed under the social security system; and

"Whereas Congressman CECIL KING, of California, and Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON, of New Mexico, have introduced such legislation in Congress; and

"Whereas there is a time honored tradition in America of caring for our aged citizens when their productive years are over, and this tradition has been carried out through legislation establishing and consistently broadening the social security system over the past 27 years; and

"Whereas great numbers of our senior citizens living on fixed incomes can ill afford the ever rising cost of adequate medical care during the years in their lives when medical needs are the greatest: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly of the State of California, That the Assembly of the State of California urges and endorses the immediate enactment by Congress of legislation generally following the principles of the King-Anderson bill establishing a system of medical insurance for our senior citizens under social security; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to all Members of Congress from this State, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to the Vice President of the United States in his capacity as Presiding Officer of the Senate, and to the President of the United States."

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

"HOUSE RESOLUTION 1440

"Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact the President's public welfare program (H.R. 10032)

"Whereas the President of the United States has submitted legislation to the Congress designed to strengthen and to render more realistic the Nation's public welfare program; and

"Whereas H.R. 10032, incorporating the provisions of the President's public welfare legislative program, is of vital import to the welfare and well-being of more than 7 million Americans whose lives are intimately touched by public welfare assistance; and

"Whereas H.R. 10032, if enacted, shall revitalize the administration and philosophy of public welfare by enabling and assisting the individual States in administering public assistance child welfare programs geared toward prevention, rehabilitation, and intensive case-work service; and

"Whereas the sound and progressive concepts underlining H.R. 10032—concepts calling for increased Federal financial participation in services and administrative costs; expansion and improvement of child welfare services; incentives aimed at the gradual elimination of public assistance residency requirements in each of the States and toward the establishment of community work and training programs within public assistance; authorization of protective payments; increase in adequately trained public assistance personnel; extension of aid to dependent children of unemployed parents; extension of increase in Federal share of public assistance payments; and the option to States of combining, under a single plan, adult programs for aid to the aged, blind, and disabled—offer a promising opportunity to Rhode Island and to each of its sister States to more fully meet the challenges of public welfare of the sixties: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be respectfully petitioned to enact H.R. 10030; and be it further

Resolved, That duly certified copies of this resolution be transmitted forthwith by the secretary of state to the Honorable John F. Kennedy, President of the United States, the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, Vice President of the United States; the Honorable Wilbur Mills, chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee; the Honorable John W. McCormack, Speaker of the House; the Honorable John F. Fogarty, Congressman from Rhode Island; the Honorable Fernand J. St. Germain, Congressman from Rhode Island; the Honorable John O. Pastore, U.S. Senator from Rhode Island; and the Honorable Claiborne Pell, U.S. Senator from Rhode Island, earnestly requesting that each use his best efforts to secure passage of H.R. 10032."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii; ordered to lie on the table:

"SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 22

"Concurrent resolution expressing the confidence of the people of Hawaii in the United Nations and urging its financial support by the United States

"Whereas the people of Hawaii represent and support the cause of mutual understanding among the diverse peoples of the earth; and

"Whereas the United Nations is the one political organization in the world which is based on the common bonds and aspirations of peoples in all portions of the globe; and

"Whereas we recognize that the United Nations offers the best chance for containing the violence which historically has ac-

companied the formation of new nations; and

"Whereas the United Nations has incurred extraordinary expenses in its assigned task of making peace among rival claimants for power in the Congo; and

"Whereas delinquencies in the payment of assessments by member nations have caused deficiencies in the budget of the United Nations; and

"Whereas the Government of the United States has been asked to make a 25-year loan of \$100 million bearing 2-percent interest, to the United Nations, to help tide it over this period of financial stringency; and

"Whereas voices of doubt and suspicion have been raised against this loan, questioning the value of the United Nations in terms reminiscent of the obscurantist isolationism which frustrated the United States after World War I in its relationships with the world community; and

"Whereas American participation in this loan has both symbolic and practical importance to the United Nations; and

"Whereas Hawaii's voice should be heard in this national debate, to reaffirm our desire to strengthen the hand of the United Nations in guarding the peace throughout the world: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the First Legislature of the State of Hawaii (the House of Representatives concurring), That the delegation from Hawaii in the Congress of the United States is respectfully but urgently requested to support the proposal that the United States subscribe to a loan to the United Nations sufficient to meet the fiscal needs of the world organization; and be it further

Resolved, That certified copies of this concurrent resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, the President of the U.S. Senate, the Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives, Senator OREN E. LONG, Senator HIRAM L. FONG, and Congressman DANIEL K. INOUE."

Resolutions adopted by the City Councils of the cities of Petaluma, Chico, Gardena, San Luis Obispo, La Verne, and Monterey, all of the State of California, protesting against the enactment of legislation to impose a Federal income tax on income derived from public bonds; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A letter from the Hackers Association of Washington, D.C., Inc., signed by Henry G. Bartsch, executive secretary, transmitting the petition of Cabell Daniel Moody, secretary of that association, praying for a redress of grievances; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

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

Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Finance:

"RESOLUTIONS MEMORIALIZING THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES TO ENACT LEGISLATION GRANTING CERTAIN PENSIONS TO VETERANS OF WORLD WAR I

"Whereas it has been the policy of the United States to assist its veterans by granting them a pension, in consideration of their services in the Armed Forces of their country in time of war; and

"Whereas there has been no general pension granted to veterans of World War I: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts hereby urges the Congress of the United States to enact legislation granting a pension of \$100 a month to veterans of World War I; and be it further

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

each member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives of the United States.

"Adopted by the house of representatives March 22, 1962.

"WILLIAM C. MAIERS,
"Clerk.

"Adopted by the senate in concurrence, March 27, 1962.

"THOMAS A. CHADWICK,
"Clerk.

"Attest:

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

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, identical with the foregoing, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

NEW YORK STATE COUNCIL OF MACHINISTS OPPOSES STRATEGIC TRADE WITH SOVIET BLOC—RESOLUTION

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, there is mounting public protest against the present policies of the United States and the West with regard to trade with the Sino-Soviet bloc. An increasing number of Americans are expressing their deep concern over the extent to which Western products and technology are being used to build up the military and economic strength of the Communist bloc.

Recently, the 34th semiannual convention of the New York State Council of Machinists adopted a resolution calling for a change in our present export-control policies. The delegates to this convention represented approximately 100,000 members of machinists' locals throughout New York State.

Joseph Drago, president of Local Lodge 893 of the International Association of Machinists, has been spearheading the machinists' drive to prevent the export of highly technical machinery and economically strategic materials to the Communist bloc. His efforts and the strong resolution of the International Association of Machinists deserve the highest commendation. I hope that the administration and Congress will give full support to the pleas of the International Association of Machinists and other groups for a more realistic export-control program. It is time to call a halt to the flow of strategic goods to countries which have threatened "to bury us."

Mr. President, I know that the resolution of the International Association of Machinists will be of interest to many of my colleagues. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the resolution be printed in the RECORD and that it be appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, as follows:

Whereas the Soviet Union and its satellites are working toward the destruction of the free world's capitalistic system; and

Whereas Khrushchev's policy is to use the free world's industrial capacity against itself; and

Whereas the machine tool industry in the United States is on the verge of collapse as a direct result of the Communists' plans to copy, build, and undersell the United States; and

Whereas the present U.S. export-control policy allows such heavy industrial machinery items such as iron and steel mill products (needed for the construction of tanks, planes, and submarines), electrical machinery and apparatus (needed for guidance systems in intercontinental missiles), construction, excavating, and related machinery (needed for higher Berlin walls, and carving out airstrips in Laos and North Vietnam), paper pulp and paper processing machinery (certainly not used to print Bibles or ballots), aircraft parts and accessories (no explanations needed), and enriched uranium (needed for building 50 megaton bombs); and

Whereas U.S. Senator KENNETH KEATING, of New York, after a thorough investigation, including a European trip, states: "In recent years the United States and our free world allies have made a substantial contribution to Communist growth and power by being major suppliers of advanced technology and machinery to the Sino-Soviet bloc"; and

Whereas Congressman THOMAS M. PELLY, of the State of Washington, has remarked in the House of Representatives on the export of U.S. goods to Iron Curtain countries, "To my mind, this is a sorry loss and a sad commentary on the patriotism of some exporters, who put personal gain above love of country and, in cooperation with fuzzy thinking bureaucrats in the Department of Commerce are trading with the enemy and furnishing vitally needed material for building up the Communist military potential"; and

Whereas U.S. Senator WARREN G. MAGNUSON, chairman of the Senate Committee on Commerce, has stated that at one time he was very much in favor of trade with the Sino-Russian bloc because he felt it would reduce tensions and foster better cooperation between the United States and the Communists, has now changed his views and is introducing a bill to the Senate to cut out this trade; and

Whereas the Senate Internal Security Committee is planning to resume its hearing on this vital issue in the near future: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the delegates to this 34th semiannual convention of the New York State Council of Machinists instruct the secretary to notify the New York Senators of the United States, and Congressmen, to introduce or support legislation which will change the present export-control policy that permits the export of highly technical machinery and economically strategic materials to the Sino-Soviet bloc.

Adopted April 1, 1962.

RESOLUTION OF MO-ARK BASINS FLOOD CONTROL AND CONSERVATION ASSOCIATION

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, at a recent meeting of the board of the Mo-Ark Basins Flood Control and Conservation Association, a resolution was adopted urging adequate appropriations to expedite the early completion of the necessary investigations, surveys, advance designs, planning, and engineering of the Bureau of Reclamation projects in these river basins.

The proposed projects play an important part in the control of water runoff in these river valleys.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD, and referred to the appropriate committee.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Public Works, as follows:

Inasmuch as the President and other high governmental officials have recently em-

phasized the desirability of expediting and expanding the Federal public works program in order to bolster the economy of our area and other areas through increased employment and job opportunity and there are a large number of important civil works projects of permanent benefit to the area both under the Bureau of Reclamation and the U.S. Corps of Engineers in the Missouri, Kansas, and Arkansas River Valleys where engineering, planning, investigation, and surveys have not been completed to the extent where construction contracts could be awarded and additional job opportunities afforded and the appropriation of the necessary funds to complete such engineering work by the aforesaid Federal organizations should be promptly made: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by the board of the Mo-Ark Basins Flood Control and Conservation Association at a special meeting held in the Town House Hotel in Kansas City, Kans., on March 22, 1962, That the representatives in Congress, both Senators and Members of the House of Representatives, from this area, be urged to take whatever steps may be necessary to secure adequate appropriations to expedite the early completion of the necessary investigations, surveys, advance designs, planning, and engineering of the various flood control and water resources projects, including pollution control and sewage treatment projects now pending or suggested in these river valleys and that members of the Subcommittees on Water Resource Appropriations of both the U.S. Senate and the House of Representatives be alerted to the desirability and necessity of making available sufficient funds at the earliest possible date in order that construction funds could be appropriated for immediate action to accomplish the objectives above mentioned in relation to increased employment and job opportunities in the area.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

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

S. 2522. A bill to defer the collection of irrigation maintenance and operation charges for calendar year 1962 on lands within the Angostura unit, Missouri River Basin project (Rept. No. 1326).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, without amendment:

H.R. 11027. An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended (Rept. No. 1327).

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. ANDERSON (for himself and Mr. PASTORE) (by request):

S. 3129. A bill to amend the Atomic Energy Community Act of 1955, as amended, to provide for the disposal of federally owned properties at Los Alamos, N. Mex., and for other purposes; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. CLARK:

S. 3130. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to purchase industrial and commercial evidences of indebtedness to promote certain industrial and commercial loans in redevelopment areas by lending institutions in order to help such areas plan and finance their economic redevelopment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CLARK (for himself, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. MORSE, Mr. LAUSCHE, and Mr. KEFAUVER):

S. 3131. A bill to assist cities and States by amending section 5136 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, with respect to the authority of national banks to underwrite and deal in securities issued by State and local governments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

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

By Mr. JAVITS:

S. 3132. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special series of postage stamps in recognition of the 25th anniversary of the death of George Gershwin; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

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

By Mr. DODD:

S. 3133. A bill to authorize loans by the Federal Government to local public school systems whose funds have been withheld or withdrawn by State or local governments because of the desegregation of one or more schools in such systems; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

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

S. 3134. A bill to fix the rates of basic compensation of employees of the Senate press, periodical, radio and television, and photographers galleries; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. TALMADGE:

S. 3135. A bill for the relief of Dr. and Mrs. Charles Edward Cunningham; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McNAMARA:

S. 3136. A bill to authorize appropriations for the fiscal years 1964 and 1965 for the construction of certain highways in accordance with title 23 of the United States Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

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

By Mr. LAUSCHE:

S. 3137. A bill for the relief of Edward J. McManus; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEATING:

S. 3138. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 in order to provide for research to determine criteria and means for abating objectionable aircraft noise; to the Committee on Commerce.

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

By Mr. PROUTY:

S. 3139. A bill making an authorization for an appropriation to provide for the expenses of a joint select committee of the Senate and House of Representatives to study the problem of local self-government for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

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

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 3140. A bill for the relief of Elizabeth J. Padilla; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey:

S. 3141. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to relinquish to the State of New Jersey jurisdiction over any lands within the Fort Hancock Military Reservation; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 3142. A bill for the relief of Michael J. Venezia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey when he introduced the first above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 3143. A bill to amend section 660 of title 18 of the United States Code, relating to the misuse of common carriers' funds derived from commerce, in order to expand the coverage of such section; to the Committee on Commerce.

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

By Mr. BEALL:

S. 3144. A bill for the relief of Marcello Chioveilli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BIBLE (by request):

S. 3145. A bill to amend the Code of Law for the District of Columbia to give the Commissioners of the District of Columbia or their duly designated representative authority to transfer title to motor vehicles when the only assets of a decedent's estate consist of not more than two motor vehicles;

S. 3146. A bill to amend the act concerning gifts to minors in the District of Columbia; and

S. 3147. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Business Corporation Act; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

COMPETITION IN THE STATE AND MUNICIPAL BOND MARKETS

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill designed to introduce more competition into the State and municipal bond markets in order to reduce the interest rates States and municipalities must pay to finance capital improvements.

Last year State and local indebtedness increased by \$5 billion, as it has in each of the preceding several years. The amount of State and local debt outstanding at midyear was \$72.5 billion—about three-fourths of which represented local government obligations.

These figures indicate the weight of the burden of debt amortization on State and local budgets. Any step which can help reduce the rate of interest these governments must pay is of tremendous importance to State and local governments and their taxpayers.

The bill which I have introduced would authorize commercial banks to underwrite and deal in revenue bonds.

At the present time, commercial banks may underwrite and deal in general obligation bonds—that is, bonds which are secured by the general revenue resources of the issuing State or local governments—but are barred from dealing in bonds which are backed only by the earnings from governmental enterprises.

The consequence is that a limited number of investment dealers have a monopoly on the underwriting of revenue bond issues. A large part of the capital market is not now being tapped.

This bill has the support of the American Municipal Association, the U.S.

Conference of Mayors, and many State municipal organizations, including the Pennsylvania League of Cities.

In 1961, commercial banks represented about 53 percent of the whole municipal bond market mechanism in America. They were the principal underwriters and distributors of 72 percent of all new general obligation bonds and notes sold in 1961, based on par value. But more than one-third of all State and municipal bond financing today takes the form of so-called revenue bond financing, from which commercial banks are excluded.

This exclusion, I submit, is based on conditions which existed in the bond market at the time of the passage of the Glass-Steagall National Banking Act in 1933 which no longer exist today. During the intervening years the whole nature of revenue bond financing has changed radically.

Until the end of World War II, the volume of revenue bonds was relatively small and tended to be concentrated on certain unusual types of projects, such as toll bridges. Thus, with a number of exceptions, revenue bonds were considered greater risk investments than so-called general obligation bonds.

For a variety of reasons, there has been a major shift in municipal financing. More and more, new types of revenue bonds are being used in place of what once would have been general obligations. However, these revenue obligations are quite different than the former high-risk type of bonds. Basically they are general obligations in different form, and in previous years would have been called general obligations.

Today, for instance, many States have set up authorities which float bonds to build schools, office buildings, highways, bridges, water and electric plants, etc. The legislature then appropriates sufficient money to the authority out of general tax receipts to amortize the bonds. This type of revenue bond financing has increased sharply in recent years.

It is obvious from the legislative history of the Glass-Steagall Act of 1933 that the intent was to get the commercial banks out of promotional, speculative, development projects, and more specifically out of the corporate and foreign bond business. It was not until 1939 that "revenue bonds" were defined and a ruling made that the banks would not participate in such financing. As I have pointed out, the nature of revenue bond financing has altered sharply since then.

Subsequent developments have demonstrated that Congress has drawn the distinction in commercial bank bond participation between private and sound public financing. It has approved commercial bank activity in such high grade public bonds as those of local housing authorities and those issued by the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development—World Bank—Federal land banks, Federal intermediate credit banks, Federal National Mortgage Association, home loan banks, and the bonds of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

The proposed legislation permits commercial banks to underwrite, trade, and deal in municipal bonds only to the extent national banks can invest in such bonds under the National Banking Act. It provides the following safeguards:

First. The bonds must be of high quality with a proven record of earnings.

Second. They must be publicly offered, have satisfactory trustee arrangements and all the other factors that make an issue qualify as a sound investment.

Third. The amount of bonds of one issue which a bank may own or be obligated to buy is limited to 10 percent of the bank's capital and surplus. The risk to the depositor is thus eliminated, since only a fractional percentage of the bank's capital funds, and not the depositors' funds, are involved.

In summary, Mr. President, State and local governments need the broadest possible market for their growing volume of securities. The broader the market the greater the competition, the lower the interest rate. The problem will grow as the volume of financing continues to increase. The growth of State and local bond borrowing is indicated by the following table:

Year:	Amount
1945.....	\$818, 781, 000
1950.....	3, 693, 604, 000
1955.....	5, 976, 503, 000
1960.....	7, 229, 500, 000
1961.....	8, 344, 512, 000

State, State-agency and local government revenue bonds issued in the past 4 years which are acceptable for bank investment and would have been eligible for bank underwriting under the proposed legislation

State	1958		1959		1960		1961	
	Number of issues	Amount (thousands)	Number of issues	Amount (thousands)	Number of issues	Amount (thousands)	Number of issues	Amount (thousands)
Alabama.....	6	\$12, 110	12	\$80, 064	5	\$102, 775	8	\$43, 000
Alaska.....	2	4, 273	1	7, 500	2	3, 450	1	3, 800
Arizona.....	1	4, 880	4	19, 100	2	10, 630	2	5, 000
Arkansas.....	1	5, 300	2	10, 300			1	1, 530
California.....	8	62, 900	14	113, 750	10	81, 690	11	129, 700
Colorado.....	2	10, 500	1	6, 000	2	17, 750		
Connecticut.....	1	3, 250	1	62, 500				
Delaware.....					1	9, 000		
Florida.....	26	84, 745	35	144, 022	30	166, 780	22	77, 155
Georgia.....	8	51, 420	6	14, 637	4	7, 550	14	128, 000
Idaho.....	2	2, 850	1	4, 350			1	1, 700
Illinois.....	12	82, 580	6	37, 915	5	11, 990	3	56, 325
Indiana.....	17	65, 645	16	64, 500	13	21, 729	14	49, 520
Iowa.....	3	10, 500	1	1, 500	3	6, 930	4	9, 045
Kansas.....	1	1, 000			1	8, 000	1	5, 100
Kentucky.....	4	6, 025	8	21, 224	11	34, 240	10	50, 727
Louisiana.....	4	15, 111	4	6, 700	4	14, 450	8	24, 015
Maine.....	1	1, 000						
Maryland.....	3	30, 400	3	28, 336	3	34, 184	3	30, 792
Massachusetts.....			1	71, 750	1	9, 600		
Michigan.....	7	117, 995	8	105, 950	10	110, 735	11	122, 475
Minnesota.....	1	1, 200	3	27, 636	1	48, 820		
Mississippi.....	5	16, 900	7	24, 900	3	14, 400	3	12, 822
Missouri.....	4	13, 887	1	7, 500			3	12, 553
Montana.....	2	7, 000	2	2, 500				
Nebraska.....	2	16, 000	2	28, 042	2	4, 250	4	26, 200
New Jersey.....	2	16, 890	2	17, 415	2	2, 000		
New Mexico.....	1	2, 000	1	2, 203	1	1, 350	3	6, 240
New York.....	7	112, 400	9	556, 530	7	289, 800	7	311, 363
Ohio.....	8	135, 355	5	34, 975	7	13, 665	4	68, 850
Oklahoma.....	1	20, 500			1	62, 750	3	11, 265
Oregon.....					1	25, 500	2	6, 360
Pennsylvania.....	45	205, 232	50	192, 257	43	181, 591	51	273, 922
Rhode Island.....					1	2, 000		
South Carolina.....	2	3, 200	3	8, 950			2	3, 800
South Dakota.....	1	2, 050						
Tennessee.....	3	16, 500	4	8, 095	2	5, 270	4	8, 000
Texas.....	19	67, 510	26	91, 353	17	49, 474	21	95, 195
Utah.....					1	1, 600	2	2, 700
Virginia.....	1	6, 150			1	41, 700	1	27, 500
Washington.....	9	52, 090	8	220, 165	12	122, 945	8	25, 294
West Virginia.....	2	3, 679	2	6, 840	3	6, 075	3	11, 150
Wisconsin.....	4	25, 225	6	26, 315	1	15, 000	8	49, 070
Hawaii.....	1	12, 500	3	28, 000	2	8, 500	1	3, 000
Puerto Rico.....	2	40, 000	1	20, 000	3	35, 440	1	22, 000
Total.....	230	1, 348, 752	289	2, 103, 774	218	1, 581, 613	245	1, 712, 168

Revenue bond financing, from which commercial banks are now automatically and arbitrarily excluded, runs about one-third of the total market, as follows:

Year	Total new issues of State and municipal bonds	General obligation bonds	Revenue bonds
1945.....	\$818, 781, 000	\$615, 381, 750	\$203, 399, 250
1950.....	3, 693, 604, 000	3, 093, 681, 000	599, 923, 200
1955.....	5, 973, 503, 000	4, 244, 089, 000	1, 732, 414, 000
1960.....	7, 229, 500, 000	5, 034, 680, 000	2, 194, 820, 000
1961.....	8, 344, 512, 000	5, 761, 505, 000	2, 583, 007, 000

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a table showing the volume of State and local government revenue bonds issued in the past 4 years.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the table will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3131) to assist cities and States by amending section 5136 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, with respect to the authority of national banks to underwrite and deal in securities issued by State and local governments, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. CLARK (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The table presented by Mr. CLARK is as follows:

TWENTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE DEATH OF GEORGE GERSHWIN

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, in honor of a great personality, I send to the desk a bill to provide for the issuance of a special series of stamps in recognition of the 25th anniversary of the death of George Gershwin. George Gershwin was a man who, in the cultural annals of our country, should have a very unique place. He was born in 1898, and at the age of 21 he had already written his first major musical work for the Broadway theaters. A very few years later he was responsible for what history will record as a great shift in musical idiom. If it is not already historic, I think it will be. He showed that jazz could be the subject of serious composition as performed by serious symphonic orchestras. He showed that jazz was an art form in itself, and a form which has since been followed in the world.

One has but to mention the Rhapsody in Blue, Concerto in F, Porgy and Bess, and An American in Paris to record some of the great musical compositions of which we are very proud.

I had the privilege of attending the 25th anniversary tribute to George Gershwin at Carnegie Hall on March 18, 1962. It was a magnificent celebration. I ask unanimous consent that a list of officers of the concert committee of that great celebration, together with a biography of George Gershwin, may be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

OFFICERS OF CONCERT COMMITTEE

Chairman, Mr. Nicholas D. Biddle; cochairmen, Mr. and Mrs. Robert D. L. Gardner, Mr. and Mrs. Leopold Godowsky, Mrs. Horace E. Dodge II; cochairmen—women's committee, Mrs. Averell Clark, Mrs. Denniston L. Slater; chairman, men's committee, Mr. Lonsdale F. Stowell; and coordinator, Mr. Henry F. Ayres, Jr.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

George Gershwin was born in Brooklyn, N.Y., September 26, 1898, the son of Morris and Rose Bruskin Gershwin. Most of his early boyhood was spent on the lower East Side of Manhattan where he attended public school, was champion roller skater of Forsythe Street and fought in the street fights engaged in by the kids of the neighborhood. He began studying the piano at the age of 12. His first teacher was a Miss Green. Later he studied with Charles Hambitzer who, quick to recognize his talents, taught him harmony and introduced him to the works of Chopin and Debussy. He attended the High School of Commerce for a short period. During that time he was official pianist for the morning assembly exercises.

At the age of 15 he became a pianist in the professional department of Jerome H. Remick & Co., publishers of popular music. His salary was \$15 a week. This job involved pounding the piano 10 to 12 hours a day. When he offered a song of his own composition he was told, "You're here as a pianist, not a writer." He gave up the job and soon had his first song published, for which he received \$5. This was in 1916. The song was called "When You Want 'Em You Can't Get 'Em, When You've Got 'Em You Don't Want 'Em," with lyrics by Murray

Roth. Shortly after, he became rehearsal pianist for the Dillingham-Ziegfeld production "Miss 1917." During a Sunday night concert at the Century Theater where "Miss 1917" was playing, Miss Vivienne Segal introduced two of his numbers which brought him to the attention of Max Dreyfus, then head of Harms, Inc., music publishers. He signed with Dreyfus at \$35 a week. Although he had many more flattering offers he decided that his place was with Dreyfus who was not only a publisher of musical comedies and operettas but also a fine musician and a student of the classics. During this time he continued his musical studies with Edward Kilenyi and then Rubin Goldmark. There was rarely a period in his life when he was not studying. His last teacher was Dr. Joseph Shillinger.

In 1919 he wrote his first complete score for Broadway in the musical comedy produced by Alex Aarons, "La La Lucille," although before this he had contributed interpolations to various other musical shows. That same year he wrote his first big song hit, "Swanee," for which Irving Caesar wrote the words and which Al Jolson sang in "Sinbad."

From then on Gershwin's rise was rapid. Beginning in 1920 he wrote, among other things, the music for "George White's Scandals" for 5 consecutive years. It was in the fourth of this series, in 1923, that he attempted a work more extended than the usual 32-bar form. It was a short one-act opera called "135th Street," and in it may be found the beginnings of his later creative expressions. Paul Whiteman was in the "Scandals" of 1923 and was so impressed with the quality of the music that he later, in 1924, invited George to contribute to the now historic concert at Aeolian Hall, February 12, 1924, where the "Rhapsody in Blue" was first played.

Deems Taylor wrote, following the playing of the "Rhapsody" that Gershwin was "a link between the jazz camp and the intellectuals." After the worldwide success of the "Rhapsody," leading composers began to experiment with jazz.

Presently the New York Symphony Society commissioned Gershwin to compose a work of symphonic scope. As a result the "Concerto in F" was heard at Carnegie Hall with Walter Damrosch conducting and the composer at the piano. Incidentally, this was the first work that Gershwin orchestrated himself; all he had ever done in this line was a number or two in "Primrose," an operetta he wrote in London.

Beginning in 1924 with "Lady, Be Good," he composed for Aarons and Freedley seven musical comedies (with lyrics by his brother Ira) "Tip-Toes," "Oh, Kay," "Funny Face," "Treasure Girl," "Girl Crazy," and "Pardon My English."

In 1928 he wrote "An American in Paris" which was first performed by the Philharmonic-Symphony Society, again under Damrosch. Curiously enough, the typically French sections were written in New York while the American "blues" section was written at the Hotel Majestic in Paris.

In 1926 Edgar Selwyn told George S. Kaufman he would like him to do an entirely new type of musical with the Gershwins. "Strike Up the Band" was the result and was hailed with delight by the few but the many thought it far too bitter. With the assistance of Morrie Ryskind it was rewritten in 1930 and was the first of the three satirical operettas done by the quartet of Kaufman, Ryskind and the Gershwins. The second was "Of Thee I Sing," which was awarded the Pulitzer Prize in 1932 (produced by Sam H. Harris) and was followed by "Let 'Em Eat Cake" in 1933.

Mr. Gershwin often appeared at the Lewisohn Stadium concerts of the Philhar-

monic Symphony in New York as soloist composer, and conductor. One program devoted entirely to his own works, given August 16, 1932, attracted an audience of over 18,000 which set a record for this stadium. At Ravinia Park and other stadiums and concert halls his appearance usually broke local records for attendance. In the year 1936 he had more performances of his works played by symphonic organizations than did any other American composer.

Perhaps his most ambitious work was "Porgy and Bess." He first got the idea of making an opera of Du Bose Heyward's novel some 9 years before it was finally produced as such for he had found on writing Heyward that a dramatic version was being readied for the theater. In 1933 he and Heyward got the New York Theater Guild to sponsor an operatic version. With Ira helping on the lyrics and Rouben Mamoulian directing, the opera opened to great acclaim in Boston, then played 16 weeks in New York and was followed by a road tour. It will be seen in full in Los Angeles in February 1938 under the sponsorship of Merle Armitage. Also a European presentation is being readied.

Hollywood called in 1930 and the picture "Delicious" resulted. In the summer of 1936 he again appeared in Hollywood to do "Shall We Dance?" For Astaire-Robers, "A Damsel In Distress," now in production and was working on the "Goldwyn Follies" when the collapse occurred which 2 weeks later proved to be caused by a tumor in the brain. He died Sunday morning, July 11, 1937, in Los Angeles at the age of 38.

Besides his music, Mr. Gershwin was also interested in painting. He became an ardent collector. Also about 1928 he himself began to paint, and was considered exceedingly capable by professional critics. Early this year he completed portraits of Jerome Kern and Arnold Schoenberg.

Mr. JAVITS. I point out that here, too, is an Horatio Alger story, as George was born in Brooklyn, spent most of his life on the lower East Side—I know that life well, since it was my own origin—and rose to the great height of world recognition as an artist and composer.

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

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

The bill (S. 3132) to provide for the issuance of a special series of postage stamps in recognition of the 25th anniversary of the death of George Gershwin, introduced by Mr. JAVITS, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Postmaster General is authorized and directed to issue a special series of postage stamps, of such appropriate design and denomination as he shall prescribe, in recognition of the 25th anniversary of the death of George Gershwin. Such stamps shall be first offered for sale to the public at New York City, N.Y., on as early a date as practicable during the calendar year 1962.

FEDERAL LOANS TO CERTAIN LOCAL PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEMS

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, on March 21 I introduced a bill to authorize the

Federal Government to make grants to local school districts to cover the cost of drawing up desegregation plans and the cost of preparing school personnel to deal with the problems incident to desegregation.

Today I am introducing a bill which deals with a more serious obstacle in the path of the desegregation of our Nation's schools.

It would provide Federal loans to local school systems whose normal revenues have been cut off by their State or county government because they attempt to desegregate. The terms of these loans would be worked out by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare on a flexible basis to be adapted to the immediate need.

These loans will enable desegregating school districts to keep their schools in operation until such time as State and county governments are brought, through one means or another, to recognize the futility of their resistance to the Constitution and to the moral insistence of the American people that equal rights and opportunities be extended to all Americans.

There are a number of instances, and they will multiply in the future, in which local school boards are trying to desegregate in compliance with the Supreme Court decision but are prevented from doing so because State or county authorities cut off the funds that are necessary to operate local schools.

The most publicized instance of the denial of funds to a school board preparing for desegregation occurred in New Orleans, where those who would obey the law were blocked by those who would not. There were similar occurrences in Virginia in 1958 and in Arkansas in 1957.

In Alabama, Mississippi, and South Carolina no measures have been taken toward school integration. One reason for this is the widespread belief in these States that any school board attempting to desegregate its schools will lose the State assistance that is necessary to maintain local schools.

We have here a rather novel political problem which is that State governments are blocking the attempts of local school districts to comply with the Federal Constitution. In the long run, the courts will strike down these interferences but in the short run, the Federal Government can speed desegregation by making available to localities the funds denied them. Local school systems would thus be able to operate their schools until such time as court decisions reopen the closed sources of revenue.

We must look upon these attempts to circumvent the Supreme Court desegregation decision as a sort of last-ditch resistance that will pass away. Devices of this kind will succeed for a time but we know that in the end, desegregation will prevail. It must prevail if our Nation is to continue its progress toward ever fuller realization of the concepts of equality, liberty, and individual dignity which gave it birth.

Our task, in the meantime, is to speed the process as much as we can and at the same time to prevent thousands of

schoolchildren from becoming victims of tragedies such as the total shutdown of the school system in Prince Edward County, Va.

This is a modest proposal but it meets a specific demonstrated need and could have a great effect in hastening the general desegregation of our Nation's schools. We know that once desegregation is successfully carried out in any new locality, it will spread rapidly in all directions.

This bill is designed to enable those local communities that wish to comply with the law of the land to do so, and by their example, to speed the day when boys and girls in every community in this land can expect and receive the inheritance envisioned for them at the founding of this Nation: fair treatment, equal rights, and an honest chance to compete on even terms for their share in the promise of American life.

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

The bill (S. 3133) to authorize loans by the Federal Government to local public school systems whose funds have been withheld or withdrawn by State or local governments because of the desegregation of one or more schools in such systems, introduced by Mr. DONN, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR CONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN HIGHWAYS, FISCAL YEARS 1964 AND 1965

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize appropriations for the fiscal years 1964 and 1965 for the construction of certain highways in accordance with title 23 of the United States Code, and for other purposes.

I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce to the President of the Senate—explaining the bill—be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3136) to authorize appropriations for the fiscal years 1964 and 1965 for the construction of certain highways in accordance with title 23 of the United States Code, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. McNAMARA, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The letter presented by Mr. McNAMARA is as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, D.C., April 6, 1962.

THE HONORABLE PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The Department of Commerce submits herewith as a part of its legislative program for the 87th Congress, 2d session, a draft of a proposed bill: "to authorize appropriations for the fiscal years 1964 and 1965 for the construction of certain highways in accordance with title 23

of the United States Code, and for other purposes."

The Department of Commerce recommends enactment of the proposed legislation by the Congress.

The draft bill, which is designated the "Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1962," would carry out the recommendations made by the President in his transportation message which has just been submitted to the Congress, and would provide for levels of authorizations proposed in the 1963 budget for the Federal-aid highway program. Its broad purpose is to provide the necessary authorizations for continuation of the Federal-aid highway program and for other Federal highway and road construction programs in the Departments of Commerce, Interior, and Agriculture, and to strengthen and improve the role that the Federal-aid highway program will play as part of the President's program to assist in the planning and development of comprehensive and balanced urban transportation.

The draft bill provides for authorizations of \$950 million for the Federal-aid primary and secondary highway systems and their extensions within urban areas for each of the fiscal years 1964 and 1965. This level was recommended by the President, to the Congress in his special highway message of February 28, 1961. It represents an increase of \$25 million for each year over the \$925 million authorized for each of the two previous fiscal years, and is consistent with the national interest expressed in section 101(b) of title 23, United States Code.

The bill also includes authorizations for the fiscal year 1964 and for the fiscal year 1965 to continue programs for forest highways, forest development roads and trails, park roads and trails, parkways, Indian reservation roads and bridges, and public lands highways. In addition, authorizations for a new program are proposed for public land development roads and trails for the development, protection, administration and utilization of lands and resources administered by the Bureau of Land Management in the Department of the Interior. Proposed authorizations for these programs, together with amounts previously authorized for fiscal years 1962 and 1963, are shown in the enclosed schedule. Additional justification will be provided by the Departments of the Interior and Agriculture for those direct road programs within their jurisdictions.

A major objective of this bill is to increase the effectiveness of the Federal aid highway program as an instrument of Federal assistance for strengthening and improving urban transportation. In order to achieve this objective, the President has recommended in his transportation message that four amendments be made to Federal aid highway law. These proposals have been incorporated into this draft bill and are described below.

A new program of Federal assistance is proposed for families and businesses displaced as a result of Federal-aid highway construction comparable to existing provisions under urban renewal legislation. The Bureau of Public Roads estimates that about 15,000 families and 1,500 businesses will be displaced each year in the next 6 to 8 years by the completion of the Interstate System alone. Section 3 of the bill amends Federal-aid highway law to redefine the term "construction" to specifically include relocation payments and administrative expenses incurred by the States in providing assistance, as an appropriate cost of right-of-way acquisition for highway projects. This section also authorizes the Secretary of Commerce to require assurances by the State highway departments of feasible temporary relocation methods and of the availability of suitable dwellings to accommodate dis-

placed families, and to approve Federal-aid participation in State relocation payments, with specified limitations, for reasonable and necessary moving expenses and actual property losses not otherwise compensated.

Certain States are finding it increasingly difficult to improve the extensions of the Federal-aid secondary system into urban areas because of the higher priority for the use of available urban funds on the improvement of arterial streets in these areas. Under existing law, secondary funds are not available under certain conditions for use in urban areas and, as a result, in many cases secondary routes are improved up to the urban limits, and urban funds are not available for their improvement within these urban limits. Section 6 of the bill would remove the present limitation on the use of Federal-aid secondary funds for financing extensions of the secondary system in urban areas.

A major objective of national transportation policy in the use of Federal assistance programs should be to encourage and facilitate the development by States and local communities of balanced transportation systems consistent with long-range comprehensive development plans. In order that this objective may be expeditiously carried out, certain modifications of the basic Federal-aid highway legislation are considered highly desirable. Accordingly, section 7 of the bill would require, as a condition to the approval of a highway program involving a metropolitan area, that State and local agencies undertake transportation planning on a continuing basis which should be consistent with adequate comprehensive development plans prepared for such metropolitan areas.

This provision, we believe, would encourage balanced transportation planning and improve the quality of general metropolitan planning. It would in no way delay the current Federal aid highway program. Reasonable time would be allowed for the States and local communities to establish the continuing planning process that would be required and to produce the plans to which their highway systems would conform. The cooperative working arrangements undertaken by the Bureau of Public Roads with States and localities in the area of transportation planning will permit the Federal guidance and leadership necessary to achieve the objective of sound and uniform transportation planning in metropolitan areas.

In order to stimulate additional highway research activities in the Federal-State cooperative areas, provisions of existing law regarding the use of Federal aid highway funds apportioned to the States for planning and research purposes are revised significantly by section 8 of the draft bill. Generally, this section provides that the amount of funds available for all forms of highway research would be increased, highway planning and research funds would be matched by the States, and the funds if not so used for these purposes would lapse.

More specifically, an additional one-half of 1 percent would be made available for highway research purposes from funds apportioned to the States for the Federal aid primary, secondary, and urban programs. This additional one-half of 1 percent, together with State matching funds, would amount to almost \$10 million annually, and would be in addition to the present 1½ percent which is currently being used for both highway planning and highway research.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that enactment of this proposed legislation would be in accord with the program of the President.

Sincerely yours,

C. D. MARTIN, Jr.,
Acting Secretary of Commerce.

Schedule of existing authorizations for direct Federal highway and road construction programs and proposed authorizations under draft bill to authorize appropriations for the fiscal years 1964 and 1965 for the construction of certain highways in accordance with title 23 of the United States Code, and for other purposes

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Program	Existing authorizations		Proposed authorizations		
	1962	1963	1963	1964	1965
Forest highways.....	\$33.0	\$33	-----	\$33	\$33
Forest development roads and trails.....	35.0	40	\$10	70	85
Public land development roads and trails.....	-----	-----	-----	2	4
Park roads and trails.....	18.0	18	-----	22	25
Parkways.....	16.0	16	-----	16	16
Indian reservation roads and bridges.....	12.0	12	-----	16	18
Public lands highways.....	3.5	3	-----	3	3

AIRCRAFT NOISE ABATEMENT

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958. The purpose of this amendment is to direct the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency to conduct and encourage research to determine criteria for and means of abating objectionable aircraft noise. He would be authorized to do this within the Federal Aviation Agency or in cooperation with any other public and private agencies.

Mr. President, the problem of aircraft noise is an increasingly serious one. Those who live near airports can testify to the increased air traffic over the last decade. Moreover, jet flights are now being introduced at airports across the Nation. Millions of dollars are being spent to expand runways to provide for jets. Next to nothing is being spent to preserve the comfortable homes and quiet neighborhoods in communities near our large airports.

Mr. President, 20th century America certainly cannot ban the airplane. There is also no point in locating airports so far away from the people who use them that it takes longer to get to the airport than it does to make the flight.

It is not enough merely to set flight patterns that minimize noise in residential areas or establish ceilings for flight. Undoubtedly, these regulations do some good, but, at best, routing patterns provide a measure of relief from the worst noise nuisances, limited by wind, weather, and other flight requirements. They are not a cure.

Mr. President, the real gravity of the noise abatement problem has been underscored by the Supreme Court decision of early March. In a unanimous decision, the Court held that property owners must be compensated when low flights make property so useless as to constitute a "taking" of the property for public use. The Constitution requires that just compensation be provided for any property so taken. By a 7-to-2 vote the Court held that an agency operating an airport was liable for compensation

payments under these circumstances. Suits have already been filed against the New York Port Authority, which operates New York's International Airport at Idlewild, and other agencies and municipalities all over the country. More suits are expected.

Frankly, Mr. President, I do not consider aircraft noise an insoluble problem. I find it hard to believe that a nation which can send a man three times around the world in space is still unable to devise a method for quieting the operations of a jet or propeller plane.

Mr. President, I am aware that, even without this legislation, the Federal Aviation Agency is taking its first tentative steps forward. In cooperation with NASA, the FAA last July began a program to define and rate noise levels so that standards can be established, both for individual engines and for airport areas. FAA is apparently also on the verge of letting contracts in a long-term supersonic transport engine development program, which will include work on internal engine contours designed to reduce noise at the source.

The purpose of this legislation is to spell out, beyond any doubt, in the text of the Federal Aviation Act, the responsibility of the Agency in this area. Its purpose is to give the full weight of congressional support to noise abatement efforts and specifically to direct the Administrator to move forward with vigor and imagination to meet this challenging problem. I know full well that we cannot legislate a solution to the noise problem. But we can and should write clearly into the legislation our deep interest in and support for an accelerated and expanded program of aircraft noise abatement efforts. I strongly urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 3138) to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 in order to provide for research to determine criteria and means for abating objectionable aircraft noise, introduced by Mr. KEATING, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 312 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following:

"NOISE ABATEMENT RESEARCH

"(d) The Administrator shall conduct, and encourage, cooperate with, and render assistance to, other appropriate public or private agencies or organizations in the conduct of research to determine means for establishing practical aircraft noise criteria and for abating objectionable aircraft noise. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this subsection the Administrator may make grants, contracts, or other arrangements without regard to sections 3648 and 3709 of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 529 and 41 U.S.C. 5)."

JOINT SELECT COMMITTEE TO STUDY THE PROBLEM OF THE PROPER FORM OF LOCAL SELF-GOVERNMENT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill which would establish a joint select committee of the Congress, consisting of three Senators and three Members of the House, for the purpose of studying the problem of the proper form of local self-government of the District of Columbia.

The bill, in addition, would authorize appropriation of the sum of \$50,000 for expenses attendant upon the business of such joint committee for the purpose of hiring necessary assistants.

The bill requires that the committee prepare a report, including a suggested form of self-government of the District together with reasons for its conclusions. That report would be required to be submitted to the Congress not later than January 1, 1963.

I am convinced that there is some necessity and justification for the matters contained in this bill and I shall discuss them at length and in some detail at a later time.

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

The bill (S. 3139) making an authorization for an appropriation to provide for the expenses of a joint select committee of the Senate and House of Representatives to study the problem of local self-government for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. PROUTY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

JURISDICTION OVER LANDS WITHIN FORT HANCOCK MILITARY RESERVATION, N.J.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to enable the Federal Government to retrocede jurisdiction to the State of New Jersey in the area of Sandy Hook, N.J., now under lease to the State for use as a State recreation area.

This bill would remove a technical difficulty that still remains despite the close cooperation among State and Federal officials on all steps taken to make this area available to the State.

Sandy Hook was, until an agreement was signed in recent months, reserved by the Army for military purposes. Fort Hancock is on this peninsula; so are several Nike missile bases. Last summer however—with the help of the President, Secretary of the Interior Udall, and the Department of Defense—the State was successful in convincing the Army officials that a 460-acre area on the peninsula could be leased to the State for recreation purposes. The State will prepare detailed plans, too, for the possible use of other parts of Sandy Hook for similar development if military needs permit.

We in New Jersey appreciate the cooperation of the many Federal officials

who have helped in this project. Several of them were present at the recent dedication ceremonies for the first recreation area. It was a memorable occasion.

However, one technical item remains. I have been informed by the New Jersey State Department of Conservation and Economic Development that, when Sandy Hook was originally given to the Federal Government, jurisdiction over the area was given up by the State and turned over to the Federal Government.

This means that, while the State has the lower part of Sandy Hook under lease, it has no jurisdiction thereon. Any kinds of crimes committed would have to be referred to the F.B.I. State officials would have no authority to make any arrests or do any other type of police activity.

And so it is necessary for the Federal Government to retrocede jurisdiction to the State. I might point out that previous Federal legislation has authorized the Department of the Army to take similar action in other cases. The bill I introduce today is identical with one passed by Congress in the case of the State of Illinois in connection with the Fort Sheridan Military Reservation.

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

The bill (S. 3141) to authorize the Secretary of the Army to relinquish to the State of New Jersey jurisdiction over any lands within the Fort Hancock Military Reservation, introduced by Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 660 OF TITLE 18, UNITED STATES CODE, RELATING TO MISUSE OF COMMON CARRIERS' FUNDS DERIVED FROM COMMERCE

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which would amend section 660 of title 18, United States Code, in order to protect the funds and property owned or transported by common carriers in interstate commerce. Under existing law, officers, directors, and employees of interstate transportation companies are subject to Federal prosecution if they misappropriate moneys or property in commerce.

There is, however, a growing trend in transportation toward the use of independent contractors to perform services once performed by employees. Existing Federal law is not applicable to these independent contractors. As a result, many interstate carriers have not been able to get protection from theft or embezzlement.

Several cases have been called to the attention of the Commerce Committee involving conversion of the funds of a common carrier. Because of the multi-State nature of the operations, it is impossible to identify in which State the criminal act occurred. Therefore, no State has been able to prosecute and the offender had to answer to no law.

This situation and its variations have been repeated many times.

Mr. President, my purpose in introducing this measure is twofold. Common carriers are currently experiencing some critical financial problems. The crimes which would be covered by the broadened scope of Federal criminal law represent an area where the carriers involved have been helpless to stop the depletion of their assets. Adoption of this proposal and some prosecutions pursuant to its terms would have a healthy deterrent effect.

In addition to conserving transportation capital, this measure would also reduce charges to the public, for in the final analysis shippers and consumers will find that they bear the burden in the form of increased rates. In the same way that the cost of labor and fuel and capital equipment is passed on to the public, the cost of criminal acts depleting common carrier revenue is passed on. This should be stopped, and it can be.

I sincerely trust that the committee to which this measure is referred will act promptly and favorably on this measure which undoubtedly is in the public interest.

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

The bill (S. 3143) to amend section 660 of title 18 of the United States Code, relating to the misuse of common carriers' funds derived from commerce, in order to expand the coverage of such section, introduced by Mr. SMATHERS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

AMENDMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954, TO PROVIDE A CREDIT FOR INVESTMENT IN CERTAIN DEPRECIABLE PROPERTY—AMENDMENTS

Mr. COTTON submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H.R. 10650) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a credit for investment in certain depreciable property, to eliminate certain defects and inequities, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

Mr. HARTKE submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to House bill 10650, supra, which was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

CREATION OF BOARD OF PUBLIC LANDS APPEALS IN THE OFFICE OF SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of April 4, 1962, the names of Mr. BIBLE and Mr. CHURCH were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 3107) to establish in the Office of the Secretary of the Department of the Interior a Board of Public Lands Appeals, and for other purposes, introduced by

Mr. GRUENING (for himself and other Senators) on April 4, 1962.

SERVING OF ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGES IN SENATE WING OF THE CAPITOL OR THE SENATE OFFICE BUILDINGS — ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF RESOLUTION

Under authority of the order of the Senate of April 5, 1962, the names of Mr. JOHNSTON, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. CARLSON, and Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware were added as additional cosponsors of the resolution (S. Res. 325) to amend rule XXXIV to prohibit the serving of hard liquor in Senate wing of the Capitol or Senate Office Buildings, submitted by Mr. MORSE on April 5, 1962.

NOTICE OF RECEIPT OF NOMINATION BY COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I desire to announce that today the Senate received the nomination of G. Griffith Johnson, of Connecticut, to be an Assistant Secretary of State for Economic Affairs.

In accordance with the committee rule, this pending nomination may not be considered prior to the expiration of 6 days of its receipt in the Senate.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON FOREIGN ASSISTANCE PROGRAM BY COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I wish to announce that the committee will hear public witnesses on the foreign assistance program for 1963 beginning at 10 o'clock Wednesday morning, April 18, in room 4221, New Senate Office Building.

NOTICE OF POSTPONEMENT OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF IRVING BEN COOPER TO BE U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE, SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that the public hearing scheduled for Thursday, April 12, 1962, at 10:30 a.m., on the nomination of Irving Ben Cooper, of New York, to be U.S. district judge for the southern district of New York, has been postponed to Thursday, May 3, 1962, at 10:30 a.m., in room 2228, New Senate Office Building.

At the indicated time and place persons interested in the hearing may make such representations as may be pertinent.

The subcommittee consists of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING], and myself, as chairman.

**NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON BILLS
PENDING BEFORE RETIREMENT
SUBCOMMITTEE OF COMMITTEE
ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL
SERVICE**

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, on behalf of the Retirement Subcommittee of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Thursday, May 10, at 10:30 a.m. in room 6202 of the New Senate Office Building on the following measures:

S. 2362 and S. 387, bills to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to provide for the inclusion in the computation of accredited service of certain periods of service rendered States or instrumentalities of States, and for other purposes.

S. 1337, a bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act so as to increase, in the case of children attending school, from 18 to 21, the maximum age for receiving benefits under such act.

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

Persons wishing to testify on these measures can make arrangements to do so by calling Capitol 4-3121, extension 5451.

Other members of the subcommittee are the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG], and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS].

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

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

By Mr. LONG of Missouri:

Article containing an account of the history of journalism in Dunklin County, Mo., published in the Daily Dunklin Democrat, at Kennett, Mo., on April 2, 1962.

**PROPOSED COMPENSATION TO NEW
YORK FOR EXTRA POLICING DUR-
ING UNITED NATIONS GENERAL
ASSEMBLY SESSION**

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I should like to express my support for the position taken in the Senate by my colleague [Mr. KEATING] yesterday on the bill which has come over from the other body relating to the reimbursement of New York City for unusual expenses incurred in 1960 in the police arrangements to protect the leaders of other countries, notably the leaders of the Communist bloc, when they attended the United Nations General Assembly session, now historic, in that year in New York. Such leaders included Khrushchev, Tito, Nasser, Gomulka, Castro, and Kadar.

I can add a word of special testimony in this respect. I was a member of the

House Committee on Foreign Affairs. I was the sponsor of the U.N. building laws, by designation of my venerable chief, Representative Eaton, who was then chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. I had a great deal to do with the headquarters agreement and all the laws which relate to the U.N. occupancy of that area.

I can testify that it was fully contemplated at that time that if we did have a serious security problem, New York would handle it, but it would do so as the agent for the Nation. That point was very fully recognized.

New York receives advantages for having the U.N. in New York. So does the United States, and so does the world.

New York does not send in a bill every Wednesday, or every time important visitors are received or important meetings of the U.N. are held. But anyone who was in New York at that time—and I lived there and observed the situation myself—realizes what a tense situation existed at the time of the 1960 session. We know that a particular concentration of leaders with big names could be and were endangered, as we all knew. Therefore it was a special and unusual situation which I believe, in all justice, calls for the reimbursement which the other body has voted, and which I hope very much we, with similar understanding, will vote, too, recognizing that it is sometimes the case that a great city like New York acts as trustee for the Nation with great credit. It has great financial problems, greater than those of any other city in the world, probably, because of its size, complexity, and other problems which we all know only too well. I hope very much that favorable action may be taken at an early date on that bill.

LOWELL MASON'S GRACE

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, every year on the opening day of the baseball season in Washington, Lowell Mason, a former member of the Federal Trade Commission, gives a luncheon. This year the Vice President, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and many Members of the House and Senate were in attendance.

On each of these occasions, Lowell Mason reads a grace that is fitting and outstanding.

I ask unanimous consent that the grace given this year be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

LOWELL MASON'S GRACE

Lord we thank Thee for the bounty of this table—

The salt from the sea, the bread, meat, and drink,

From valley, plain, and mountain

All grown by men whose hands we have never grasped, faces we have never seen, voices we have never heard.

Lord we thank Thee for a greater bounty—
For the bounty of friendship at this table.

Not the frivolous friendship born of similar habits, language, and appetites—

But for friendship born of strong differences of opinion and high respect for common aims.

These are the legislators, we see them face to face.

They give us their hands, their voices are our voices.

Lord we thank Thee for even a greater bounty—

Not alone for the friendship of those who stand momentarily by our table—

But those who stand eternally by our shoulders—

Mr. Sam, Styles, Andy, Bob Taft, Vandenberg, La Follette, Paul, and a great host of others who,

"Have put off their shoes—softly to walk by day within our thoughts."¹

Lord, for all Thy bounty.

We give thanks.

**FARM LEGISLATION AND VIEWS OF
ACTUAL FARM OPERATORS**

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, as this session of Congress considers farm legislation, I think it is important that we get the views of actual farm operators who work and cooperate with the programs day in and day out.

A group of Greeley County, Kans., farmers met on March 9; and after discussing the present program, as well as prospective programs, they submitted to me a copy of the minutes of the meeting.

I ask unanimous consent that the minutes of the meeting be made a part of these remarks in the RECORD.

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

**MINUTES OF GREELEY COUNTY, KANS., FARMERS
ON VIEWS OF FARM OPERATORS**

An impromptu meeting was held on Thursday evening, March 29, 1962. The purpose of the meeting was to ascertain the opinions of those present with regard to the present Federal farm programs as they apply to Greeley County, Kans.

It is believed that a large majority of those present were agreed as follows:

That the present acreage allotments for Greeley County are inequitable for two reasons:

A. By 1951 it had become a standard practice in Greeley County to summer fallow nearly all land which was to be planted to wheat. Therefore, the acreage available to wheat had been reduced by approximately one-half before the period used for apportionment started. Other areas have adopted the practice at a later period and thereby increased their production on the larger bases apportioned to them.

B. Drought conditions and early spring rainouts materially curtailed feed grain production on many farms in the county during the years 1959 and 1960 which were the years used as a basis for feed grain program allotments.

This point might be summarized by stating that in this particular area the feasibility of planting any particular crop during any particular growing season is dependent upon the vagaries of the weather. This statement is much more true in western Kansas than it is in eastern Kansas. Because of the well known wind erosion problem farmers in Greeley County need more flexibility than is permitted under the present program.

It is believed that the above-mentioned inequities could be corrected and the desired flexibility obtained by adoption of the following:

1. Readjustment of feed grain base, using Greeley County ASC records on the 10 years

¹Hugh Orr's "They Softly Walk."

preceding the first year of feed grain controls.

2. Combining the wheat and all feed grain bases, including milo, barley, rye, silage, or feed, after readjustment of feed grain base.

3. Permit the planting of any crop or any combination of crops on the combined base. Only one harvest of the base acres to be permitted in 1 year. But, for example, if entire base is planted to wheat and wheat were destroyed before feed grain planting time, feed grains could be planted on base acres and harvested.

4. It is believed that there is no surplus of the quality of wheat that is normally produced in Greeley County. Therefore producers should be permitted to plant all of their combined base acres to wheat if they desired to do so. They would then be permitted to sell the wheat produced on their wheat base acres on the open market under price supports. However, if production on the wheat base acres falls below the established Greeley County average they will be permitted to market enough of the wheat produced by them, on nonwheat-base acres, to bring them up to the normal Greeley County average. Other nonwheat base acre wheat could be sold at feed grain prices and under feed grain price supports, or carried over under bond or certificate to be sold in a future crop failure year as milling wheat under the county average quotas.

5. That because of the size of normal operations and the large number of nonresident landowners, each farm should be considered to be a separate unit for the purposes of determining compliance in any program. In other words, some landowners may desire to participate in the program and some may not.

6. That the combined base should not go below 50 percent of the total cultivated acres of any farm.

7. That since wheat harvest in Greeley County normally does not start until around July 1, the plowup date on excess acreage under the existing wheat program should be extended to June 1.

It is believed the above would:

1. Permit operators to engage in many more desirable soil conservation practices.

2. Permit operators to plan ahead because the suggested program is far less complicated.

3. Reduce problems of administration.

4. Reduce cost to the Government.

5. Not increase surplus.

GOLDEN ANNIVERSARY OF THE INSTITUTE OF RADIO ENGINEERS

Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. President, on March 28, 1962, David Sarnoff, chairman of the board of the Radio Corp. of America, made a most interesting and profound address. I ask unanimous consent that the address be placed in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

ADDRESS BY DAVID SARNOFF, CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD, RADIO CORP. OF AMERICA, INSTITUTE OF RADIO ENGINEERS GOLDEN ANNIVERSARY BANQUET, NEW YORK CITY, MARCH 28, 1962

The occasion that has brought us together tonight—the golden anniversary of the Institute of Radio Engineers—is, indeed, a happy and significant one. And for many of us, it is deeply moving.

Our personal histories and professional careers—compounded of victories and defeats, of hopes fulfilled or thwarted—are closely woven into the history of the Institute of Radio Engineers. The half century we commemorate is filled with dramatic developments in communications and with

heart-warming memories of close personal relationships, of cherished friendships, and of comradeship in creative enterprise.

In considering what I might appropriately say tonight, my first impulse was to speak of the remarkable accomplishments of the organization and its membership. But even the most condensed recital of that crowded period would exhaust the time allotted to me, and it would also run counter to our tradition of looking to the future rather than the past.

There is one historical vignette, however, that needs to be recalled. This picture, still unblurred after 50 years of exposure, is of a venturesome trio of pioneers who met in 1912, in Whyte's Restaurant on Fulton Street, in New York City, to found the Institute of Radio Engineers.

They were indeed a select and inspired group, these explorers of the newly opened world of wireless, and they deserve honorable mention tonight: Alfred N. Goldsmith, John V. L. Hogan, and Robert H. Marriott. They became the argonauts for a new era of scientific adventure, and were quickly joined by other pioneers whose work and dedication laid the foundations for the worldwide growth of the Institute of Radio Engineers. From the labors of those early innovators have grown the science, art, and technology of electronics, encompassing the universe of matter and energy, from invisible to infinite.

Those of us who subscribed to the institute's first declaration of purpose: "To advance the art and science of radio transmission," were moved primarily by a vision of what this interplay of electrical and magnetic forces could mean to human progress. Even with the primitive instruments of that day, tapping out coded messages, we sensed a power to convey men's thoughts, voices, and ultimately their images, across the barriers of space and time. We conceived the Institute of Radio Engineers not merely as a forum for the dissemination of new principles and concepts, but as a forge in which we could test, mold, and temper the character of our infant technology in an atmosphere of free scientific inquiry.

In a personal sense, I can relate the growth of our technology to two events, one at each end of the 50-year span. In 1912, as the Institute of Radio Engineers was being formed the SS *Titanic* struck an iceberg and was sinking in the Atlantic some 1,500 miles from our shores. As the wireless operator at the Marconi station on the roof of the Wanamaker store in this city, it took me 72 hours, with the equipment then available, simply to receive the news of the disaster and the names of the survivors.

Last month, using modern communications equipment, we were able to maintain almost continuous two-way contact with an astronaut who traveled 81,000 miles in space in less than 5 hours—about the same length of time it took me to travel between my home in New York and Washington, D.C.

On that day, I happened to be traveling by train to a White House meeting with President Kennedy and through the media of home television, car radio, pocket radio, and hotel television, I kept fully informed on Colonel Glenn's epic journey. Listening to my pocket radio, I recall walking from my compartment to the dining car at the other end of the train. In the few minutes this required, Colonel Glenn flew from the Hawaiian Islands to the Pacific coast—a distance of some 2,500 miles.

Such is the measure of progress in communication and flight made in the 50 years of Institute of Radio Engineers' life.

I recall, as do others here tonight, our spirited discussions during the early IRE organizational meetings on the choice of a name. There was a strong disposition to prefix the letter A—standing for American—

to IRE. Finally, the decision was made that the Institute of Radio Engineers should and would be truly international in scope.

Fifty years have validated the wisdom of that decision. Nearly one-eighth of the Institute of Radio Engineers' 100,000 members today come from nations outside the United States and its possessions, grouped in 26 sections around the globe. In 105 countries or territories, from Aden to the Antilles, the symbol of Institute of Radio Engineers denotes an active membership.

Since 1930, it has been the custom for a Vice President of the organization to come from a nation other than the United States. In 1957, in fact, neither the President nor the Vice President of the IRE was a resident of our country. During this half century, the IRE has been an adviser, a participant, or a sponsor at countless international conferences for the advancement of electronic communications.

The nature of our science has dictated in some measure this pattern of growth on a global scale. The electron itself recognizes neither natural nor man-made boundaries, and the art of electronics has emerged as a rich mosaic to which many men from many nations have made important contributions.

As we enter our second half century, the chief obstruction to the pursuit of our founding aims is the political conflict that dominates our times. It is a type of obstruction inherent in the Communist system, which views science as an instrument of ideological as well as physical warfare, and which relentlessly bends it to that purpose. It is the antithesis of the IRE's founding concept of a universal and free science, a partnership global in scope and aims.

In my judgment, a clear understanding of this fact, and of its implications for the future, is indispensable not only to the membership of the IRE but to all who believe in free science and free society. If our cherished concept is to prevail, then we must act resolutely to place it in the service of freedom itself. This, indeed, is the great challenge of our second half century.

To meet it, we must first recognize realistically that the leaders of Communist technology are functionaries of a political apparatus wholly committed to the subjugation of freemen and the destruction of free societies. Communism operates on the principle that science is a basic instrument of state policy, a policy geared to world domination. While Mr. Khrushchev and his associates change faces on many issues, they have never deviated from their relentless pursuit of this objective.

As part of their politico-scientific approach, the Communists, by concentrating heavily in the areas of space and military atomics, have cultivated the claim that their science is superior in all respects. But this is a false claim. Actually, their scientific and technological capabilities are more limited than most of the world realizes. I am convinced that we can, if we so determine, demonstrate both the qualitative and quantitative superiority of free science across the board.

To do this, however, we must have a far more systematic and effective mobilization of the free world's scientific resources than our present informal alliance provides. We must concentrate our talents and facilities for scientific victory for peace, just as we have organized the forces of NATO for military defense. And we must do so with the sanction and support of the principal governments of the free world.

What are the resources that can be mustered for such an effort?

Among the 500 million persons within the Atlantic community alone there is a gigantic reservoir of scientific and technological strength unmatched in aptitudes, skills and creativity.

Over the past quarter century, there have been 34 Nobel prize winners from the United States in the fields of physics, chemistry, medicine and physiology; 44 from Western Europe, and only 5 from the Soviet Union. Since the beginning of the century, the ratio of Nobel prize winners is 175 to 6 in favor of the West.

Western Europe today possesses an impressive array of gifted men devoted to searching out basic scientific principles. Its universities and scientific centers—Goettingen, Oxford, Cambridge, the Sorbonne, Milan, Delft, Upsala, Copenhagen—are well-springs of creativity in key research areas. To pace its own economic growth, Western Europe also is moving swiftly into the development and industrial application of basic knowledge.

The United States in recent years has contributed a substantial share of the world's finest creative thinking. It excels today in the experimental approach, in the richness and variety of its facilities, in unrivaled opportunities for putting concepts into application.

These diverse strengths on both sides of the Atlantic complement and support each other. On the one hand, few European nations, even collectively, possess the resources to pursue such vast and expensive undertakings as the exploration of space. For lack of opportunity, immensely talented scientists in these countries are consequently not utilizing their abilities to the utmost.

On the other hand the United States, largely because of its own swift advances, is gradually depleting its storehouse of fundamental scientific knowledge—the springboard for further technological progress. The demand for basic principles seems to be outpacing the supply.

Through more extensive basic research, we must expand our scientific knowledge and channel its flow into other areas of the world for the support of freedom's needs.

This can best be accomplished, I believe, through the creation of an organization which I would call the Free World Community of Science—an organization where competence is the only visa, and capabilities are fitted together for maximum results without regard to nationality.

The United States might properly take the lead in establishing such an organization, which initially could embrace the nations of Western Europe, North and South America, Australia, and Japan. Any countries which permit free scientific inquiry unhampered by political ideology, would be welcomed.

This community of science could include scientific leaders in the major areas of the physical and life disciplines from each participating nation. Established on a permanent basis, it could be responsible for proposing key research areas, initiating specific research and development projects, coordinating the resources essential to their implementation, and creating, wherever desirable, specialized international research institutes. It should function with a minimum of political direction, and with its financial support contributed by the member nations.

Organizations such as the IRE could play a vital role in the development of the community of science; first by proclaiming their support of it and then by counselling on organizational problems during the formative phase. It would also be within their province to proposed suitable projects, to recommend the most qualified scientists and engineers, to help evaluate progress, and to suggest promising avenues of exploration. There are many organizations here and abroad which possess the qualities of technical competence, objective appraisal and political independence necessary to make useful contributions.

Even today we could place certain areas of research under a canopy of common free

world scientific interest. In each area, breakthroughs would change human life for the better and would manifest to all mankind the scientific leadership of the West.

I have grouped them into five broad categories which range across the natural laws of life, matter and energy, and involve some of the most critically pressing human and physical problems of our time.

1. Genetics and heredity: We have begun the assault on the innermost mysteries of the life process—decoding the nucleic structure of the living cell, its activities, differentiations and transmitted characteristics. Knowledge of these basic life functions might make it possible ultimately to alter or modify cellular structures. This could lead in turn to the elimination of bacterial or viral diseases, and conceivably to more useful strains of plant and animal life.

2. Communications and space: In our own area of primary interest—communications—we are now in the planning and early development stage for a cosmic system of interconnected high-level synchronous satellites, low-level satellites, ground stations and networks. Such a system will enable us to furnish every type of communication to every place on earth, to space vehicles and to the planets beyond. Whenever man ventures from this planet, science is challenged with the supreme task of providing him with the means of seeing and talking with his fellow men wherever they may be.

Recently the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, through Colonel Glenn and Project Mercury, dramatically demonstrated the potentialities of space for peaceful purposes. It is axiomatic that when a vacuum is unsealed, there is an inrush of air. As the vacuum of outer space is unsealed by our intrepid astronauts, we must mount a Western team effort to insure an inrush of freedom.

Another area of infinite promise for scientific collaboration in this general category is weather control. The success of the four Tiros television weather satellites has already indicated the possibility that we can vastly strengthen the defense of person and property against the turbulence of the skies and the seas.

Where there are resources and individuals in the free world capable of significant contributions to these new dimensions of science, they should be joined to the sum of a united effort.

3. Conversion of saline to fresh water: Two-thirds of the peoples of the earth live in areas that are water-starved. For millions of them, the presence of a few feet of water spells the difference between life, bare existence, or death. The nations which offer an efficient, low-cost process for large scale purification of salt or brackish water will possess a weapon as potent as space ships in the battle for men's allegiance. President Kennedy has said rightly, that this is as important as landing on the moon.

4. New sources of food: Barely one-sixth of the world's people are well fed, and nearly half exist in a state of subnutrition or malnutrition. In the areas where food deficiencies are greatest, the rate of agricultural production has been slowest.

In 20 years the population of the earth will increase by 1 billion, and 40 years from now it will total 6 billion. For every plate of food on the table today, there must be two plates by the year 2000—and most of that second plate can come from the world's oceans.

Acre per acre, the oceans can sustain at least as large a plant crop as the land; yet, the harvest of the sea today provides less than 1 percent of the human diet. The oceans offer an immediate challenge to our proposed community of science for improving food supplies by transforming fishing from a nomadic pursuit to an organized farming activity, including the scientific

processing of highly nutrient algae and plankton for food purposes.

5. New sources of energy: Research in atomic, electronics, and other fields, is now providing us with the means to convert solar energy, fossil fuel energy, and atomic fission energy, directly into electric power. And through further research we shall ultimately learn how to make practical use of nuclear fusion energy. When that day comes, we shall be able to tap the limitless energy sources in the oceans.

Before too long, many isolated parts of the world will have sources of electricity that will not require large central power stations and extensive transmission systems. When we learn how to convert all forms of matter into energy for practical uses, we will have at our disposal the maximum force in nature. It will then be possible to cleave new coastlines, level mountain ranges, and transform the Sahara or our southwestern deserts into irrigated gardens.

To quicken the pace of these explorations, I suggest the establishment of an international data processing center to assemble, digest, translate, and make available promptly the essential data contained in the volumes of technical papers being published around the world. This year alone, the total of such papers will approach 60 million pages. Concealed in this mountain of information are thousands of ideas for new materials, products, and processes that could be invaluable to our progress in science and technology.

Tonight, I have attempted to outline only a concept and the directions it might take. I realize that the implementation will require time, effort, a degree of willingness to forsake parochial interests, and a firm faith in the future of free nations. While it would be necessary, for security reasons, to exclude certain activities of a scientific nature that relate to national defense, this would not contradict the broader and peaceful purposes of the new scientific alliance.

In January, President Kennedy told the Congress: "The Atlantic Community is no longer concerned with purely military aims. As its common undertakings grow at an ever increasing pace, we are, and increasingly will be, partners in aid, trade, defense, diplomacy, and monetary affairs."

To these, I believe, we must now join the partnership of science.

As the founders of the IRE recognized half a century ago, the concept of isolation in science is illusory and in the end self-defeating. We can no longer afford the luxury of American science, or British, French, Italian, or German science, if the individual parts are smaller than the sum. We must mobilize all of free science into the race for supremacy over the forces governing the universe. We cannot afford to fall behind in this race. The Communist challenge to the free world on the military, economic, political, and psychological fronts demands that we hold first place in science and technology.

Four centuries ago, Francis Bacon said: "Knowledge is power." Amended for the 20th century, his words might read: "Scientific knowledge is world power."

The dominant task that our organization faces in the next 50 years is to help translate scientific knowledge into power—power that can safeguard human freedom and justice, that can make life more rewarding and more secure for men everywhere. For the IRE, I am confident this golden anniversary will prove to be another commencement.

ECONOMIC VALUE OF WYOMING'S SHEEP AND WOOL INDUSTRY

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, it is often difficult to assess the value of a particular segment of a State's economy without

the assistance of some definite guideposts.

In the day-to-day press of events it is easy to lose sight of just how important a single industry can be to a State's economy.

I was, therefore, gratified to receive a special report, which served to reemphasize the importance of a vital part of Wyoming's great agricultural industry, the sheep and wool industry, prepared by a former colleague, Prof. Glenn Roehr-kasse.

This report is a survey made possible by the University of Wyoming's division of agricultural economics, and with the cooperation from the Wyoming Wool Growers Association.

This survey indicates that the total Wyoming dollar benefit from sheep and wool equal more than \$71 million.

I think the Wool Growers Association has performed a valuable service in initiating this study which should be of considerable interest to many people, and I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the RECORD.

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

THE ECONOMIC VALUE OF THE WYOMING SHEEP AND WOOL INDUSTRY TO WYOMING'S ECONOMY

(By Glenn P. Roehr-kasse)

The sheep and wool industry is one of the important agricultural industries in the State. Wyoming's agriculture income in 1960, in terms of cash receipts plus the value of home consumption, amounted to \$178,498,000. Approximately 17.34 percent of this income comes from the sheep and wool industry, or about \$30,948,000. Actually this industry in terms of cash receipts is the second largest single agricultural income producer in Wyoming, being exceeded only by the cattle industry.

While it is possible to determine, in terms of cash receipts, the relative value of this industry to the total Wyoming agriculture, it is an intricate task to determine the economic value of the industry to Wyoming's economy. Nevertheless, the purpose of this report is to present the results of an investigation into what is the economic value of the Wyoming sheep and wool industry to Wyoming's economy.

Wyoming's economy is made up of the aggregate economic activity of all its people. Money income is generated by money expenditures. Every time a dollar is spent by someone to purchase goods or services, this dollar represents an income for the person who receives it. The economic activity in the State is generated in two separate ways: First, economic activity within the State can be brought about by intrastate purchases and sales. That is, when people within the State purchase goods and services from in-State sources, they generate economic activity by increasing the circulation of in-State money. Secondly, economic activity within the State can be brought about by importing new money (by exporting goods and services). The new money then further generates economic activity through intrastate sales and purchases. The economy of Wyoming cannot be considered as an isolated one, since goods and services are exported from the State as well as being imported into the State. These imports, which are purchases made outside the State by people within the State, represent leakages to the State's economy.

The effect of any industry on a State's economy can be resolved by determining the amount of new money that comes into the economy from the exporting of goods and

services and then tracing the flow of this money through intrastate transactions until the money actually flows from the economy in the form of leakages.

In order to analyze the impact of the sheep and wool industry on Wyoming's economy, it is necessary to have data available on the total income received and on the total expenditures made by the industry in the various industry sectors of Wyoming. An estimate was made of the total income received and the total expenditures made by the industry during the calendar year 1960. These estimates are presented in table 1. That year was chosen because data were available for 1960 on the distribution of expenditures between various industry sectors of the State.

TABLE 1.—Estimated total income received and total expenditures made by the Wyoming sheep and wool industry in the various sectors of Wyoming, based on 1960 data

Income:	
Sheep and lambs.....	\$17,003,000
Value of home consumption..	140,000
Wool.....	9,428,000
Government payments.....	4,377,000
Total income.....	30,948,000
Expenditures:	
Agriculture (hay, grain, etc.)..	2,373,000
Manufacturing (lumber, etc.).....	345,000
Transportation and utilities..	1,013,000
Farm product handlers (elevators, feed dealers, etc.)..	1,999,000
Wholesale (bulk dealers, etc., e.g., gas and oil).....	1,616,000
Retail (general merchandise, building materials, implements, autos, etc.).....	4,753,000
Services (personal services, business and professional, etc.).....	136,000
Finance (banks, investment companies, insurance companies, etc.).....	244,000
Contractors (building and other).....	739,000
Local government (taxes).....	1,337,000
State and Federal Government (State taxes and leases).....	494,000
Household (hired labor, operators' income, profit, etc.).....	13,262,000
Imports (purchases outside the State of Wyoming).....	2,637,000
Total expenditures.....	30,948,000

The expenditures of the industry, as presented in table 1, indicate the amounts that were spent in the various industry sectors during 1960. For example, the industry purchases \$2,373,000 worth of agricultural goods (hay, grain, etc.) from the agricultural sector. They also spent \$4,753,000 in the retail trade to purchase ranch supplies, building materials, ranch equipment, etc. All the other expenditures can be interpreted in a similar manner.

The expenditures listed under the household sector include a hired labor charge of \$7,684,000, which leaves only \$5,578,000 for the operators' income and profit. It has been assumed that Federal income taxes will be paid by the household sector. The import sector denotes all expenditures that have been made outside the State of Wyoming, whether these expenditures were for purchasing feed, sheep, trucks, or otherwise.

The expenditures made by the sheep and wool industry, as shown in table 1, indicate the direct effect the income received by the industry has on the economy of the State. However, these direct effects are not the total contributions of the industry to the State's economy. In order to determine this total effect, it is necessary to evaluate the indirect effects the original income of the sheep and

wool industry has on the State's economy. These indirect effects are generated as the original income moves by successive spending cycles through the interrelated industries of the State's economy until it eventually leaks away to sources outside of Wyoming.

A study has recently been made by the division of business and economic research on the economy of southwestern Wyoming. This study, which made use of the techniques of input-output analysis, serves as the basis for estimating the total impact (both direct and indirect effects) that the original income received by the sheep and wool industry has on the State's economy. The estimated direct and indirect effects that accrue to each industry are presented in table 2. These are the total benefits that accrue to each industry after the income received by the sheep-and-wool industry has had a chance to complete the cycling process through the entire economy.

TABLE 2.—Estimated total business and revenue produced in the various industry sectors of Wyoming due to the Wyoming sheep and wool industry, based on 1960 data

Industries:	
Agriculture (hay, grain, etc.)..	\$3,257,000
Minerals (oil, gas, coal, etc.)..	552,000
Manufacturing (lumber, etc.)..	1,236,000
Transportation and utilities..	3,591,000
Farm product handlers (elevators, feed dealers, etc.)..	2,167,000
Wholesale (bulk dealers, etc., e.g., gas and oil).....	5,380,000
Retail (general merchandise, building, material, implements, autos, etc.).....	19,358,000
Services (personal services, business and professional, etc.).....	2,581,000
Finance (banks, investment company, insurance company, etc.).....	1,598,000
Contractors (building and other).....	1,523,000
Total business produced..	41,243,000
Other activity (noncommercial):	
Local government revenue.....	2,242,000
State and Federal Government revenue.....	3,932,000
Personal income (labor income, operators' income, profit, etc.).....	24,212,000
Total business and revenue produced.....	71,629,000

It is estimated that \$30,948,000 of income to the sheep and wool industry will generate approximately \$41,243,000 of commercial business. Moreover, this same income will produce an additional \$6,174,000 of local, State, and Federal Government revenue and \$24,212,000 of personal income. Thus, an income of \$30,948,000 produced a total of \$71,629,000 of business and noncommercial revenue. Almost one-half of the total business produced went to the retail trade. That is, retailers received \$19,358,000 out of \$41,243,000 (the total business produced). A considerable part of the total business received by the retail trade is due to the secondary effects, since the sheep and wool industry's direct purchases from the retailers were only \$4,753,000 (table 1).

The sheep and wool industry is an important contributor to the economy of Wyoming, since most of the income received by the industry represents new money coming into the economy. Practically all the production from the industry is exported outside the State of Wyoming for further processing. This income, which the industry receives from exporting its production outside the State, is largely spent within Wyoming (table 1). Thus, most of the income received by the industry enters the State's income stream, generating new income as it moves throughout the State's economy until

eventually it leaks to sources outside the State.

While the sheep and wool industry may not be the largest single agriculture income producer within the State, nevertheless, the industry does make a significant contribution to Wyoming's economy. First of all, since the industry exports practically all of its production, it is responsible for importing new money into the State. Secondly, since most of this new money is spent within the State, it is injected into the State's income stream to generate additional income through intrastate economic activity.

INTERNATIONAL TRAVEL: GOOD WILL AND GOOD BUSINESS

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, on Monday, April 9, 1962, the Sixth Regional Conference on International Travel held under the auspices of Secretary of Commerce Luther H. Hodges and the U.S. Department of Commerce, was held at Dallas, Tex., this one for the six South Central and Southwestern States of Arkansas, Kansas, Louisiana, Mississippi, New Mexico, Oklahoma, and Texas.

A most beneficial regional conference was held with a notable keynote address by the Honorable Luther H. Hodges, an informative speech by the Honorable Voit Gilmore, Director of U.S. Travel Service and speeches by approximately six other persons.

Due to requests for my remarks at that meeting, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, at this point a copy of my remarks at this regional conference at Dallas, April 9, 1962, titled "International Travel: Good Will and Good Business."

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

INTERNATIONAL TRAVEL: GOOD WILL AND GOOD BUSINESS

Mr. Chairman, Secretary Hodges, distinguished officials, guests, it is an honor and a duty, but also a high personal privilege to participate in this major regional southwestern conference on international travel. The new U.S. policy of encouraging foreign tourists to visit America has tremendous potential for good. It is good business, it is sound economics, it is first rate diplomacy. If it succeeds, we will stabilize the movement of gold to and from our Nation, thus strengthening our currency, and we will build new bridges to international understanding, higher and stronger than any now being built. A million more visitors from abroad in these United States each year will carry home more good will for America each year than all the diplomats you can find striped pants for.

Increasing numbers of people from Mexico, Central and South America, Europe and Japan have become prosperous enough to plan foreign travel and many are eager, if encouraged, to visit our land. Moreover, many of these countries now have relaxed their currency restrictions on travel abroad, making it timely for us to encourage more people to come to the United States for temporary travel.

The stimulation of more foreign tourism is definitely in the national interest. This program will make very significant contributions both to better international relations and to the American economy. The passage of the International Travel Act of 1961, which established an enlarged travel office in the Department of Commerce and of which I am cosponsor, will do much to

further these objectives. As a member of the Senate Commerce Committee, I attended hearings on the bill. It is a vital law, in a vital area of national interest.

I think it fortunate that this program is under the jurisdiction of the Commerce Department—which is out for tourists and doesn't have to delay to negotiate treaties. The Office of International Travel was placed under the jurisdiction of a department that already had an Assistant Secretary for International Affairs, who, under the Secretary of Commerce, presides over the Advisory Committee on Export Policy, the Bureau of Foreign Commerce and the Office of International Trade Fairs.

It is fortunate, too, that this "Visit U.S.A." program is being created at a time when we have as Secretary of Commerce a man of exceptional energy, vision and ability. Some historians have said that the Commerce Department has had only one great secretary: Herbert Hoover. Others have said that Texas' own Jesse Jones was the greatest Secretary of Commerce, but the historians of the future, whether they say the Commerce Department has had one, two, three or more great Secretaries, will always have to include Luther H. Hodges as one of the great ones. America is the gainer that this tourism program is under his direction.

Since passage of the 1961 act, I have been in Europe, Asia and Africa. My experiences there in the fall of 1961 have confirmed my belief in the need for a more active U.S. travel promotion program as a means of increasing international understanding. In view of the continuing world strife we cannot afford to overlook any contribution to the easing of world tensions. Making it possible for more of the ordinary citizens of the world to come into personal contact with each other is one of the most effective ways of promoting understanding between peoples of diverse cultures, races and nationalities.

Tourism and other programs which bring foreigners to our shores are also the best antidote for the propaganda attacks of our enemies. As you know, the Communists are sowing seeds of mistrust in the minds of people abroad. This can best be combated by encouraging more people to come and judge for themselves the true character of the American people and our democratic institutions.

Realizing this, our Government has sponsored a number of exchange programs under the Smith-Mundt and Fulbright Acts and other special legislation. These programs have already yielded benefits far in excess of the funds invested in them. There is every reason to believe that the "Visit U.S.A." program can be equally productive. The sharing of ideas through personal contact strengthens genuine understanding and the mutual respect basic to the peace and security of the free world.

In my 5 years in the Senate, I have met in seminars in Washington with many groups of foreign students, studying in America. These are informal, unpublicized, off-the-cuff, frank study sessions. We generally ask them what they like best and least about America. Members of every group, including students from Canada, Australia, England, Europe, Africa, South America, and Asia tell us that they have been surprised, amazed, pleased by the innate kindness and goodness of the American people; that they and the people generally where they live, had their ideas of America molded by American movies and American TV films, and that our movies and TV films shown abroad had created an almost worldwide image of Americans as a drunken, evil, violent, oversexed people. These foreign students are relieved and pleased to find Americans kind, courteous, friendly, sympathetic and helpful, a churchgoing, God-fearing, law-abiding people with their ideals hitched to stars of

goodness, as well as celestial travel. These foreign students tell us in Washington that our movies and TV films of crime, vice, sex, and evil exported and shown in their countries do Americans more harm than all the Communist propaganda they hear.

Foreign tourists in the United States will see what these foreign students see, if we but act toward all foreign visitors as we do toward these foreign students. If we could increase the number of foreign tourists visiting America by 1 million per year, the intangible good will values would be incalculable. All the billions we pour out in foreign aid may fall on fallow ground unless the people aided know what kind of people we are.

We can also expect equally important economic benefits from a stepped-up tourist promotion program. Our gold reserves are down to something over \$16 billion, from a high of about \$23 billion a few years ago.

A substantial slice of the imbalance of payments with the resultant decline in our domestic gold balances is caused by the excess of American tourist spending abroad over the comparatively small amount of foreign tourist travel in America. The tourist trade costs little to produce, yet it is one of the world's primary means of distributing wealth across State and international boundaries.

Although tourists spend money largely for food, lodging, gifts, clothing and local transportation, these activities in turn provide income for almost every conceivable type of supplier, distributor, artisan, businessman, and professional. Hotels, for example, return 85 percent of every tourist dollar they receive to the local economy in wages and expenditures for food, drink and supplies to operate the hotel and for miscellaneous expense.

Texas can have an important role in this new foreign tourist promotion program. The sheer size and variety of the State offers almost unlimited possibilities to tourists. Texas has distinctive sights like the primitive harshness and color of the Big Bend country on the southwestern border, the solitude of the Big Thicket in east Texas, the rugged peaks of the Davis Mountains, the long stretch of white beach on Padre Island, the free expanse of the big ranches, the third largest cavern in the world, as well as growing and thriving cities like Dallas, Houston, and Fort Worth, and a city of cultural blend like San Antonio. These attractions are familiar to many of you—they should be seen and appreciated by many more.

Sun, sea and sand give the Texas Gulf coast all the ingredients of another type of vacation paradise. Padre Island, which stretches from Corpus Christi nearly to the mouth of the Rio Grande has already proven to be a mecca for those who love open beaches, while fishermen, hunters, and sailing enthusiasts find equal delight in the coastal marshes, bayous and beaches of this area.

I have sponsored a bill, S. 4, to create a national park on 88.5 miles of Padre Island, which has been favorably reported out of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. The establishment of such a recreation area will immeasurably benefit this region of Texas, and the whole State, as well as international tourism. Recent studies of the economic effects of establishing national parks has shown that they significantly enhance the economy of the region as well as preserve the area's natural, scenic, and recreational values.

The use of Padre Island as a national park will likewise generate new income and employment for service industries in the area.

Why do I bring in Padre Island at this point? It is because of the tremendous importance of our national parks in our appeal to international tourists. Some foreign stu-

dents tell us that the National Park System was the most impressive thing they saw in America; that it represented to them a government concerned with the well being of its people and appreciative of the forces of creation. Even students from Australia have told me that, of all the things they saw in America, the national parks and their management impressed them most, and gave them an ideal to carry home; something to try to emulate in their own land.

Of the more than 100 independent nations of the earth, 78 are each smaller than Texas, while 72 each have less population than Texas. So, on area and population alone, Texas is destined to have an important role in our international tourism picture. Geographical location assigns it an even more important role.

With a 1,000-mile long common boundary with Mexico along the Rio Grande, we in Texas hold the tourism door for Mexico's 35 million people, largest in Latin America save Brazil. Many of Mexico's citizens want to visit Texas. In the past, some have wondered if they would be welcome. It is our opportunity to let them know that they need hesitate no longer. The welcome mat is out to our closest neighbor, and Dallas, home of the greatest State fair in the Nation can lay out the finest welcome mat of all.

As the U.S. Travel Service moves toward its goal of doubling the number of foreign tourists in our country in the next 4 years, Texas must prepare all of its display windows with special care.

Because of its location, Texas has the most unique opportunity of all our States to improve our relations with Latin America. We should encourage this by making sure these people receive a warm welcome and are treated with true Texas courtesy and hospitality while they are here.

If we succeed, these visitors will take home a good impression that will have more influence on their opinion of the United States than anything else that can be done. The best voice of America is the voice of her people on the streets, in the churches, in the market places, on the highways and on the airlines, all across this broad land.

It is up to us to help the United States take advantage of this vast untapped market and unique opportunity to further the cause of peace and freedom.

OUR STAKE IN SAMOA

Mr. LONG of Hawaii. Mr. President, Congress and the Kennedy administration are making vigorous efforts to overcome the past neglect of American Samoa. This neglect was detailed in a report which Senator GRUENING and I made last year following our study of conditions there pursuant to Senate Resolution 330, 86th Congress. The Honolulu Advertiser recently printed a series of stories by reporter Jack Teehan giving an up-to-date report on American Samoa and the steps being taken to meet our responsibilities in that important Polynesian possession. The importance of Samoa is outlined in an editorial from the Advertiser of March 30, 1962. Since much remains to be done, I invite the attention of my colleagues in the Senate to the editorial entitled "Our Stake in Samoa." I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

OUR STAKE IN SAMOA

If Hawaii is to offer real leadership in the Pacific, now is the time for us to look to the south—to American Samoa.

Hawaii, as a Washington economic consultant noted in the Advertiser series by Jack Teehan, has a real stake in the U.S. possession.

The real future of many Samoans lies here in Hawaii and on the mainland. Today, because of our neglect, most of the Samoan youth are not properly educated and are un-equipped to compete in a modern society.

Too many of them are headed for menial jobs, state welfare rolls or worse.

The eyes of Congress have been opened wide to the prevailing conditions in American Samoa, thanks to men like Senator Oren E. Long, Samoa's Governor H. Rex Lee, and Representative Michael Kirwan, of Ohio, to name a few.

Money is pouring into the islands from Washington—some \$25 million to be spent there in the next 3 years.

These funds will provide American Samoa with the skeletal framework for a basic economy.

The money will finance essential schooling, medical care, highways, powerplants and agricultural aids needed to put American Samoa on its feet and headed in the right direction.

Governor Lee hopes to flesh out this framework with more small industries and a thriving, selective, tourist business.

His goal is to make American Samoa a model community in the South Pacific and the hub of Polynesia. This community would help all its South Pacific neighbors, providing the many resources and training facilities which they lack.

It is essential that these goals be fully realized. We must "put our money where our mouth is" and follow up words with deeds to show that there are practical sides to the American dream.

Nor can plain political considerations be overlooked. We cannot afford another Cuba. The Soviet Union has already made political overtures to the independent state of Western Samoa, which has more than five times the population of American Samoa and is but 45 minutes away by plane.

We are now making positive moves to counter any Soviet influence in the area even though initial technical aid offers from Moscow were rebuffed.

Within 2 years our educational TV system will blanket Western Samoa and a U.S. radio station will be heard throughout most of Polynesia.

If we can follow this up with concrete assistance, including public health training and research to stamp out diseases which afflict humans, animals, and plants, we will make many new friends.

Hawaii, as the most advanced part of the mid-Pacific, can play an important role in this program.

A team of lay and government experts from Hawaii working with Governor Lee, could make a special feasibility study to determine just how Hawaii can help fill the needs of American Samoa.

Aid is needed in many fields, including medical, public health, agriculture, education, public works—the list is almost endless.

Hawaii has the men and the skills to get the job done. The Congress finally is doing its part—and must continue to, with adequate appropriations. Now Hawaii should give what it has to give, that special brand of Polynesian understanding and aloha which can come only from our Islands.

"CAPITOL CLOAKROOM"

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, on March 20, the CBS Radio program "Capitol Cloakroom" began its 15th year on the air.

My distinguished colleague from Minnesota, Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, was featured on the anniversary program.

I ask unanimous consent that the transcript of this broadcast be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

CBS RADIO'S "CAPITOL CLOAKROOM" BEGINS 15TH YEAR ON AIR MARCH 29 AND CHALKS UP BROADCAST NO. 700

WASHINGTON, D.C., March 20, 1962.—"Capitol Cloakroom," CBS Radio's oldest continuous public affairs interview program, begins its 15th year on the air Thursday, March 29, with its 700th broadcast.

Heard for the first time on the CBS Radio network March 31, 1948, "Capitol Cloakroom" in its 14-year history has presented the views of hundreds of members of Washington officialdom—Senators, Representatives, Cabinet members, ambassadors, labor leaders, Governors, political party chairmen, foreign secretaries, and other leading political figures who have been in the Nation's Capital.

Among "Capitol Cloakroom's" most prominent guests have been President John F. Kennedy, who appeared at the time he was a Senator, and former Presidents Eisenhower and Truman, both of whom were heard on the program by special recording.

Taking its name from a Capitol Hill institution, "Capitol Cloakroom" is devoted primarily to the affairs of Congress. The present officers of the Senate have been heard on the program—Vice President LYNDON B. JOHNSON, of Texas, Democratic Leader MIKE MANSFIELD, of Montana, Democratic Whip HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, Republican Leader EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, of Illinois, and Republican Whip THOMAS H. KUCHEL, of California.

Among leaders of the House of Representatives who have been guests are Speaker JOHN W. MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts, Democratic Whip HALE BOGGS, of Louisiana, and Republican Leader CHARLES A. HALLECK, of Indiana.

Because the great majority of its guests are Members of Congress, "Capitol Cloakroom" frequently originates in the House and Senate Radio Galleries in order to accommodate its distinguished interviewees.

Following the March 22 program, U.S. Senators will have been guests a total of 581 times, including special appearances of 42 new Senators as they arrived in Washington. Members of the House have appeared 109 times.

Presidential Cabinets have been represented on the program 55 times and, in addition, there have been interviews with 24 ambassadors and 108 other officials.

Though its format on special occasions has included more than one guest, "Capitol Cloakroom" generally presents a prominent figure facing penetrating questioning by three CBS news Washington correspondents, with Charles von Fremd as anchor man. The interview is completely unrehearsed as guest and reporters consider the top issues of the day.

CBS news Washington correspondents who rotate in conducting the informal interviews are Wells Church, Nancy Hanschman, George Herman, Roger Mudd, Paul Niven, Robert Pierpoint, and Neil Strawser.

"Capitol Cloakroom," produced by Ellen Wadley of the public affairs staff of CBS news, is broadcast on the CBS radio network Thursdays. In Washington, it is heard on WTOP Radio Sundays at 7:05 p.m., e.s.t.

"CAPITOL CLOAKROOM"

(As broadcast over the CBS Radio network, March 29, 1962)

Guest: The Honorable HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, U.S. Senate, Democrat, of Minnesota.

Correspondents: Charles von Fremd, Nancy Hanschman Dickerson, and Roger Mudd.
Producer: Ellen Wadley.

Mr. VON FREMD, Senator HUMPHREY, is there a way out of the arms race peril?

Mrs. DICKERSON. How will the Supreme Court's decision on reapportionment affect the Democratic Party?

Mr. MUDD, Senator, what are the prospects for the administration's major legislative proposals?

ANNOUNCER. "Capitol Cloakroom." From the Nation's Capital, CBS Radio brings you the 700th presentation of "Capitol Cloakroom," a spontaneous and unrehearsed transcribed interview with an outstanding public figure. This week's guest is Senate Democratic Whip HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, of Minnesota. He meets with CBS News Correspondents Charles von Fremd, Nancy Hanschman Dickerson, and Roger Mudd.

First we hear from Mr. von Fremd.

Mr. VON FREMD, Senator HUMPHREY, welcome once again on "Capitol Cloakroom" which, if you will permit us to boast just a little bit, is another anniversary day for the oldest program of its kind on the air. With this broadcast we begin our 15th consecutive year on the air and our 700th program.

You are no newcomer to "Capitol Cloakroom." In fact you were our guest on this same date a year ago. We know from past experience you have got much to say in answer to our questions, so let's begin with that chronic nagging one: As a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, and the chairman of the Disarmament Subcommittee, do you think there is a way out of the arms race peril?

Senator HUMPHREY. Well, can I first express just a personal note. I want to say "Happy birthday" to "Capitol Cloakroom," and happy birthday on this, its 15th year and this, the 700th program. I think I have been on a good number of these programs and I have always enjoyed the privilege.

Mr. VON FREMD. Thank you very much, Senator; and so do we.

Senator HUMPHREY. Now, to your question, "Is there a way out of the arms race?"

I am sure that every reasonable and sensible person believes there must be a way found to curb the ever-growing arms race. Of many reasons for this, the arms race within itself is a risk, it poses a threat to world peace, particularly if that race gets out of balance with one side getting the ascendancy.

Furthermore, the burden of the costs of the arms race in terms of the utilization of physical and human resources is becoming intolerable in many areas of the world and is beginning to take a heavy toll even in a rich and prosperous country like our own. Is there a way out? I felt that the recent conference at Geneva, which is still underway, but particularly the participation by our Secretary of State, Mr. Rusk, indicates that there may well be a way out because, despite all of the intransigence of the Soviet Union in such areas as Berlin and the violence that is taking place in Vietnam, there was a degree of calculated moderation on the part of the Soviet diplomats at Geneva and particularly on the part of Mr. Gromyko.

There apparently is a feeling that some way out must be found, and I believe that that way out will not come by arguing over old problems, but starting to find some new areas of contact and of understanding. And one of those would be Soviet-United States cooperation in the field of outer-space research and development and scientific exploration. This is a new area.

Now, outer space can either become a battleground of the great powers or it can become a laboratory of cooperation and we are at the breakpoint right now, this year. If we can decide through the auspices of the United Nations, for example, for multi-lateral international cooperation in the field

of outer-space research and exploration, I think we will have had the first opening for curbing the arms race, because we will curb it in a new area of conflict; namely, outer space.

Secondly, I think that we ought to press very seriously this matter of the prevention of accidental war. I have talked about this before. The modern machines of war, with electronics and with automation, make it possible for both mechanical and human error to precipitate a major global conflict. Some breakdown in communications could cause this. Therefore, there must be every possible way taken to prevent accidental war.

I have proposed a conference of the military leaders and the scientific leaders of the United States and the Western allies, the Soviet Union and her allies on this one subject of how do we prevent accidental war? What precautions can we take? What do we know that the Soviet Union is doing to prevent accidental war?

We have no information. We know that we have taken some very definite precautionary steps but we ought to know what the other side is doing, too.

Mrs. DICKERSON, Senator, while these things are going on, the United States still has said that we will resume nuclear tests next month in the atmosphere. Do you think that there is any alternative for U.S. resumption of those tests if the Russians do not agree to an inspection ban, and they don't seem to be agreeing to that now? Is there any alternative for us?

Senator HUMPHREY. I don't think so. We've made a decision. I believe the decision was taken after the most careful thought and consideration. The President of the United States has as his first obligation the protection of American security, the protection of this Nation. He is the Chief Executive, the Commander in Chief. I know that the President and our defense officials and our scientists examined very carefully the recent Soviet tests. I know that men in the field of science who are basically opposed to the extension and expansion of nuclear weaponry and particularly nuclear tests came to the conclusion after examining the results of the findings on Soviet tests that it was necessary for our country to have another series of tests unless the Soviet Union would immediately agree to halt any further testing and any further developments in nuclear weapons; even that is a calculated risk. I want to be very frank with this audience that, even if the Soviet Union were to sign a nuclear test prohibition treaty today, with proper inspection, that we are still running a risk because of the great advances which the Soviets made in their recent test series. But everything is a risk and you have to take some risks about a risk, so that's what we were perfectly willing to do, so I think the President would have to go forward with these tests.

Now, there may be some way that we can bring them under reasonable control. We might very well, since the Soviet has threatened itself to have further tests, try to come to some agreement as to the number of tests. And, between the two powers.

And, secondly, we might want to come to an agreement as to—if there are to be any further tests after this series, of reducing that number of tests. There may be something that we could agree upon.

Mrs. DICKERSON. Well, Senator, you talk about risks and you say we must take them. Do I infer that you think that since the Russians latest series of tests they are ahead of us? Do you personally think they are in the matter of the kinds of nuclear testing?

Senator HUMPHREY. No, I don't think that the Soviets are ahead of us in quantity of weapons, nor do I think they are ahead of us in basic quality or sophistication, at this time. I do feel, however, that the recent Soviet tests which were of an exploratory

nature may very well have laid the scientific base for very significant Soviet advances in the next year or the next 2 years. And, if that is the case, then our margin of superiority over the Soviets could be liquidated or lost. And while I am very concerned about the arms race and the so-called balance of power with all of the risks involved in that, I think an even deeper and greater concern would be over the imbalance of power and imbalance in the hands of the Soviets or of the Sino-Soviet bloc. I think that this would threaten peace as nothing else could. So we are, what we are doing today is, we are hanging on desperately in the quest for peace by the use of power. In the meantime, we are appealing through every known channel of diplomacy and contact to the Soviets and to the Communist area to halt the arms race before it gets completely out of hand.

I think that this appeal must be made, and it must be made with ever new vigor and new—with continuing sincerity. Whether there will be any response, who knows?

Mrs. DICKERSON. Well, as everyone knows, the Russians said if we test, they are going to start testing again. And you said just a second ago that you are concerned about the balance with one side getting the ascendancy. Can't the case be made that by our testing we are forcing them into testing again because they are worried about the balance?

Senator HUMPHREY. Yes, the case can be made on that basis, and some people have made it.

I would say, however, that at the present time the Soviet Union is harder pressed than the United States is in terms of its ability to maintain the defense or the arms struggle. I'd like to develop that point for just a moment.

It was my view during recent years that we neither had a disarmament policy nor an arms policy. What we did, we coasted. We had a defense budget about big enough to take care of minimum needs without any sacrifice on the part of our people, and it was big enough so that the Soviets could pay for it without any real breakdown of their economic structure.

Now we have put the pressure on in recent months. We have improved our defense system. We have given greater flexibility and mobility to our military forces. We have really plowed into the Defense Establishment billions of dollars of new capital. This is causing difficulties for the Soviets. If they are going to keep pace, it means that they must divert capital from much-needed domestic programs. They have a shortage of capital far beyond what we have. They are going to have to make up their mind in the Soviet Union—do you want tractors or are you going to have more missiles?

Mr. Khrushchev is right now, it seems to me, at a point where great decisions are being made in the Soviet Union and those decisions may very well mean a continuation of the arms race, or they may mean, if we are firm, and if we are not—I don't want us to be bellicose or arrogant—but just firm and dedicated, if we pursue a course of strength I think we may very well compel the Soviet Union to reevaluate this arms race that they are in and they may very well want some disarmament in order to be able to fulfill their objectives on the domestic scene.

Remember, the Soviets have made great promises to their people and to the world, and the Soviet Union now stands before the world with an agriculture that is a failure, with a 7-year plan that is behind, and with a 20-year proposal that doesn't have a prospect of success.

Now, the Soviets understand the importance of propaganda and psychological warfare, and I think Mr. Khrushchev is going to have to come to a decision within the next 12 months as to whether or not he is going to scrap a 7-year plan, forget his speech about the next 20 years of the Soviet Union and how they are going to surpass the United

States, or have to engage in the arms race even more than he is at the present time.

Mr. MUDD. Senator, the Senate is going to have to make a decision pretty soon on this U.N. bond issue. I would like to ask you what is wrong with RICHARD RUSSELL's proposal that the U.N. be relieved of repaying this \$38 million to the United States?

On paper this looks like a pretty good plan. Senator HUMPHREY. Well, if that was all there was to it, it wouldn't be so bad; but Mr. RUSSELL's proposal doesn't mean to give life to the U.N., it means to give it a sort of patriotic and historic burial. It will just leave the U.N. stripped because what he also said was, of course, that this would have to be as a credit to any further obligations on the part of the United States to the U.N. And, furthermore, he indicated that any action on the part of the U.N. that related to military action would have to come back to the Congress of the United States for approval.

Now, we haven't been engaged in any U.N. military action except in Korea. The United States has only been engaged in that particular military action. And, may I say that the U.N. helped the United States; after all, the attack in Korea was an attack on American forces, it was an attack upon an American ally and upon a vital area in the world to American security. And the fact that the United Nations joined with us in the defense of South Korea was an advantage to the United States and I think also to the peace of the world.

Mr. RUSSELL's proposal is not designed to strengthen the United Nations. It is designed to leave the United Nations financially prostrate because the United Nations needs capital now, it doesn't just need forgiveness of our share of the United Nations' indebtedness to us, it needs about \$200 million worth of capital if it's going to continue its peacekeeping operations.

And what disturbs this Senator is that the United States of America has a great stake in the ability of the United Nations to enter into peacekeeping operations. We were the author of the peace resolution in the General Assembly in 1950, at the time of the attack in Korea. We bypassed the veto of the Security Council. We gave the General Assembly the authority to commit U.N. power and U.N. forces and U.N. nations to areas of defense and areas that needed police action.

This was our proposal and for years we thought this was one of the most astute and most far-reaching and far-seeing proposals in our diplomacy. Here is the United Nations now performing peacekeeping functions in the Middle East, and the Middle East is still a powder keg. The recent Syrian-Israeli clashes indicate this. Here is the United Nations attempting to keep the peace in Africa, and it's doing a fairly good job. If either one of these areas breaks out into open hostilities without the United Nations there to do police action, one or the other big powers will be there, either the Soviet Union or the United States; and if we meet the Soviet Union head on in the Middle East, it's World War III. If we meet the Soviet Union head on in Africa, it's World War III.

The fact that the United Nations is doing this job of keeping the peace is in the vital interest of the United States. It's not only in our interest in terms of saving the peace, of saving our country, but of saving our men and saving our dollars. I, for the life of me, can't understand why anybody would want to cripple the peacekeeping machinery of the United Nations unless, unless you just sort of feel that this world isn't what it is. This is the world of the 20th century. This is not the world of Metetrnich, and this isn't the world of George Washington, and it isn't the world of the 19th century, it's the late 20th century with the world in revolution

and violence and disorder, and the United Nations performs the vital function of the policeman in many areas.

Mrs. DICKERSON. Senator, we have been talking about decisions being made. The Supreme Court recently has made a decision on the Tennessee case, the effect of which will be to give city voters a greater voice in State governments which have long been dominated by rural areas. Now the Democrats are traditionally much stronger in the cities. How will this recent Supreme Court decision affect the Democratic Party nationally?

Senator HUMPHREY. Well, Mrs. Dickerson, it seems to me that the first thing that this decision does, is to fulfill the purpose of our Constitution; namely, the establishment of truly representative government.

Now, there has been a hue and cry in this country for a good long time that power is gravitating to the National Government, that Washington, the Government in Washington, has been taking over the responsibilities that ought to be local, and that Government is getting too far away from the people; and that the National or the Federal Government is getting too big and that State governments are losing their effectiveness and their powers are being usurped by the Federal Government.

There is a degree of truth, of course, to all of these charges. But we might ask ourselves, why has this happened? And one of the reasons that it's happened, and not the only reason; but one of the reasons that the Federal Government grows bigger and stronger is because State governments have been unresponsive to local needs. And what the Supreme Court has said, it has served warning upon States, upon citizens in States, it has served warning upon the leaders, the political leaders in State governments to put their house in order, to give representative government a truly representative meaning; and not to have a representative government in the form of a legislature that no longer represents the population.

I happen to think that this decision, instead of developing, or instead of exaggerating the power or increasing the power of the Central Government in Washington, will do much to increase the power of State governments. Because the day that State legislatures are reapportioned, the day that legislatures really reflect the makeup of the population in a State will be the day that State governments will take on more responsibility in their own particular area. And when that happens, you will have a decentralization of power, and I think government will become more meaningful and more representative and more responsive to the needs of the citizenry.

So, this is a great decision in the long run. I think it will act, I think it will precipitate some very important action.

Now, as far as the political implications are concerned, well, out my way Democrats win in the country. We win in the cities, too, thank goodness, but our main problem has been in the smaller, what we call the smaller towns.

I don't think there is any guarantee that Democrats, or the Democratic Party, will be naturally victorious in the cities or industrial areas. We have lost industrial areas.

Robert Taft was quite a Republican leader around this part of the world. He was a great Senator and he was a great political leader. He carried industrial areas in Ohio that were highly unionized. I think what you really need to take into consideration about this decision is not what it does to the political parties as such, but what does it do for government, and this decision is a good government decision. It has done more to bolster representative government than any decision that I have read for a long time, or heard of. And I might add to those who feel that the Supreme Court is usurping some

powers here, that the answer to that is, Put your own house in order.

Mr. MUDD. Senator, is the Democratic Party, and this administration, going to be able to go to the voters this fall with a good legislative record from this Congress?

Senator HUMPHREY. Yes. From the 87th Congress, yes, from both sessions. We had a very good record in the first session of the 87th Congress and I think we will have a good record in the second session. We are right now at that point in the proceedings of the Congress where legislation really starts to move.

Mr. MUDD. Are you gloomy about the prospects of any of the major proposals from the White House, take medicare or tax reform or the tariff program in particular?

Senator HUMPHREY. Well, you have selected three very important ones. I would say that the tax reform measure will most likely go through after quite a bit of anguish and gnashing of teeth and oratory, but I believe that the basic provisions of the President's proposal on tax reform will be adopted.

Mr. MUDD. It's being chopped up in the House, or an attempt is being made—

Senator HUMPHREY. Well, they have been chopping at it, they haven't chopped it up and it's the same old woodchoppers; you would have expected this; this is nothing, there is nothing sensational about this.

I am interested, however, in noting how the Republicans are attempting to chop out of the tax bill the investment credit feature which is really probusiness, which is designed to stimulate business, which is a great tax relief for American business. And yet the party of business, supposedly, the Republican Party that has hoodwinked many businessmen into believing that it was for them, now finds, these businessmen now find that the party is revealing its true colors, its just an "aginer," just plain against the administration's program.

Now, as far as the foreign trade bill is concerned, it will pass.

Mr. MUDD. Will you have a woodchopper's ball out on the floor of the Senate on that one?

Senator HUMPHREY. Yes. I expect that you can look forward to these normal developments of the political arena. But when we are all through, the mighty oak of the President's program of foreign trade will be there, with most of the limbs on it, may I add.

Mr. MUDD. This metaphor has gotten enormous. [Laughter.]

Senator HUMPHREY. Medicare, you mentioned—

Mr. MUDD. Yes.

Senator HUMPHREY. This will be the hottest political issue, I think, in Congress. It will be the most, the one that has the greatest amount of emotion and explosiveness attached to it. I'll just simply say this: I hope that we will pass medicare, that is, the program of hospital and nursing home care for people aged 65 and older under the terms of social security. We are going to have a vote on it. The American people want it. The young people want it. They want it for their— for their elders, they want it for this country, and if the Congress does not pass the hospital and nursing home care program, all I can say is every Congressman will have to face the political music when he goes home because, make no mistake about it, this is the most important and the most volatile, and I think the most sensitive political issue that has ever been before this Congress in this administration. And we are going to fight this one through. We want this program. If we don't get it this time, we'll make it a political issue in November and we will go to the people. We'll ask the people to repudiate those who voted against it and we will ask the people to support those who voted for it or who pledged their

vote for it. I think there is no other way to face up to this.

Mr. VON FREMD. Senator HUMPHREY, we only have about 45 seconds left. I would like to ask this one:

Some strange things are happening across the country, if we believe the pollsters. The Democratic Party is—is on the increase in popularity, it seems from border to border—this despite the fact that the incumbents lose on off years. What do you think this means?

Senator HUMPHREY. I think it means a great Democratic victory in November. President Kennedy is popular, his program is popular. The Democratic Party has proven itself to be a reasonable, responsible, progressive party. We have a program; we are taking that program to the people. The opposition, the Republican Party, is, as I said before, is chopping away, whacking away, it's against it. It has no program and very frankly can't make up its mind whether it has a leader, and without a leader and without a program I don't think you can expect to get much public support.

Mr. VON FREMD. On that note we've run out of time.

Thank you very much, Senator HUMPHREY, for being with us once again on "Capital Cloakroom."

ALLOWANCE OF ADVERTISING COST AS A CHARGE AGAINST DEFENSE CONTRACTS

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, last year I was pleased to provide some leadership on an amendment to limit the allowance of advertising cost in trade publications as a charge against defense contracts—Public Law 87-144. It is my understanding that a great needless expense to the American taxpayer has been eliminated as a result of the passage of this amendment.

Recently, I conferred with Lawrence E. Hartwig, Chairman of the Renegotiation Board of the United States, in regard to what their policy should be in the light of this recent legislation. I am happy to inform my fellow lawmakers and the interested Government agencies and private organizations engaged in defense work that the Renegotiation Board has change its own regulations to conform with this policy.

I ask unanimous consent that a certain subchapter of the Renegotiation Board regulations—part 1459—be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

PART 1459—COSTS ALLOCABLE TO AND ALLOWABLE AGAINST RENEGOTIABLE BUSINESS MISCELLANEOUS AMENDMENTS

1 Section 1495.7(b). "Advertising" is amended in the following respects:

(a) The heading of paragraph (b) is deleted and the following is inserted in lieu thereof: "Advertising in fiscal years ending on or before March 31, 1962."

(b) A new paragraph (c) is inserted to read as follows:

"(c) Advertising in fiscal years ending after March 31, 1962.—(1) Items of advertising expense incurred solely for (i) the recruitment by the contractor of personnel required for the performance by the contractor of obligations arising under a renegotiable contract or subcontract, (ii) the procurement of scarce items required by the contractor for the performance of a renegotiable contract or subcontract, or (iii) the disposal of scrap or surplus materials acquired by the contractor

in the performance of a renegotiable contract or subcontract, are recognized as costs allocable to renegotiable business in accordance with the method of accounting found by the Board to be acceptable under section 1459.1(b). The costs of publishing catalogs, technical pamphlets, house organs and other similar publications are not, for the purposes of this paragraph, considered advertising expenses; for the treatment of such expenses, see section 1459.8(f)."

(2) Other advertising expense is allocable to renegotiable business as follows:

(i) In the case of renegotiable business performed under subcontracts, advertising expense will be allocated thereto provided that the products sold under such subcontracts are substantially the same as those sold in such subcontractor's normal commercial business. In the allocation of such advertising expense consideration will be given to (a) the volume of nonrenegotiable business in the year under review as contrasted with the subcontractor's normal volume of commercial business, and (b) the total amount of such advertising expense in the year under review as contrasted with the subcontractor's normal advertising expense.

(ii) In cases in which it can be demonstrated that a prime contractor or subcontractor engaged in renegotiable business to the detriment of its normal commercial business in the year under review, and thereby incurred the risk of loss of its competitive position in the industry concerned, the Board will allocate to renegotiable business that portion of the prime contractor's or subcontractor's normal advertising expense which the Board deems properly attributable to the effort by the prime contractor or subcontractor to forestall such loss of competitive position.

2. Section 1459.8. "Other costs, expenses, and reserves" is amended by adding a new paragraph (f) to read as follows:

"(f) Publications.—The costs of publishing catalogs and technical pamphlets designed to aid users of the contractor's products, and house organs and other publications directed to labor and personnel management and relations, are recognized as costs allocable to renegotiable business in accordance with the method of accounting found by the Board to be acceptable under section 1459.1 (b)."

(Sec. 109, 65 Stat. 22; 50 U.S.C. App. Sup. 1219.)

THE STATE OF THE UNION

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, the pace of today's world is so fast that it is seldom possible for us to make an objective appraisal of the real position our country finds itself in during this period of history. It requires a masterful understanding of the past, and a vision of the really worthwhile goals of man, to be able to pinpoint our present position with cool detachment and chart a course into the future that will bring us to the destination we truly hope to reach.

Such a work appeared on the editorial page of last Sunday's Kansas City Star. Roy A. Roberts, author of this editorial, is a longtime newspaperman, whose vast experience over a great many years, and intimate acquaintanceship with many of the great political leaders of both parties, have given him the knowledge and understanding necessary to making such an appraisal. His extremely thoughtful article, entitled "Some Thoughts on the State of the Union," shows great perceptiveness.

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed at this point in the

RECORD, so that my colleagues in both Houses of the Congress, and as many people as possible throughout the country, will have it available for reading, study, and reflection upon the challenges he has so clearly defined.

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

SOME THOUGHTS ON THE STATE OF THE UNION

(By Roy A. Roberts)

Just where does the United States stand in the world today?

It is a question which we should be asking ourselves over and over. After a recent and too-short trip to Washington, I am convinced more than ever that America needs to examine itself closely, to face up to the stark, naked facts of life, as unpalatable as the process may be.

Bluntly, you can put it this way:

The United States is still the most powerful single nation in the world.

But no longer does it stand alone in leadership, calling all the shots and making all the decisions. The plain truth is that decisions, today, must be made in the light of conditions which are wholly beyond our control. You can say, without exaggeration, that we are no longer the master of our own destiny.

To a degree, I think this fact accounts for some of the bewildered thinking in Washington and throughout the country. The truth of our times has by no means been accepted universally. We live in a new era, and that is an understatement. It is also an era which renders obsolete many preconceived concepts of government and politics.

Consider a few of the significant changes in our national position:

No longer does the United States possess a national economy in which the effects of our actions need be considered no farther than the water's edge. We have entered a global economy with its deep and far-reaching implications.

We still think of ourselves as the richest nation on earth. We are. But we are also a debtor nation, facing serious problems of international finance. You sense that this consideration is influencing Washington thinking more than any one factor. It is a restraining influence in all fiscal and budgetary matters.

If we are still the richest Nation, we also remain the most powerful. Yet the United States is being challenged as it has never been challenged before by world communism. The United Nations, once in Washington's pocket as an agency of foreign policy, has passed beyond our control. Even in the Atlantic alliance, we find ourselves frequently persuading, not just leading. We cannot act independently of our partners, or tell them what to do. Our allies do not always accept the U.S. position as meekly as they once did. It may jar us as a people, but more and more decisions must be tailored not just to the U.S. picture, but to the entire global situation. We may and do still lead; but there is a significant and historic difference.

Today, the United States has the greatest working labor force in history. Yet there is also a nagging hard core of unemployment. The rapid advance of automation is partly responsible for this. And while man has devised the machines that make automation possible, he has by no means solved the social and economic problems that are its by-product.

If we are in the midst of industrial revolution, we are also witnessing a virtual technological explosion on the farm. We move at an accelerated pace into the era of farm modernization, with vast repercussions on the entire economy. At the same time the process of urbanization is accelerating.

Political power is moving from the rural areas to the cities. This is something that has been discussed for some time; but now, unmistakably, it is here.

We are also rushing pell-mell into the age of science and of space. It is exciting, exhilarating, but it is much more than a spectacle and we are much more than mere spectators. No man could predict the ultimate effects of the great force of science on civilization.

Such, in broad strokes, is the picture of our country today. For better or worse, that's it.

And because these changes have come so suddenly, almost within the last few minutes from the long viewpoint of history, we have not, as a people, begun to grasp their full significance.

Look back a mere 2 years, to the political conventions of both parties in 1960. There was a common theme: We are in the sixties now. A new era. A new frontier. New horizons. New challenges. Break with the past. Move into the rising sun.

Of course, most of this was window dressing, designed, at Los Angeles and at Chicago alike, to create an image. For the obvious fact is that the platform of each party, before it was written, was hopelessly antiquated. Model T concepts for the space age.

In the 1960 campaign, the Democrats emerged victorious. Quite naturally, our attention should focus on that party and on the government it is providing for these changing times. And immediately we discover a paradox. In Washington, I sensed that the President's chief handicap today is this: For three decades his party has been thinking in terms of the New Deal and the Franklin D. Roosevelt era. But, in 1962, the philosophy of the New Deal is as obsolete as the Harding-Coolidge days that preceded it. It simply will not work any more.

The New Deal philosophy, to a large degree, was based on the principle of dividing up, through taxation, the good things of life. It also assumed that the panacea for any and all ills was the quick expansion of Government into every field.

I am not going to debate, in 1962, whether the philosophy worked in 1932. Suffice to say, it doesn't today. In the Roosevelt era we lived in a national economy which no longer exists. Then the implications of a sharp tax increase, of wage boosts in excess of productivity, of higher prices, of Government deficits—all stopped at the water's edge. We were selling largely to ourselves.

Today, the United States must look to world markets to find an outlet for its increased gross national product. And, as we look abroad, we discover a sharply competitive world. By now we should have learned the obvious truth: A nation can price itself out of the market. And we should know, too, the dangers of the profit squeeze which can apply the sudden brakes to a free-enterprise economy. It is elementary. Not enough investment capital is flowing back into the productive machinery. Expansion of the Nation's industrial plant has been slowed.

Look at the economy, today, on paper: It is sound, certainly; but soundness alone does not promise a major increase in the rate of growth. This picture in effect points to the failure of the New Deal economic theories.

At the end of World War II we had all the world markets. We had the gold.

In only a few years, we find ourselves fighting a tough battle for world markets—not to gain new ones, but to hold the old ones. We are constantly aware of the continuing threat to the gold supply.

Look abroad, for a contrast. You see the nations of the European Common Market, largely built up with U.S. aid after the war. Collectively, they have achieved a much faster rate of growth in productivity than has this country. And in some instances,

European national treasuries have carried much heavier welfare programs than has the Treasury in Washington.

But here is a point which we miss sometimes. We think of ourselves as the leading nation of capitalism. We tend to speak of "socialist" Europe. But Europe's postwar recovery has been built, not on socialism, but on sound, incentive capitalism. The profit system has been properly honored as the sure device to feed a rapid flow of venture capital back into the industrial complex. By contrast, the United States has lived on in the New Deal heritage of tax-and-spend.

True, the Common Market nations with their low living standards and their heritage of wartime destruction, needed almost everything, as the United States did several decades ago. They, too, may feel this sloup of expansion in due time. Moreover, they have been sheltered by the United States which has assumed the chief burden of free world defense. This has permitted the European nations to operate with less of a tax load on business—certainly a much smaller load than anything we know in this country.

In a consideration of European growth, another factor must be remembered. Today, the market nations and their neighbors on the Continent, as well as Japan, are operating with virtually new industrial plants. The war wiped out the old factories. In the United States, we have our new plants with intricate, automated equipment. (And we have the headaches as well as the benefits of automation.) But a large part of our industrial equipment is obsolescent if not obsolete. Productivity suffers.

So you find a political paradox: A Democratic administration attempting to coax Congress into giving business a tax-credit incentive to accelerate plant replacement and modernization. But it has run into opposition both from Democrats steeped in new dealism, and from a substantial part of the business community.

Back to Europe for a moment and a footnote to the history of our times. The fact is, the Common Market bloc, not the United States, not Communist Russia for all its self-advertised expansion, provides the significant chapter of economic development in this postwar period.

Because this is so, the prosperous United States finds itself, today, knocking at Europe's door, seeking a basis for working more closely with the Common Market. We knock not because we are motivated to assist Western Europe, but to protect ourselves, and to act also as a spokesman for Japan and the South American nations which are so dependent upon us.

Stand clear of the European Common Market, and we will, eventually, be frozen out. At least, that is the way most people in Washington see it. And this fact illustrates most vividly, I think, the changing position of the United States in the world today.

I doubt, quite frankly, that Mr. Kennedy will obtain all of the new trade authority that he seeks. To the degree that this authority is lessened, the United States may be hampered as it attempts to deal with the Common Market. But you have to be realistic and recognize the deep emotional impact that trade legislation has always had in this country.

Generally, the business community is split down the line on the trade proposal, with probably most business people for it. Labor and farm groups are definitely in the camp of more liberal trade. They are recognizing the obvious: That while the new trade program may create some disadvantages and injure some localities, there is no alternative. It is essential to the Nation's future.

Again, let's look at the picture on paper—this time the fiscal picture of the Nation. It appears to be strong enough. Our invest-

ments abroad far outweigh European investments in this country. But there is a startling and little understood difference in the character of the two.

For the most part, U.S. credits and investments abroad are either frozen or in permanent productive plants. Actually, the U.S. encouraged this form of private investment to help Europe get back on its feet. Now, quite frankly, we wish we had some of the money and some of the plants back in this country.

On the other hand, much of the European capital in this country—and it runs into the billions—is in the short-term money market. It is fluid. It is also an important factor in our economic pattern. The American dollar, of course, is recognized as the free world's chief unit of exchange.

But it must be protected. If confidence in the dollar is lost, this fluid European capital could be withdrawn almost overnight. It could precipitate a dollar crisis and a crash that might make the 1929 debacle look like an exercise in full prosperity.

In the United States, do we fully accept the imperative of protecting the dollar? I am not sure that we do. Certainly the World Bank and other international monetary agencies have for some time looked askance at the symptom of extended deficit financing in this country. They keep a close watch on the possibility of more inflation. Those in charge of our monetary policy know this. The President knows this. But it is doubtful if Congress, the President's party, or even the country as a whole fully appreciates this hard fact of monetary life today.

Why, only a few years ago it seemed that the United States was going to be choked with its own gold supply. You heard jokes about the need for a dozen more Fort Knoxes to hold the surplus. It's different now, because of our enormous commitments abroad. We must protect the gold reserve against further drastic runs; but we must again be realists and recognize that under the relentless pressures of communism, we cannot pull back into an economic fortress America.

This problem of the dollar, of gold, of the balance-of-payments deficit—and really, it is only one problem with many facets—is always with us. And it unquestionably exerts great restraint on our monetary and fiscal policy.

Such pressures, in the New Deal era, would have created their false panacea: peg Government bonds and print more Federal Reserve notes against them, thereby diluting the currency. It was the path of inflation. But of all the routes that are being tried in Washington these days, I am certain that the administration will not follow this one. It has not been suggested. Perhaps with a strictly national economy, this printing press solution could be argued. But not today. We are again reminded that we live in a truly global economy.

Just where is the President in this picture? Where does he stand in this period of great change?

In the first place, I sensed, on my trip to Washington, that he definitely knows the score. He understands what these changes mean to America. And certainly I do not think that John F. Kennedy is reliving the New Deal days.

Yet the President is, in a very real sense, buffeted from two sides. On the one side, among his advisers, are the spenders, who believe that all things are attainable once the Treasury taps are opened wide. They believe in more and bigger governments. And they fight for their beliefs in administration powwows. On the other side are some hard-core, sound-money, very practical realists who know that we must constantly watch not only the domestic economy but the great, wide world. And they recognize that the national growth rate which we must have can be attained only by stimulating business

and providing the incentive to investment. These realists do not, as do their opposites, regard profit as an evil word.

I got the impression in Washington that the President's sympathy is with the spenders, with the development of welfare programs. But his sympathy is tempered by an acceptance of reality. He knows that you simply cannot do, today, all the things that might seem desirable.

Above all—and I say this in no derogatory sense—the President is a politician, and a smart one. Of course government is a science of politics and compromise. Mr. Kennedy can project what he would like to do but he knows that if he goes too far in seeking his goals, he may lose his hold on party and country. A President who has lost command at home is powerless as a world leader. John Kennedy does not intend to lose his grip.

The recent steel settlement is probably a perfect example of the way he would chart the economy, if he could. The 25-hour week recently won by the New York electricians is a clear-cut example of what he does not want.

Yet of course the problem is not as simple as black and white. Decisions must be made in view of politics and of reality. I think, generally, that you can place the decisions to come in four general categories. On the President's mind constantly are:

Defense, which has an undisputed priority and over which, really, there is no argument. Unemployment, over which there is great argument.

The need for greater national growth. Budget balancing and the need for protecting the dollar.

Each consideration presents staggering problems. But for our purposes, we can disregard defense. As I said, there is little room for argument here. We must spend what we must spend. The other three items in this catalog of Presidential concern are, I think, closely interrelated. Personally, I do not think that you can establish a priority. For example, the surest route to full employment is to stimulate national growth. And we cannot have, in this global economy, a healthy rate of national growth if the dollar deteriorates further.

A President, however, must make decisions. And if Mr. Kennedy, for example, should turn to spending and welfare programs as a means to cure unemployment, he would be running the risk of more deficit spending. A President must also be politically sensitive. In the Kennedy camp are the labor leaders, and more and more they have been pressing for action on unemployment. They think of action in terms of additional public work programs, more spending, more government. There is increasing talk of the need for a shorter workweek.

Yet spending, shorter workweeks, and what have you would also be a drag on national growth, which is essential if we are to be able to finance successfully the programs that labor seeks. A vicious circle.

So you see the President resisting the drive for a shorter workweek, and attempting to satisfy the pressures of the spenders by providing modest public works programs in depressed areas. It is a path of compromise. I think you will see more and more of such compromise. The question is one of emphasis. Quite frankly, I do not think that the President can provide a program that will satisfy the many pressure groups without running a deficit next year. It may not be a disastrously large deficit and it may represent a limited victory for fiscal soundness. But I suspect that the deficit will come. It will be of some size.

For not the least of the President's problems, I suggest, are the throwbacks to the New Deal who still inhabit Washington and Capitol Hill. They are capable of exerting great pressure. And right now, at least, the

congressional picture is more the product of pressure groups than of party labels. If you do consider party labels, you have to recognize that much of the Democratic thinking, in Congress, still reflects the Rooseveltian philosophy. And the Republican leadership, to a large degree, has tended to scatter its fire all over the place.

So you have the global picture as seen by a visitor to the Nation's Capital. The problems of this new era may seem staggering. Yet, they are staggering, I suggest, only to the degree that we fail to understand them. The world is, in a sense, remaking itself before our very eyes. We have the choice of accepting today or living in the past.

And I am confident that with due self-examination, with a recognition of our changing position in the stream of history, the United States will make the right decisions. At the moment, we do not grasp the full meaning of change, and this accounts, to a large degree, for our national frustration which, in turn, leads to the extremism of both left and right.

We need only understanding and perspective. For no one can convince me that the United States is a tired, wornout, aged nation. Indeed, it is by no means a fully developed country.

We may look at our history and see the proof of the American system and its startling success. Whatever its faults, our free enterprise democracy has produced plenty, even a surplus. By contrast, the totally planned system of the Soviet Union and Red China has produced scarcity. Too much is preferable to too little.

With full bounty, the American system has produced a most generous people, and a people with a genius in which we must have faith. Their destiny has not been fulfilled. I am confident that, with an understanding of this new world in which we live, we can move on to even greater heights.

ACADEMY AWARDS, 1962

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, I am certain the majority of my colleagues joined with most of the Nation last evening to watch the telecast of the 34th annual awards of the Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences. It is natural that I should take a measure of pride in this event, for the heart of the American motion picture industry is located in the State of California.

I am sure, too, that those of you who saw the Oscar Awards shared my pride when the top award went to a motion picture that was American in type, in character, and in spirit. The locale was America, the theme was America, the music was America, and the young people who gave it charm, style, and distinction were American.

If I emphasize this point it is only because I believe this film is an outstanding tribute to American motion picture-making. In no way does it lessen our warm congratulations to those gifted artists and craftsmen from other lands who shared in last night's awards.

While some two dozen awards in various categories were made last evening honoring men and women from all over the world, I want to mention only the principal winners. These award winners are:

Best motion picture: "West Side Story," Mirisch Pictures, Inc., and B. & P. Enterprises, Inc., United Artists.

Best directing: Jerome Robbins and Robert Wise for "West Side Story."

Best motion picture actor: Maximilian Schell, in "Judgment at Nuremberg."

Best motion picture actress: Sophia Loren in "Two Women."

Best supporting roles: Rita Moreno and George Chakiris, both for their roles in "West Side Story."

Best screenplay: Abby Mann for "Judgment at Nuremberg."

Best original screenplay and story: William Inge for "Splendor in the Grass."

Best foreign language film: "Through a Glass Darkly," A. B. Svensk Filmindustri, Sweden.

FREE ENTERPRISE HORSESENSE

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, the role of a Senator who tries to write some good American free enterprise horse-sense into administration legislation in this session of the Congress becomes more and more discouraging.

That is true with respect to nearly all administration proposals, but one of the most glaring examples, in my opinion, has to do with foreign aid, which is such a "sacred cow" it has become an untouchable, as far as the White House is concerned.

Despite the continuing opposition of some of us who long ago sensed growing public resentment toward year after year foreign spending, it has become apparent that this administration will put the pressure on again for approval of its foreign aid budget of nearly \$5 billion.

So, I tried in the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations to inject into the bill some provisions which make sense.

First. Deny aid to any country expropriating American-owned property.

Second. Require that part of foreign aid money be spent in the United States.

Third. Require that foreign aid money be earmarked for private enterprise.

I will continue, Mr. President, to fight for these principles because they are strictly American free enterprise horse-sense. But, it is already apparent that these are not the principles with which this administration agrees, because Secretary Rusk has opposed me at every turn. The story of how he has done so is related in an article entitled "Red China and Soviet Clashes Cited by Rusk" in the April 5, 1962, edition of the Washington Star. I ask that the article be included as a part of my remarks.

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

RED CHINA AND SOVIET CLASHES CITED BY RUSK

Red China and the Soviet Union have become rivals in dispensing foreign aid, Secretary of State Rusk reported today.

The two big Communist powers also have clashed on trade policy and are competing for leadership of Communist parties outside the Soviet bloc as well as within. Mr. Rusk told the Senate Foreign Relations Committee as it began hearings on President Kennedy's foreign aid bill.

Mr. Kennedy is asking a \$4,878 million appropriation for foreign aid in the 1963 fiscal year and \$2,125 million in new authorizations.

In the past 7 years the Sino-Soviet bloc, Mr. Rusk said, has committed only \$4.4 bil-

lion in economic aid and \$2 billion in military assistance. Only a fraction of these commitments have been filled, he reported.

OPPOSES CAPEHART IDEA

Mr. Rusk opposed a suggestion by Senator CAPEHART, Republican, of Indiana, that Congress write into the foreign aid bill a provision that any nation expropriating American property without full compensation would lose its economic and military aid from the United States.

The United States "can't quit and go home," Mr. Rusk said, because some nation expropriates holdings of private American investors. Other means are available to seek guarantees against expropriation without compensation, Mr. Rusk told Senator CAPEHART.

A Brazilian state recently took over an American-owned telephone company against the advice of Brazil's Central Government. Mr. Rusk reported he is encouraged that a settlement can be reached with the Brazilian Government.

Senator CAPEHART also suggested writing into the foreign aid bill a provision that countries receiving American aid for making purchases outside their own country should use their aid money to buy in the United States.

Mr. Rusk also resisted this proposal. Some purchases by aid recipients in third countries results not only in a higher yield per dollar but provide dollar exchange for the third countries to buy in the United States, he said.

JUDGMENT DEFERRED

Mr. Rusk deferred judgment on a third CAPEHART suggestion that the United States earmark a percentage of its grants and loans to underdeveloped countries for investment in private enterprises. The Secretary observed that a number of loans for rural and housing developments, however, have the effect of bolstering private enterprise.

Senator CAPEHART warned that the American people are concerned about U.S. expenditures of \$89 billion on foreign aid since World War II while only \$4 billion has been spent on flood control and \$27 billion on highways in the United States.

The Federal debt is larger than all the other countries in the world combined, the Senator said.

Senator SYMINGTON, Democrat, of Missouri, questioned the huge aid program for India, which he said released Indian funds for building a gigantic military establishment.

Mr. Rusk replied that if the United States and other Western Powers did not provide India funds for its economic development, India would still use its meager resources for military requirements.

ELIMINATION OF NATIONAL ARMIES

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, as I promised last Thursday during debate on the U.N. bond measure, I am placing in the RECORD a second reply received from the Director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, which seeks to explain a UPI story datelined Geneva, March 31, calling for elimination of national armies within 9 years. Mr. Foster says the new story is wrong on two counts: first, it is oversimplified; and second, the time period in question is 3 years, not 9, and this refers only to the first stage of the disarmament program.

I should like to draw out several of the points made in this letter for your special consideration. Last Thursday the complete disarmament program was made a part of the RECORD and you may

recall that the seven main titles of stage I are: To establish an international disarmament organization, to reduce armed forces and armaments, to contain and reduce the nuclear threat, to reduce strategic nuclear weapons delivery vehicles, to promote the peaceful use of outer space, to reduce the risks of war by accident, miscalculation and surprise attack, and to keep the peace.

This is surely a great deal to hope to accomplish in 3 years and to use Mr. Foster's words, a gross oversimplification, if taken literally. Suppose Russia were to give its faithful cooperation though I feel sure not one Member of this Chamber would accept this, what then of two foreign powers now laboring to give birth to their own nuclear capability, France and Red China, neither of whom were in attendance at the recent Geneva Conference. How is it possible to take a position on this stage I when two of the principals have refused to acknowledge its existence?

The final paragraph of this letter concludes by pointing out that the executive branch believes that the "revolutionary development of modern weapons within a world divided by serious ideological differences has produced a crisis in human history." The premise expressed is that weapons have caused the crisis. Experience and history tell us otherwise. They show us, in unmistakable truth, that men—not conditions or things—cause all human crises. While the outward conditions of life have changed radically, the basic problems of our times are no different than they were in Washington's or Lincoln's time. It is too easy to say that the development of modern weapons in a divided world has produced a crisis in human history and that, therefore, we must at all costs find means of reducing warmaking capabilities. The crisis is in human relationships and is not likely to lessen if we, as a nation, adopt the idea that our possession of modern weapons is the root cause of trouble throughout the world.

I now wonder just how far we have, unilaterally, already gone in carrying out the aims of stage I. Appendix I of the First Annual Report of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency begins:

Report of the Governments of the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to the 16th Session of the United Nations General Assembly on the Results of Their Exchange of Views on Questions Relating to Disarmament and to the Resumption of Negotiations in an Appropriate Body, Whose Composition Is To Be Agreed Upon.

Attached to this report is a joint statement—United States and the U.S.S.R.—of agreed principles for disarmament negotiations, dated September 20, 1961, which was placed before the U.N. at this time.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter and the joint statement from the appendix be inserted in the RECORD and call especial attention to item 8 of appendix I that—

States participating in the negotiations should seek to achieve and implement the widest possible agreement at the earliest possible date.

Skipping down a few lines you will see the sentence:

And efforts to insure early agreement on and implementation of measures of disarmament should be undertaken.

This ties in directly with that part of stage I, to reduce strategic nuclear weapons delivery vehicles, subtitle (b) of which says:

Production of agreed categories of strategic nuclear weapons delivery vehicles and agreed types of weapons designed to counter such vehicles shall be discontinued or limited.

Last Thursday in connection with this disarmament stage I, I remarked that I wondered if we cannot find some of the opposition to the B-70 and RS-70 in the above referred to discontinuation and limitation of nuclear weapons delivery systems. Mr. Foster's letter has done nothing to remove these doubts.

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

U.S. ARMS CONTROL
AND DISARMAMENT AGENCY,
Washington, D.C., April 6, 1962.

HON. BARRY GOLDWATER,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR GOLDWATER: I regret that you feel that my reply to your inquiry of the morning of April 5, 1962, was not responsive.

The UPI story datelined Geneva from the March 31, 1962, Arizona Republic which was forwarded with your first letter states that "The United States will submit to the Geneva Disarmament Conference a plan calling for elimination of national armies within 9 years and their replacement by a United Nations force."

This statement is incorrect in two respects. First, it is an oversimplification to say that our plan calls for the elimination of national armies.

The U.S. position at Geneva is based upon the program for general and complete disarmament in a peaceful world which President Kennedy proposed on September 25, 1961, and which was enclosed in my earlier letter. This program calls for the reduction of armed force levels to 2.1 million by the United States and the U.S.S.R. in the first stage. It also calls for ultimate "disbanding of all national armed forces and the prohibition of their establishment in any form whatsoever other than those required to preserve internal order and for contributions to a United Nations peace force." This disbanding would not take place, however, until the third and last stage of disarmament; not until we were assured that other countries had taken and were taking similar steps, not until other measures had been carried out by all countries to assure the security of all in a disarmed world. Moreover, it would not apply to those forces retained by nations "to preserve internal order."

Second, at the present time it is not contemplated that our proposal would specify a precise figure such as 9 years within which this disbanding would inevitably take place.

The September 25, 1961, program does not state the length of any of its three stages. On March 15, 1962, Secretary Rusk stated at the Geneva Conference that, given faithful cooperation, the first stage could be completed within 3 years. No position with respect to the other two stages has been stated.

The United States rejects the Soviet view that arbitrary time limits can be established in advance for a total program of disarmament. The period of time required is a function of the measures to be taken, their verification and the necessary transition from

stage to stage. Whether countries determined to proceed from the first to the second, or the second to the third stage would depend on whether other countries were complying with their obligations, and whether effective international control had been established. Moreover, as my earlier letter stated, countries cannot be expected to disarm if the international political atmosphere does not warrant it. In this connection, the United States would wish to see whether further evolution had taken place toward a peaceful world in which international disputes were settled without resort to force or threats of force.

The executive branch is preparing a draft outline of provisions of a treaty to carry out the September 25, 1961, program. As I indicated in my earlier letter, we have already consulted with appropriate committees of the Congress, and further consultation is planned. You may be assured that this Agency intends to comply with section 33 of the Arms Control and Disarmament Act, which provides:

"That no action shall be taken under this or any other law that will obligate the United States to disarm or to reduce or to limit the Armed Forces or armaments of the United States, except pursuant to the treaty-making power of the President under the Constitution or unless authorized by further affirmative legislation by the Congress of the United States."

Let me conclude by pointing out to you that we in the executive branch believe that the revolutionary development of modern weapons within a world divided by serious ideological differences has produced a crisis in human history. The September 25, 1961, program is intended to achieve greater security for the United States by providing for the progressive reduction of the war-making capabilities of nations under effective international control, and simultaneous strengthening of international institutions to settle disputes and maintain the peace. The U.S. program does not call for unilateral disarmament; it specifically requires that arms and armed forces be reduced by both sides in a manner that will not affect adversely the security of any state.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM C. FOSTER.

APPENDIX I

REPORT OF THE GOVERNMENTS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS TO THE 16TH SESSION OF THE UNITED NATIONS GENERAL ASSEMBLY ON THE RESULTS OF THEIR EXCHANGE OF VIEWS ON QUESTIONS RELATING TO DISARMAMENT AND TO THE RESUMPTION OF NEGOTIATIONS IN AN APPROPRIATE BODY, WHOSE COMPOSITION IS TO BE AGREED UPON

In accordance with their statements of March 30, 1961, at the 15th session of the U.N. General Assembly, the Governments of the United States and the U.S.S.R. wish to inform the members of the General Assembly of their exchange of views on questions relating to disarmament and to the resumption of negotiations in an appropriate body, whose composition is to be agreed upon.

1. The exchange of views took place in Washington, D.C., from June 19 to June 30; in Moscow from July 17 to July 29; and in New York from September 6 to September 19, 1961.

2. As a result of the exchange of views, the two Governments submit a joint statement of agreed principles which they recommend as guidance for disarmament negotiations when such negotiations are resumed. The text of these agreed principles is attached hereto in the form of a joint statement of the two Governments.

3. The two Governments were not able to reach agreement on the composition of a negotiating body prior to the 16th General Assembly.

Attachment: Joint statement of agreed principles for disarmament negotiations.

SEPTEMBER 20, 1961.

JOINT STATEMENT OF AGREED PRINCIPLES FOR DISARMAMENT NEGOTIATIONS

Having conducted an extensive exchange of views on disarmament pursuant to their agreement announced in the General Assembly on March 30, 1961,

Noting with concern that the continuing arms race is a heavy burden for humanity and is fraught with dangers for the cause of world peace,

Reaffirming their adherence to all the provisions of the General Assembly Resolution 1378 (XIV) of November 20, 1959,

Affirming that to facilitate the attainment of general and complete disarmament in a peaceful world it is important that all states abide by existing international agreements, refrain from any actions which might aggravate international tensions, and that they seek settlement of all disputes by peaceful means,

The United States and the U.S.S.R. have agreed to recommend the following principles as the basis for future multilateral negotiations on disarmament and to call upon other states to cooperate in reaching early agreement on general and complete disarmament in a peaceful world in accordance with these principles.

1. The goal of negotiations is to achieve agreement on a program which will insure that (a) disarmament is general and complete and war is no longer an instrument for settling international problems, and (b) such disarmament is accompanied by the establishment of reliable procedures for the peaceful settlement of disputes and effective arrangements for the maintenance of peace in accordance with the principles of the United Nations Charter.

2. The program for general and complete disarmament shall insure that states will have at their disposal only those nonnuclear armaments, forces, facilities, and establishments as are agreed to be necessary to maintain internal order and protect the personal security of citizens; and that states shall support and provide agreed manpower for a U.N. peace force.

3. To this end, the program for general and complete disarmament shall contain the necessary provisions, with respect to the military establishment of every nation, for—

(a) Disbanding of armed forces, dismantling of military establishments, including bases, cessation of the production of armaments as well as their liquidation or conversion to peaceful uses;

(b) Elimination of all stockpiles of nuclear, chemical, bacteriological, and other weapons of mass destruction and cessation of the production of such weapons;

(c) Elimination of all means of delivery of weapons of mass destruction;

(d) Abolishment of the organizations and institutions designed to organize the military effort of states, cessation of military training, and closing of all military training institutions;

(e) Discontinuance of military expenditures.

4. The disarmament program should be implemented in an agreed sequence, by stages until it is completed, with each measure and stage carried out within specified time limits. Transition to a subsequent stage in the process of disarmament should take place upon a review of the implementation of measures included in the preceding stage and upon a decision that all such measures have been implemented and verified and that any additional verification arrangements required for measures in the next stage are, when appropriate, ready to operate.

5. All measures of general and complete disarmament should be balanced so that at no stage of the implementation of the treaty

could any state or group of states gain military advantage and that security is insured equally for all.

6. All disarmament measures should be implemented from beginning to end under such strict and effective international control as would provide firm assurance that all parties are honoring their obligations. During and after the implementation of general and complete disarmament, the most thorough control should be exercised, the nature and extent of such control depending on the requirements for verification of the disarmament measures being carried out in each stage. To implement control over and inspection of disarmament, an International Disarmament Organization, including all parties to the agreement, should be created within the framework of the United Nations. This International Disarmament Organization and its inspectors should be assured unrestricted access without veto to all places as necessary for the purpose of effective verification.

7. Progress in disarmament should be accompanied by measures to strengthen institutions for maintaining peace and the settlement of international disputes by peaceful means. During and after the implementation of the program of general and complete disarmament, there should be taken, in accordance with the principles of the United Nations Charter, the necessary measures to maintain international peace and security, including the obligations of states to place at the disposal of the United Nations agreed manpower necessary for an international peace force to be equipped with agreed types of armaments. Arrangements for the use of this force should insure that the United Nations can effectively deter or suppress any threat or use of arms in violation of the purposes and principles of the United Nations.

8. States participating in the negotiations should seek to achieve and implement the widest possible agreement at the earliest possible date. Efforts should continue without interruption until agreement upon the total program has been achieved, and efforts to insure early agreement on and implementation of measures of disarmament should be undertaken without prejudicing progress on agreement on the total program and in such a way that these measures would facilitate and form part of that program.

SEPTEMBER 20, 1961.

AUTHORIZATION FOR APPROPRIATIONS FOR ARMED SERVICES, 1963

The VICE PRESIDENT. The hour of 2 o'clock has arrived; and the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be read by its title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 9751) to authorize appropriations during fiscal year 1963 for aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels for armed services, and for other purposes.

ESTABLISHMENT OF PADRE ISLAND NATIONAL SEASHORE

Mr. BARTLETT. 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. 1195, Senate bill 4.

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

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 4) to provide for the establishment of the Padre Island National Seashore.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of the bill.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. GORE obtained the floor.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield to me at this time, if it is understood that in doing so he will not lose his right to the floor?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

THE SAN LUIS AGREEMENT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I had planned to speak later this afternoon, and at some length, in opposition to the Department of the Interior contract on the San Luis project. I shall make that speech tomorrow or at the next meeting of the Senate. But this afternoon I wish to have certain basic material printed in the RECORD.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a copy of my resolution of April 2.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 322) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. RES. 322

Whereas the Senate on May 12, 1959, during consideration of S. 44, a bill relating to the San Luis unit of the Central Valley project, struck from such bill section 6(a) which provided as follows:

"Sec. 6. (a) The provisions of the Federal reclamation laws shall not be applicable to water deliveries or to the use of drainage facilities serving lands under contract with the State to receive a water supply, outside of the Federal San Luis unit service area described in the report of the Department of the Interior, entitled 'San Luis Unit, Central Valley Project', dated December 17, 1956."; and

Whereas by such action the Senate clearly expressed its will and intent to the effect that it was unwilling to exempt any part of the San Luis project or any waters flowing into and out of the San Luis Reservoir from applicable provisions of Federal law; and

Whereas the House of Representatives concurred in the action of the Senate by passage of S. 44 without incorporating in such bill any provision comparable to section 6(a); and

Whereas a proposed agreement between the Department of the Interior and the State of California has been submitted to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the Senate pursuant to Public Law 86-488 and is now before that committee for its consideration; and

Whereas that agreement, if approved by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, would result in effectuating the policy contained in section 6(a) set out above and would counteract the expressed policy and intent of the Congress; and

Whereas in view of the determination by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs that hearings on the proposed agreement will not be conducted: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the Senate is hereby requested (1) to adopt a committee resolution expressing its disapproval of the proposed agreement between the Department of the Interior and the State of California heretofore submitted to the committee pursuant to Public Law 86-488, and (2) to notify the Department of the Interior that any such agreement hereafter submitted to the committee should conform to the policy

and intent expressed by the Congress in enacting Public Law 86-488.

Mr. MORSE. This morning I appeared before the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and made a statement in opposition to the San Luis contract, and I urged the committee to reject the contract for the time being, until a thorough legal analysis of the contract can be made.

I ask unanimous consent that my statement of this morning be printed in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT OF SENATOR WAYNE MORSE BEFORE SENATE COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS ON SAN LUIS AGREEMENT APRIL 10, 1962

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I wish first to express my appreciation to the chairman of this committee for affording me the opportunity to appear here this morning and express my views on Senate Resolution 322, relating to the San Luis contract, which I introduced with the cosponsorship of Senators DOUGLAS and PROXMIER. I am aware of the fact that the committee had previously decided not to hold hearings on the San Luis contract and I am therefore grateful to the chairman and to the committee for reconsidering the matter.

It will be recalled by some members of the committee that in 1959 this committee unanimously reported a bill, S. 44, which authorized construction of the San Luis project which is adjacent to, and a unit of, the Central Valley project in California. It will also be recalled that the Senate after 4 days of debate decided to delete from the bill a provision (section 6(a)) which exempted the so-called State service area from the 160-acre limitation. This limitation, which has been in the Reclamation Act of 1902, limits the amount of water purchased by one person to that amount sufficient to irrigate 160 acres, or 320 acres in the case of husband and wife. The purpose of this law is to distribute benefits from Federal subsidies as widely as economically practicable, with special reference to the family farm.

My resolution is consistent with the intent of the Senate in 1959 when it refused to exempt the State service area. The Secretary of the Interior has, in effect, by signing the San Luis contract which exempts the State service area altered the policy of the Congress by doing what both the House and the Senate refused to do.

It may well be that a majority of this committee may agree with the decision of the Secretary of the Interior, but I am sure that if the committee's review of this important problem indicates that the contract under consideration violates the intent of the Congress, it will not hesitate to return the contract to the Department with its stamp of disapproval.

Today we are in somewhat the same position we were in on May 5, 1959. Then we had before us a bill; now we have before us a contract, an instrument which will carry out the purposes of the bill. The bill and the contract are part and parcel of the same problem. The contract merely seeks to effectuate the purposes of the legislation. But an extraneous matter has intruded itself into the contract. I refer to that part of the bill which was deliberately and after lengthy debate excised from the legislation.

Since discussing this subject on the Senate floor on April 2, I have had reviewed again the contract between the State of California and the Secretary of the Interior. It was published in the RECORD on the same day that the debate took place, and appears at pages 5717 to 5721 of the CONGRESSIONAL

RECORD. By this time I hope that every Senator has had an opportunity to examine the document.

The San Luis contract reinforces the arguments which the Senator from Illinois and I made against the original bill before section 6(a) of S. 44 was deleted. Consequently, I hope action is taken to hold up automatic approval of the contract until every Member of the Senate has had an opportunity to read and study this contract. I call the committee's attention to the component parts of the joint service facility as set forth in the contract. These consist of the:

1. San Luis Dam and Reservoir.
2. San Luis forebay, related dam, and related wasteway.
3. San Luis pumping-generating plant.
4. San Luis Canal, but not including water service turnouts and check structures and other appurtenances specifically associated with such turnouts.
5. Flood retention basins, floodways, outlet channels, wasteways, equalizing reservoirs check structures, and other structures as necessary for the proper operation and maintenance of the San Luis Canal.
6. Mile 18 pumping plant.
7. Switchyard and related electrical facilities at San Luis pumping-generating plant and at mile 18 pumping plant, including any necessary transmission facilities between such plants. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, April 2, pp. 5717-5718.)

Is it not significant that the U.S. Government is going to construct all these facilities? Engineers of the Bureau of Reclamation will design and build the San Luis Reservoir, the canals and other facilities. There is nothing in the contract on this point to indicate that it's a State project. No, it is obviously a Federal project.

I am aware, of course, that the contract provides that the State of California will be called on to contribute an "equitable" portion of the cost. What is this equitable share? According to section 16 of the contract, "The State shall pay 55 percent and the United States shall pay 45 percent of the actual cost of construction." Obviously, the Federal share of the cost of joint-use facilities is very substantial.

How are the benefits divided? I call the committee's attention to section 19(a) which indicates that at the reservoir, the State's part of the project, will receive 52.38 percent of the water and at the most distant reaches of the project, the State will receive up to 84.43 percent of the water. Here are the percentages listed in the contract, appearing at page 5719 of the April 2 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

"OPERATION AND USE OF JOINT-USE FACILITIES

"19. (a) The rights to use of the capacities of the joint-use facilities are allocated as follows:

	"State share (percent)	Federal share (percent)
Feature:		
San Luis Reservoir.....	52.38	47.62
San Luis forebay.....	52.38	47.62
San Luis pumping-generating plant.....	52.38	47.62
San Luis Canal, reach 1.....	52.38	47.62
Mile 18 pumping plant.....	54.20	45.80
San Luis Canal:		
Reach 2.....	54.20	45.80
Reach 3.....	60.17	39.83
Reach 4.....	75.41	24.59
Reach 5.....	84.43	15.57"

Upon the basis of these figures it is clear that the rights of California are carefully protected to the hundredth of a percentage point.

In reading the record of the hearings on the San Luis project in 1959, I recall a somewhat prophetic comment by my colleague, Mr. ULLMAN, from my own State.

Congressman ULLMAN remarked that California people were very tough bargainers. I am wondering who wrote this contract. Did the representatives of the economic interests in California write it? This contract protects with great exactness, as I have indicated, the interest of those who will benefit. The question which the members of this committee should consider is: Does it adequately protect the interest of the United States?

I call the committee's attention to another provision of the contract which relates to the definition of the State service area. The State service area is defined as an area outside the Federal San Luis area. I know of no one who, up to this hour, has precisely defined the boundaries of the State service area. I presume it can be any area which can be connected by a canal to the San Luis Reservoir or the San Luis Canal. Is it possible that the proponents of the legislation and authors of the contract refrained from defining the State service area so that the big landowners under what might be called "water gerrymandering" would get all or nearly all of the water?

It is well known that because of the free provision of the reclamation law, the power subsidies and nonreimbursable features such as flood control, that water from Federal projects is much cheaper than irrigation water purchased from State or private projects. I am wondering if the interest of the people of California is protected adequately by this contract. The general taxpayers of the United States are to be saddled with the costs of the noninterest provision in regard to the Federal San Luis area. Are the taxpayers of the State of California going to have to bear additional burdens mainly for the benefit of the big landowners? This is also a question the committee should also consider, because after all, the taxpayers of California are citizens and taxpayers of the United States.

I call the attention of the members of the committee to the portion of the contract which states that the joint-use facilities shall be designed and constructed by the United States in such a manner as to permit the integration and continued operation with other units of the Federal Central Valley project. I further call the attention of the committee to that part of the contract (section 20) which provides that all of the joint-use facilities may be transferred, for operation and maintenance purposes, to the State of California. This transfer is contingent only on the agreement of the State authorities and the United States.

I ask this question: Are those who actually wrote this provision into the contract planning to eventually take over operation and maintenance of the San Luis Federal unit?

I call the committee's attention to the provision (18a) in the contract which says that if Congress fails to appropriate money the "State may elect to assume control of the joint-use facilities and complete construction of such facilities for its own use."

Last week on the Senate floor I developed this point regarding application of the limitation to water in Federal canals and ditches which was set forth in the Warren Act as follows: "Provided, That water shall not be furnished from any such reservoir or delivered through any such canal or ditch to any one landowner in excess of an amount sufficient to irrigate 160 acres."

I also arrived at the conclusion that under existing law the 160-acre limitation must be applied if Federal benefits are received. I do not believe anyone who carefully reads this contract can logically conclude that there will be no Federal benefits accruing to water users outside the Federal San Luis unit. This point seems crystal clear. The existence of the San Luis Reservoir and its

appurtenances, at the cost of a substantial amount of the Federal taxpayers' money, would benefit California; otherwise the State would build the project entirely at its own cost.

Finally, I will briefly emphasize two major points.

In the Ivanhoe decision the U.S. Supreme Court said the purpose of reclamation is to "benefit people, not land" and to distribute these benefits "in accordance with the greatest good to the greatest number of individuals."

This is indeed the worst time in history from the viewpoint of those who may benefit from our reclamation program to breach the family farm provision of our reclamation law. Taxpayers in the humid East and in the Midwest will be prejudiced against worthy reclamation projects if this contract is approved.

The cause of reclamation will be associated with great subsidies to factories in the field, to great landowners such as the Kern County Land Co. and others who fatten on the misery and exploitation of migrant labor. There is a great moral issue here as well as an economic one. I quote from a recent communication of Father Vizzard of the Catholic Rural Life Conference:

"It would be tragic if by action of this administration conditions should develop in this country which would call forth the rejoinder, 'physician, heal thyself'; for if the Solicitor's opinion is allowed to stand it will open the door wide to increased and more tenacious land monopoly in California.

"Acceptance of the Solicitor's opinion would be gravely disappointing and impossible to explain to those who are convinced that the family farm and not land monopoly deserves support of public policy."

Mr. Chairman, I have also prepared a detailed legal analysis of the Solicitor's opinion of December 26, 1961, on the San Luis agreement. Time will not permit me to read this opinion to the committee, but I ask that it be included in the hearing record at this point in my remarks. I urge that it be studied seriously by every member of the committee, before final action is taken on this contract.

Because of the importance of this hearing, and the widespread interest it has prompted, I ask that the hearing of today be printed and that copies be made available to those who are interested.

I am indeed grateful to the chairman and the members of the committee for the time you have allotted for my testimony.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have made a legal analysis of the contract, and I offer it now. It is under the headline "Illegality of the Agreement Dated December 30, 1961, Between the United States of America and California, Respecting the San Luis Project." I ask unanimous consent that this legal memorandum be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HART in the chair). Is there objection?

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

ILLEGALITY OF THE AGREEMENT DATED DECEMBER 30, 1961, BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND CALIFORNIA, RESPECTING THE SAN LUIS PROJECT

Bases of the improvident and illegal contract dated December 30, 1961, entered into between the United States of America and California "For the Construction and Operation of the Joint-use Facilities of the San Luis Unit" are misconceptions of the law. Those erroneous concepts are reflected in the opinion dated December 26, 1961, of the Solicitor of the Department of the In-

terior declaring inapplicable the so-called 160-acre limitation of reclamation law. Reference in that connection is made to the fact that Secretary Udall has done that which the Congress unequivocally and intentionally refused to do. At a time when the Nation is moving steadily toward land and water monopolies, Secretary Udall accelerated the process by unprecedented and unwarranted action.

An analysis of the Solicitor's opinion as it relates to the contract for the San Luis project dispels any doubt that the principles enunciated in Senate Resolution 322 should be adopted.

Initial error contained in the Solicitor's opinion stems from his conclusion as to the import of the legislative history of the San Luis Act. On the subject the opinion declares:

"In my opinion the legislative history clearly indicates that Congress did not intend to require application of Federal acreage limitations by striking sections 6(a) and 7."¹

Not only is that quoted declaration contrary to fact but the opinion subsequently rejects the thought there expressed. There is only one conclusion clearly expressed in the legislative history. It is this:

Congress expressly rejected all efforts to exempt the San Luis project from the excess land provisions of the reclamation law. Congress accomplished that express rejection of the efforts to exempt the San Luis project from the acreage limitation when both the Senate and the House struck this provision from the bills before them:

"The provisions of the Federal reclamation laws shall not be applicable to water deliveries or to the use of drainage facilities serving lands under contract with the State to receive a water supply, outside of the Federal San Luis unit service area described in the report of the Department of the Interior, entitled 'San Luis Unit, Central Valley Project,' dated December 17, 1956."

Any effort to read into the legislative history any other interpretation than that just expressed is doomed to failure. Yet the opinion is based upon the concept that "Congress * * * (clearly) did not intend to require application of Federal acreage limitations by striking sections 6(a) and 7." Remove that fallacious keystone from the opinion and it collapses, taking with it the agreement between the United States of America and California.

Keeping in the forefront the last quotation from the opinion reference is next made to this statement from it:

"In the debates on the San Luis Act the principal issue was the elimination of provisions expressly exempting the State service area."²

That quoted excerpt is the proper analysis of the legislative history, pointing up the error earlier expressed in the opinion on page 1, that Congress "clearly" did not intend to make applicable the excess land provisions when it rejected the attempts at express exemption. Logical sequitur of the last quoted succinct statement would be the application of the following principle of statutory construction, earlier alluded to by the Solicitor:

"Normally, when an exemption is removed from a bill before enactment, the presumption is that the legislative body intended the law to apply in the situation described in the exemption."³

Thus the opinion at page 24 places the correct analysis upon the legislative history; cites the appropriate principles of construction on page 7, which seemingly should be controlling—and then reaches an opposite

¹ Solicitor's Opinion, Dec. 26, 1961, p. 24.

² Solicitor's Opinion, p. 24.

³ Solicitor's Opinion, p. 7.

conclusion. In fine, that approach is the hallmark of the opinion.

Next the opinion states: "There was no clearly expressed consensus as to what reclamation law would mean with the exemption eliminated."⁴

Import of that sentence is not entirely clear. It does, however, reflect a circumstance in which the Solicitor recognizes he would have been legally sound in declaring applicable to the San Luis project the long-established precepts of the land policies of the National Government, which are geared to preserving the family-size farm. Rather than pursuing that course he rejected the policy and struck a blow for land and water monopolies.

There then follows this pertinent statement: " * * * a common denominator of legislative intent can be derived from the debates. First, Congress intended that no benefits were to be conferred on the State service area by Federal investments without carrying the burdens of Federal law."⁵

Here again, the opinion's hallmark: Correct analysis of the legislative history, correct interpretation of the law—wrong conclusion.

The quotation from the opinion invites reference to (a) the San Luis Act; (b) the contract entered into between the United States of America and California pursuant to that act; calls for this inquiry: Can it be logically asserted that Federal investment confers "no benefits on the State service area"?

Negative response is demanded to that question. From the language of the act it is abundantly manifest that the Federal investment actually makes possible the facilities which are used to deliver water to the ephemeral State service area, wherever that area may be located. When Congress is requested to expend huge sums of Federal funds to build a project—albeit in cooperation with the State—it is absurd to rule, as does the opinion, that Federal investment does not confer "benefits upon the State service area."

Pertinent in that connection is this recitation from the agreement between the United States of America and California:

"4. Whereas the State and Federal acts previously referred to authorized the (a) coordinated operation of certain San Luis unit facilities, known as joint-use facilities, and (b) an equitable sharing of the costs of these facilities by the State and the United States; "

What is meant by the "equitable sharing of the costs"? There is a single answer to that query: Federal investments conferring benefits upon the lands to be served by the facilities to be constructed. What are those facilities? A large and costly dam to be built using Federal investments. A canal 107 miles long using Federal investments. Numerous appurtenant facilities and structures to be built using Federal investments—Federal investments in materials; Federal expenditures in paying employees to design and build the main and appurtenant works.

Federal investments—whether in whole or in part—confer benefits upon the service area of the State. Test of the correctness of that conclusion: Withdraw the Federal investments and there would be no facilities to bring water to the State service area, wherever it may be.

Again from the agreement, this proviso:

"Sharing of costs of construction—

"16. The State shall pay 55 percent and the United States shall pay 45 percent of the actual cost of construction * * * of the San Luis project."

When the United States of America pays 45 percent of the costs of construction of a project, it makes a Federal investment; a

Federal investment from which enures huge benefits to the State service area. Any doubt on the proposition is removed by concise recitations from the agreement:

"17. * * * (d) Upon completion of construction and transfer of the joint-use facilities * * * the United States shall submit to the State a final accounting of all costs and expenses incurred in connection with such construction, the amount of the total costs to be borne by each party and the total contribution made by each party."

As a consequence the contract requires that a balance be struck as to the extent of the Federal investments which benefit the State service area.

Not only does the agreement of December 30, 1961, provide for Federal investments to benefit the State service area, it—and somewhat incredibly in view of the Solicitor's opinion—spells out with specificity the measure of the benefits on a percentage basis which the State service area will receive. In that connection this clause is most enlightening:

"OPERATION AND USE OF JOINT-USE FACILITIES

"19. (a) The rights to use of the capacities of the joint-use facilities are allocated as follows:

Feature:	(55 percent State investment) State share (percent)	(45 percent Federal investment) Federal share (percent)
San Luis Reservoir	52.38	47.62
San Luis forebay	52.38	47.62
San Luis pumping-generating plant	52.38	47.62
San Luis Canal, reach 1	52.38	47.62
Mile 18 pumping plant	54.20	45.80
San Luis Canal:		
Reach 2	54.20	45.80
Reach 3	60.17	39.83
Reach 4	75.41	24.59
Reach 5	84.43	15.57

The Federal investments; the allocations of benefits derived from the San Luis project, all as set forth above, must be read on the background of this statement from the opinion:

"Section 2 of the Warren Act standing alone requires the application of acreage limitations where the United States cooperates with an entity (here the State) in the construction of irrigation facilities even where no Federal subsidy is extended to the lands served by the entity."⁶

Once again the opinion correctly states the law. However, having attained the high plateau of sound reason from which there could emanate but a single conclusion—the applicability of the 160-acre limitation to the State service area, it topples into its most grievous error. For, declares the opinion:

"We should not precipitate a conflict with a State which Congress was careful to avoid, unless such conflict is necessary to carry out national policy."⁷

It is impossible to perceive any basis for the statement just quoted. Does it necessarily follow that there is a Federal-State conflict by reason of a historical policy stemming from the Homestead Act? That inquiry is especially pertinent in view of the fact that much of California was settled by reason of effectuation of the policy of maintaining family-size farms. Dissipating the Solicitor's fallacious reasoning as to Federal-State conflict; indeed, the rationale of his entire opinion is this statement by the Highest Court:

"From the beginning of the Federal reclamation program in 1902, the policy as declared by the Congress has been one requir-

ing that the benefits therefrom be made available to the largest number of people, consistent, of course, with the public good. This policy has been accomplished by limiting the quantity of land in a single ownership to which project water might be supplied. It has been applied to public land opened up for entry under the reclamation law as well as privately owned lands, which might receive project water. (See Taylor, "The Excess Land Law: Execution of a Public Policy," 64 Yale L.J. 477.)

"Significantly, where a particular project has been exempted because of its peculiar circumstances, the Congress has always made such exemption by express enactment."⁸

Failure of the Solicitor to cite the above-quoted and emphasized statement from a case squarely in point, tends further to cast doubt upon the correctness of his opinion.

Final reference is made to the agreement which was executed by the United States of America and California by reason of the opinion reviewed above. It is impossible to contemplate an arrangement which is more prejudicial to the United States of America; beneficial to California. There passes to California control of a vast Federal investment paid for by all the people. Undoubtedly that the contract is the opening wedge for the seizure of the entire Central Valley reclamation project. Nowhere in the document is there a means of determining the actual extent of Federal responsibility in the construction, operation, and maintenance of the project. It is impossible, moreover, to ascertain with any degree of certainty the full obligation which the National Government incurs by this wholly one-sided arrangement.

It follows necessarily that the Secretary of the Interior could not abandon the fundamental precepts of the reclamation law in regard to the acreage limitation and to contract with California that:

"19. (b) The State shall not be restricted in the exercise of its allocated right to the use of the capacities of the joint-use facilities for water service outside the Federal San Luis unit."

As a consequence Congress should refuse to approve the contract in question.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in essence, I have analyzed this contract both from the standpoint of the reclamation law of 1902 and from the standpoint of the Warren Act of 1911. In my opinion the contract between the Department of the Interior and California is not a sound one. I consider it to be an illegal contract, in violation of both of these basic laws of the United States, particularly as regards protection of the 160-acre limitation.

Mr. President, all I am seeking is a postponement of final consideration of this contract until the Senate, through its Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, can conduct its own legal analysis of the contract. I think the Senate owes this to the people of the United States and that it would lead to renewed negotiations between California and the Federal Government. The result could be a different contract.

At this time I wish to point out—as I did this morning, when I appeared before the Interior Committee—that no one can tell us where the California State service area will be, under this contract. The first thing we should insist on is, of course, that we have a blueprint of exactly what the contract will cover.

⁴ Solicitor's Opinion, p. 24.

⁵ Solicitor's Opinion, p. 24.

⁶ Solicitor's Opinion, p. 28.

⁷ Solicitor's Opinion, p. 28.

⁸ *Ivanoe Irrig. Dist. v. McCracken*, 357 U.S. 275, 292 (1957).

Second, California has some great responsibilities in connection with this matter, if it is to get the important benefits which will flow to it under the San Luis contract. I am satisfied that the contract, if put into effect, will constitute a windfall to the great land corporations of California, many of which own millions of acres of land. I put all that data in the RECORD on April 2; and I believe the matter must be studied from the standpoint of the unjustified and undeserved windfalls of which these great land corporations will be the beneficiaries.

Next, Mr. President, I warn the Senate to look out for this contract, because in my judgment it will turn out to be pretty much of a source of municipal water supply for town after town in California. These towns might very well turn out to be the beneficiaries of substantial Federal subsidies, because of the fact that over \$200 million of Federal funds have gone into the San Luis project in the first instance.

I think all these legal aspects of the matter need to be explored fully. That is why I urge postponement of the contract.

I thank the Senator from Tennessee very much for his courtesy in yielding to me.

I close by saying to the Senate now—as I said this morning to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs—that we had better give heed to the telegram which was sent to this body by Governor Brown, of California, on May 7, 1959—a communication which in my judgment had a good influence on the Senate at that time. The Governor of California sent it to the junior Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], to be delivered to the Senate. The telegram reads as follows:

SACRAMENTO, CALIF., May 7, 1959.

Senator CLAIR ENGLE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Having seen many statements in the press regarding the application of the Federal reclamation laws to the San Luis project, I wish to reiterate what I have said in the past regarding this matter. Upon the basis of my own legal analysis and that of all my legal advisors I am convinced that the Federal reclamation laws do and will apply to all Federal facilities and service areas of the San Luis project. In addition, with or without the language contained in section 6(a) under S. 44, the Federal reclamation laws do not and, in my view, should not apply to the State facilities and State service areas of the project. I am, and I believe that the California Legislature also is, opposed to any unjust enrichment or monopolization of benefits by owners of large landholdings as a result of either Federal or State operation.

However, I feel that the handling of this matter, insofar as State activities are concerned in relation to this project or other State construction, should come as a result of State legislation. I intend, at an appropriate time and before contracts are executed, to take this matter up with the California Legislature in order to preclude the undesirable results which I have described, but I firmly believe that this matter should not delay either Federal or State authorization or construction.

EDMUND G. BROWN,
Governor.

The California people got the authorization, but now they want the contract. I say most respectfully that good faith requires California's making clear to us the limits of its State service area, and justifies our insisting also that these monopolies, these large land corporations, do not get the windfalls to which I have referred. The only way in which that can be done is for the California Legislature to give that guarantee to the people of the United States. But the California Legislature has not done so. At the hearing this morning a witness on behalf of the State of California said that in 1961, some bills to this effect were introduced, but were not passed. Mr. President, why should they have been passed? If they think they can get the contract without passing such legislation, of course, they are going to try to get the contract, and not pass the bills.

Mr. President, the Senate should hold the Governor of California to his telegram of May 7, 1959, and the Senate should make clear that no contract will be issued until California lives up to what I consider to be a reasonable contract to expect of California, and proceeds to give us the assurance to which we are entitled, as regards what is covered by the so-called State service area. California should also guarantee that these large land corporations and monopolies are not going to be the beneficiaries of the Federal subsidy to the tune of about \$200 million of the funds of all the taxpayers of the Nation, which they have poured into the San Luis project. Whenever California is willing to do that, I will then say, let us go on with the contract.

I close by saying that I do not intend to stop fighting in this controversy; and, for whatever they may be worth, I shall make my services available to those who will join in the fight against this determined attempt to do damage to the 160-acre limitation. I intend to fight for as many years as may be required until finally we get this issue before the Supreme Court of the United States. I am satisfied that once we get it before the Supreme Court, both the reclamation law of 1902 and the Warren Act of 1911 are bound to be so applied by the Supreme Court as to reverse the Department of the Interior and its Solicitor, insofar as this contract is concerned.

THE PORTLAND, OREG., UNION-INDUSTRIES SHOW

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, Portland, Oreg., from May 25 through the 30th, will be the site of the now-famous Union-Industries Show. It is produced by the AFL-CIO Union Label and Service Trades Department. Joseph Lewis is the show's director, and also is secretary-treasurer of this important department of the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations.

This unique exhibition is an excellent example of labor-management cooperation. Joseph Lewis is one of the leading exponents of teamwork between union workers and managers of industries,

and this event is a graphic demonstration of union-made goods and union services. It shows how employees and employers can work together for the benefit of all Americans. It proves that union labels, shop cards, and service buttons are the symbols of good will among unions, industry, and the consuming public.

This will be the 1962 AFL-CIO Union-Industries Show, open to the general public, admission free, with its more than \$22 million worth of action-packed all-union displays showing virtually all the crafts and skills and services of union workers and the products and services of fair management.

The Union-Industries Show will occupy all usable exhibit space in the splendid exhibition facility of the Portland Memorial Coliseum, with its total floor space of over 100,000 square feet. Capital prizes and souvenirs to be awarded the thousands who will attend organized labor's colorful extravaganza will be worth more than \$80,000.

Staged each year in a different major American city, the Union-Industries Show is sponsored and produced by the AFL-CIO's national union label and service trades department, and is known worldwide as "the show with a purpose."

Why do labor unions, their fair employers, and so many agencies of the Federal Government put so many thousands of dollars and so many man-hours of toil into producing this the world's largest labor-management exhibition and then throw the doors open to everyone—with free admission and nothing to be sold or offered for sale?

Of course, it is a tremendous effort to build better business for the union employer; but, most of all, it is to let the world know of the harmonious relations existing between labor, management, and Government in our free society under this system of free enterprise.

So, Mr. President, Portland is the place to be, from May 25 through May 30 of this year. And the AFL-CIO Union-Industries Show is the thing to see. Against the spectacular background of Mount Hood's towering 11,245 feet—only 89 minutes from the magnificent Pacific Ocean—and surrounded by reminders of the history of our Nation's farthest frontier, you will enjoy viewing organized labor's greatest effort for the year. Visit the City of Roses and come to the 1962 Union-Industries Show.

CHEMICAL PROGRESS WEEK

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, this week, April 9 to April 13, is being observed nationally as Chemical Progress Week. This week has been set aside to spotlight the many fine advancements made by the chemical industry and its thousands of workers to contribute to healthier, more comfortable, safer lives for every American. The chemical industry has made a vital contribution to our race for outer space, as well as in the development of synthetic fibers and miracle drugs.

This important industry provides us with many of the goods essential to our health, food, clothing, shelter, transportation, communication, defense, and other needs. The chemical industry converts raw materials into more than 10,000 chemical products in more than 12,500 plants operated by thousands of chemical manufacturers. In New York State, we have 1,500 chemical industry establishments, employing 64,000 people.

For every 10,000 persons employed in production facilities in the chemical industry, there are 623 working in research—one of the highest proportions of any U.S. manufacturing industry. The chemical industry has always depended very greatly upon basic research and development.

I am happy today to give recognition to the progress made through the efforts of the chemical industry. Through their purposeful research, Americans have been able to enjoy a better life; and through their research for the future, Americans live in a better world.

TRIUMPH OF THE CAUSE OF FREEDOM

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, on the broad international scene there are substantial indications that the tide of world events, unfavorable for us in a succession of discouraging events, may have turned and that the cause of freedom is now on the ascendancy. As the cold war continues on through its second decade, a sense of confidence seems to be returning to the West. Spirits are recovering and faith in our capacity to influence the course of events has been bolstered. This has not been brought about by dramatic victories. Instead, the West is coming to grips with the realities of the cold war struggle.

The change cannot be measured in terms so dramatic as a rollback in the Iron Curtain or the collapse of an entrenched Communist regime. Nor is there any discernible softening in Communist attitudes or objectives. It is, rather, that the free world, and particularly the United States is now moving more determinedly and with a greater sense of confidence.

Before undertaking to analyze what I consider to be an improvement in our overall position, let us examine briefly the background and the general course of world events which has led us to our present situation. After the defeat of the Axis Powers in 1945, the world again seemed safe—just as it had seemed after the First World War. The United States then enjoyed a position of political, economic, and military strength unequalled in modern history or any other time of history. Both our major allies and our enemies in that conflict lay devastated by the war. No nation, indeed, no combination of nations, was in a position to challenge the United States in terms of political, economic, or military power.

But even with all our power and peaceful intent, the short-lived euphoria was totally shattered in the late 1940's and

early fifties. As James B. Conant put it:

The coup d'etat in Prague, the Berlin blockade, the Korean war demonstrated the kind of world in which we lived, a divided world, and the division was broad and deep. The issue was freedom.

The emergence of a Communist Soviet Union as a major industrial and military power that frankly sought to expand its totalitarian control was a fact that could not be denied or ignored.

Though slow and reluctant to acknowledge that peace was not secured, we responded to the challenge of world leadership with the creation of NATO and a far-flung alliance system which remains an essential part of our defense posture today. At the same time, the Marshall plan went into effect, releasing European talent and energy to rebuild half a continent and to eliminate conditions which made the area vulnerable to Communist subversion. At great expense, we lavished upon friend and former foe, for their rehabilitation, for their growth beyond prewar standards, and for their armament or rearmament funds in huge amounts—many billions of dollars greater than the total extracted from the vanquished by the victors in all former wars combined.

Yet peace was still not to be. Imperialism surged from Moscow, and even more recklessly from Peiping.

We met the challenge of Korea in the only way it could be met—with armed force. Working through the United Nations, we fashioned a new concept of collective action to resist aggression. But we emerged from that conflict without decisive victory and without adequate new policies to meet changing world conditions.

The policy of military containment was continued, shoring up existing military bases around the periphery of the Communist bloc and establishing new ones. Bilateral military pacts were signed with as many nations as possible, be they fledgling or mature. More often than not, there was little real mutuality in our mutual security agreements.

The post-Korea period was characterized by the slogans "more bang for a buck" and "massive retaliation." These described a doctrine—though not really a policy—which if pursued to its logical conclusion could but ultimately reduce our military alternatives to a choice between nuclear war and withdrawal.

There were slogans, too, to describe our objectives. Chiang Kai-shek was unleashed so as to permit him to reconquer the mainland of China. And there were rash words about liberation of Eastern Europe.

The containment policy which had held the line in Europe—though no one was "liberated"—did not work as well in southeast Asia. Communist penetration of the Indochinese peninsula forced the collapse of the French empire in that area. It seemed to some that communism, or regimes sympathetic to communism, would inevitably engulf the whole of that area so rich in resources and whose people were so ripe for exploitation.

Western unity was strained, on some occasions almost to the breaking point. Our major NATO allies launched an ill-fated military action in the Middle East and we were embarrassed that they would take so serious and so ill-advised a step without even consulting us.

During the 1950's we engaged in summit conferences which produced hopeful language that proved to be devoid of substance. Somehow the failure to achieve diplomatic solutions to world problems was, by intense Soviet propaganda campaigns, turned into diplomatic defeats for the West.

There was a sense of frustration and audible grumbling among our people. Burning with a will to win, many despaired for want of sufficient policy and direction.

The emphasis on foreign aid shifted from Western Europe and Japan, where it had been demonstratively successful, to the so-called underdeveloped nations, some of them in theretofore obscure areas of the world. This outpouring of aid seemed but an ineffective effort to secure the unreliable loyalty of autocratic regimes.

In 1957, the Russian feat of launching a satellite captured the imagination of the world. There was no question at that point that Russia was ahead in the race into space. Russia's known superiority in rocket thrust lent some degree of credence to the claim of technical superiority over the West. Then, too, the Soviets made much, propagandawise, of their claim that the rate of economic growth in Communist countries exceeded our own.

In the eyes of our friends, U.S. policy appeared negative, with our action limited, almost always, by the necessity to react to Soviet initiative. There was real doubt, at home as well as abroad, as to whether we meant what we said and said what we meant. No one doubted that we were opposed to communism, but there was sometimes doubt as to what kind of world we were striving to create or what kind of world we would create if we could. Among other things, we were showing ourselves as impaled upon the horns of that old pragmatic dilemma; whether we should support a colonial ally when we doubted it was morally right, or to support a genuine nationalistic movement when we were apprehensive about its future orientation. We preached democracy and individual freedom, but we often granted aid to support despotic regimes which used our aid further to oppress the peoples for whose welfare our aid was given.

As a result of all this, the standing of the United States in the eyes of the world declined during the last half of the 1950's. Yet—and in spite of sputnik—there had been no sudden or dramatic change in economic, political or moral strength of the United States and the Sino-Soviet bloc. Rather, there appeared to have occurred a slow erosion of the United States prestige because of increasing doubt about this country's understanding of world developments and its capacity for and will to exercise world leadership.

Perhaps U.S. prestige and confidence reached its nadir and Soviet prestige reached its zenith at the Paris Summit Conference in May 1960. We had agreed to participate in this summit conference when there was little evidence or hope that anything constructive could be achieved. This, of course, was the conference which Khrushchev angrily and abruptly terminated before it could get underway, bitterly denouncing the United States for the U-2 incident. At the same time, he withdrew an invitation previously extended to President Eisenhower to visit the Soviet Union.

There followed, then, Khrushchev's rude performance with his shoe at the United Nations and his demand for "troika" control of all international organizations. His conduct at Paris and later at the United Nations, and still more recently Russian action in resuming atomic tests while negotiations were pending at Geneva, served to impress the minds of neutralists and others with the cold purpose of Soviet leaders.

I do not suggest that these incidents, or any one of them, in and of themselves, brought about a turning point in the trend of the cold war. Just as the decade of the fifties witnessed no single dramatic defeat for the West, there has been no single readily identifiable victory or incident to serve as a historical milestone. But it does seem to me that the period of time in which they occurred may represent a turning point in the effectiveness of Russian tactics in the formulation of world opinion.

The turning of the tide, which I seem to perceive, may prove to be transitory or illusory. But I believe the facts at hand indicate that our situation is definitely improved, both in terms of our capacity and will to win the struggle and in terms of confidence in our leadership at home and abroad.

As opposed to our wavering posture of the fifties there is now a perceptible hardening of our position, a firmer measure of support for our policies, a clearer understanding of our problems, greater confidence in the strength we are prepared to bring to bear in the East-West struggle.

President Kennedy's performance has contributed materially to an image of vitality, strength, and determination. But this is by no means the sole element. Bold words and courageous action are essential, but standing alone they are not enough. The hardened position of the West has been and will be effective only to the degree that we possess the economic and military strength to back it up.

The countries of Western Europe and Japan have been restored to a position of industrial strength. This has been accomplished in substantial part with our aid, under policies formulated in the administration of President Truman and continued under Presidents Eisenhower and Kennedy. At home, we are once again demonstrating our ability to rebound from economic recession, whether Democrat or Republican be in the White House. The military buildup, which is now coming into fruition, is the culmination of programs initiated under President Eisenhower and which have

been accelerated under President Kennedy.

The increasing support for the U.S. position in the United Nations is in consequence of policies whose broad outlines have been consistent under both Democratic and Republican administrations. These actions and programs, let me emphasize, are bipartisan in origin and support.

There is no gainsaying the fact that rapid expansion of the United Nations up to 104 members has created problems, and that there is room for improvement in the organization's financial and administrative arrangements. Yet, the fact remains that the United States has never lost a crucial vote in the history of the organization, while the Soviet Union has felt compelled to use its veto power 100 times. Recently the United Nations has decisively repulsed the Soviet troika scheme, overridden the Soviet opposition to intervention in the Congo, and it has rejected a move to seat the Communist Chinese by a larger margin than in the previous year.

The usefulness of the U.N. in our divided world has become increasingly apparent and the wisdom of our support for this institution has been regularly demonstrated—dramatically so in the case of the Congo.

The United States has always been both idealistic and realistic in its view of the U.N. We have looked for no panacea or world government. Rather, we have envisaged an institution which would preserve vitally important means of communication and conciliation among sovereign countries in a dangerously revolutionary world, which would at least encourage its members to live up to the ideals of the charter, and which would accept global peacekeeping tasks to the extent that the membership was able to support them. The record on these counts generally is a good and encouraging one.

During the period since May 1960, we have suffered some setbacks and, undoubtedly, there will be others. There is no question, for example, about the misstep made with regard to Cuba. But there is considerable debate about the nature and extent of the error. There is room for doubt that any policy beyond quiet diplomatic moves could ever have made progress toward a solution of the Cuban problem. In any event, much of the lost ground has been recouped since the so-called invasion attempt. The Organization of American States, at its recent meeting at Punta del Este, voted to exclude Cuba from that Organization and agreed that Castro's brand of communism is wholly incompatible with the inter-American system. Political and economic isolation may well prove to be an effective remedy for the Cuban malady.

Despite the Cuban incident and slow progress in other problem areas of the world, the fact remains that, since 1960, the free world position has not been nibbled to death in scattered spots around the globe. Long-range U.S. policy and programs, I believe, reflect a clearer understanding of the problems and a more realistic approach to their solutions.

I have said that there was no single readily identifiable event which marks the turning of the tide and that we have achieved no major single triumph which would be said to foretell our ultimate victory. Nevertheless, there is evidence which is cumulative in nature which, it seems to me, demonstrates that things are going better for us than they have in the past decade.

Let me recite some of the things which have occurred since the U-2 incident in May of 1960.

Last year, the Western cause benefited from the meeting between President Kennedy and Mr. Khrushchev in Vienna. When that meeting was announced, I thought that President Kennedy had made a mistake. I am happy to say that events proved me to be in error. All reports indicate that this was a most realistic confrontation. It must have been a shocking experience for President Kennedy, who had been hopeful of finding some means of accommodation between the East and West, to learn in a face-to-face discussion that Khrushchev was as hard as nails and utterly unyielding.

But President Kennedy reacted in the right way. Upon returning from Vienna, he set in motion action to give tangible evidence of the firmness of our policies. Our buildup of military strength was augmented and accelerated by callup of the Reserve Forces. We have added almost \$4 billion to previously planned military budgets of the current and following years. We have maintained and increased our strategic nuclear deterrent capacity, but instead of continuing to depend almost totally upon nuclear weapons we have provided greater balance to our military posture by adding to the strength of our conventional forces, both in terms of numbers and in terms of their operational readiness. We are now in a position to respond effectively to a wider variety of military challenges that the Communist bloc might put forward.

Yet, because this country above all is dedicated to peace—though not at the price of freedom—we have now created an Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. This has been done in the belief that, especially compared with the investment in armaments, a mere fraction of our national talent and imagination has hitherto been brought to bear on the potential benefits that may be realized in arms control measures.

The political unity of the free world nations has been strengthened. Frequent consultations with our major allies have done much to reverse the pattern of disunity that was apparent during the Suez crisis.

In addition to efforts to achieve a greater degree of political unity, we have encouraged the nations of Western Europe to move rapidly to make the Common Market a reality and we are moving in concert with them to marshal the economic resources of the free world for maximum strength to apply to the economic challenge.

The Berlin crisis and the larger problem of Germany's future remain basically unchanged and combustible. But I believe the Kremlin is now convinced that we mean business when we say that we are determined to maintain our posi-

tion there. The conviction carried by the Western defense posture has permitted us to keep the diplomatic door ajar without arousing cries of appeasement. Though we remain willing to negotiate, any element of softness is no longer discernible either to the Soviet or to others.

In South Vietnam the West is expressing its determination in a very tangible way. Though I acknowledge some misgiving in this instance, there can be no doubt as to the boldness and vigor of the undertaking.

Without question the U.S. decision to resume nuclear tests reflects the determination inherent in our policy. Whatever feeling the Kremlin may have entertained that our national security could be compromised by Communist propaganda campaigns, our strength and firm determination must surely now be the subject of an agonizing reappraisal by the Soviets.

The action taken at Punta del Este, followed by our complete trade embargo with Cuba, will serve further to isolate Castro and constitutes a new approach to the vexatious Cuban problem. Its example will not go unnoticed elsewhere.

Other profoundly important developments should be noted within this overall context. Remedying the past lack of concentrated effort to attend to the urgent problems of the Western Hemisphere, this country and its Latin American friends have gone into partnership through the Alliance for Progress to relieve poverty and overcome social injustice in the great continent to the south. Already we have made commitments of more than \$900 million in loans and grants to assist in housing, educational, economic, health, and other programs in Latin countries. There are bound to be serious difficulties in carrying out such a program—a program which is in fact dedicated to peaceful revolution. Yet—and whether or not the Alliance program had been established—there was bound to be a revolution in South America. By putting forth the Alliance we have accepted this fact and have dedicated ourselves to promoting and molding the inevitable changes into channels more peaceful and humane than violent and brutal.

In the Dominican Republic a dictator has been ousted with reasonably good prospects for the development of a democratic government. Political anarchy and economic collapse, those twin cup-bearers to communism, have been averted and there are indications that far-reaching development programs will shortly be getting underway in that country.

The energy, idealism, and old-fashioned decency of American youth have been directed into creative and constructive channels by the newly established Peace Corps. One of the best measures of its success is that demand from other countries for Peace Corps volunteers far outruns the supply. Our young people are not just giving, but receiving, the knowledge and cultural sympathy needed to bring nations closer together in human terms, as they already have been made interdependent through 20th

century means of communication and transportation.

In the Congo the Communist bloc has suffered a major setback. Developments in this former Belgian colony have been the subject of great confusion. Doubt has been expressed, in all sincerity, as to the correctness of United States and U.N. Congo policies. Yet those who doubt the wisdom of the U.S. policy in support of U.N. Congo action should pause to consider the alternatives.

It should be remembered that at the time of U.N. intervention conditions of political and economic anarchy prevailed in the Congo. The Communist bloc was moving in to pick up the pieces. Had this move succeeded, the free world position in all of Africa would have suffered perhaps an irretrievable loss. But because of the U.N. operations, the bloc did not succeed. We are certainly not out of the woods, but the prospects for a stable and independent central Congolese Government look better today than at any time since the painful birth of the Congo as a nation.

On the psychological and propaganda front, the magnificent orbital flight of Colonel Glenn has narrowed the Soviet lead in space exploration, which has caused us embarrassment since the days of the first Sputnik in 1957. This success is important, not so much for what was done, but because of the way in which it was done. To undertake so difficult a feat before the very eyes of the entire world is in sharp contrast with the secrecy that surrounds Soviet effort. Achievement of success with literally hundreds of millions of people glued to their television and radio sets following each development cannot but have had a deep impression upon the world.

Meanwhile, we see increasing evidence that communism is beginning to show its seams. Shortages of goods and food are so serious that high Communists talk publicly about private ownership of livestock and private incentives. What heresy. And with more emphasis on education more political stirring in Russia is evident. Soviet leaders today keep an eye on public opinion and sentiment among the Russian people—and other heretic development.

Ideological differences between the U.S.S.R. and Red China become crucially important and cannot easily be papered over. Their differences affect not only the Communist bloc nations but also the policies and strength of Communist parties outside the bloc. Both in Russian and in Red China, communism has failed its most basic objective—the production of food. Recrimination about who is responsible is published widely in the world press, and Soviet officials are summarily fired for failures.

Mr. Khrushchev has been unable to point to any significant victory, either military or diplomatic, with which to divert attention from Communist problems on the home front. Here a word of caution may be in order. In the short term, the current difficulties within the Communist bloc could result in dangerous adventures by one or the other of the two major partners aimed

at distracting attention from domestic difficulties. In any case, we should not—indeed must not—base our own policies on hopes of the collapse of Communist regimes. Yet their mounting failures and the unrest of their people can hardly be described as the wave of the future, at least not very convincingly.

All of these things, taken together, add up, I believe, to substantial improvement of the U.S. position and the free world position in the cold war. Admittedly, the margin is not great, and the issues are fearsomely complex and not liable to early and final solutions, yet the evidence is accumulating that the corner has been turned. Most important of all, we are moving with firmness, courage, and confidence. Our people have the will to win and our policy and our determined purpose is to win the goals of peace and freedom.

The problems and challenges which still face us are of tremendous proportions. Much remains to be done to bring about a clearer enunciation of our broad objectives. We have not resolved our policy dilemma with respect to the remaining colonial areas and our foreign aid program still suffers from lack of realistic direction and still remains afflicted with much short-range expediency.

On balance, however, we are moving forward and I believe there is a basis for caution optimism. Yes, Mr. President, I believe that the prospects for peace, security, and freedom, are brighter today than they have been at any time in recent years.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HICKEY in the chair). Will the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I commend and compliment the distinguished Senator from Tennessee for making the speech he has just completed making. To me, this is the kind of speech which has been long overdue. The Senator is to be commended for the honesty with which he has approached the subject and the candor which he has displayed in covering it. He has done a distinct service in trying to avoid the pitfalls, one way or another, and in endeavoring to keep the feet of the Nation, so to speak, on the ground, where they belong. It is a speech which has been long overdue.

Mr. GORE. I thank my distinguished friend.

PADRE ISLAND NATIONAL SEASHORE, TEXAS

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill (S. 4), to provide for the establishment of the Padre Island National Seashore.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, Padre Island, Tex., is the third area to be considered by the Senate during this Congress for development as a national seashore. Last year we passed legislation establishing Cape Cod, Mass., and Point Reyes, Calif., as units of the national park system. Each of these

areas differs from the others in many respects but they share one important feature—they provide this country and its people an outstanding setting for outdoor recreation. While much has been said on the subject in this and other forums, I cannot stress sufficiently the importance of proceeding rapidly with the acquisition and development of those areas in our Nation that have a potential as recreation resources.

The suitability of the Padre Island area for inclusion in our national park system has been examined very carefully by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. Hearings were held in Texas in 1959 and public hearings on the subject were conducted here in Washington in 1960 and 1961. Several members of the committee have visited the island on inspection trips. Padre Island is truly a unique area. There within a few miles of the city of Corpus Christi we find mile after mile of excellent beach and sand dunes, topographical features that are in growing demand by the public. Unfortunately, as public demand is increasing at an amazing rate the availability of such areas for public use is decreasing at an alarming rate.

It is the judgment of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs that Padre Island should be established as a national seashore. This area has marvelous credentials for such development and I am hopeful that the Senate will act favorably on the pending bill, thus providing on the gulf coast the type of recreational facilities the Congress has already authorized at Cape Cod on the Atlantic coast and, I am confident, will authorize at Point Reyes on the Pacific coast.

Mr. President, the senior Senator from Nevada, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Lands, has spent a good many hours and days in conducting hearings on this legislation. He has made a personal inspection of Padre Island. We appreciate the contribution he has made in this respect and I know he shares my enthusiasm for this legislation which he has reported to the Senate from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I appreciate the words which have just been spoken by the chairman of the committee on this very important piece of legislation. I have a short statement which I should like to make. I see the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] on the floor, and shall not suggest the absence of a quorum, as I was about to do, because he has returned to the floor.

Legislation authorizing the development of Padre Island, Tex., as a unit of the national park system has been pending before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs since June 27, 1958, in one form or another. The bill presently before the Senate, S. 4, proposes to develop some 83 miles of the island as a national seashore.

Padre Island is a typical barrier reef extending some 117 miles along the Texas gulf coast from Corpus Christi on the north almost to Mexico on the south. The island varies in width from a few hundred yards to approximately 2 miles. Separating the island from the

mainland is Laguna Madre, a bay having a maximum width of about 10 miles and a maximum depth of about 9 feet. Through the Laguna Madre has been dredged the Intercoastal Canal.

Padre Island is the longest island or barrier reef along the shores of the United States. While the island is quite uniform in elevation, irregular sand dunes, some up to 40 feet high, parallel the beach on the gulf shore and appear elsewhere on the island in lesser dimensions. Padre Island affords excellent, broad, and gently sloping beaches for many miles, particularly in the northern section along the gulf within the proposed boundaries. The climate is comparable to that of southern Florida. Because of the gradual slope of the gulf shore along the island, the area is ideally suited to swimming, surf fishing, and other types of beach recreation.

With the exception of those portions of the island that are subject to periodic inundation, the plant life is largely that type of vegetation typical of dunes areas—sea oats, ragweed, and other such shrubs and grasses. Grazing of cattle is presently carried on but would be terminated eventually if seashore status is accorded this area.

There are no commercial activities or developments within the suggested seashore boundaries other than petroleum production and the grazing of livestock I have just mentioned. There are no urban developments whatsoever.

S. 4 authorizes the acquisition of approximately 328,000 acres of land and waters. Of this total, 57,000 acres are fast lands, 124,000 acres are subject to inundation, and 147,000 acres are water surface acreage. It is estimated that approximately 112,000 acres are privately owned and the balance is owned either by the State of Texas or its political subdivisions. Title to lands owned by the State or its political subdivisions could not be acquired without the consent of those owners.

This is specifically written into the bill, S. 4, which is now before the Senate for consideration.

The legislation limits land and water acquisition costs to \$4 million.

Oil and gas are currently being produced within the proposed seashore boundaries. The island also serves as a base for the directional drilling of wells which bottom in the Gulf of Mexico outside the proposed boundaries. The production from such wells is carried by underwater gathering pipelines back to the island for separation processes and transshipment.

The mineral estate in the lands of Padre Island is of great value. The production potential of the areas adjacent to the proposed seashore is also very substantial. Inasmuch as the contiguous areas are State owned, the revenues arising from mineral production therein are pledged to the permanent school fund of the State of Texas. Production on privately owned lands within the proposed boundaries of the seashore also provides revenues to the State of Texas in the form of income and severance taxes.

Inasmuch as mineral exploration and production on Padre Island is carried on

in a relatively unobtrusive fashion and in recognition of the importance of providing for the continuation of this type of commercial activity, S. 4 has been amended by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in a manner that will permit the fullest possible development of the mineral resources of the general area. The owners of mineral interests in the proposed seashore will be permitted to retain them. Development of these interests will be permitted to proceed in the future under regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior.

As a means of guaranteeing the most economical development of the valuable petroleum resources of the areas immediately adjacent to the seashore, S. 4 prevents the acquisition by the Secretary of all grants, leases of or easements in land on Padre Island in effect on the date of enactment of the bill which are reasonably necessary for the exploration, production, development, or transporting of oil and gas minerals both within the seashore and the areas contiguous thereto. Representatives of the oil and gas companies operating on Padre Island have assured us that they are completely satisfied with these guarantees.

As I have pointed out previously, Padre Island is an excellent site for surf fishing. The surrounding waters abound in a variety of species. Both sport fishing and commercial fishing would be permitted in seashore waters under management arrangements with the State of Texas. While big game animals are not present on the island, the Secretary has authority under section 6 of this bill to authorize the hunting of migratory waterfowl.

Mr. President, areas in this country which have the recreational potential of Padre Island are fast disappearing into private ownership. This is a vast area of beaches ideally suited for public use. Land values on Padre Island are appreciating at a very rapid rate.

Mr. President, it seems to me—and I think it was the feeling of the majority of the members of the committee, also—that now is the time to preserve this area for the enjoyment of the thousands upon thousands of citizens whose recreational needs could be accommodated on Padre Island.

The interest of the senior Senator from Texas in this project has been unflagging. He has been persistent in his efforts to move the proposed legislation forward, first in the subcommittee, then in the full committee, and now, finally, on the floor of the Senate, where the bill is today, for what I hope will be the final, successful action on this particular piece of proposed legislation. The senior Senator from Texas is to be commended for the splendid work he has done on this very important proposal for a national seashore at Padre Island.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I congratulate the able senior Senator from Nevada for his excellent statement; for his chairmanship of the Subcommittee on Public Lands; and for the careful hearings he has held on the bill.

I also congratulate the distinguished senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], chairman of the Committee

on Interior and Insular Affairs. They have attended extended hearings; they have been on the land; they have visited Padre Island; they have studied the issue so carefully that I find they know more about it than do many persons who live right near that area. I commend them for their diligence, for the study they have made, and for their complete mastery of this subject.

Mr. PROXMIRE obtained the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield, provided he does not lose the floor?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Montana, provided I do not lose the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is my understanding that the Senator from Wisconsin desires to make a statement which will take about 10 minutes; and that at the conclusion of those remarks the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower] will offer a motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

I ask unanimous consent—and this proposal has been cleared, I believe, all the way around—that when the motion to recommit has been offered, there be a limitation of debate of 1 hour on the motion, the time to be divided equally between the Senator from Nevada [Mr. Bible] and the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower].

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the majority leader yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Do I correctly understand that the unanimous-consent agreement relates only to the motion to recommit?

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Other amendments will be offered to the bill; but the time to be under control relates only to the motion to recommit.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is correct.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the minority leader yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. Would the Senator from Illinois desire to have a limitation on other amendments?

Mr. DIRKSEN. That cannot be ascertained until the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Allott] comes to the Chamber.

U.N. DANGER FROM SENATORIAL ATTACK RECALLS SENATE DESTRUCTION OF LEAGUE OF NATIONS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, it was a group of articulate and prestigious Senators who by their words and actions in effect gutted the League of Nations in the 1920's. The League represented the finest flowering of idealism in international affairs up to its day. It was the inspiration and highest goal of President Woodrow Wilson. It had wide popular support in the United States, and in nearly every nation of the world. Undoubtedly it had defects, but at the time it was conceived and created,

it represented the world's best hope for peace.

Yet the League was destroyed before it ever really came into being. It was destroyed because the Senate of the United States refused to ratify the League covenant. It was destroyed in large measure because Senators who sincerely wanted peace toured the country calling attention to the League's possible defects, charging that this organization was both useless and dangerous. By poisoning the well of public opinion, these Senators prepared the way for the premature burial of the League.

I cannot help feeling that today's critics of the United Nations, although extremely able men—certainly many of the ablest men in the Senate—are performing a similar disservice to it. By placing a heavy public emphasis on the potential inconveniences that membership in the United Nations may involve us in, these critics draw attention away from the organization's actual accomplishments.

In that connection, I call attention to an excellent article entitled "How United States Fared in the U.N.: Scorecard on 10 Issues," written by Martin G. Berck and published in the New York Herald Tribune of Sunday, April 8, 1962. I read from the article:

HOW U.S. FARED IN THE U.N.: SCORECARD ON 10 ISSUES

(By Martin G. Berck)

UNITED NATIONS, N.Y.—Whatever the justification for Washington's increasingly critical view of the United Nations, it does not stem from U.S. defeats here in the headquarters of the world organization.

The fact is that in recent months defeats have been remarkably few. On some issues we have done not badly; on most issues we have done amazingly well.

Of course the record does not supply the complete answer to all doubts as to the future. In the longer view one must start with a truism, that putting 104 politicians in one great hall does not automatically create a parliament of man. The truth is readily enough seen in State legislatures or in Congress. Yet here in the General Assembly is a far more diverse mixture from which far less political harmony can reasonably be expected.

Out of 51 U.N. members in 1946, only 11 were from Africa or Asia. Afro-Asian nations today number 51 of the U.N.'s 104 members, diluting Western and Latin American voting strength, giving vigorous impetus to U.N. action on so-called colonialism questions, and causing deep anxieties among America's colonial partners.

Issue by issue, frequently there are heated clashes on matters grandiose and picayune, but there is one all-embracing principle guiding delegates from the lowest spot in Upper Volta to the innermost point of Outer Mongolia. That is national interest.

The question then is how often the United States has managed to swing a majority of other nations into line with its views, or has found the majority stand compatible with American interests.

The first and most critical test of the current General Assembly came last September with the plane crash in Africa that killed Secretary General Dag Hammarskjöld, and many feared it threatened to bring down the whole U.N. framework with him.

Soviet shoe pounding and table thumping the previous year had signaled the start of a Russian fight to liquidate the Secretary General's job and replace it with a veto-handcuffed troika, marking the end of an independent Secretariat.

But the Russians had to back down, chiefly because the Afro-Asians shunned the troika idea and overwhelmingly endorsed the American position that you get nowhere with three horses running in different directions.

Facing isolation, the Communist bloc had to link hands with the rest of the world organization. The result was the unanimous election of a mild-mannered Burmese, U Thant, who subsequently found occasion to confirm the American view that he was tough and canny enough to pilot the world organization in the Hammarskjöld tradition and then some.

Here is the score on the principal issues:

CHINA

Pundits had predicted that Communist China's admission and Nationalist China's ouster was almost assured. After the first full-dress debate in a decade, the General Assembly adopted the American position that a two-thirds vote was necessary to change things, then defeated a Russian proposal to do so by a vote of 37 in favor, 48 against, with 19 abstentions. Diplomats were astounded at the anti-Communist margin.

NUCLEAR TESTS

Despite the timidity of the Belgrade conference of neutralists in condemning resumption of nuclear testing, 87 countries decried the announced Soviet intention to blast a 50-megaton bomb. Only the 11 Communists (including Cuba) opposed the Assembly resolution. From leftist, oft-befuddled Mall came the only abstention.

Another measure calling for a test ban passed by 70 to 20, with the Communists, the United States, and Britain forming an unusual lineup in the defeated minority. Burned once, the United States said it could not go along with another uninspected uncontrolled test moratorium.

Then the Assembly called for a test ban treaty "under an effective and impartial system of verification" to make it veto-proof and cheat-free. This time the United States voted with the winning majority of 71. Only the Communists opposed.

The United States withheld support from other measures lacking ironclad guarantees against Soviet cheating, supported ones that so stipulated.

DISARMAMENT

Unanimous resolutions set the stage for the Geneva disarmament talks, which, however futile, permitted the United States to steal Soviet thunder by endorsing the principle of general and complete disarmament. It also gave the neutralists a more realistic appreciation of the American position that this can never be more than a popular slogan or a pious hope without meaningful international guarantees.

OUTER SPACE

The Assembly unanimously resolved that international law applies in outer space, and celestial bodies are not subject to national appropriation. This means that any hammer and sickle emblem planted on the moon by the Russians cannot form the basis of a territorial claim. In addition, the groundwork was laid for international cooperation in outer space projects in meteorology and communications.

APARTHEID AND SOUTH AFRICA

Mr. President, one of the most striking victories, but one of the least remarked and least noticed, was that with regard to apartheid in South Africa. The article states:

Largely through Asian influence, a Soviet move to punish South Africa with sanctions was beaten down. Then the assembly, by 97 to 2, condemned South Africa's racial policies but carefully avoided rash action, refuting charges that the assembly is dominated by Afro-Asian irresponsible extremism.

COLONIALISM

And I think this may be part of the heart and soul of much of the opposition to the United Nations—

Drastic Communist measures calling for immediate independence of all territories, however ill prepared, punitive measures against Portugal on Angola, an untimely withdrawal of Belgian troops from Ruanda-Urundi, all were defeated or forced to be withdrawn, largely because a majority of Afro-Asians favored the more moderate approach advocated or supported by the United States.

What passed, with American support, were measures aimed at bringing about a rapid but step-by-step end to colonialism, an expression of self-determination for Angolans, and an attempt to bring Ruanda-Urundi to independence without courting another Congolese explosion.

By large majorities, the Assembly also took account of oppression in Tibet, Hungary, and North Korea.

CUBA

A lengthy and stormy debate in the Assembly's main political committee on Cuba's charges of new American aggression produced not a single vote outside the Soviet bloc to sustain them or even to take official notice of them. Repeated attempts to revive the charges in the Security Council and challenge decisions taken by the Organization of American States also got nowhere.

ECONOMIC AFFAIRS

A decade of development program to hasten industrial growth and combat illiteracy, hunger, disease, and land reform was proposed by the United States and unanimously approved. Also strongly favored by the United States were plans to establish a world food program and a capital development fund.

BOND ISSUE

Bailing the U.N. out of a financial crisis stemming largely from the refusal of the Communists, France, and Belgium to pay for the U.N.'s peace-keeping operations in the Congo and the Middle East necessitated the floating of a \$200 million bond issue. So far, 26 countries have purchased or pledged amounts totaling \$54,661,175. The Kennedy administration, author of the plan, seeks authorization from Congress to buy up to \$100 million worth.

CONGO

Of course, one of the most striking and dramatic victories has been with regard to the Congo, although, of course, it has been misinterpreted. It seems to me that as regards the Congo, we won a clear-cut victory in the United Nations; and it was an astonishing performance because, in my judgment, it avoided what could have been a confrontation between the United States and Russia under extremely difficult circumstances, or an appeasement of the Russians, which could have led to the destruction of freedom in Africa, Asia, and perhaps elsewhere in the world. But, instead, the independence of the Congo has been supported in Africa and in many other areas, thanks to the United Nations.

I believe the United Nations has proven itself an effective instrument of peace and has proven that U.S. foreign policy with regard to the United Nations has been not only constructive and idealistic, but also eminently successful. I think there is much to be praised about the United Nations, as I have indicated; and I think most of the Members of this

body will endorse much that the United Nations has done.

The remainder of the article reads as follows:

Last fall, the Security Council strengthened the Secretary General's hand to deal with secession in Katanga. He indicated he would also use these powers to meet rebellion centering around leftist Antoine Gizenga, whose movement subsequently fizzled. When the Soviet Union went to the Council last January to squelch the increasingly promising chances of a peaceful end to Katangese secession and demand a new round of shooting, it failed to get even Afro-Asian support.

Despite what many regard as an impressive list of American triumphs in the U.N. at a time when the United States no longer commands an automatic majority, a rattling re-examination in Washington seemed bound to come.

Most vexatious is the assumption that American security interests in NATO are in conflict with U.N. considerations. It is not forgotten that the United States parted company with the British and French over Suez, the French on Algeria, the Belgians on the Congo, the Portuguese on Angola, and have given the Dutch less than full support on New Guinea, and the British on Southern Rhodesia.

Discontent engendered within the alliance over colonial matters gave rise to misgivings in Congress. But no one has suggested that NATO therefore will run aground. It won't, because military and political interests of NATO members far outweigh colonial concerns. Nor can it be taken for granted that these policy problems would not still be there—and in spades—even if the U.N. tipped over into the East River.

The point that American Ambassador Adlai E. Stevenson finds necessary to hammer home is that it is a mistake to pit the U.N. against NATO. Both are instruments to serve American interests.

HAS KEPT PEACE

At the same time, it must be admitted that it is not always an easy matter to strike a balance between the two on an urgent colonialism issue.

As an executive agency, an independent power whose role some would curtail, the U.N. can point to war stopping or peace keeping in the Gulf of Aqaba, the Gaza strip, on the Syrian and Jordanian borders, in Kashmir, Lebanon, Laos, and, most notably, the Congo, all with varying degrees of success.

What this means for the United States is that American and Soviet troops were not propelled—as they might have been—into direct confrontation that could develop into a major war.

The big, sometimes bumptious, occasionally disorderly glasshouse of lengthy speeches and thick documents is a cause for concern because it is growing in ways that cannot be precisely charted.

But the United States regards its long-range security interests as based on maintaining free and independent countries throughout the world. If this is a goal that the world in general approves—and it is hard to see how it can be otherwise—then the prospects for the U.N. cannot be too gloomy.

Furthermore, Mr. President, a few days ago James Reston, head of the Washington bureau of the New York Times, wrote an article which was published in the Times; and the article is most instructive in regard to the United Nations, because in the article Mr. Reston points out that Senators who have attacked the United Nations as not being representative seem to have forgotten

that the Senate of the United States itself is not the most representative body in the world. Mr. President, I am proud of the Senate, and I am very glad to be a Senator. But I think there is no doubt that an entirely representative basis is not necessary in order to have effective a democratic republic or an institution like the United Nations that serves as an instrument of peace, morality, and reasonable representation.

For instance, Alaska has, in effect, approximately 20 times the representation in the Senate that Wisconsin has, and about 80 times as much as New York has. Obviously there is no equality of representation in the Senate; yet that was the main point of criticism advanced the other day by several Senators against the U.N. Actually, Mr. President, any student of the Senate and also any student of the United Nations could easily criticize both institutions from that point of view.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article by Mr. Reston be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES AND THE UNITED NATIONS

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, April 5.—Many of the criticisms of the United Nations in the U.S. Senate are true. Let us admit it: the U.N. has not achieved peace or justice. It has not ended the wars in Laos or Vietnam or the Congo. It has soaked the rich to help the poor. It gives equal voting rights in the Assembly to small states and large states. It plays politics with great events. And darned if that is not precisely true of the U.S. Senate as well.

Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, of Montana, complained the other day that it was unfair to have the same vote in the Assembly for the little countries as for big countries. Senator RICHARD RUSSELL, of Georgia, pointed out yesterday that little Gabon had as much voting power as the United States, which has 433 times as many people.

Hard cheese, said the Senator (who did not rush to support the Supreme Court's recent reapportionment decision), but this, of course, is what happens in the U.S. Senate. Montana with 674,767 people in the 1960 census, Georgia with 3,943,116, and New York with 16,782,304 all have two votes in the U.S. Senate and Mr. MANSFIELD, of Montana, is majority leader of the place, and a good one, too.

UNFAIR, UNEQUAL, IMPERFECT

Life is unfair, as President Kennedy observed the other day. And unequal, too, but it is unequal and unfair and imperfect everywhere, including the U.S. Senate. The Armed Services Committee, which Senator RUSSELL heads, hasn't stamped out war in Laos, Vietnam, or the Congo either, and Georgia hasn't rejected its share of Federal funds raised in those big States like New York.

The Senators who oppose bailing out the U.N. because of its failures are making some good points, but they don't go far enough. They liked the U.N. when the United States controlled the voting. They approved bloc voting in the U.N. when those two unlikely characters, Nelson Rockefeller and Adlai E. Stevenson, established the bloc-voting practice back there in the first U.N. meeting in San Francisco and London in 1945-46. But our blocs are not so large now and this is a problem.

We are in danger of losing control of the Assembly and even of seeing it used against the principles of the U.N. itself. The Senators are right in saying that the U.N. cannot deal effectively with direct confrontations between the great powers, that the Security Council is paralyzed in such cases by the veto, and that the General Assembly is an increasingly capricious and unwieldy political instrument.

But so is the U.S. Senate. Also, it was a U.S. Senator, Arthur Vandenberg, of Michigan, who turned the U.N. General Assembly into "the town meeting of the world"—his phrase—and the U.S. Senate that rejoiced at the transfer of peace-enforcement power from the Security Council to the Assembly.

This transfer of power revolutionized the U.N., but the United States did it, and it was no secret then that the colonial empires were being liberated and the size of the General Assembly increased. What is ironical, and even vaguely amusing now, is that Senators, of all people, should be complaining that the Assembly talks too much, that it trades votes, that it is untidy financially, and that it is not the answer to all the world's problems.

As Churchill said when the Germans got bogged down in the winter of the Soviet Union, "They should have known that it snowed in Russia." The Senators are no doubt justified in rebelling against the tiresome State Department and White House cliché that the United Nations is "the last great hope for peace in the world"—it is no such thing—but all parliamentary bodies tend to be oversold. Even the U.S. Senate is constantly being advertised, usually by Senators, as "the greatest deliberative body in the world."

WHAT IS THE U.N.?

What is deliberative about the present Senate debate on the U.N. and world affairs? It is talking as if the U.N. somehow had some mysterious power of its own, that it can stop aggressions in Goa that Senators themselves don't want to send U.S. troops to stop, that in some curious way it is responsible for the world's problems instead of merely reflecting those problems.

The U.N., however, is not wholly unlike the Senate. It is not responsible for friction in Berlin, any more than the Senate is responsible for unemployment in Detroit—probably not as much. Both merely mirror the problems placed before them and deal with them imperfectly in an obviously imperfect world.

Besides, Senators had better be careful about refusing to pay for political mistakes. For if this idea were to spread, they might soon be as broke as the U.N. itself. They voted \$300 million for Laos, which vanished in the jungle fogs changing nothing. But they have to go on, and they will, because the alternatives are worse. Like the General Assembly, the Senators like to talk, but in the end they seldom have the courage of their prejudices.

FOREIGN AID TO TITO SUPPORTS OPPRESSION SHOWN BY RE-ARREST OF DJILAS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, on Sunday it was reported that Milovan Djilas, who is a dissenter in Yugoslavia, has once again been arrested—although he has been ill—by the Communist government of Marshal Tito, and has been thrown back into jail. Dr. Djilas has protested very vigorously both Russian communism and Yugoslav communism. As a matter of fact, recently he published an article in which he attacked the Soviet Union for crushing the Hungarian revolution, and stated that that meant

the beginning of the end of communism, including the "Titoist brand."

Obviously, Mr. President, the arrest of Djilas was for the purpose of preventing the release of a book he has written, and which is ready for release in New York.

Recently two excellent editorials dealing with this matter have been published. But they do not however make the point that I am making—namely, that when the subject of aid for Yugoslavia comes before the Senate, this year, there should be—as I hope there will be—strong opposition by Senators.

The arrest of Djilas was—on the basis of the best information I have seen—because what he has written might be embarrassing to Khrushchev, as well as to Tito. It is obvious that there is no opportunity for freedom in either Soviet Russia or Yugoslavia. Freedom is ruthlessly suppressed. This development testifies, once again, to the fact that Tito is supporting the Soviet regime, and that he will continue to do so, as he has in the past, against the interests of the United States of America.

Mr. President, I hope Congress will seriously consider this situation when it considers the foreign aid bill.

In connection with this matter I ask unanimous consent to have an article from the New York Times and the editorials dealing with this subject printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

TALKING OUT OF TURN

The Yugoslavs may have a special form of communism separate from the Soviet brand; but as soon as one begins to think of them hopefully as approaching membership in the free world, one gets a fresh demonstration that an all-powerful state is necessarily tyrannical. The news that Milovan Djilas is back in prison is simply a reminder that no dictatorship is inclined to consider itself sufficiently firmly established to tolerate dissent or unorthodoxy.

Mr. Djilas seems to be an inveterate dissenter. He seems also to be a man of extraordinary hardihood and courage. Released from prison on parole a little more than a year ago—on terms, it is said, that forbade his writing about politics—he must have gone to work at once on a new book entitled "Conversations With Stalin" containing highly controversial material not altogether agreeable to Yugoslavia's dictator, Marshal Tito. He has now been arrested, at any rate, under the terms of a recently adopted statute forbidding the publication of documents harmful to the state. Such a statute effectually precludes the expression of any political opinion not approved by the powers that be.

The specific nature of Mr. Djilas' offense is not yet clear. It is reported that his book, dealing with the men around Stalin, says some uncomplimentary things about Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev. If this is the real reason for imprisoning Djilas, it reveals a good deal about the independence of Yugoslavia; no doubt it is prudent for little tyrants to be careful of the sensibilities of big tyrants. The arrest of Djilas reveals a great deal, too, about life in Yugoslavia. Indeed, Djilas in jail speaks far more loudly and eloquently than Djilas at liberty.

THE YUGOSLAV CENSORSHIP

Though the Yugoslav Government has given no public reason as yet for its decision to rearrest Milovan Djilas, the cir-

cumstances make plain that this action was closely connected with the scheduled early publication here of Djilas' latest book, "Conversations With Stalin." The book presents evidence that Stalin was primarily responsible for the cold war.

How ironical it is now that Tito's Communists in Yugoslavia, whom Stalin tried to destroy a decade ago, should now in effect rush to the aid of Stalin's memory by trying to stop the publication of this volume and to punish its author. Presumably the political motivation is President Tito's fear that this new evidence against Stalin may damage Premier Khrushchev in the delicate fight between Stalinists and anti-Stalinists among the world's Communists.

The use of police methods to try to still Milovan Djilas' pen by a Yugoslavia that prides itself on relative liberalism contrasts unfavorably even with Moscow's treatment of Boris Pasternak, who was at least not imprisoned for publication abroad of "Doctor Zhivago."

Another important issue is raised by the decision of the American publishers of Djilas' book to postpone publication and to withdraw galleys which had been distributed among book reviewers. The latter action took place last week on the same day that the president of the publishing firm had conferred with a Yugoslav information official here.

The publisher's solicitude for Mr. Djilas' welfare is understandable and commendable; but from the record of Djilas' past bravery, we must assume he knew the risks he was running in writing and sending abroad this book, and was willing to bear the consequences as part of his personal battle against the totalitarianism he loathes. We seriously question the advisability of permitting governmental pressure—by Yugoslavia or any other government—to prevent publication of a book that could well be a major historical document.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 8, 1962]

DJILAS' WORDS OF PROTEST BROUGHT HIS DOWNFALL

(By Russell Porter)

Milovan Djilas, who was arrested in Belgrade yesterday apparently because of a book he has written about Stalin, was for many years a close friend and associate of President Tito.

But he has been a critic of communism, including the Yugoslav dictator's brand, for the last 10 years. He has written several books demanding more democracy in Yugoslavia and criticizing the drive for power and privilege of the Communist leaders.

His book, "The New Class," published here in 1957, expounded the theory that the Communist overthrow of capitalism inevitably developed a new class of exploiters of the people.

His new book, "Conversations With Stalin," deals with talks between Stalin and M. Djilas during and after World War II, before Yugoslavia broke with the Soviet Union. It was reported the Tito regime was upset at the possible adverse effect of the book on its current relations with the Soviet Union.

Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc., had announced the book for publication May 16, but said yesterday it had been indefinitely postponed.

William Jovanovich, president of Harcourt, Brace & World, ordered the postponement Friday because he felt the situation needed to be studied further. He said he had talked with Drago Bujica of the Yugoslav Information Office here Friday, but declined to tell what he had said.

Mr. Jovanovich said he was seeking a visa to go to Belgrade Wednesday. He has not heard from M. Djilas about the arrest, he said. M. Djilas wrote to him that he was planning the book after his release from prison in 1961, and he made two trips to

Belgrade to discuss it with M. Djilas in 1961 and 1962, he went on. He received the manuscript last December.

Mr. Jovanovich said that he owned the world rights to the book and that no serializations or foreign editions would be authorized for the present. The book has not been fully printed and bound, he added.

Before and during World War II, M. Djilas served 3 years in a Yugoslav prison cell, fought in the Spanish Civil War, was a member of the Communist underground in Yugoslavia and a partisan leader.

After the war he helped Marshal Tito build and operate the Communist system in Yugoslavia. He was formerly chairman of the National Assembly.

When Marshal Tito broke with Stalin in 1948, M. Djilas stood near the top of the Titoist hierarchy and acted as the chief Yugoslav propagandist. He continued to occupy a high place in the regime until 1953, when he broke with Marshal Tito.

BUREAUCRACY SCORED

He charged at that time that the Yugoslav Communist bureaucracy was preventing the development of democracy and asserted that Communists were not necessary to lead the way to socialism.

Marshal Tito stripped M. Djilas of his government posts and party offices in 1954. A year later, M. Djilas again incurred official wrath because of an exclusive interview he gave the New York Times, elaborating on views the regime considered heretical. He was sentenced to 18 months in jail in 1955, but the sentence was suspended and he was put on 3 years' probation.

The country house that had remained at his disposal despite his loss of high party and government rank was taken from him. He and his family then moved in a small flat in Belgrade.

He was arrested again in 1956 after the New Leader, an anti-Communist Socialist journal in New York, published an article by him attacking the Soviet Union for crushing the Hungarian revolution. He said it meant the beginning of the end of communism, including the Titoist brand.

This time he was sentenced to 3 years in prison. While in jail he completed "The New Class," which was smuggled to this country for publication. After its publication he was retried and sentenced to 9 years in prison, but he was pardoned in 1961.

Excerpts from Mr. Djilas' book were published in the New York Times on April 2 in C. L. Sulzberger's column on foreign affairs. They indicated that Stalin announced the start of the cold war at a Kremlin dinner party in 1944 by saying: "This war is not as in the past; whoever occupies a territory also imposes on it his own social system."

M. Djilas quoted Stalin as having said: "Churchill is the kind who, if you don't watch out, will slip a kopeck out of your pocket" and "Roosevelt dips in his hand only for bigger coins."

According to the author, Stalin also said: "The war will soon be over. We shall recover in 15 or 20 years and then we'll have another go at it."

M. Djilas said Stalin told him in 1948 that "the West will make Western Germany their own and we shall turn Eastern Germany into our state."

He also quoted Stalin as having said Yugoslavia should "swallow" Albania. Stalin also said the Chinese Communists were right in fighting Chiang Kai-shek after the Japanese surrender, and the Russians were wrong in advising them to reach an agreement with him.

TO FIND TRUTH, ABANDON CONFORMITY

Mr. PROXMIER. Mr. President, recently Leo Rosten made a magnificent

speech at the National Book Awards, in New York. It was the best received address in the history of the awards. His address was entitled "On Finding Truth: Abandon the Straitjacket of Conformity."

In the course of his speech, Mr. Rosten stated:

The most practical things in this world of ours are not dynamos, nor mechanisms, nor computers, nor aircraft; the most practical things are ideas. It is always from some curious abstract, "daydreaming" egghead that our marvelous gadgets come.

The contempt of "practical" men for curious men, or of "realists" for "just theoreticians," rests on nothing more than ignorance. The one thing that curiosity can never be, is idle.

Mr. Rosten concludes his magnificent speech in these words:

WE MUST LEARN

We must learn to seek change without violence. Always change, and never violence—not even in words, much less in deeds.

We must try to understand each other by reconciling ourselves to the fact that most of us never really mature; we simply grow taller.

We must meet fanaticism with courage, and idealism with caution.

We must be skeptical of that which is promised, but not proved.

We must be strong enough to be gentle.

We must know that life will always have unbearable stretches of loneliness, and that we can never truly be understood—even by those who love us; that we cannot completely understand someone else, no matter how much we want to. We must moderate, therefore, our demands on others.

We must have the courage to live without absolutes, without dogmas, the courage to seek imaginative escapes from the straitjackets of conformity, knowing—with Emerson—"Whosoever would be a man, must be a nonconformist."

We must learn to meet life in a series of tentative and impermanent approximations, knowing that the final goals may never be reached, that the last truths may be forever unknowable, but that life holds nothing more precious than the process by which, to the fullest stretches of which man is capable, we stretch the mind and the heart.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire speech by Mr. Rosten be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

ON FINDING TRUTH: ABANDON THE STRAIT-JACKET OF CONFORMITY

(By Leo Rosten)

(NOTE.—This is the text of an address, "The Free Mind," made by Mr. Rosten at the National Book Awards in New York recently. It was the best received address in the history of the awards. Mr. Rosten's latest book, "Captain Newman, M.D." is on the best-seller lists now.)

We live among madmen. We are surrounded by those who believe in witchcraft. The most critical problem which freemen face today is to get some of their cocitizens to listen—to listen to that which seems to threaten them. For the right to talk involves the duty to listen.

We are all raised so that we confuse a way of thinking with the way of thinking. We must all try—desperately hard—to see things not as we are but as they are. The function of the thinker, the scientist, the writer, the editor—indeed, the function of the freeman and the free mind—is, stubbornly and painfully, to try to find truth—

truth as it is, not as we want it to be, or hope it to be, or prefer it to be. The wife at the cocktail party who said indignantly to her husband, "Darling, don't you think you ought to stop drinking? Your face is already beginning to get blurred," suggests the singular capacity of human beings to project onto the outer world that which might more properly be examined within.

To be free means to have made a deep and incontestable commitment to the self: to love ideas, to examine them, to explore them no matter where they lead; to test what is new, even what is threatening. For wisdom is not much more than the capacity to confront dangerous ideas with equanimity.

IDEAS—PRACTICAL THINGS

Now, there is a special irony in what I am saying. Not so long ago, in these United States, the target of political disdain and political contempt was that pathetic, that unrealistic, that useless person—the egghead. Everyone in this room, I take it, is an egghead. You may remember that our then Secretary of Defense, in turning down a project for basic research, dismissed it with this historic comment: "Basic research is when you don't know what it is you're trying to find out." Now, aside from the appalling syntax, which suggests that the Secretary had not taken the trouble to learn how to construct a sentence in his native tongue, no idea can be more absurd; for if there is anything that research, or thought, or exploration are incapable of being, it is useless. In one sense, no experiment ever fails (it tells us that some factors do not necessarily correlate).

The most practical things in this world of ours are not dynamos, nor mechanisms, nor computers, nor aircraft; the most practical things are ideas. It is always from some curious abstract, "daydreaming" egghead that our marvelous gadgets come.

The contempt of "practical" men for curious men, or of "realists" for "just theoreticians," rests on nothing more than ignorance. The one thing that curiosity can never be, is idle.

Now, the freeman, the curious man, will always disturb his society, because he will always confront freshly what is conventional. He will always dare to reexamine what seems to others to be "obvious." The writer and the thinker are engaged in a lifelong struggle to free themselves from the prisons of the familiar.

Isn't it an astonishing fact that it wasn't until the 15th century that men invented perspective in painting, and tried to get others to look into, and not just at, a picture? Isn't it astonishing that it wasn't until the late 19th century that painters had the courage to do what every child has done (and had beaten out of them by fond teachers and parents)—put colors into shadows. Isn't it astonishing that it wasn't until Cezanne that men dared to try to reverse the illusion of perspective, so that a picture could seem to come out toward us? Doesn't it seem to you extraordinary that it wasn't until the impressionists that men discovered that cool colors seem to recede and warm colors seem to move forward, and that color can be used to gain the illusion of depth?

Today it is impossible for you or me to look, to see, as we would have looked or seen before strange, curious, original, and revolutionary men taught us how to see differently from the way we did before. It's impossible to look at a building, or a bowl of fruit, without paying tribute to that new vision which was given to us by Monet, or Cezanne, or Picasso, or Braque.

HISTORICAL PRECEDENTS

And if this is true in the field of what seems so simple—the visible, the real, that which is right in front of our eyes—how much more true is it in the arena of ideas?

For how many thousands of years did men see the sun rise in the east and move across the heavens? They saw the sun move, just as we see the sun move. And they assumed that it is the sun that moves—until someone, some curious, dreaming, idle egghead, surely long before Copernicus, took an amazing, imaginative leap and asked, "Wait. What if I were on the sun? Would it not look as if it is the earth which is moving? And, if this is so, how do we know which, in fact, is moving? And how can we test it? How can we find out? How can we prove it?"

Throughout the history of the human race, men have been tortured and killed, despised and attacked, for asking just such questions, for daring to suggest that the prevailing folklore may be wrong. It is these men—the men who resist the crippling effects of conventional education—who confront the known as if it is new. It is these men who make the reality which we inherit, and who will change the reality which our children inherit.

THE FALLING APPLE

Consider Isaac Newton, who asked, not "Why does the apple fall?"—that was known—but, "How far out does gravity reach?" And, "Why do objects attract each other without some intermediary medium? What is mass? What is force? What is inertia?" "When you press a stone," said Newton, "the stone presses back."

Or Harvey, who asked so simple a question: "But where does the blood go? Where does it come from?"

Or Darwin, who asked, "But where do human beings come from?"

Or Lobachevski, who said, "Is a straight line always the shortest distance between two points? On a curve? On the globe?"

Or Rutherford, who had the astounding temerity to say, "Can it be that inside this tiny, tiny thing called the atom, is recapitulated the universe itself, with a sun and planets and lots of space?"

Or Einstein, who asked, "What do we mean by 'simultaneous'? How can two things occur at the same time, if we do not allow for the fact that we are on a moving object when we observe them?"

Or Sigmund Freud, who looked at children, who listened to people, and who said, "Mistakes are not accidental. Dreams are not absurd. Symbols have meaning. It is possible both to love and to hate. There is a world below the known and the conscious."

DARING TO QUESTION

Each of these men was doing what? He was daring to confront the prevailing model with skepticism. He was daring to question the mythologies by which we live.

Our life is dominated by myths, from which only the thinker, the writer, the philosopher, the scientist, the freeman can truly liberate us.

Here are some myths which we all believe, unless we make an effort to examine them:

There is the myth: "Facts speak for themselves." Now, this is perfectly idiotic. Facts don't speak at all; facts are meaningless until they are arranged, patterned, analyzed, interpreted. For years, out in the borough of Queens, they used to advertise: "Come to Queens and live longer." They proved that the death rate in Queens is substantially lower than it is in Manhattan. Now, the death rate is the same everywhere, if you wait long enough, 100 percent. It was true that, per 100,000 people, fewer seemed to die in Queens in any given year than in Manhattan. But this was so for a good reason: They didn't have very good hospitals in Queens—and when people got sick, they came to New York, where they died.

Do the facts speak for themselves?

There is the myth that you should always tell the truth. Now, I submit that life would be intolerable if people went around telling

each other the truth all of the time. You can't always tell the truth to a child, or to your wife, or to your parents. There are times when it is kind not to tell the truth.

THE LEFT AND THE RIGHT

There is the myth that the extreme left and the extreme right, politically, are violently and unalterably opposed to each other. But the far left and the far right have much more in common with each other than either does with the middle. We can understand political behavior better if we distribute opinions not on a straight line, but in a circle, so that the extreme right and left meet, as indeed they do—since both believe in suppressing ideas, in throttling freedom, in using violence, in making no distinction between ideas and heresies, between treason and dissent. Both say that some books and some men and some ideas are dangerous. Of course, they are; democracy is a dangerous way of living. But the suppression of ideas is worse. In the midst of terrible crises no less severe than ours, the men who founded this country adopted the Bill of Rights. They were not afraid of the free exercises of free minds. They knew that freedom isn't freedom if it is confined to that which is inoffensive; that there is no freedom when controversy has been abolished. This country was not founded by cowards.

There is the myth that security is the highest social good. Well, the most secure place in the world is a prison—but who wants to live there?

There is the myth I hesitate to utter—so outlandish is it—that men and women are equal. This is madness. The fight for equality under law has led to a conclusion which is biologically and psychologically insupportable. Men and women belong to different races, as different as Eskimos and Hottentots. It is impossible for any man truly to enter the universe of a woman, or for any woman truly to grasp and sense and empathize with the internal structure of the male.

Little Johnny sent a note to the girl next to him in school, a typical masculine note: "Dear Mary, I love you. Do you love me? (signed) Johnny." And he got back from Mary a lovely, feminine note: "Dear Johnny, I do not (underlined three times) love you. Love, Mary."

UNHAPPY CHILDHOOD

There is the myth that you can explain neurotic behavior by attributing it to an unhappy childhood. But all childhood is unhappy; all childhood is charged with uncertainty and fear, with conflict and frustration, with unbearable rage and unattainable desire. It makes little sense to talk about unhappy childhoods unless we ask why some people emerge from childhood with their productive capacities enriched, while others remain paralyzed by unresolved and infantile dilemmas.

There is the myth that it is wrong to spank a child. Well, for about thirty years, I think, we were tyrannized by this cliché. Now, I assume that civilized people don't say, "Dear, let's have some fun. Let's beat up the kids." The relevant question, surely, is this: If you are angry enough, for whatever reason, to want to strike a child, what do you do with that anger? I submit that if you do not spank the child, the alternatives you leave him are pretty horrible. For the child knows that the parent is angry; and what can the child think? "Oh, he's mad; he's real mad. If I were that mad, I'd hit; I'd kick; I'd bite; I'd chew; I'd knock him down; I'd cut him up. But he doesn't. Oh how much better he is than I. Will I ever be that good?" Or, "He's mad. He'd really like to slug me. Why doesn't he hit me? I know why he doesn't hit me. Because if he ever let go, he'd kill me—which is what I suspect he's been wanting to do all

along." Or, "When will he become human? What do I have to do to make him like other parents?" And so on. We can only celebrate the insight of a departed colleague, George Bernard Shaw, who once said, "Never strike a child in cold blood."

There is the myth that children should adjust to their group. Well, is the group worth adjusting to? Are there not some who are meant to be alone, who are meant not to be well-liked, who are meant not to be popular? If you want your children to be popular, I'll tell you how. Tell them to ask people for advice. Don't listen to the advice; don't take it; just ask—and everyone will love you and think you are wise and good.

ON HANDLING LEISURE

There is the myth that a 35-hour week is better than a 40-hour week, that more and more leisure is desirable. But I suspect we have not begun to learn how to handle the leisure we already have. The American weekend has become a prolonged exercise in the destruction of time: Frantic drinking, barbecuing, infidelity, reckless driving, all by people bamboozled into thinking that the American way of life means: Don't ruminate; don't think; fill up every free moment with strenuous relaxation.

There is the myth that every problem has a solution. But some problems will never be solved, and can only be reshaped and reformed. Do you want an example of a problem which can never be solved? It's illustrated by Groucho Marx, who once resigned from a country club with these words, "I don't want to belong to the kind of club which accepts people like me as members." This, in vulgar form, is a fair example of what Bertrand Russell calls the set paradox.

There is the myth that eloquence means wisdom, that the articulate are able. Some of the most articulate people I know wouldn't know how to operate a newsstand. And I would hate to have our country run by, say, painters, or musicians, or even by poets. Wisdom is often found in the dry and noneloquent analysis of reality.

And finally, there is that myth to which so many of us are beholden—that the purpose of life is to be happy. I know of nothing more demeaning to man than this narcotic pursuit of "fun." People no longer say, "Goodbye." They say, "Have fun!" Now, where was it written that life can ever be easy, or free of conflict or pain? Those who want the refuge of happiness can find it in tranquilizing pills, or in senility.

There was a time when men were permitted the dignity of depression, when we were permitted moods, and preoccupation, and uncertainty. But under the vulgarized diffusion of psychiatric "insights," we are all made to think that, not only must we be happy, but we must never feel depressed. Even worse—you must feel guilty about feeling depressed.

MOODS AND SYMPTOMS

We are no longer allowed to have a mood without having it interpreted as a "symptom." We are no longer permitted to be ill without raising grave suspicions that we are, in fact, "sick" (as in "sick-sick-sick"). We can no longer say that someone needs help without meeting superior and knowing smiles: "Help" doesn't mean aid, any more; it means "cure."

The purpose of life is not to be happy—but to matter, to be productive, to be useful, to have it make some difference that you lived at all.

I end this happy occasion with a little creed, a creed to which, in my judgment, all freemen must forever hold fast. We must forever oppose hysteria and error, even when error is wrapped in patriotism, even when error is embraced by those we like. We must learn that those we like are not always right, and those we don't like are not always

wrong; for an idea has nothing to do with who is for it or who is against it.

WE MUST LEARN

We must learn to seek change without violence. Always change, and never violence—not even in words, much less in deeds.

We must try to understand each other by reconciling ourselves to the fact that most of us never really mature; we simply grow taller.

We must meet fanaticism with courage, and idealism with caution.

We must be skeptical of that which is promised, but not proved.

We must be strong enough to be gentle.

We must know that life will always have unbearable stretches of loneliness, and that we can never truly be understood—even by those who love us; that we cannot completely understand someone else, no matter how much we want to. We must moderate, therefore, our demands on others.

We must have the courage to live without absolutes, without dogmas, the courage to seek imaginative escapes from the strait-jackets of conformity, knowing—with Emerson "Whosoever would be a man, must be a nonconformist."

We must learn to meet life in a series of tentative and impermanent approximations, knowing that the final goals may never be reached, that the last truths may be forever unknowable, but that life holds nothing more precious than the process by which, to the fullest stretches of which man is capable, we stretch the mind and the heart.

THE DEFICIENCIES OF THE MERCHANT SHIP CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, in this day and age, we frequently face great difficulty in placing first things first. I sympathize with those in high places who have the responsibility of assigning priorities, in order of rank, to our national objectives. By and large, I find little with which to quibble. But, in our intense preoccupation with matching or besting the Russians on a wide score of long-range fronts, we may be unwittingly overlooking an area in which our avowed enemy could soon surpass us, to our detriment from both a short-range and long-range standpoint. I refer to the lifeline of our commerce by sea—our privately owned merchant marine.

This is, of course, sound reason for the Russians' latter-day interest in a maritime capability. It is an instrument of economic as well as psychological warfare—to say nothing of its advantage as a defense auxiliary. Starting from scratch in the post-World War II period, the U.S.S.R. has built a merchant marine which threatens to overshadow all other maritime powers throughout the world. From all accounts, even as the Kremlin devotes all-out efforts to putting a man on the moon ahead of the United States, its race for commercial seapower supremacy continues to be pressed vigorously.

Shipyards behind the Iron Curtain are busy, and orders for the construction of additional freighters to carry the hammer and sickle to all areas of the globe have been placed with shipyards in some free nations.

By contrast, the United States seems to struggle annually with its conscience where a merchant marine is concerned. And, regrettably, the maritime industry

seems always to be the first target of re-entrenchment efforts when budget crises arise. Disregarded at such times are the views of various Presidents of the United States who, particularly in this century, have emphatically declared the merchant marine to be absolutely essential to the best interests of our country.

Bearing out such official views is the incontestable fact that the 5,000 cargo vessels built at such huge costs under wartime pressures were a major factor in the allied victory in World War II. Winston Churchill and U.S. military leaders in that war are agreed on that. However, such wartime building programs create peacetime problems of vessel obsolescence which twice have burdened our economy and impaired our competitive capacity vis a vis the maritime fleets of the world.

It was to avert this threat of mass obsolescence, and to assure maintenance of our merchant marine at top efficiency that the current phased program of vessel replacement was developed by the Maritime Administration in 1958. Unfortunately, in the 5 years of the program, the minimum annual goal of 25 new vessels was achieved only once, in fiscal 1961. The current year program was allowed to bog down to the point where only seven new vessels were to be contracted for, but there was such a howl of protest, countrywide, that six vessels for the Moore McCormack line, scheduled to be placed under contract in early July, were advanced to June in the scheduling. Thus fiscal year 1962 will see only 13 vessels placed under contract, a far cry from the 30 vessel minimum, later scaled down to 25, which had been deemed essential annually if the replacement goal were to be achieved.

What of fiscal 1963? Well, more than \$90 million of funds authorized for spending in fiscal 1962 were carried over to fiscal 1963, and supplemented by \$50 million of new funds, to provide for building 18 new vessels. Thus the 2-year total of 31 vessels placed under contract, would be just one vessel above the original contemplated annual number, 30.

In effect, the Budget once again has failed to provide the funds necessary to attain the national maritime policy so often proclaimed in statutes, of "a merchant marine sufficient to carry * * * a substantial portion of the waterborne export and import foreign commerce * * * capable of serving as a naval and military auxiliary in time of war * * * and composed of the best-equipped, safest, and most suitable types of vessels." At a rate of 31 vessels in 2 years, it would require 12 years to replace the remainder of the present subsidized fleet. Final contracts would be placed in fiscal 1975, for delivery in fiscal 1977. This would require retention in service of vessels as much as 30 to 33 years—which assuredly would not represent the "best-equipped, safest and most suitable types of vessels" envisioned in the national policy enunciated in the 1920, 1936, 1946, and other statutes.

This replacement program sequence bears eloquent testimony to the back-of-the-hand treatment usually applied by the Administration to the merchant ma-

rine. The program was developed by the Maritime Administration, the agency established by Congress to carry out the national policy for an "adequate * * * modern * * * safe" commercial fleet. At that time, and for many years before, the normal life of a commercial passenger liner or dry cargo vessel was accepted universally as 20 years. Beyond that, lack of modern features, increasing repairs, and so forth, were felt to make vessels over 20 years of age uneconomic.

Then budget difficulties arose—and suddenly, under the previous administration, the theory was advanced, and finally enacted into law, to set the normal vessel life at 25 years. Now under this administration, it develops that replacement of vessels on a 25- to 30-year basis becomes entirely feasible. Thus vessel life is lengthened from 20 to a possible 30-year span—and minimum annual replacement goals are lowered from 30 to 25, to 13 in fiscal 1961, and 18 for fiscal 1963. Concurrently, budget appropriations for Government's participation in the program go down, down, down.

At the same time the Nation is told by Government's mobilization planners that our merchant shipping fleet is inferior in many respects.

At this point, in my remarks, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an appraisal of "Ocean Shipping To Support the Defense of the United States," prepared just about 1 year ago by Vice Adm. John Sylvester, Deputy Chief of Naval Operations—Logistics.

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

OCEAN SHIPPING TO SUPPORT THE DEFENSE OF THE UNITED STATES

INTRODUCTION

The United States must be prepared today—and throughout the foreseeable future—to deal immediately and effectively with any emergency that may be forced upon us. We must be ready at all times to fight limited wars, or general war, or to support our foreign policies under tense conditions short of actual conflict.

The prosecution of war might employ the full range of our Nation's resources. Our entire industrial capability is available to be integrated into our overall national defense effort. To support sustained combat operations and to project our military power overseas, our Armed Forces would rely heavily upon American industry. Our maritime industry would play a central role, supplying the raw materials to feed domestic industries and carrying the bulk of our troops and their equipment and supplies to overseas areas.

The strategic importance of ocean transportation in wartime dictates that the United States must have under its control sufficient active merchant-type shipping to promptly meet our initial emergency sealift requirements.

Our present capability to handle this task is marginal at best. The slow rate of progress made in the replacement of aging vessels has left us facing the 1960's with a largely obsolescent merchant marine. Orderly shipbuilding programs and replacement programs should be instituted without further delay.

It is often proposed that we rely on our friends among the European maritime nations to provide our emergency shipping needs. We should keep in mind that the in-

terests of the United States are global, and emergencies may well arise wherein our interests would not be identical with those of our European allies. Even within the NATO framework it appears probable that the combined requirements of the NATO nations will exceed the total capabilities of the NATO shipping pool.

BACKGROUND

At the outbreak of World War I, shipping available for charter to American interests suddenly became extremely scarce. Charter rates skyrocketed. We were forced to hastily improvise a shipbuilding program which was both costly and inefficient, and peak production was not reached until after the war ended. We learned in World War I that the law of supply and demand is real. We were subjected to the same lesson again in World War II.

The primary mission of the American merchant marine is the task of transporting our domestic waterborne commerce and a substantial portion of our foreign export and import ocean trade. Our industrial economy is now dependent on sea transportation for the importation of vast amounts of petroleum, metal ores and other raw materials, and for the exportation of finished products. No other type of transportation can meet these tremendous requirements. It is imperative that the world's foremost trader control sufficient merchant shipping to transport what we need, when and where we need it. This is true from the standpoint of our emergency requirements, and it is also valid when we consider the outflow of dollars in payment for foreign-controlled shipping services.

A collateral and extremely important mission of the American merchant marine is the maintenance of a posture of strength and readiness that will contribute to our national security. In the event of either limited or general war we would require the services of a large number of merchant-type ships to meet our military, industrial, and civilian demands.

It is important that the ability to meet our anticipated wartime needs be insured to the maximum practicable degree in peacetime by the ready availability of active, privately owned merchant ships employed in gainful ocean commerce. Only actively employed merchant ships can provide the rapid response required. Further it is only the active merchant marine that will provide in peacetime the employment for skilled American seafarers in sufficient numbers to allow effective wartime personnel expansion of our maritime effort. The magnitude and quality of active U.S. commercial tonnage in peacetime will determine, in the event of a future war, whether or not we will be required to initiate crash programs for shipbuilding and personnel procurement. Even so, we cannot presume that time will be available.

REQUIREMENTS AND AVAILABILITIES

Periodic evaluations of merchant shipping requirements and availabilities are made jointly by the Department of Defense, the Department of Commerce, and the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization. Similar joint appraisals are made by the Maritime Administration and the Navy Department.

These evaluations of shipping availabilities have consistently shown that the United States does not have sufficient active merchant shipping to meet our initial needs for general war, even when we combine the total of U.S.-flag and U.S.-controlled foreign-flag shipping. Consequently, our estimated total capabilities must include planned early activations from the National Defense Reserve Fleet—under optimum assumed conditions which make no allowances for possible damage to shore facilities. Some allowance is made for cumulative losses of shipping from enemy action.

It is expected that a new joint Navy-MARAD review of merchant shipping requirements, and availabilities will be completed this summer. The last such joint review was conducted in May 1959 and updated in mid-1960.

Our sea transportation resources for limited war are currently under review and reappraisal by the Department of Defense for determination of the present capability of sealfit to support military requirements under varying limited war conditions. Pending this reappraisal, these resources are considered as quantitatively adequate in the tanker category. Qualitatively, particularly in terms of cargo ship speed and characteristics, much improvement is highly desirable.

The degree of promptness with which sealfit responds in an emergency will have an important impact on the eventual outcome. A limited war crisis could well become a race against time to evacuate nationals, to re-deploy troops, and equipment, or to augment and resupply existing forces overseas. To be prepared for such situations, we must rely on the ready availability of active modern merchant ships of all types.

PRESENT CAPABILITIES

Existing inventories of sealfit resources under U.S. flag, as of January 1, 1961, are summarized below:

	Number	Deadweight tonnage
a. Dry cargo ships:		
Operational.....	703	7,586,900
Reserve fleet.....	1,387	14,146,300
Total.....	2,090	21,733,200
b. Tankers:		
Operational.....	373	7,121,500
Reserve fleet.....	86	1,083,700
Total.....	459	8,205,200
c. Passenger ships-transport:		
Operational.....	47	171,301
Reserve fleet.....	107	259,233
Total.....	154	330,534

¹ Includes about a thousand Liberty ships of little or no wartime value, recommended for scrapping.

² Passengers (emergency capacity).

Additional sealfit resources consisting of certain active vessels under the so-called flags of convenience as of January 1, 1961, are as follows:

	Number	Deadweight tonnage
a. Cargo ships:		
General cargo and reefer.....	97	941,500
Bulk cargo.....	71	1,728,600
Total.....	168	2,670,100
b. Tankers.....	282	8,360,600
c. Passenger transports.....	5	17,900

¹ Passenger emergency capacity.

The active U.S. flag sealfit capability is comprised of active merchant ships under U.S. flag and merchant-type ships operated by the Military Sea Transportation Service (MSTS).

The additional sealfit resources listed consist of certain foreign-registered merchant ships considered as under "Effective U.S. Control" for emergency use. The term "Effective U.S. Control" applies to selected American-owned ships which have been registered by their owners under the so-called "flags of convenience" (Panama, Liberia and Honduras), in order to reduce operating costs. In such cases, the Maritime Administration has negotiated agreements with the parent shipping companies in the United States to make these ships (which in the main are large tankers and bulk ore carriers) available to the U.S. Government in the

event of a national emergency. The Department of Defense and the Maritime Administration consider that such ships can be reasonably expected to be available and are therefore under "Effective U.S. Control."

The vast proportion of our U.S. flag merchant tonnage was constructed under the World War II building programs: 79 percent of our dry cargo and 54 percent of our tanker tonnage are in the 15- to 19-year-old age bracket. Nearly all of these ships were mass produced for specific wartime purposes. Many of their design features were matters of expediency rather than choice. They have long been outmoded from the standpoint of modern design.

The capabilities shown as comprising the national defense reserve fleet may be misleading. It should be pointed out that about 1,000 of the dry cargo ships are slow-speed Liberty types of extremely limited usefulness. Over 300 Liberties have already been sold for scrapping under approvals to select and scrap 780 of the poorest quality ships. Their marginal value did not warrant the cost of further preservation efforts. Of the 107 transport/passenger ships, 51 are 17 knot C-4 austerity transports and 23 are 15.5 knot Victory troopships.

We can look forward to further depreciation of the overall potential of the reserve fleet—from the standpoints of both quantity and quality. Consequently, there is an obvious need that the reserve fleet be upgraded by the trade-in of aging ships under orderly replacement programs. This requirement goes hand-in-hand with the need to modernize our active merchant fleet.

DRY CARGO SHIPS

Only 1.7 percent of the U.S.-flag tonnage of dry cargo ships are under 5 years of age. Only 5.9 percent are from 5 to 9 years old. This latter age group includes the Mariner class ships, that were built by the U.S. Government, plus a few modern container ship conversions. The 20-knot C-4 Mariners, which can do 23 knots if required, represent an impressive step forward in cargo ship design. Their performance has been highly praised by several private operators, to whom 29 of the ships were sold. Three of these ships have been converted into passenger ships. The defense sealfit value of the Mariner class ships is very high.

With regard to future construction of dry cargo ships, the Department of Defense recommends that the design characteristics listed below be incorporated to the maximum degree that is commercially practicable:

(a) Speed: When built under construction-differential subsidy contracts and certified as being suitable for economical and speedy conversion into naval auxiliaries, dry cargo ships should have a sustained sea speed of 20 knots or better. Dry cargo ships certified as otherwise suitable for the use of the U.S. Government in time of war on national emergency, should have the maximum sustained sea speed possible consistent with the commercial utilization of the ship. Where construction subsidies and/or national defense allowance are not involved, the owners are encouraged to build into the ships, the highest commercially economical speeds.

(b) Other characteristics: The most practical and useful types of general-cargo vessels, from a military point of view, appear to be those having the capacity and characteristics of the C-3's and C-4's (particularly Mariners), of Maritime Administration design. However, much is to be desired in the matter of modernization with respect to cargo handling equipment and methods. Cargo vessels should be designed and equipped to load and discharge, using their own gear, in one-half the time now required by the existing C-3's and C-4's. At least one hatch of each vessel should be served by a "jumbo" boom of 60 tons capacity and all hatches should be equipped with 10-ton

booms. There is a definite need for a limited number of heavy lift ships equipped with oversized hatches and cargo booms capable of lifting up to 150 tons.

(c) Special type cargo ships: Roll-on/roll-off ships on the order of the USNS *Comet* as well as ships with partial roll-on/roll-off capability offer advantages in meeting requirements for the oversea movement of mobile military equipment such as wheeled and tracked vehicles. Additionally, we encourage the continued development of "container cargo" ships, which are designed to carry containerized and palletized cargoes. Further construction of such ships in peacetime would increase active capability and afford operating experience. U.S. shipyards would also gain construction experience which would enable them to commence early production under an emergency situation.

TANKERS

American shipowners have built a good number of modern tankers in the past few years—some constructed in the United States for registry under U.S.-flag but most built abroad for registry under foreign flag. Of the U.S.-flag tanker tonnage, 26.5 percent is under 5 years old. These new ships range in speed from 16 to 18 knots. Consequently, the overall quality of our total tanker capability is much better than the dry cargo category.

The tanker building program should continue in order to provide orderly replacement of aging ships. It is recommended that future tanker construction incorporate design features as indicated below:

(a) Speed: Where national defense allowances are made, and the ships are certified as suitable for speedy and economical conversion into naval auxiliaries, tankers should be capable of a sustained speed of 20 knots or more.

(b) Other characteristics: Although tankers of larger DWT capacity can be utilized to a limited extent, the recommended general characteristics of commercial tankers most suitable for military purposes are 25,000 to 32,000 DWT, capable of carrying several types of petroleum products. At the same time, there is still a requirement for smaller tankers of about 17,000 DWT to handle products to and from limited terminal facilities. All new commercial tankers should have the ability for transfer of their cargo at sea to provide a limited fueling-at-sea capability. Further, this capability should be added to existing tankers when it is feasible to do so. The expense of the necessary modifications and equipment are relatively small, in the magnitude of \$17,000 per ship. Tankers so equipped will be capable of replenishing fleet oilers at sea or in unimproved harbors. Under emergency conditions, such tankers could provide fuel directly to combatant fleet units.

PASSENGER SHIPS/TRANSPORTS

Seven new passenger ships have been built since World War II and three have been converted from Mariner class cargo ships. The seven new ships are the 25-knot *Constitution* and *Independence*, the 33-knot *United States*, the 20-knot *Santa Paula* and *Santa Rosa*, and the 21-knot *Brasil* and *Argentina*. The Mariner conversions are the 20-knot *Mariposa*, *Monterey*, and *Atlantic*. These ships have contributed significantly to our maritime prestige and to our defense readiness.

Additionally, the 19-knot *President Cleveland* and *President Wilson* were converted from troopships. These ships, however, are basically World War II types. They form a part of the older, and major segment of our total trooplift capability, which is not fully suitable for possible future emergencies. The majority of our ships are old, deficient in speed, and lacking in other features that are important in minimizing the hazards of moving troops by sea.

There is an urgent need to improve the quality of our trooplift potential, and in this regard the construction of the two authorized but unfunded superliners should be expedited. For ships that will be employed in wartime to transport personnel through areas in which hostile modern submarines may be operating, it is necessary to set much higher standards of performance and safety than would be required for ships carrying dry cargo and fuel.

(a) Speed: Speed is the best defense that merchant ships can employ against an enemy. The faster the target, the more difficult it is to hit with submarine torpedoes—or to pin-point with aircraft-launched missiles. Fast ships can be operated independently over more devious routes than is possible in convoy operations. This complicates the search and attack problems of enemy aircraft and submarines. Studies and analysis confirm that vulnerability to submarine attack is significantly and progressively reduced as speeds of 20 to 25 knots and greater are attained.

Troopships constructed in the future, and passenger ships suitable for conversion into troopships, should be capable of a sustained speed of 25 knots or greater. In no case should their maximum sustained speed be less than 20 knots.

The Department of Defense has consistently and repeatedly urged that all new merchant-type shipbuilding incorporate the maximum speed that is economically practicable. In this regard, it is important that our merchant ships be commercially successful. To be of immediate use to the Department of Defense in an emergency, they must be operating commercially at the time they are first needed.

(b) Other features: Emphasis on added speed should not obscure the significance of other national defense features which can be built into a merchant ship. High standards of compartmentation reduce vulnerability to enemy hazards by localizing damage. Various preventative measures increase a ship's resistance to the spread of fire. Special mountings minimize breakdowns of essential machinery under shock.

Endurance adequate for round-trip voyages at maximum sustained speed is a vital factor in wartime. Additional fuel capacity, the size of distilling plants, the storage space for provisions, and many other design aspects have an important bearing on endurance. Many of the foregoing factors, aside from improving the wartime utility of a ship, also assure safer, more versatile and reliable performance in peacetime commercial operations.

FUTURE OUTLOOK

The subsidized segment of the U.S.-flag merchant fleet amounts to 313 berth line ships. They operate over essential trade routes under mandatory voyage scheduling procedures dictated by the Maritime Administration. Several unsubsidized shipping companies have applications pending for Governmental subsidy.

The rate of replacement of subsidized ships is much slower than that considered necessary to avoid future obsolescence "in block." The replacement program for fiscal 1962 has been set at 14 ships; proper replacement even on a 25-year life basis, will require 25 to 30 ships per year.

The 85th Congress authorized, but did not appropriate funds for, the construction of two large high-speed passenger ships—one of 33 knots and one of 30 knots speed. Construction of these two ships would significantly improve our trooplift potential. They would almost double our active capability in the important speed range of 25 knots and above.

The rate of progress of the building programs will depend on actions taken in the future with respect to construction-differ-

ential subsidies. It is hoped that it will be practicable for future governmental subsidy funding to keep pace with the contractual schedules for replacement.

Our unsubsidized shipping companies operate approximately 600 ships under U.S. flag. Few unsubsidized operators, if any, have either a comprehensive or a long-range plan for the replacement of aging ships on an orderly time schedule.

Over the past year, increasing pressure has been exerted against "flags of convenience" by maritime labor organizations through the courts and the labor relations boards. This pressure is making it less and less practicable for American owners to operate their ships under "flags of convenience." This raises the question as to what steps should be taken to insure the continued availability of these ships for purposes of national defense. It is important to note that well over half of the tanker tonnage available to United States control is registered under the flags of Liberia and Panama.

Prior to the outbreak of World War II, the part of our shipping that was engaged in the coastal and intercoastal trade was the largest segment of the U.S. merchant marine. At that time nearly 700 ships took part in the carriage of our deepwater domestic trade. Shortly after our entry into the war, practically the entire coastal and intercoastal merchant fleet, which at that time represented about 60 percent of our total ocean-carrying capability, was put into service, usually transoceanic, directly supporting the war.

With the domestic deep-water fleet engaged, worldwide, in supplying the Allied Armed Forces, the domestic trade which they formerly carried was absorbed by other modes of transportation. The domestic deepwater common carriers have never regained their former status. Only 3 companies with a total of 15 ships are currently furnishing common carrier service. One of these, the Luckenbach Steamship Co., has announced its intention to terminate its intercoastal service, which will leave only 10 ships in this trade.

Ships engaged in coastal and intercoastal trade occupy a particularly significant position relative to the emergency use of transportation. Ships in the coastwise trades are the most readily available for emergency usage of any ships in the U.S. merchant fleet. In their normal operations they are always close to U.S. ports, ready immediately to handle such high-priority movements as may be necessary. Of course, to be available for immediate use, these ships must be active and operating commercially at the time they are first needed.

At the onset of a major, nuclear war, the domestic deepwater fleet would be uniquely fitted to act as a link between our coastal cities during the period of likely disruption of systems of land transportation. A large percentage of the ships in domestic trade would be at sea at any given time and would therefore be most likely to escape damage. Their ability to provide communications and transportation between coastal cities during the period just after an attack could be highly important. Systems of land transportation in the United States are especially vulnerable at many focal points. The ability of the domestic deepwater fleet to provide essential coastal and intercoastal movements of priority material might well be crucial. A number of the ships of this fleet are especially adapted for rapid cargo handling, giving them an increased value at such a critical time.

EMERGENCY EXPANSION

One basic factor to be considered in the development of specific construction programs is the necessity for the maintenance of a sufficient number of private shipyards in operation to form the base for expansion in time of war to meet large ship construc-

tion and ship repair programs. The Department of Defense has emphasized that the existence of these active privately owned shipyards, together with the skills of the shipyard workers and the capabilities of the tools, equipment and facilities, is essential to the national defense.

SUMMARY

Under the most optimistic assumptions, and on a quantitative basis only, the United States still possesses a marginal capability to carry out the sea transportation tasks of a general war.

There are serious qualitative deficiencies in our overall seafit capability, particularly in the dry-cargo ship and the transport-passenger ship categories. The further aging of outmoded ships will aggravate this situation.

The present rate of new shipbuilding will not offset the rapidly approaching block obsolescence of the vast proportion of U.S.-controlled merchant-type tonnage—both active and reserve. There is an urgent need for increased emphasis on orderly ship construction.

The continued depreciation of ships in the National Defense Reserve Fleet without cyclic purification will soon generate serious quantitative deficiencies in our total seafit capability.

Crash building programs in wartime can only be avoided by maintaining a modern and adequate maritime posture in peacetime.

CONCLUSION

In order for the United States to maintain adequate merchant shipping to meet our initial wartime needs, it is important that the ships of both subsidized and non-subsidized operators be periodically replaced under orderly and progressive programs. In so doing, every advantage should be taken of recent and future technological developments. Cargo-handling equipment and propulsion plants should be further improved—with a view to reducing the transit and turnaround times of commercial shipping.

Our shipbuilding programs should be far-sighted in order that ships contracted for in coming years will be actually competitive throughout their economic lifespan. Ships built with foresight will be more readily adaptable to speedy and economical conversion into naval auxiliaries, or otherwise suitable for naval use in the event of war.

THE WHITE HOUSE,

Washington, December 4, 1961.

DEAR MR. HOOD: The President has asked me to acknowledge your letter of November 28. The importance of seapower to the vitality and strength of the Nation is so well acknowledged it needs no demonstration. We cannot permit this element in our strength to deteriorate.

The state of the Union message is not yet being drafted, but we appreciate having your suggestion for consideration.

Sincerely,

MYER FELDMAN,

Deputy Special Counsel to the President.

SHIPBUILDERS COUNCIL OF AMERICA,

Washington, D.C., November 28, 1961.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: History records that no leading world power has long retained its position without seapower—the sum total of ships, weapons, shipyard capacity, and geography which enable a nation to use the sea advantageously during war and peace. It records that a world power cannot long survive without the means to support its own commerce and trade. It is a historical fact that as a nation's total seapower deteriorates, so does its foreign trade—and so does it as a world power. The sun has set on many nations who permitted—perhaps unwittingly—their foreign trade and shipyards to vanish as a result of national apathy in the face of international competition.

But, the Soviet Communist empire is apparently not unaware of these basic historical facts, and according to late dispatches, is making positive efforts to increase its foreign trade and to correct its seapower deficiencies. It is becoming more and more obvious that they intend to solidify their place as a world power by becoming strong in foreign trade and on the seas.

In view of the extraordinary challenges now faced by the United States, we have noted, with increasing concern, reports indicating that the Federal Government is considering abandonment, either temporarily or permanently, of the time proven procedures—subsidies if you will—which make it possible for the United States to have in-being those indispensable components of seapower—an adequate merchant marine and a supporting shipbuilding and ship repair industry. We find these reports incredible, and feel they cannot be safely ignored.

Your convictions as to the role of the United States in promoting the cause of freedom for all mankind have been ably, forcefully, and widely voiced. Yet, the United States—the cornerstone of the free world—is permitting elements of its seapower to be deficient from both a qualitative and quantitative standpoint. That is exactly what is happening in terms of our merchant marine, and we cannot believe you will sanction a further dilution of the Nation's seapower.

Without a subsidy equalization for maritime purposes, ships carrying the U.S. flag cannot compete with lower cost foreign competition; and without this assistance, the U.S. merchant marine will be unable to continue as a customer of U.S. shipbuilding and ship repair yards. While a ship is generally built at the water's edge, countless hours of employment for American working men and women go into the production of materials, components, and services which flow from practically every area in the Nation to the shipyard. In terms of shipyard employment versus employment in supporting activities, an equivalent number of man-hours of work, and frequently more, are performed in areas remote from the coast.

We hope that as part of the discussion of foreign trade in your forthcoming state of the Union message to the Congress, now undoubtedly in preparation, you will include appropriate remarks on the essentiality of an adequate U.S. merchant marine and a sound shipbuilding and ship repair industry in its support. By so doing, you can effectively allay fears that this country will scuttle its merchant marine, and you can energize the passage and approval of suitable legislation and appropriations to insure that this country has an adequate maritime capability to meet any and all uncertainties in the future.

The Shipbuilders Council of America is composed of shipbuilders, ship repairers, and allied suppliers from all sections of the United States, and we fervently hope you will personally give attention to the vital importance of merchant ships and shipyards in-being in these critical times.

Respectfully yours,

EDWIN M. HOOD,

President.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, I call my colleagues' attention to this discouraging account of our maritime capability. In summary, it is poor. I find no evidence that the deficiencies mentioned have been corrected or improved in the last 12 months.

One conclusion in this report is deserving of particular emphasis. It reads as follows:

The present rate of new shipbuilding will not offset the rapidly approaching block obsolescence of the vast proportion of U.S.-controlled merchant-type tonnage—both active and reserve. There is an urgent need

for increased emphasis on orderly ship construction.

My colleagues will note the reference in the passage I have just read to "orderly ship construction." Here again, though a vessel replacement program under Federal auspices has been underway, I find no evidence that it has been conducted in an orderly fashion. In the first year 15 ships were built, 14 the next, 13 the next, and 31 the next; 13 are scheduled to be placed this year, with the expectation that contracts for 18 vessels will be awarded in fiscal year 1963. This is hardly a healthy diet for the Nation's shipyards—nor could it be called an orderly program by which the shipyards can do any reasonable degree of forward planning which is so essential to the retention of essential skills and which is so essential for the continued employment of American working men and women.

Across my desk recently passed copies of correspondence on this subject from a shipbuilding labor executive to the Secretary of Labor, and I request unanimous consent that these letters be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

PACIFIC COAST METAL TRADES
DISTRICT COUNCIL,

San Francisco, Calif., January 4, 1962.

Subject: Federal Maritime Commission budget proposals for shipbuilding funds.
Hon. ARTHUR J. GOLDBERG,
Secretary of Labor, U.S. Department of Labor,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. GOLDBERG: On behalf of the 10,000 families who make their living in shipbuilding and ship repair on the Pacific coast of the United States, I ask leave to bring to your personal attention a combination of circumstances and apparent Government policies which are a threat to jobs for these 10,000 American families and which, in the opinion of many, constitute a threat to our national security.

This commences with a threefold report first circulating about 5 weeks ago, to the effect that:

1. Department of Commerce is considering freezing all shipbuilding funds for the balance of fiscal 1962, which would affect contracts for several ships scheduled to be bid during this period.

2. A high-placed administration official has recommended a 3-year moratorium on any further ship construction in the Federal Maritime Commission's fleet replacement program, which is designed to build 30 ships per year to 1972.

3. An outside study, prepared for and submitted to the Federal Maritime Commission, points out the opportunities for savings in Federal appropriations by having American merchant vessels built abroad in foreign shipyards—with foreign labor.

Since this report first circulated, repeated inquiries have been made of the Department of Commerce, all of which have elicited the same reply—

1. That Department of Commerce has not issued and does not plan to issue orders discontinuing use of shipbuilding funds,

2. That Commerce cannot estimate the number of shipbuilding contracts that will be let next year,

3. That Commerce plans are proceeding on the "assumption that a goodly number of American ships will be built in American shipyards during the next few years with the aid of construction subsidies."

No comments have been made concerning the reported 3-year moratorium or the citation of savings that could be made if we built our ships in foreign yards with foreign labor.

As the chief operating official of the Pacific Coast Metal Trades Council, I have made an earnest effort to determine just what the facts are. I respectfully submit to your office that the following is an accurate description of the situation facing our union members today:

1. The Congress and the executive branch of our Government in 1957 embarked on a long-range fleet replacement program, aimed at building 30 ships per year to replace our World War II built ships, now obsolete.

2. In reliance on this program, thousands of families, hundreds of small businesses, and numerous large shipbuilding yards, made heavy financial commitments, which for the families as well as the companies cannot be amortized unless this program goes forward to completion or substantially to completion.

3. Now, however, these same families and business organizations are faced with a full 6-month period—from January 1 to about June 30, 1962, during which only one ship will be contracted for.

4. This gap in the shipbuilding program, while now in terms of contract signing, will in the months ahead turn out to be a period of unemployment in the shipbuilding trades in the United States, and a serious gap in the replacement program, which Defense Department officials have repeatedly stated is so important to our national security. Shipbuilding cannot operate on a stop-start basis and be efficient.

5. We are informed on what we believe to be reliable authority that this threat to jobs and national security has resulted from:

(a) A willingness on the part of some steamship operators to postpone—or "stretch out"—the performance of their contracts with the Maritime Commission to replace their World War II ships with new vessels built in American yards.

(b) An equal willingness for, and even implied urging by certain Commerce Department officials, of a slowdown in the program, instead of some effort to adhere to the 30 ships per year objective.

Most alarming of all, we are reliably informed—and Commerce officials have broadly hinted—that in the budget proposals now being discussed with the White House, no funds whatsoever will be requested for shipbuilding for fiscal 1963. This reportedly is on the ground that the 6-month gap outlined above has left some \$120 million over in this year's appropriations which can be used in 1963. Obviously if this occurs, no extra funds would be available in 1963 to make up for a half year of no contracts in 1962.

We are not military people, and we know that military decisions are not the province of our Department of Labor. However, we cannot help but be astonished when our Nation embarks upon a long-range fleet replacement program with the full endorsement of the Defense Department and after a few halting years of operation, we find the program scuttled by some mysterious indifference or desire to smother it—all of this at a time when the Congress and the administration are calling for full speed ahead in every other area of defense.

We have no desire to suggest the involvement of your Department in matters not in the realm of labor's interest. And should inquiries by you result in a determination that your Department has no legitimate interest in this matter, we should not expect your Department to pursue it further. In view, however, of the extraordinary circumstances surrounding this important defense program, and its impact on American jobs—plus the overtones of building foreign with foreign labor, we respectfully request that

you make such inquiries as you deem appropriate and furnish us with what information you feel can properly be passed along to our members.

Yours very truly,

THOMAS A. ROTELL,
Secretary-Treasurer, Pacific Coast
Metal Trades Council.

JANUARY 10, 1962.

HON. ARTHUR J. GOLDBERG,
Secretary of Labor,
U.S. Department of Labor,
Washington, D.C.:

This supplements Rotell letter January 4 to you relating FMC shipbuilding funds.

Line	Ships	Bid opening		Contract date	
		Old	New	Old	New
United States.....	7	Mar. 30	May 15	June 25	Aug. 10
Lykes.....	7	Apr. 3	July 26	June 26	Oct. 18
Grace.....	4	Mar. 4	July 2	May 21	Sept. 18

This is so startling a coincidence it obviously raises inference these revised dates were deliberately contrived to push a total of 18 ships over the June 30, 1962, line into fiscal 1963, thus enabling Commerce Department to forego requesting any shipbuilding funds in budget reportedly to go to Congress January 18. On page 3 our letter January 4 we reported being reliably informed, and reported broad hints by Commerce Department officials, that no shipbuilding funds would be sought for 1963.

In view above circumstances we respectfully request you obtain if possible answers to following questions:

1. Who initiated these delays resulting in a famine for second half fiscal year 1962?
2. By what authority were these delays contrived?
3. Did Defense Department approve these delays?
4. What action can be taken to reinstate original bidding and contracting dates?
5. If impossible reinstate original bid dates can new dates nonetheless be revised again and thus these 18 ships be reinstated as part of 1962 fiscal year?

We believe it essential these 18 ships be reinstated in fiscal 1962. If not, will be only 7 ships awarded this year as against 31 the year before. We completely in accord governmental economy, but as long as Defense Department endorses strong merchant marine, and as long as untold billions are appropriated for missiles, rockets and highly controversial moon shots, we will insist on continuation of at least this threadbare shipbuilding program of 30 ships per year.

Respectfully submitted.

PACIFIC COAST METAL TRADES DISTRICT
COUNCIL,

GORDON PUCKETT,
President.

SEATTLE, WASH.
THOMAS A. ROTELL,
Executive Secretary-Treasurer.

SAN FRANCISCO.
HENRY MCCARTHY,
Vice President.

PORTLAND, OREG.
M. E. McLAREN,
Vice President.

SEATTLE, WASH.
JOSEPH ZIFF,
Vice President.

SAN FRANCISCO.
A. J. TIMMONS,
Vice President.

HUNTINGTON PARK, CALIF.
JOHN STARKE,
Vice President.

TACOMA, WASH.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, the vessel replacement program has several very

Since that letter the undersigned have had brought to their attention publication entitled "Weekly Outlook Letter" for January 6, 1962, published by Simmons Boardman Publishing Corp., 30 Church Street, New York, and National Press Building, Washington, D.C. Page 1 of that publication attributes to Federal Maritime Administration revised bid dates on total of 18 ships for 3 lines. Original bid dates are listed, as well as new revised dates. Significantly, when the new contract award dates are revised backward the same number of days each of the bid dates have been revised forward. Contract award dates for all of these 18 ships fall into fiscal year 1962, rather than in fiscal 1963, as per following table:

important facets of vital importance to the prosperity and security of our country, as well as to the economy of the thousands of skilled craftsmen in the 12 shipyards—4 of them on the west coast—which currently build oceangoing vessels.

After long investigation and study by responsible committees of the Congress, at various times in the past half century, Congress has declared it to be in the national interest to have at hand at all times, a modern, privately owned merchant marine adequate for the needs of peace and of war. The vessel replacement program now underway constitutes the soundest, most adequate, most economical approach to implementation of that policy that our country has ever embarked upon.

I think it is a mistake to slow down that program on the theory that vessels can be modern, safe, and competitive when they are long past what has been accepted generally as the normal, economic vessel lifespan. We not only must have in being at all times the adequate, modern commercial fleet that our national maritime policy envisions, but, as a necessary companion and support of that adequate fleet, we must have in being at all times a modern, well-equipped shipbuilding industry, capable of meeting any emergency needs of the future.

I believe we are failing to implement the national maritime policy both as to an adequate merchant marine and as to an efficient shipbuilding industry when we move at half speed in the replacement program as we are doing.

I speak not only for our west coast shipyards but also for the entire strategic shipbuilding capacity of our Nation when I say we cannot, we must not, in our concern for a future in outer space, take from our maritime industry the support it needs to meet the problems of the present day.

I hope the Congress will see fit to remedy the deficiency in the maritime budget for fiscal 1963 by providing additional funds for vessel construction that will put the vessel replacement program back in stride.

I thank the Senator from Wisconsin for yielding to me.

PADRE ISLAND NATIONAL SEASHORE, TEXAS

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill (S. 4) to provide for the establishment of the Padre Island National Seashore.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, the pending business is Senate bill 4. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be adopted en bloc and that the bill as thus amended be considered as original text for the purpose of amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendments agreed to en bloc are as follows:

On page 5, line 4, after the word "of", to strike out "his" and insert "the improved"; on page 6, line 14, after the word "Secretary", to strike out "may" and insert "shall"; in line 16, after the word "the", where it appears the first time, to insert "oil and gas"; in line 19, after the word "of", to strike out "the" and insert "such", and in the same line, after the word "minerals", to insert "from beneath the surface of those lands and waters and the land and waters adjacent thereto"; after line 22, to insert:

"(d) Any acquisition hereunder shall exclude and shall not diminish any right of occupation or use of the surface under grants, leases, or easements existing on the effective date of this Act which are reasonably necessary for the exploration, development, production, storing, processing, or transporting of oil and gas minerals that are removed from outside the boundaries of the national seashore or from the lands or waters within the boundaries of the national seashore and the Secretary may grant additional rights of occupation or use of the surface for the purposes aforesaid upon the terms and under such regulations as may be prescribed by him."

On page 7, line 9, after "Sec. 6.", to insert "(a)"; after line 20, to insert:

"(b) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this Act, land and waters now or hereafter included in any migratory bird refuge within the boundaries of the Padre Island National Seashore shall continue as such refuge under applicable laws and regulations, but such lands and waters shall be a part of the seashore and shall be administered by the Secretary for recreational uses not inconsistent with the purposes of such refuge under such rules and regulations as the Secretary may prescribe. Nothing in this Act shall limit the power of the Secretary to acquire lands and waters for any migratory bird refuge."

And, on page 8, line 7, after the word "be", to strike out "appropriated" and insert "appropriated"; 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 in order to save and preserve, for purposes of public recreation, benefit, and inspiration, a portion of the diminishing seashore of the United States that remains undeveloped, the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to take appropriate action in the public interest toward the establishment of the national seashore set forth in section 2 of this Act.

"Sec. 2. The area comprising the portion of the land and waters of Padre Island situated in the coastal waters that is described below is designated for establishment as the 'Padre Island National Seashore':

"Beginning at a point one mile northerly of North Bird Island on the easterly line of

the Intracoastal Waterway; thence due east to a point on Padre Island one mile west of the mean high water line of the Gulf of Mexico; thence southwesterly paralleling the said mean high water line of the Gulf of Mexico, a distance of about three and five-tenths miles; thence due east to the two-fathom line on the east side of Padre Island as depicted on United States Coast and Geodetic Survey chart numbered 1286; thence along the said two-fathom line on the east side of Padre Island as depicted on United States Coast and Geodetic Survey charts numbered 1286, 1287, and 1288 for a distance of approximately eighty-five miles; thence westerly crossing Padre Island to the easterly line of the Intracoastal Waterway at a point northerly of Three Island; thence northerly following the easterly line of the Intracoastal Waterway as indicated by channel markers in the Laguna Madre to the point of beginning.

"Sec. 3. (a) The Secretary of the Interior (hereinafter referred to as the 'Secretary') is authorized to require by donation, purchase with donated or appropriated funds, condemnation, transfer from any Federal agency, exchange, or otherwise, the land, waters, and other property, and improvements thereon and any interest therein, within the area described in section 2 of this Act or which lies within the boundary of the seashore as established under section 4 of this Act (hereinafter referred to as 'such area'). Any property, or interest therein, owned by the State of Texas or political subdivision thereof may be acquired only with the concurrence of such owner. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any Federal property located within such area may, with the concurrence of the agency having custody thereof, be transferred without consideration to the administrative jurisdiction of the Secretary for use by him in carrying out the provisions of this Act.

"(b) The Secretary is authorized to pay for any acquisitions which he makes by purchase under this Act their fair market value, as determined by the Secretary, who may in his discretion base his determination on an independent appraisal obtained by him.

"(c) In exercising his authority to acquire property by exchange, the Secretary may accept title to any non-Federal property located within such area and convey to the grantor of such property any federally owned property under the jurisdiction of the Secretary within such area. The properties so exchanged shall be approximately equal in fair market value, provided that the Secretary may accept cash from or pay cash to the grantor in such an exchange in order to equalize the values of the properties exchanged.

"Sec. 4. (a) As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act and following the acquisition by the Secretary of an acreage in the area described in section 2 of this Act, that is in the opinion of the Secretary efficiently administrable to carry out the purposes of this Act, the Secretary shall establish the area as a national seashore by the publication of notice thereof in the Federal Register.

"(b) Such notice referred to in subsection (a) of this section shall contain a detailed description of the boundaries of the seashore which shall encompass an area as nearly as practicable identical to the area described in section 2 of this Act. The Secretary shall forthwith after the date of publication of such notice in the Federal Register (1) send a copy of such notice, together with a map showing such boundaries, by registered or certified mail to the Governor of the State of Texas and to the governing body of each of the political subdivisions involved; (2) cause a copy of such notice and map to be published in one or more newspapers which

circulate in each of the localities; and (3) cause a certified copy of such notice, a copy of such map, and a copy of this Act to be recorded at the registry of deeds for the county involved.

"Sec. 5. (a) Any owner or owners (hereinafter in this subsection referred to as 'owner') of improved property on the date of its acquisition by the Secretary may, as a condition to such acquisition, retain the right of use and occupancy of the improved property for noncommercial residential purposes for a term not to exceed twenty-five years, or for a term ending at the death of such owner, the death of his spouse, or the day his last surviving child reaches the age of twenty-one, whichever is the latest. The owner shall elect the term to be reserved. In any case where such an owner retains a right of use and occupancy as herein provided, such right may during its existence be conveyed or leased, in whole, but not in part. The Secretary shall pay to the owner the fair market value of the property on the date of such acquisition less the fair market value on such date of the right retained by the owner.

"(b) As used in this Act, the term 'improved property' shall mean a private noncommercial dwelling, including the land on which it is situated, whose construction was begun before September 1, 1959, and structures accessory thereto (hereinafter in this subsection referred to as 'dwelling'), together with such amount and locus of the property adjoining and in the same ownership as such dwelling as the Secretary designates to be reasonably necessary for the enjoyment of such dwelling for the sole purpose of noncommercial residential use and occupancy. In making such designation the Secretary shall take into account the manner of noncommercial residential use and occupancy in which the dwelling and such adjoining property has usually been enjoyed by its owner or occupant. The amount of such adjoining property to be so designated by the Secretary shall in no case be less than three acres in area, or all of such lesser amount as there may be, except that the Secretary may exclude from the amount of adjoining property so designated any beach or waters, together with so much of the land adjoining such beach or waters as the Secretary may deem necessary for public access thereto.

"(c) When acquiring land, waters, or interests therein for the Padre Island National Seashore, the Secretary shall permit a reservation by the grantor of all or any part of the oil and gas minerals in such land or waters, with the right of occupation and use of so much of the surface of the land or waters as may be required for all purposes reasonably incident to the mining or removal of such minerals from beneath the surface of those lands and waters and the land and waters adjacent thereto, under such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary.

"(d) Any acquisition hereunder shall exclude and shall not diminish any right of occupation or use of the surface under grants, leases, or easements existing on the effective date of this Act which are reasonably necessary for the exploration, development, production, storing, processing, or transporting of oil and gas minerals that are removed from outside the boundaries of the national seashore or from the lands or waters within the boundaries of the national seashore and the Secretary may grant additional rights of occupation or use of the surface for the purposes aforesaid upon the terms and under such regulations as may be prescribed by him.

"Sec. 6. (a) Except as otherwise provided in this Act, the property acquired by the Secretary under this Act shall be administered by the Secretary, subject to the provisions of the Act entitled 'An Act to establish

a National Park Service, and for other purposes', approved August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535); as amended and supplemented, and in accordance with other laws of general application relating to the national park system as defined by the Act of August 8, 1953 (67 Stat. 496); except that authority otherwise available to the Secretary for the conservation and management of natural resources may be utilized to the extent he finds such authority will further the purposes of this Act.

"(b) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this Act, land and waters now or hereafter included in any migratory bird refuge within the boundaries of the Padre Island National Seashore shall continue as such refuge under applicable laws and regulations, but such lands and waters shall be a part of the seashore and shall be administered by the Secretary for recreational uses not inconsistent with the purposes of such refuge under such rules and regulations as the Secretary may prescribe. Nothing in this Act shall limit the power of the Secretary to acquire lands and waters for any migratory bird refuge.

"Sec. 7. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act; except that no more than \$4,000,000 shall be appropriated for the acquisition of land and waters and improvements thereon, and interests therein, and incidental costs relating thereto, in accordance with the provisions of this Act.

"Sec. 8. If any provision of this Act or the application of such provision to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the remainder of this Act or the application of such provision to persons or circumstances other than those to which it is held invalid, shall not be affected thereby."

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I move that S. 4, the bill to establish Padre Island National Seashore, be recommitted to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

I suggest the absence of a quorum—

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his suggestion of the absence of a quorum?

Mr. TOWER. Yes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may make some requests without the time being counted against the time allotted under the agreement, and that likewise the time taken for the call of the roll under the suggestion of the absence of a quorum not be taken from the time allotted.

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

Mr. TOWER. 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. TOWER. 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. TOWER. Mr. President, I yield myself 15 minutes.

There are some very compelling reasons why Senate action on the proposed national seashore on Padre Island be postponed until the next Congress. There is considerable opposition to the present bill in my State of Texas, and it is, I think, soundly based.

Presently, there is an active working committee of the Legislature of the State of Texas which is trying to solve problems of ownership, mineral rights, school funds, and so forth. They are preparing a report for the next session of the State legislature.

I would like to read a wire that I received from the chairman of that committee, Mr. Grainger McIlhane. I note for the benefit of my friends on the other side of the aisle that the Texas Legislature is made up almost entirely of Democrats. There are 109 Democrats and 2 Republicans. At the time the committee was established, there were no Republicans. There are no Republicans serving on the committee.

The telegram reads as follows:

As chairman of the legislative land study committee which consists of five house members appointed by the speaker of the house pursuant to house resolution passed during the regular session, 57th session of the Texas Legislature, our committee has been checking into problems involving Padre Island and Laguna Madre which comprises all the acreage in the proposed national seashore area and described in the Yarborough bill, the Young bill, and the Kilgore bill. My committee strongly urges that all action on the proposed national seashore project be withheld during this session of Congress because of problems of ownership of the surface and mineral rights due to survey problems and title questions.

GRAINGER W. MCILHANEY,
Chairman, Legislative Land Study
Committee.

I should also like to read into the RECORD the statement by the land commissioner of the State of Texas, the Right Honorable Jerry Sadler. Also, I might note for the benefit of my friends opposite, the Democrats, that this is a statement he made to the members of a committee that was appointed by the Governor of my State to look into the feasibility of establishing a State park on Padre Island. The Governor who appointed the committee is the Right Honorable Price Daniel, a Democrat, and a former Member of this body, who appointed this committee with instructions that they should study the feasibility of making a State park on Padre Island.

Before I read Mr. Sadler's statement to that committee, I should like to note it is my understanding that it has been the policy of the administration to act cooperatively with State governments on conservation, recreation, and park matters.

There seems to be a strong likelihood that the State will act to make Padre Island, or a portion of Padre Island, a State park area. This would take the responsibility away from the Federal Government and would accomplish the objective sought in the Senate bill now pending.

I should like to read this statement by the land commissioner to the special committee.

STATEMENT BY JERRY SADLER TO LAND
COMMITTEE

Mr. Chairman, members of the Padre Island Committee, I am happy for this belated opportunity to discuss the future of Padre Island. I trust all of you understand why

I missed the first meeting. It was not from choice, I assure you.

I have a specific duty here, of course, to protect the interest of the 2,500,000 boys and girls who attend our public schools. That is no longer only a mineral estate with a potential of \$1 billion. The Reagande la Garza Act provided for industrial development of the area also, with all revenues going to the public school permanent fund. The beaches of Padre Island are State school property as well as its adjacent waters.

There is another reason for opposing the National Seashore Act which I have not divulged until this time. There is great doubt as to the area of school estate which would be handed over to the Federal Government. The figure of 200,000 acres has been banded about with the conclusion that another 100,000 acres would somehow be acquired from private owners of the island proper.

Those are other men's figures, not mine. In fact, I am asking the attorney general to take action to determine the area of State ownership on the island and its vicinity, and verification of my claim would change these proportions considerably.

I contend, after study of U.S. Coast and Geodetic Survey charts Nos. 1286, 1287 and 1288, that the attorney general can recover for the State no less than 70,000 acres now held by private ownership, including some producing oil area, wells actually out in the water and production by directional drilling.

Such recovery would mean a giveaway of at least 250,000 State acres instead of 200,000 and would jeopardize even a greater potential of State school wealth. For the National Seashore Act provides for Federal regulation of all mineral development and it is high time its backers stopped pretending otherwise.

And certainly it behooves this committee to recommend that no consideration be given this national seashore area proposal until Padre ownership is determined.

I will be happy to illustrate on what grounds I ask this action by the attorney general. The present owners of the island proper hold title from a Spanish land grant of the 18th century to Nicholas Balli, a priest of Matamoros. The grant was for 11 leagues or 48,708 acres. According to the Fuente survey of 1828, the island proper contained 49,382 acres.

Then came the survey of 1941, which showed Padre's area to be 135,213 acres. We know from field notes filed in the land office that this survey is in error. One crew started running the west line of Padre from the north while another group worked up from the south. They were exactly 2.51 miles apart when they drew even. It was necessary to project a line of that distance from their surveys to join.

Using the three U.S. Coast and Geodetic Survey charts previously mentioned, our engineers calculated Padre's present area to be 65,000 acres.

If an actual survey confirms this claim, then the State will recover some 70,000 acres from the private owners whose rights under the Balli grant extend only to the line of mean higher high tide.

However, I do not wish to leave the impression that the size of the area involved might change my feeling about this proposed giveaway. Even 1 acre of State school land would be too much. Already such giveaways in the so-called public interest have stripped the State school domain down to one-fortieth of the surface area allotted in the constitution of 1876 and its mineral estate to one-fifteenth of the original size.

Both the Governor and attorney general, the other two members of the school land board, have supported my position that the National Seashore Act jeopardizes the billion

dollar mineral potential of the Padre area. Of course, it precludes any industrial development whatsoever.

I have heard the weak arguments that the national seashore proposal recognizes the State's mineral ownership and that regulation by the Secretary of the Interior will not affect development. I do not believe that it will work for one government to own the minerals and another to control them. That is like giving your daughter in marriage but regulating when the groom may kiss his bride.

It takes only commonsense to realize that any revenues lost to our public schools because of Federal regulations of this area would be balanced by direct taxes levied in Texas school districts.

Mr. President, my reason for reading that was to show the character of the opposition in my State, and to cite some pertinent facts which I think are very significant in connection with this issue. I think the statement pretty well expresses the sense of general opposition to this measure in my State.

There are many other reasons, I believe, why we should further consider the measure and not pass it in this Congress. The bill which has been proposed, as Senators will note by looking at the map against the wall, comprehends an area including quite a bit of mudflats and tidelands which are not needed and which, for the most part, are not suitable for recreation, which cannot very well be developed.

I point out further that the area comprehended by the bill is actually too large, 88.5 miles. This is contrary to the consensus of thinking about how much area should be comprehended by a park on Padre Island.

There is currently pending in the House of Representatives a bill authored by two Representatives from the districts affected, both of whom are Democrats, Representative Young and Representative KILGORE. The bill provides for a substantially smaller area, comprising approximately 65 miles.

A further fly in the ointment is the fact that the State legislature in 1959 approved the idea of a national seashore park comprising only about 45 miles, which is represented by the small area outlined in blue on the map against the wall.

I think, certainly, we must take into consideration the views of the State legislature, of the Governor, of the land commissioner, and of the two Representatives in Congress from the area affected. For the benefit of my friends on the opposite of the aisle, I note they are all good Democrats, with good Democratic backgrounds. I think we should take cognizance of their feelings on this issue.

I further note that the Navy uses a portion of Padre Island as a target area for bombing practice. It is estimated it would cost approximately \$202,000 to replace the Navy target range. A question has been appropriately raised, "Where would the range be located?"

About the only suitable area in the vicinity, near the Corpus Christi Naval Station, would be in the middle of the King Ranch, and I tremble to think

what might happen if we tried to take over a portion of the King Ranch.

I believe it should further be noted that the cost figure cited, the maximum authorized appropriation for the Padre Island cost, is totally unrealistic. Only \$4 million is to be set aside. The more conservative estimates I have heard with respect to land value run from \$8 million to \$10 million. Some estimates run even very much higher, up to \$45 million or \$50 million.

I have communicated with a real estate appraiser, who claims that values which average \$1,000 per acre are realistic, based on actual land transactions on Padre Island. The figure stated of \$4 million, to buy out the private lands, is too small. I point out that the Secretary of the Interior guesses it would cost twice that much. It is an unrealistic figure.

Further, no provision is made for a highway which would run the length of Padre Island. Right now the only means of ingress and egress are on both ends, the northern and southern ends of the island. This means that the area, which is supposed to be accessible to tourists and to people who wish to use the beaches and the seashore, really is inaccessible by highway. There is no provision in S. 4 for the construction of a highway. There is no provision for funds for a highway, and no authorization for it.

Many people might go into the area, without the highway, perhaps in private automobiles or even in jeeps or in trucks, or vehicles of that type. These people would, to a certain extent, actually be in danger. The weather along Padre Island is not always the best. It is good most of the time. Most of the time it is sunny, nice, and warm and salubrious, but of course tropical storms are very capricious. They come up without too much warning. The tide situation in the area is uncertain. It is fraught with a certain amount of danger for someone going into the area who is not familiar with the area.

Unless we provide for adequate ingress and egress I think we would be placing in jeopardy lives of people who are unsuspecting tourists. As the minority views note, there is an ancient doctrine of an attractive nuisance which might apply, which might make the Federal Government liable under lawsuits involving millions of dollars with respect to loss of life or property, in the eventuality of acts of God over which man has no control.

Mr. President, I do not think it is unreasonable to suggest, in the light of the very sound arguments which have been raised against action on the bill at this time, that the bill be recommitted to the committee.

I favor the creation of a park on Padre Island. I would hope that the people of Texas would take this on as their responsibility.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNAMARA in the chair). The time of the Senator from Texas has expired.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

I hope the people of Texas will assume this as a responsibility. I believe they will. I believe they will make adequate provision for the type of park that I think everyone would be proud of and would want to visit. A substantial portion of the island should be left open for commercial development. It could mean a very great deal to the economy of that area of our State for much of it to be open for commercial development.

I note that during the past winter the frost damaged our citrus crop in the lower Rio Grande Valley. It has left a gaping void in our economy down there. People in the area are looking forward to some potential commercial development. The chambers of commerce of virtually all the valley towns have opposed the enactment of S. 4 at this time. Certainly the views of those citizens should and must be taken into consideration.

In the light of the facts that have been presented here, I believe it would be wrong for us to plunge into the project headlong. For one thing, 200,000 acres of the proposed area, most of which are mudflats, are held by the State of Texas; and the Federal Government might have considerable difficulty in acquiring the land described and comprehended by the bill. One very high-placed State official told me in no uncertain terms that the State of Texas had no intention of yielding up the 200,000 acres to the Federal Government.

So I urge that the bill be recommitted to the committee so that it can be given more study, so that it can be perfected, and so that the elements in opposition and the arguments against the enactment of the bill can be taken into consideration. In the event of the failure of the State to act next year, we can perhaps pass a Padre Island Park bill that will be more acceptable to everyone.

If the State of Texas fails to act, I for one will acquiesce in and support the creation of a national seashore park on Padre Island, but not under the terms of the present bill.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON].

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HICKEY in the chair). The Chair recognizes the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I only hope that we do not inherit consideration of the bill again. The Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has given as much attention to the acquisition of Padre Island as it has, I believe, to all the rest of the park proposals that we have had during the present session. We have created the Cape Cod National Seashore, which had been attempted many times before. We spent some time on that subject. We passed a bill to create a Great Basin National Park. We worked on a bill to create a park at Point Reyes, Calif.

The time that has been spent by individual members of the committee on the proposed Padre Island Park probably

exceeds all the time spent on the other projects I have named.

It may be that the State of Texas has not had a sufficient opportunity to make a full presentation. Time after time Gov. Price Daniel has been invited to testify. All he would have to do would be to board a plane, come to Washington, and tell us that he has a different view than the one entertained by the committee. I make the same statement with relation to Jerry Sadler, the land commissioner. At least three different times he was invited to appear before the committee and give testimony. If he wishes to give testimony, the door is open.

If the bill should be referred back to the committee, we might again send telegrams to Governor Daniel and Land Commissioner Sadler, and again neither might put in an appearance. There is no point in repeating the same process again and again.

I was very much interested in what the junior Senator from Texas said about the interesting situation that might arise if one government had the surface rights in the area and some other government the mineral rights. That is not an unusual situation in the public-land States of the West. In the State of the distinguished Presiding Officer, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HICKEL], and in the States of many other Senators, we constantly see a situation in which the Government grants certain lands for schools and reserves the mineral rights, and we observe two Government agencies involved, one owning the land and the other the mineral rights. That combination occurs frequently. Such a procedure would not give us any trouble in this particular instance.

I do not know how we could compute what the size of the park should be in advance of its creation. It is true that the Senate bill contemplates 88 miles of park. It is also true that the House bill proposes a park comprising 65 miles. In the legislative process such differences are not unusual. Time after time the Appropriations Committee of the House will pass a bill containing one set of figures, and when the bill comes to the Senate, the Senate proposes another set of figures. That does not cause government to break down.

The two Houses of Congress go into conference on the question and try to harmonize their different views. The conference committee comes out with a compromise that takes into consideration the views of both Houses.

In this particular instance the same thing could easily happen. The Senate might pass a bill proposing a park consisting of 88 miles of land. In its wisdom the House might pass a bill containing 65 miles. The committees of the two Houses might meet and decide on one figure. It might accept the upper limit or it might accept the lower limit. What the conference emerges with will be a compromise figure that will be satisfactory to Congress.

A highway the length of the island has been proposed. I do not know about that project. I was in Corpus Christi on

Friday of last week. At that time I had an opportunity to discuss the question with certain individuals. They were not particularly interested in the project. One man had a very strong view. He said, "Whatever you do, don't build a highway." I was surprised. I thought he was the one individual who would want a highway.

He said, "Do not build a highway. Let them come in from the north; let them come in from the south; but leave the rest of the area as a wilderness for a long time to come.

There again we have a difference of opinion. There are people in Texas who feel that there should be a highway the entire length of the park.

I was in Corpus Christi at the time a desalinization plant was opened at Freeport. I believe that was approximately 14 months ago. I flew down there with a group of people from the great State of Texas to see that fine plant in Freeport start. I went across to Corpus Christi, where, as I recall, a meeting was held. Many persons were present. There was a large group. I have forgotten the exact hall in which the people were gathered.

But those people seemed to be enthusiastic for the establishment of such a park. I know that the Representative from that area was present. While he did not agree with us in relation to the size of the park desired, he certainly recognized, I am sure, the overwhelming sentiment of the folks there that the park should be created.

On the basis of frequent visits of that nature the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has decided that the bill should be reported to the Senate. When it reaches the floor of the Senate and is acted upon, the Senate can work its will. It can do as it wishes.

I ask only that the bill be not recommended to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, again to tie up our deliberations for a long time to come. The distinguished senior Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] is about as persistent a pleader as I have ever encountered. Day after day after day he would stop me in the hall and say, "When is my bill to be considered?"

I do not want him back again. I want to be footloose from him. I wish to have the measure acted upon so as to avoid the situation which has existed for a long time.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. TOWER. How would the Senator feel if a motion were made to refer the bill to another committee?

Mr. ANDERSON. I do not want to have the jurisdiction of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs invaded. I would feel better at night if I knew the bill was somewhere other than in the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Seriously, we have given the bill all the consideration that it merits. We have given it every hearing the bill should have.

We have tried in every reasonable way to find what needs to be done with the

bill. The bill was considered a long time during the previous session of Congress. Therefore, I believe we have given it due consideration.

I am not worried over the fact that two individual governments may be involved. And I am not worried about the cost of the project. I have heard figures that it would cost \$4 million, \$8 million, \$40 million, or \$75 million. I believe someone suggested that the cost might be twice \$50 million. The valuation of land on the tax rolls in that area should be ascertained. I am sure the land is assessed for what it is considered to be worth, and the assessment does not approach the figures about which we are talking.

What would happen if we passed a bill contemplating the expenditure of \$4 million, and the price tag was higher than that? In the past few years, one of the things we have learned is that a great many people are interested in recreation and will contribute to the acquisition of recreation areas.

Some time ago there was a desire to acquire an area at Cape Hatteras. There was not sufficient money to acquire the area. The State of North Carolina wanted to contribute a certain amount of money, but it was limited. Representatives of the Park Service flew Mr. Paul Mellon to the area in order to show him the wonderful possibilities. They said, "This area ought to belong to the Federal Government."

They carefully explained to Mr. Mellon that the land was in two tracts, and that the two tracts should be acquired, that it ought to be in the ownership of the Federal Government, but the State of North Carolina could acquire only a portion of it.

The Park Service man who was with Mr. Mellon told me the story. He said that he seemed to make no impression on Mr. Mellon. He kept pleading with him to do something about it. Silence prevailed in the plane. Mr. Mellon sat quietly for sometime. Finally he looked over to the Park Service representative and said, "How would you like the money? In one check or two checks?"

That was the only question in Mr. Mellon's mind.

He felt this ought to be used for the public benefit and should be acquired for that purpose. He made a very substantial contribution to it.

We can compare this issue with what happened up at Cape Cod, where people were willing to put up money to make sure of the acquisition of a fine recreational area for the benefit of all the people. When Yellowstone Park was created, it was referred to as a public pleasuring ground. These areas are that, Mr. President. They become public pleasuring grounds. They are not places that are roped off, in which only certain groups of people can bathe and enjoy themselves. They become public in every sense of the word.

I only say that in this particular instance we have some very fine precedents that we can follow. A great deal of work is being done in this area to establish fine things. I recognized that probably of all the States in the Union there is no

State that has in it so many fine philanthropic citizens as has the State of Texas, that has as many private foundations with so many endowments for the benefit of the people.

I say that I am sure, if the price tag goes over \$4 million, we will find some people there who will say this is desirable for the benefit of the whole Nation, and will make a contribution. We will find that someone will make it possible if the price tag goes up. I believe that the \$4 million price tag may be satisfactory. Of course it may not be. There was a considerable amount of testimony to the effect that the price tag may go higher than \$4 million. If in the House, in the judgment of two of the Members there, the price tag is inadequate, they can amend the bill in the House, and then it can go to conference, where the matter can be ironed out.

I do believe, Mr. President, that this bill should not be referred back to the committee, but, instead, should be passed by the Senate.

Mr. BIBLE. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I wish to express my regrets to the distinguished Senator from New Mexico, the chairman of the committee, if I felt impelled to speak to him on so many occasions. I do want to tell him, however, that it was in response to the persistent demands of the people in my State. I have a file of papers before me, which are only a part of the many editorials and papers that I have received on this subject of Padre Island. They come from the Red River area all the way south to Corpus Christi, and across the State as far as Abilene. No other problem has aroused such public interest as this one has in the 5 years that I have been in the Senate.

For example, so far as the State running it as a State park is concerned, I refer to the most recent three very careful hearings of the able subcommittee, the Subcommittee on Public Lands. That committee has had a great deal of experience.

I refer to page 46 of the last hearings, held on April 11 and 13, 1961. There we find a resolution which was adopted by the Texas State Park Board on December 14, 1959, when the board went unanimously on record as being in favor of a Federal national seashore recreation area. They reconsidered this action on the 10th of April 1961, 14 months later, and again reaffirmed the action, when the State Park Board of Texas unanimously endorsed this Federal park project.

There is no sentiment for the creation of a State park simply because the people down there do not have enough money with which to set it up.

On the same page of the hearings we find a report of April 10, 1961, by Mr. Robert W. Baker, a State senator from Harris County, Tex., who is the chairman of the Legislative Beach Study Committee. It was a joint study committee of both houses of the legislature. It adopted a resolution unanimously endorsing the 88-mile proposal.

In the closing days of the session of the Texas State Legislature of 1961, a

bill was being considered to agree to the Federal Government creating this park. This is printed in the senate journal for the 57th Legislature of the State of Texas, regular session, for Monday, May 29, 1961.

The bill passed the Senate of the State of Texas on May 15, 1961, setting out the field notes that we now have included in S. 4. It passed the bill by a vote of 24 to 6, agreeing to the creation of this Federal area, with the field notes in it, as I say, along the intracoastal canal on the west and the Gulf of Mexico on the east. That passed the senate, as I have said, by a vote of 24 to 6, on the 15th of May. It passed the house of representatives, also calling for the creation of this Federal seashore area of identical size, on the 26th of May 1961, by a vote of 127 to 7.

The conference committee reported the bill, signed by the conferees of the house and the senate of the Legislature of Texas, which agreed to the 66½-mile-long park.

The legislature was bound by the constitutional limitation providing that the session had to end on a certain night. One State senator from Texas filibustered the bill to death. He kept it from being passed by filibustering against it, even though it had passed the senate by a vote of 24 to 6 and the house by a vote of 127 to 7. That shows the overwhelming support for this bill by the people of Texas, because in spite of all the lobbying against it, and in spite of all the cries against it, it passed by such overwhelming votes in both houses of the State legislature.

With reference to the telegram read by the distinguished junior Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] with reference to Mr. McIlhany, chairman of the Legislative Land Study Committee of the house of representatives, appointed by the speaker of the house, as the able Senator from Texas has stated, that telegram from Mr. McIlhany proceeded on an erroneous assumption. It said that there may be litigation over titles. Of course, there may be disputes about titles. However, the passage of the pending bill does not prevent disputing claimants from disputing titles. The Government does not have to pass a law for that to happen. The money would simply be impounded.

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

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, may I have 2 additional minutes?

Mr. BIBLE. I yield 2 more minutes to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I telegraphed Mr. McIlhany, chairman of the Legislative Land Study Committee, as follows:

HON. GRAINGER W. MCILHANY,
Chairman, Legislative Land Study Committee,
House of Representatives, Austin,
Tex.:

I congratulate your committee on its work in seeking to safeguard interests of Texans in Padre Island. However, passage of the Padre Island bill S. 4 will not need to be delayed because of possible title controversies at the State level. If litigation as to ownership of surface areas results there, any Federal payments for acquisition may be paid into court pending outcome. Mineral interests are not touched by the bill, so Federal

action has no effect on where royalty income may be paid. I shall forward you a copy of the Senate committee report when it is available next week.

RALPH W. YARBOROUGH.

After that wire was sent, the Land Commissioner said that there would be entitlement to royalties. The answer is the same. There is nothing in the bill to prevent the disputants from litigating as between each other. The oil will be owned as before. There is nothing here which will bar any people from litigating private titles. Despite the concern expressed by the Land Commissioner and others, I feel that they should not have such concern, because these matters will still be possible of being the subject of litigation, and the rights of all people will be fully preserved.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 minutes.

I wish merely to reemphasize and underscore the statement that was made by the distinguished chairman of the full committee. Certainly this is one piece of legislation that should not be recommended to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs for further study. This has been studied since 1958. About three field trips have been made to the area. As chairman of the Public Lands Subcommittee I have visited the area. I know that the chairman of the committee has been there. Other Members of the Senate have visited this area also, including many distinguished Senators from the other side of the aisle. We have tried to work out a bill with a minimum of difficulty and controversy.

It is also interesting to note that in connection with most of the national park bills and national seashore bills the question of size invariably comes up. Many advocates of the Padre National Seashore would like to provide a larger national seashore than 88 miles. Some want 110 miles or 117 miles. Some want to shrink it to about 55 miles. This matter has been inherent in practically all national seashore legislation and national park legislation with which I have been associated.

It was true of the Cape Cod bill; of the Point Reyes bill; of the Great Basin bill; it is true of proposed legislation which is now pending in the Senate; it is true of the canyonlands bill. It is a part of the business of legislating and arriving at a firm decision after a careful analysis and study.

The points raised by the distinguished junior Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] were all carefully considered by the committee, not merely in one session, but in a number of sessions. There were actual inspections in the field by various members of the committee.

I feel that a thorough, workmanlike job of studying this proposal in its various forms, in accordance with the many suggestions that have been made, has been undertaken by each and every member of the committee. The bill represents the composite view of a majority of the members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. I hope that the motion to recommit will be rejected.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 minutes.

The question is not whether there should be a park on Padre Island. I think everyone is agreed as to that. I think the disagreement comes, for the most part, over the size of the park and its utility. Much has been made of the fact that this area will afford a recreational facility; yet there is no provision for the construction of a highway which would give to the park utility as a recreational center. Without a highway, there will be no utility.

I am aware of favorable action by some State agencies and legislative bodies concerning this proposal some time ago; but there has been a change of heart. Now they are considering and looking into the proposal more carefully.

A legislative committee wired me only recently:

Please do not pass the bill at this session.

I have received telegrams from various chambers of commerce which oppose the bill. For example, one such wire has come to me from the chamber of commerce in the valley. It reads as follows:

BROWNSVILLE, TEX., April 5, 1962.

Senator JOHN TOWER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Every chamber of commerce in Cameron, Willacy, and Hidalgo Counties has passed a resolution opposing Senator YARBOROUGH'S seashore bill. Also the Valley Chamber of Commerce has passed a resolution in opposition. We therefore hope you will do everything in your power to defeat the seashore bill by YARBOROUGH.

W. VERNON WALSH.

Mr. Walsh is a prominent Democrat in that area.

The two Representatives in Congress from this area are in disagreement about the bill. Why cannot we, then, postpone action on it until a more propitious time?

What is wrong with having the State operate the park? It seems to me it is a good idea. I think we ought to laud a show of initiative and responsibility on the part of the citizens of the State, rather than to insist, "No, you cannot do things for yourselves; the Federal Government will do it for you, whether you like it or not."

I hope this is not the attitude which will prevail. I hope the bill will be re-committed for serious consideration.

Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I shall support the motion to recommit, just as I voted against reporting the bill from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

I wish to make several things plain. First, the distinguished senior Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] who is in the Chamber, probably will recall that the first time he ever mentioned the Padre Island Park on the floor of the Senate, I supported his proposal. I see no reason to change my fundamental view about the park. But when the establishment of a park is being considered, other questions arise: Who will create the park? How will it be done? How large will the park be?

Later, depending on the outcome of the motion to recommit, I intend to offer certain amendments which I believe are necessary.

Second, I point out that contrary to what has been done heretofore, the Department of the Interior has completely refused even to commit itself as to the construction of highways. The map at the side of the Chamber shows Padre Island. It has a rather peculiar shape from the standpoint of geological formation. It is a long island, to which there is access only from the north end, at Corpus Christi, and from the south end, through Port Isabel.

Not only do I base my remarks on what we heard in the testimony—and I believe I sat through all the hearings; but as recently as December I went to the area and viewed it myself. I interviewed witnesses with whom the committee staff had put me in touch before I went there.

When I arrived, I was contacted by other people on the south part of Padre Island, who felt they had never had an adequate opportunity to present their views to the committee. I do not believe they had been forbidden or precluded from appearing; but perhaps because they were not so aware of the significance of the proposal or were not adequately informed about it. Nevertheless, on the lower part of Padre Island, I found an almost unanimous opposition, not to the concept of a park itself, but to the concept of a park as provided in S. 4, which the Senate is considering today.

With respect to highways, there is one responsibility the Senate or Congress cannot escape; that is, that when a national area is created, while there may be different ideas as to what constitutes a national seashore and a national park, we cannot overlook responsibility for the safety of the lives of the people who visit the area. On the one hand, it is argued by the proponents of the bill, that what must be done is to create a park which people can enter. On the other hand, they argue that a highway down the length of Padre Island cannot be maintained because the waves and storms would wash it out.

Mr. President, it is exactly those waves, those storms, those hurricanes, to which the area unfortunately is subject at times, which will imperil the lives of the hundreds—yes, perhaps thousands—of persons who will visit that area unless adequate roads are provided.

I maintain that the Government, including Congress, will bear on its shoulders the responsibility for the death of any child, any family, or any member of a family who enters that area after it has been established as a national seashore, because we will, in effect, have invited the public to enter. When we invite them to a national seashore, which is the equivalent of a national park, we are, for all practical purposes, the guarantors of their safety and health.

There is another thing which has been glossed over so lightly that one would not know it even existed. I believe there are five military installations, worth about \$250,000, located on the island. As

a part of these installations are several target areas. The installations include a naval station at Corpus Christi and Air Force fields at Harlingen and other places. They use the target ranges which are shown at a distance of about 50 miles, just above the black line on the map. It is a live-impact area. It is not a location where small bombs are dropped, which give off a little puff of powder where they hit. Live bombs are actually dropped, and they are dropped by beginning students. The location is well within 35 miles of the area which the bill provides for the national seashore.

What will be done? The \$250,000 is glossed over so lightly that one would think it had been rubbed with wax. Yet we know that if the bill should be passed in its present form, the expense to the Government will run into millions of dollars to reproduce the bombing areas which are necessary for the flying fields in this part of Texas. This is true, first, because the place where land can be obtained is primarily owned by the King interests, which lie immediately west of the island. The King interests are not likely to give it up easily, and certainly not inexpensively.

Second, everything on the installations will have to be moved to the new areas.

Third, the target areas would be at far greater distances from the bases than they are from the present bases. So there would be increased operational expenses. It is almost literally true that today the target areas are reached by the planes as they come off the end of the runways; almost immediately they do their target bombing.

As to the cost, I wish to say that the argument which the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the distinguished chairman of our committee, made is persuasive as regards the costs. However I do not believe in putting in a bill what I do not mean, and, I do not believe that a single member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs today would settle for 2½ times the stated \$4 million cost of the bill. In fact, I do not believe anyone would settle for a \$10 million cost, although I would be happy to see the Federal Government reach this bill's objective if it does some day become law, and if Texas does not build the park—for \$10 million. However, I do not believe the Federal Government can even begin to avoid keeping the cost to \$10 million.

On the north there is undeveloped land, and on the south there are county parks. One park is very well developed.

There has been debate here about the Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Let me say that the areas where people stay and camp there are nothing for anyone in the United States to be proud of. There are other parts of the Cape Hatteras Seashore where the Park Service has done well. But I wish to say that the county park at the south end of the island would make the place where people stay at Cape Hatteras National Seashore look like the slums of a big city. I say that because I have been to both places; I have seen them, and I know what I am talking about. The

county has not only this park; it is also developing another one, 5 miles above it; and it has promises of land above that, and it intends to develop that land into a park.

Mr. President, why hurry about this matter? Why not put it off until we know what the cost will be? We have heard the officials skirt the cost item in connection with this matter.

Let Texas act if it will. I think it will do a better job than anyone else could do.

Mr. President, in closing—and, Mr. President, let me inquire how much time remains available to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. METCALF in the chair). One minute.

Mr. ALLOTT. I shall do the best I can in that time.

Mr. President, one other point I wish to make in connection with this matter is in reference to the talk about wilderness areas. It is ridiculous for anyone to suggest that more than 1 person in 100 would carry water—and it would be necessary to carry water—and food and camping equipment and fishing equipment while he marched more than 1 mile down the hard sand areas there, to reach a wilderness area. It is ridiculous to suggest that many persons would ever make the attempt. A strong, able-bodied person might hike 4 or 5 miles over normal terrain; but, Mr. President, believe me when I say that hiking in such sand is no cinch. So the wilderness argument falls flat.

All in all, Mr. President, certainly the bill should be recommitted. I do not believe adequate time was given for proper consideration of these matters. Certainly the arguments raised against the bill did not receive what I thought was adequate consideration. Perhaps I was not sufficiently persuasive. But under the circumstances the bill should be recommitted, and these matters can be taken up later on.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Colorado the remainder of the time under my control.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado is recognized for 1 additional minute.

Mr. ALLOTT. I thank the Chair, and I also thank the Senator from Texas.

Mr. President, obviously it is absurd to talk about this area as a wilderness area, because a wilderness area usually has three or four access points, whereas this area has only two access points, and they are approximately 125 or 130 miles apart. Who would walk—and this is the criterion which is applied to wilderness areas, into which one must either walk or ride a horse—60 miles from either one end or the other of this Texas coastal area?

Mr. President, I have stated the essential arguments against the bill. Certainly the bill should now be laid aside or recommitted until we find what Texas wants to do about this matter.

In this situation we find that the two Senators from Texas are taking different sides on the matter. We also find that both Members of the House of Representatives who are affected by this matter—one from Corpus Christi and the

other from lower down, at Laguna Madre—both oppose the bill. Under the circumstances, it seems to me to be clear that the proper thing to do is to recommit the bill.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I am prepared to yield back the remainder of the time under my control. I understand that the time under the control of the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] has expired.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. BIBLE. Then, Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of the time under my control.

The junior Senator from Texas desires to have the yeas and nays ordered on the question of agreeing to his motion to recommit; and I would join in the request to have the yeas and nays ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

The yeas and nays were ordered. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to recommit the bill.

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

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

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] to recommit the bill. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE]. If he were present, he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I therefore withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HICKEY], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] is necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] is paired with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Georgia would vote "yea," and the Senator from Illinois would vote "nay."

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Oregon

[Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HICKEY], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] would each vote "nay."

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], and the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] are necessarily absent.

The pair of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] has been previously announced.

The result was announced—yeas 39, nays 45, as follows:

[No. 40 Leg.]

YEAS—39

Aiken	Eastland	Murphy
Allott	Ellender	Pearson
Beall	Fong	Prouty
Bennett	Goldwater	Saltostall
Boggs	Hickenlooper	Scott
Bush	Hruska	Smith, Maine
Capehart	Javits	Stennis
Carlson	Keating	Talmadge
Cooper	Lausche	Thurmond
Cotton	McClellan	Tower
Curtis	Miller	Wiley
Dirksen	Morton	Williams, Del.
Dworshak	Mundt	Young, N. Dak.

NAYS—45

Anderson	Gruening	McGee
Bartlett	Hart	McNamara
Bible	Hartke	Metcalf
Burdick	Hayden	Monroney
Byrd, Va.	Holland	Muskie
Byrd, W. Va.	Humphrey	Neuberger
Cannon	Jackson	Pastore
Carroll	Jordan	Pell
Chavez	Kefauver	Proxmire
Church	Kerr	Smathers
Clark	Long, Mo.	Smith, Mass.
Dodd	Long, Hawaii	Sparkman
Engle	Long, La.	Williams, N.J.
Fulbright	Mansfield	Yarborough
Gore	McCarthy	Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—16

Butler	Hill	Randolph
Case, N.J.	Johnston	Robertson
Case, S. Dak.	Kuchel	Russell
Douglas	Magnuson	Symington
Ervin	Morse	
Hickey	Moss	

So Mr. TOWER's motion to recommit was rejected.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the motion was rejected be reconsidered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. 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 lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I call up my amendment "4-10-62—A," and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 4, between lines 2 and 3, it is proposed to insert the following new subsection:

(d) (1) The Secretary is authorized and directed to establish and maintain such roads as are necessary for the safety of the users of the said National Seashore and is specifically directed to establish a road through the entire length of said Seashore area with access roads to the mainland from

the North end of the Island and from the South end of the Island.

(2) The Secretary is authorized to acquire by donation, purchase with donated or appropriated funds, condemnation, transfer from any Federal agency, exchange, or otherwise, such lands, waters, and other property, and improvements thereon and any interest therein, as he may determine necessary to carry out the provisions of this subsection.

Mr. ALLOTT obtained the floor.

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

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I am about to propound a unanimous-consent request.

I ask unanimous consent that there be a time limitation of one-half hour on each amendment, half the time to be controlled by the proposer of the amendment, and half the time to be controlled by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my first amendment, before a time limitation is set.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I yield myself 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. ALLOTT. For the benefit of Senators in attendance, I do not plan to speak for more than about 10 minutes. If they wish to govern their own time in accordance with that, they may do so.

Mr. President, the amendment has only one purpose. I believe it is a purpose which the Senate of the United States cannot ignore.

The amendment provides:

The Secretary is authorized and directed to establish and maintain such roads as are necessary for the safety of the users of the said national seashore and is specifically directed to establish a road through the entire length of said seashore area with access roads to the mainland from the north end of the island—

Which would be near Corpus Christi— and from the south end of the island.

Which would be near Port Isabel or Brownsville.

The Secretary is authorized to acquire by donation, purchase with donated or appropriated funds, condemnation, transfer from any Federal agency, exchange, or otherwise, such lands, waters, and other property, and improvements thereon and any interest therein, as he may determine necessary to carry out the provisions of this subsection.

I start upon the premise, as I stated earlier, that I support the first words of the senior Senator from Texas, stated on this floor, about Padre Island. I believe it should be a park. If the State of Texas wishes to make it a park, I would welcome having the State take jurisdiction, condemn the land, and make a park of it.

If it is necessary for the United States to establish the seashore, I shall support that when we can get the proposal trimmed down to the proper form and get the proper provisions in the bill.

The bill does not now contain a provision for a road. Hearings were first held upon the proposal on December 14, 1959. I wish to read from page 7 of the hearings, from the statement of the senior Senator from Texas himself, in which he quoted the Department of the Interior, in subsection 2(b):

In order to provide for the proper development and maintenance of the park, the Secretary of the Interior shall construct and maintain therein such roads, trails, markers, buildings, and other improvements, and such facilities for the care and accommodation of visitors, as he may deem necessary.

For some reason, between 1959 and 1961 the Department of the Interior has decided against even mentioning roads in the bill.

We all know the national parks. We have all been in them hundreds of times. Now the national seashore concept is coming along, which is a little different. There is to be set aside areas for the future recreation of citizens of our country.

From the standpoint of shape and location, Padre Island is a very peculiar area for a national seashore.

The area is well over 150 miles in length. At the present time access may be obtained to it only by a road at the very top end of the island. The island is composed entirely of deep sand and dunes. It is nearly impossible—indeed, for the average driver, it is impossible—to drive any distance even on the east shore of the island without bogging down his car. The vehicles in which I made my trips on the island were all specially prepared vehicles, either Jeeps or standard passenger cars which had been beefed up with extra springs and shock absorbers, 9.50 tires instead of 7.50 tires, oversize radiators, and that sort of thing.

What I have said will give Senators some idea of the problems confronting visitors to the island.

Suppose a man, his wife, and little children had entered the area at the north end of the island over the causeway at Corpus Christi and had traveled 10 or 12 miles down the beach. Suppose a storm should come up? Of course, they would hurriedly try to get out. We all know what it is like to drive in beach sand. Cars get stuck. What could be done for such a family?

Let me give the Senate an idea of what such people would face in that area in a storm. I am reading from Technical Memorandum No. 78 of the Beach Erosion Board, Office of the Chief of Engineers, published in 1956 and describing Padre Island:

It was once more or less continuously walled just back of its gently sloping beach by a chain of vegetated (15- to 25-foot) fore-dunes with low gaps. The gaps between the dunes were the sites of washover floods of storm surges. Landward from the beach, the channels remain and lead to the branching distributary channels of the washover fans or deltas.

Surges of hurricanes between 1930 and 1945 followed by drought from 1948 to 1955 have lowered the surface of the island, lowered and eroded the dunes except in areas in the extreme northern part, and largely destroyed the grassy cover which once supported cattle ranching. The area of bare migrating dune fields has been much expanded.

I have described the type of land to which we would invite people. I realize that the area has great recreational value, but it would have no recreational value unless measures were taken to protect the lives of those who might come to the area. Such protection could be afforded only by providing adequate highways.

On page 13 of Technical Memorandum No. 78 the Office of the Chief of Engineers states that the rate of flood occurrence on Padre Island is one in 4 years, probably one in 3 years. The rate of maximum floods is one in 40 years, probably one in 30 years.

Continuing to read from the memorandum:

The lists, table (table 3) and map (fig. 4) summarize information on floods that have affected Padre Island, including the writers' inferences that certain storms without flood records probably flooded the island. This flooding varies from a mere reactivation of the washover channels by floods from 3 to 4 feet above mean low water to broad floods accompanied by extensive wave-and-current erosion of dunes under surge heights of 5 to 11 feet.

Erosion and the action of salt waters followed by a drought of record length and severity have greatly changed the appearance and economic productivity of the island. Cattle were not run on the southern half of the island after 1945 and ranching at the north end has more recently been still further reduced because of loss of grass.

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

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Padre Island is an area in which bad storms will occur once in every 3 years or once in every 4 years. It is an area in which even a skilled driver, unless he has special equipment, cannot drive down the beach with any assurance of getting back.

The argument is made, "We will take that subject up later."

Are we going to pass a bill which would not protect the people whom we invite into the area? Are we going to leave it completely unprotected?

I have been in the area. I have been over the island. I drove over 35 or 40 miles of its length. I flew over it in a plane at almost stalling speeds so I could see exactly what had happened to the island. Today it is easy to see that the floods and hurricanes of last year washed the dunes and eroded the beaches as far back as 200 feet.

Are we going to invite Americans into such an area, an area into which they cannot come without special equipment, and in which severe storms may come up suddenly, or are we going to protect them? I say we have an obligation to protect them, and the provision of the amendment would protect them.

Between 1956 and the present time there have been four hurricanes in the

area, causing \$500,000 damage to parks, \$380,000 to roads, \$130,000 to Government property, and \$240,000 to private property, making a total of \$1,250,000 worth of damage in the past 5 years.

That is the meat of the argument. The Park Service representatives have said, "We cannot maintain a road the whole length of the island."

Why not? If the floods and storms are so bad that the Park Service cannot maintain a road, would we invite American families into the area and leave them stranded? Could we have 100 or 1,000 helicopters in the area when a storm is on its way in order to lift automobiles out of the sand in which they might be stuck so that they and their families could reach safety?

I have stated some of the arguments that are used. The Park Service representatives have argued against themselves in saying they cannot maintain a road through the area. Yet they say, "We want to establish Padre Island as a national seashore."

During the early part of the month of December I visited the area. Frankly, I went there because statements of the chairman of the subcommittee, the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE] and others at the hearings—not what I knew myself—had disturbed me very greatly.

I was very much concerned about the safety factor and about the feasibility of a great part of this park as a seashore recreational area. Therefore I went down there myself. The junior Senator from Texas put in the RECORD a little while ago numerous telegrams from the chambers of commerce of all the valley towns in the southern part of the valley, including the Rio Grande Chamber of Commerce. They are all in opposition to the bill unless it provides for a road.

When I was asked down there—and I had not planned originally to go there, but was urged, and almost clubbed into going down to the lower part of the island by some of the local people—I said, "I will be happy to come."

They said, "Whom can we ask in?"

I said, "Ask anyone in who wants to make his views known."

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

Mr. BIBLE. I yield 2 additional minutes to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLOTT. I understood that the unanimous-consent agreement called for thirty minutes on each side. I will conclude in two minutes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I shall be glad to ask for more time for the Senator.

(At this point Mrs. NEUBERGER took the chair as Presiding Officer.)

Mr. ALLOTT. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have placed in the RECORD at this point a list of the people who met with me at the Padre Island site.

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

James Stillman, M.D., Brownsville, Tex.; Don E. Duncan, Brownsville Herald, Brownsville, Tex.; Don Morns, Brownsville, Tex.; Pete Smith, Port Isabel, Tex.; Ted Hunt,

Port Isabel, Tex.; Edith C. Baines, Port Isabel, Tex.; N. N. Housewright, San Benito, Tex.; Gayle D. Wilhite, AIA, architect, Brownsville, Tex.; Glenn McGehee, chamber of commerce manager, South Padre Island, Tex.; Harold Bowman, manager, Sea Island Hotel, South Padre Island, Tex.; Robert E. Fowler, Brownsville, Tex.; Al McGehee (park director, Cameron City), Port Isabel, Tex.; Rhea Blasig, San Benito, Tex.; Jack Gallo-way, KCBT-TV, Harlingen, Tex.; Fletcher Robertson, Valley Newspapers; Dan Benito, Steve M. Clark, Ray Kasper, KBOR and Associated Press, Brownsville, Tex.; D. N. Segal, Brownsville, Tex.

Mr. ALLOTT. Madam President, at that time I asked them, "How do you feel about this?"

At first they said, "We would rather see it developed by the county or the State." There was not one person in that whole group who said he wanted the park without a road.

So we come back to this as a matter of commonsense. Here is an area which can be very critical so far as storms are concerned. Here is an area which has no road. Yet we are going to establish a national seashore without making it a policy to provide for a road. My amendment would require that a road be built.

Mr. BIBLE. I yield myself 5 minutes. I wish to state, first of all, that I am one of those who urged the Senator from Colorado to go to Padre Island so that he might come back with his viewpoint, whether it was the same as mine or different. We have worked together on many seashores. We find controversies in each one of them and we find different viewpoints. However, I know of no one who is more dedicated to his work than the Senator from Colorado, and I wish to compliment him for the diligence he shows in connection with each one of these issues.

I would answer the argument of the distinguished Senator from Colorado in support of his amendment with the words of the Secretary of the Interior himself with respect to this particular problem, which he presented to the committee in the hearing held on April 11 of last year, with particular reference to whether or not a road should be built. The Secretary of the Interior answered as follows:

With regard to development plans for the island, I can speak only in generalities. Decisions on the specifics of development can properly come only from long study and actually living in an area and observing public use of it. Padre Island is no exception to this. That is why we believe it would be very unwise now to involve this important conservation legislation in a decision on the concept of a through road down Padre Island.

Such a commitment would be premature, first of all, because no one has made a detailed study of the feasibility and the cost of such a road. As you know, some parts of the island are narrow, low, and subject to washover at times of storm. The maintenance, repair, need, and the benefits to be expected from such a road are among the factors that we have not determined.

Secondly, the conservation and public use purposes of the proposed national seashore go beyond the mere construction of a through highway. The conservation and public purposes include adequate access to considerable portions of the area by people riding in automobiles, but the purposes also include the preservation of wild landscapes, marshes, dunes, beach, native plant and

animal life and the feeling of spaciousness, away from the sights, sounds, and smells of automobile traffic. There are millions of people in the United States who are interested in the preservation of wild, unspoiled, undeveloped places in the out of doors. A national seashore should provide undeveloped areas for these people as well as adequate roads and other facilities for people who do not wish to get away from them. It seems to us that it would be an unwise use of the resource if we now were to make a decision that the whole island must be opened by a through road. We think wise planning dictates that decision to be made after living with the national seashore, if it is authorized, for some years and then base our decision on experience and facts which will be available then but which are not yet at hand.

If the Padre Island National Seashore is authorized by the Congress, there need be no question that there would be adequate access to it, since it would be our obligation to encourage public use and enjoyment of the area consistent with preservation of the inherent characteristics for which it is nationally significant.

The access which we do see as clearly needed for public use if a Padre Island National Seashore is authorized, is an adequate unobtrusive system of roads tied in with the access causeways at each end of the island and serving a carefully planned pattern of national seashore campgrounds, picnic areas, beach facilities, appropriately placed boat and fishing docks, visitor centers, and other park facilities designed to make visits to the national seashore more meaningful and enjoyable.

I am convinced that the Secretary of the Interior will build adequate roads on Padre Island to make access available to the people who are attracted to the national seashore. I am certain that he is just as much interested in the safety of the people who go down there as is the Senator from Colorado.

I believe that if we check through national park bills, certainly the ones that have come out of the Interior Committee in the time that I have been a member of it, it will be seen that in no instance, to the best of my knowledge, was an attempt made to direct the Secretary of the Interior where he should build a road system within any of the parks.

This was true of Cape Cod National Seashore Park. It was true of the Point Reyes National Seashore Park, which has been passed by the Senate and is now pending in the House of Representatives. It seems to me there is ample authority in the law now for the building of needed access roads to take care of the safety and the needs of the many people who would be attracted to Padre Island.

There was a difference of opinion on this point, but the majority of the committee felt very positively that there was no need for building a through road from the northern end clear down to the other end of the island, almost to its southernmost point, about 120 or 125 miles away.

Madam President, I should like to inquire how much time is left on my side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. BIBLE. I yield 3 minutes to the senior Senator from Texas, because reference has been made to the inclusion or exclusion of this provision of the bill.

Mr. ALLOTT. Madam President, before the Senator yields time, will he yield for a question?

Mr. BIBLE. I yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. Is it not true that recently before the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee Secretary Udall, in testifying for the Canyon Lands National Park, requested \$17 million for roads and for development of the Canyon Lands Park?

Mr. BIBLE. I believe that is true. The overall figure in the development period of some 7 or 8 or 10 years was \$17 million. I think certain parts of it included access roads. However, there is no request made to the committee that specific language be written into the bill providing that a road be built thus and so.

Mr. ALLOTT. Madam President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. BIBLE. I yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. The Senator referred to the testimony of the Secretary of the Interior. Is it not a fact that the Department of the Interior has been studying this matter for a period of some 20 years and yet at the hearing testified that they were not yet prepared to set up a comprehensive plan.

Mr. BIBLE. I believe they have not arrived at a comprehensive plan. The statement I have read made that clear. It will depend on how the island will develop. Then adequate access roads would be provided.

I yield the balance of the time to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Madam President, how much time remains on this side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Six minutes remain.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Madam President, I ask for only 3 minutes of that time.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD that part of the hearings on S. 4, held before the Subcommittee on Public Lands on April 11, 1961, beginning with the third paragraph on page 36 and continuing through the end of the fifth paragraph on page 38. That part of the hearing deals with the cost of the highway down the middle of Padre Island. It includes a letter from D. C. Greer, State highway engineer of Texas, under date of April 7, 1961. The letter is addressed to Hon. Oscar C. Dancy, county judge of Cameron County.

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

I think we ought to let them get the minerals out, but not let that prevent us from establishing a national seashore recreation area. Even with the most rigid conservation, this will be produced out before many now living have passed away, in my opinion. This is a transitory thing. I don't think the facts that the minerals are to be produced should deny the greater long-range park that we envision. The minerals are exhaustible, and will be used, but the inspirational appeal of the natural seashore, unchanged by bulldozers and man, is inexhaustible and will live as long as man.

There are some who contend that any Padre Island legislation passing the Congress should provide—and proposals have been advocated in Texas to this effect, they will op-

pose it unless it provides—that the Federal Government build a highway the length of the island linking Corpus Christi to Brownsville. Mr. Chairman, that is no new idea. The Texas Highway Department engineer, DeWitt Greer, has been urged many times over the years to construct a highway the length of the Padre Island. He has made surveys and they showed that the very minimum cost of such a highway with a nondurable asphalt roadway would have cost \$2.8 million back in 1954. All know what has happened to construction costs since. The Texas Highway Department surveys indicate that a minimum-quality light asphalt-top highway the length of the island would cost \$6 million. Such a highway with reinforced concrete paving, which is really needed for such a storm-exposed island highway, would cost \$9.5 million for two lanes. Because of the storms and tides, he estimates 15 to 20 percent of this highway would have to be rebuilt every year. That is why the State of Texas has not done it.

We think it is wholly unreal, for the State of Texas because of this extremely high cost and the extreme cost of the upkeep and the questionable need has refrained from constructing this island over a period of several years. With a great need for Federal funds, I cannot conscientiously endorse or urge such an expenditure at this time. Perhaps in the future some such length may be justified by the economics of that time. I would not oppose it if it is. This expenditure would so increase the cost of the proposed national park seashore by many millions of dollars as to virtually prevent us from having such a seashore.

I do not believe that the question of preservation of one of America's last great seashore areas for all Americans should hinge on whether the Federal Government agrees to build a multimillion-dollar highway which the State of Texas refuses to build because of the State's finding of nonfeasibility.

Mr. Chairman, I offer for the record a communication from the Texas Highway Department, D. C. Greer, State highway engineer, dated April 7, 1961, addressed to Judge Oscar C. Dancy, county judge of Cameron County, giving the estimates of this cost of the proposed Padre Island highway up and down the island.

Senator BIBLE. What are the costs as of today? Is this the \$9.5 million figure?

Senator YARBOROUGH. Updated from 1960, 106 miles, \$9,540,000, covering the reinforced concrete pavement, two lanes only, he said each major storm would require rebuilding 15 to 20 miles of the road. He stated orally that the high tides would stir up the shore each year.

Senator BIBLE. The letter may be made a part of the record.

(The letter referred to follows.)

TEXAS HIGHWAY DEPARTMENT,
Austin, Tex., April 7, 1961.

HON. OSCAR C. DANCY,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JUDGE DANCY: Receipt is acknowledged of your letter of April 6.

As requested, I am enclosing a sheet giving the desired information with reference to the proposed Padre Island highway. Also, as requested, I am sending a copy of same to Senator Yarborough.

Sincerely yours,

D. C. GREER,
State Highway Engineer.

PROPOSED PADRE ISLAND HIGHWAY

From Port Isabel Causeway to Nueces County Park, length 108 miles.

The 1954 estimate by consulting engineers for the two-lane road 6-inch shell-sand mixture on native sand and light asphalt top, \$2,800,000.

State Highway Department estimate in 1960 (up-dated from 1950) 106 miles for \$6

million for 8 inches of shell-sand base and light asphalt top.

Each major storm would require us to rebuild 15 to 20 miles of road.

State Highway Department estimate of 1961 (updated from 1960) 106 miles for \$9,540,000 covering reinforced concrete pavement—two lanes.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Madam President, Mr. Greer states that it would cost \$9,450,000 to build a two-lane highway the length of the island. That would be more than the estimated cost of the park. Also, he estimates that due to storms and floods it would be necessary to rebuild from 15 to 20 miles of the road each year.

The testimony also shows that year after year, the State Highway Department of Texas has been urged by some persons in Texas to build the road, but that the State has not built it because it would be very expensive to do so.

Not only would the amendment of the Senator from Colorado require the National Park Service to build the road through 88 miles of park; it would also require the Park Service to build a road the full length of the seashore area, with access roads to the mainland from the north end and from the south end of the island—at both ends of the 117-mile-long highway. Thirty-two miles of the highway would be over private lands and would enhance the value of the lands at each end. In other words, the amendment of the Senator from Colorado proposes that the Federal Government reach into the pockets of the taxpayers to add millions of dollars to the value of private land each year.

Madam President, under date of March 28, 1962, I received a letter from the Department of the Interior, signed by John A. Carver, Jr., Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

The letter reads, in part, as follows:

DEAR SENATOR YARBOROUGH: The question of a road down the full length of Padre Island is one to which we have given considerable thought. It is estimated that the road would cost at least \$9 million to build and that as much as one-fifth of it would be lost to storms annually. We know of no studies that show convincingly that there is need for such a road and we know of no national park project heretofore authorized by Congress which was made contingent upon the construction of such a road.

I point out that the Park Service builds roads in other national parks. I continue to read:

Secretary Udall stated in his testimony before the Senate committee that the Department, if the proposed national seashore is authorized, would expect to make adequate portions of the area accessible to the public and that it would be desirable to live with the project, so to speak, for a number of years before anybody would be in a position to determine whether the proposed through highway should be built. A copy of the statement which the Secretary made before the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee is enclosed for your convenient reference.

That has been referred to and is in the RECORD. I continue to read:

There is no slightest doubt in our minds that, if the proposed national seashore is authorized and established, adequate portions of it will be made accessible by roads for people traveling in automobiles. The

purpose of the seashore proposal is to preserve an outstanding area for appropriate forms of public use and enjoyment. The whole national park conservation program gives assurance that the proposed national seashore will be a public use area. If the project is authorized, detailed plans will be formulated for the facilities required for public use and such detailed plans will have to be based on careful consideration of such factors, among others, as public safety and preservation and public enjoyment of the variety of recreation attractions for which the island is noted.

The Department is giving consideration to the public safety. I have been on that island, not only at each end, but at Mansfield Pass. When boats go through the pass, one can step off and walk to either side from the middle.

The letter concludes:

Establishment of the Padre Island National Seashore without a through road would not preclude construction. A through road could be built on the island at any time that it was found to be in the public interest to do so.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN A. CARVER, JR.

Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

Madam President, causeways are sought to be built in the middle of the park. The Park Service should have an option as to how it will develop roads for the best service of the people. It should not be straitjacketed at this time.

I hope the amendment will be rejected.

Mr. BIBLE. Madam President, how much time have I remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Madam President, will the Senator yield me time?

Mr. BIBLE. I yield 1 minute to the distinguished Senator from Idaho.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Madam President, with respect to the hearing on this authorization bill, we know that the Park Service has been studying the proposal for about 20 years. Now there is great urgency to push this political bill through the Senate, when every Member of this body who knows its background realizes that the sound, constructive body at the other end of the Capitol will take no action on the bill during this session of Congress.

Why this urgency if the Park Service will take another 10 or 15 years to study and determine what roads should be built, or how human beings can enjoy a park having the necessary recreational facilities on the island?

Why not wait another 10 years? Why push the bill through now, if it will take another decade to determine the feasibility of utilizing the resources of a seashore park?

Mr. BIBLE. Madam President, I have no word to the effect that the bill, if it passes the Senate, will not pass the House and become law. I hope it will. It might be tailored or altered somewhat in size or amount. Amendments might be adopted so as to send the bill to conference. However, I hope that the bill will be enacted in its present form.

As to the road problem, the Secretary of the Interior now has ample authority, if the area should become a national

seashore, to plan the necessary access roads. He has said he would do so. The letter just read by the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] indicates that he will do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time on both sides has expired. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT]. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HICKEY], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] are necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] is paired with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART]. If present and voting, the Senator from Illinois would vote "nay," and the Senator from Indiana would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] is paired with the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Oregon would vote "nay," and the Senator from South Dakota would vote "yea."

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HICKEY], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] would each vote "nay."

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], and the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is detained on official business.

On this vote, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is paired with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Indiana would vote "yea," and the Senator from Illinois would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] is paired with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. If present and voting, the Senator from South Dakota would vote "yea," and the Senator from Oregon would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 24, nays 58, as follows:

[No. 41 Leg.]

YEAS—24

Allott	Bennett	Cooper
Beall	Carlson	Cotton

Curtis
Dirksen
Dworshak
Fong
Goldwater
Hickenlooper

Hruska
Miller
Morton
Mundt
Murphy
Pearson

Prouty
Saltonstall
Scott
Tower
Wiley
Young, N. Dak.

NAYS—58

Alken
Anderson
Bartlett
Bible
Boggs
Burdick
Bush
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carroll
Case, N.J.
Church
Clark
Dodd
Eastland
Engle
Ervin
Fulbright
Gore
Gruening

Hart
Hartke
Hayden
Holland
Humphrey
Jackson
Javits
Jordan
Keating
Kefauver
Kerr
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Long, Hawaii
Long, La.
Mansfield
McCarthy
McClellan
McGee
McNamara

Metcalf
Monroney
Muskie
Neuberger
Pastore
Fell
Proxmire
Smathers
Smith, Mass.
Smith, Maine
Sparkman
Stennis
Talmadge
Thurmond
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Yarborough
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—18

Butler
Byrd, Va.
Capehart
Case, S. Dak.
Chavez
Douglas

Ellender
Hickey
Hill
Johnston
Kuchel
Magnuson

Morse
Moss
Randolph
Robertson
Russell
Symington

So the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. ALLOTT. Madam President, I call up my amendment, and ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment may be dispensed with.

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

The amendment offered by Mr. ALLOTT is as follows:

On page 2, beginning with line 4, strike out all through the period on line 21 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Beginning at a point one mile northerly of North Bird Island on the easterly mean low water line of Laguna Madre; thence due east to a point on Padre Island one mile west of the mean high water line of the Gulf of Mexico; thence southwesterly paralleling the said mean high water line of the Gulf of Mexico, a distance of about three and five-tenths miles; thence due east to the two-fathom line on the east side of Padre Island as depicted on United States Coast and Geodetic Survey chart numbered 1286; thence along the said two-fathom line on the east side of Padre Island as depicted on United States Coast and Geodetic Survey charts numbered 1286, 1287, and 1288 for a distance of approximately forty miles; thence westerly crossing Padre Island to the easterly mean low water line of Laguna Madre; thence northerly following the easterly mean low water line of Laguna Madre to the point of beginning."

Mr. ALLOTT. Madam President, I should like to make two statements for the benefit of Members of the Senate. First, I do not contemplate asking for a yea-and-nay vote on the amendment. Second, I shall take not to exceed 10 minutes on the amendment. So far as I know, the bill will then be ready for passage. I know of no other amendment.

I asked unanimous consent to dispense with the reading of the amendment because it is technical in language, but the purpose of it is very clear. It is to reduce the length of the park from 88.5 miles to 43.5 miles.

If any Senator should be looking at the map in the rear of the Chamber, the

black lines are misleading, because they do not indicate the length of the park. The red lines, which go almost from the very bottom to the very top of the map, represent the boundaries of the park.

There are several reasons for offering the amendment, and I shall give them briefly.

First and foremost, the people who live in the southern part of this region want the park limited to this area. I have previously placed in the RECORD the names of persons who, when I was there, supported this proposal. The junior Senator from Texas has already placed in the RECORD telegrams from chambers of commerce and others who also oppose the proposal in the bill.

In addition, I offer the amendment primarily because it represents the considered views and judgment of Representatives YOUNG and KILGORE, Members of the other body from the two districts involved.

I believe none are better able to judge what is best for their own particular districts than are those two gentlemen; and both have introduced bills in the House of Representatives to reduce the length of the park to 65 miles—20 miles under the present limit. My amendment reduces the length of the park to 43.5 miles.

The next reason, to state it very cogently, is that, with the rejection of the amendment which was just offered by the Senator from Colorado, regarding roads, the Senate cannot afford to take upon itself moral responsibility for the lives of those who are going into this roadless area. The Senate has eliminated provision for roads. I assure the Senate that the bill will never come out of the other body without a provision for roads.

The pending amendment would mean that people would not get into the farther reaches of the area where they could not possibly get out in the event of need.

The next reason why the amendment is offered is that it eliminates the mud flats between Padre Island and the mainland of Texas on the west side of the island. This area is not apparent on the map, without close scrutiny, because the map is not constructed that way. As the bill provides, the red line is the line along the eastern side of the Intercoastal Canal.

There is absolutely no reason for taking that area into the park on Padre Island. In the first place, it belongs to the State of Texas, and it cannot be taken unless the State of Texas agrees to it, and a good number of officials of the State of Texas have asked us to defer action on it. In the second place, the area is nothing but mudflats, and in some cases they are 4 and 5 miles wide.

If we as Members of the Senate can sensibly exercise our duties and obligations by taking into a national park large areas which are nothing but mudflats, I think we have lost a few of our "marbles," and certainly our sense of what constitutes recreation value.

That is all I have to say about the mudflats. I could find much land in

the country on about the same level of desirability as the mudflats—land which people would be glad to donate to the United States for a park.

One of the most cogent reasons for offering the amendment to reduce the length from 88.5 miles to 43.5 miles is that after the 50-mile mark, which is just about the point where the active bombing range is, there are no real sand dunes until one arrives within 10 miles of Port Isabel at the lower end of the island. That area is left out in the amendment. In the intervening area are some low dunes, most of which are 3, 4, and 5 feet tall. One can stand on the beach on one side and look over to Laguna Madre on the other. This is the area where the greatest danger from floods, hurricanes, and high tides lies.

In my opinion, it is by far the least desirable part of the area for a national park or national recreational area. Much of the beach is rough, consisting of rock, shell beaches, and is therefore not nearly as suitable for swimming as other areas. In many places it is completely undesirable for swimming and recreation of that kind. Fishing may be engaged in, if one could get there; but now we have no roads, so people cannot reach the area.

The lowest 30 or 35 miles is that kind of area, which is not particularly suited for a national seashore. It does not have high dunes, or the type of grass found in the upper 50 miles of the area. It is unthinkable to me that the Federal Government would be spending money to acquire that land, which is so unsuitable for a recreation area. For this reason I have offered the amendment. It would eliminate the mudflats of Laguna Madre.

The remarks of members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs first drew my attention to the problem, before I had even seen the area. The remarks of members of the committee convinced me that there should be a good look at the problem. I took the look.

I believe the majority of the people in this portion of Texas, in the Rio Grande Valley, think this area should not be included. I know that all the people with whom I talked think so. There was an open invitation for anyone who wished to talk to come in and talk. I know that all those with whom I spoke believed unanimously that this area should not be included in a national seashore.

This area is particularly susceptible to storms. As the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs said a while ago, this is the area in which we would have to keep rebuilding the roads. It is not a suitable place to invite Americans. When we create national seashores, we invite Americans to visit them. They will be our guests. We will establish the area. It will be our responsibility to look after the safety of citizens. The area involved does not meet the criterion of safety. The area does not meet the criteria which a national seashore should meet. I urge that the amendment be agreed to.

Mr. BIBLE. Madam President, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado. The amendment was offered to the committee. The arguments before the committee were substantially the same as the arguments which have been given to the Senate by the distinguished Senator from Colorado.

The question as to the size of the national park or seashore is, as I have previously indicated, one of considerable concern to any committee.

When the proposed legislation first came before the Congress it was suggested that the length of the park be established at some 110 miles. The size was later shrunk to the present proposal in S. 4, 88.5 miles.

I believe the bills which have been introduced in the House of Representatives call for an area of approximately 50 miles or 55 miles in length.

This question was carefully considered by the committee, as the size of the Cape Cod National Seashore was carefully considered, as the size of the Point Reyes National Seashore was considered, and as the size of the Great Basin National Park was considered.

The position of the committee was in favor of the proposal as submitted to it by the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], who had spent many days, months, and years sponsoring the project and moving it forward to the point it has reached today.

In complete honesty, I say again that this is a question of judgment. I do not think anyone can say with finality that the area should be 88.5 miles, 75 miles, 70 miles, or 50 miles. The composite opinion of the majority view on the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs was that the size of the national seashore as contained in S. 4 is amply justified, and that the area is of great national significance. This seashore proposal was presented by the President of the United States in his state of the Union message as one of the three national seashores which should move forward in this particular session of the Congress.

I hope the amendment will be defeated. I am prepared to yield back the remainder of my time, if the Senator from Colorado is prepared to do likewise.

Mr. ALLOTT. Madam President, I do not think we are operating under a time agreement, but I am willing to yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. BIBLE. I thought there was a limitation on all three amendments. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Colorado yield back the remainder of his time?

Mr. ALLOTT. I cannot hear the Presiding Officer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Colorado yield back the remainder of his time?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield it back.

Mr. BIBLE. Madam President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has been yielded back. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado.

The amendment was rejected.

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

The bill (S. 4) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. ALLOTT. Madam President, I have discussed this question at some length this afternoon. I told the senior Senator from Texas 3 years ago that I was in favor of the idea of a national seashore at Padre Island. I still am. I find the bill, however, without the two amendments, utterly unacceptable.

Since I shall not ask for a ye-and-nay vote on passage of the bill, I wish to make it perfectly clear that I shall vote against the passage of the bill, because I do not wish to be responsible for what may happen in future years, when people come into an area in which there will not be adequate roadways. We shall be inviting hundreds of thousands of people to come to this area by establishing it as a national seashore. I do not wish to have the lives of any of those people on my hands. Therefore, I shall vote against passage of the bill.

I wish to make perfectly clear now what my vote will be, so that there will be no question in the future as to how I voted on the question of passage of the bill.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Madam President, I shall vote against passage of the bill. I think the Senate is initiating a new program which will have ramifications far beyond what we may expect. My vote will be "nay."

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD immediately prior to the passage of the bill a resolution by the Cameron County Democratic Executive Committee.

The Cameron County Democratic Executive Committee, composed of elected Democratic precinct chairmen from all parts of Cameron County, at the last regular meeting at the county courthouse adopted the resolution.

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

RESOLUTION BY CAMERON COUNTY DEMOCRATIC EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Whereas we believe that a portion of the natural wealth and beauty of Padre Island should be preserved so that it may be enjoyed by our children and our grandchildren; and

Whereas this executive committee believes that the future growth and prosperity of this county and the entire Rio Grande Valley would be greatly stimulated by a national seashore reaching into Cameron County; and

Whereas we believe that these objectives cannot be realized unless the national seashore extends into Cameron County: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this committee expresses to the Congress of the United States and all of our representatives therein our sincere hope that a Padre Island National Seashore bill will be adopted by both Houses without delay, and that there be included within the

seashore that largest possible area consistent with the requirements of private development, and that in any event the south boundary of the seashore extend into Cameron County so that the people of this county may enjoy free and unrestricted access to the seashore and may benefit by having the opportunity to be hosts to the flood of visitors which will undoubtedly result from the creation of this great national recreation area.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD immediately prior to passage of the bill an article from the Corpus Christi Caller of February 16, 1962, which quotes Mr. Frank E. Masland, Jr., Chairman of the U.S. Advisory Board on National Parks, as having said that a national seashore area on Padre Island of much less than 88 miles would be ridiculous.

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

CHOICE SEASHORE SITE—PARKS ADVISER HITS 65-MILE PADRE PLAN
(By Cliff Lawhorne)

A national seashore area on Padre Island of much less than 88 miles would be ridiculous, Frank E. Masland, Jr., Chairman of the U.S. Advisory Board on National Parks, said here yesterday during an all-day tour of the island.

Masland, whose Board advises Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall, said a seashore area preserve of no longer than 65 miles would not be desirable.

Masland toured the island with Dr. Clarence Cottam, director of Rob and Bessie Welder Wildlife Foundation and president of the National Parks Association. They were accompanied by County Judge Noah Kennedy, County Commissioner Robert N. Barnes, and County Building Superintendent Leslie Chappell.

Masland said Padre Island is "beyond question one of the most choice seashore areas still available on the entire U.S. coastline" for a national preserve.

He said that if a national seashore area designation for Padre Island "did not prove to be one of the biggest businesses in the State, it would be the exception."

A bill to establish a national seashore area on Padre Island could "get through Congress without much trouble if there were some unanimity (in the Texas delegation) in regard to it," he said.

Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH, of Texas, has introduced a bill calling for an 88-mile seashore area, and Representative JOHN YOUNG, of Corpus Christi, and Representative JOE KILGORE, of McAllen, have bills calling for a 65-mile-long preserve.

"All legitimate differences to the establishment of a national seashore area can be settled unless there is an adamant local position for a through road," Masland said.

He said the National Park Service "does not want a road and so far as I see it this is the only bone of contention."

The National Park Service is interested in providing access roads to the seashore area if it is established, he said.

"A seashore area is designated for preservation and use of the public," Masland said. "If a through road were put on the island, there would be all use and little preservation."

Masland also said the pending seashore bills protect Texas oil interests in the Laguna Madre, which is included in the area proposed for a national seashore area.

"The schoolchildren of Texas have nothing to worry about. The Federal Government is not going to take any of their money from oil revenues," he said.

Masland said regulatory measures on oil exploration are designed only to prevent companies from destroying the natural beauty while drilling for oil.

CANAL ISSUE

He also said he sees no great controversy with the intracoastal canal. "I feel this is an area of compromise. The channel should be preserved and there is enough room between the mud flats and the channel for compromise."

Masland toured 40 miles down the island, to Big Shell. He and the others not only inspected the beach areas but made periodic side jaunts behind the sand dunes and over to the Laguna Madre side of the island.

He took pictures of all portions of the island visited.

"Padre Island looks like an entirely different island than that I visited 2 years ago," Masland said. "Hurricane Carla has, in many respects, improved it."

"There is nothing else like this. I think it should be preserved in all its natural beauty. It is unique to begin with. It's big enough. Its scope is sufficient. It is compatible with preservation. There is no doubt in anybody's mind in the National Park Service as to the appropriateness of this island in the park system."

FORWARD LOOK

He said the proposed national seashore area would not just meet the needs of today "but the needs of tomorrow."

"I don't know of any instance when a national park has not proved to be a tremendous—not just a modest but a tremendous—economic advantage to the area in which it is established," he said.

Masland said that at Cape Hatteras, recently designated as a national seashore area, a number of high-class motels have been developed nearby.

"I can see the same thing here exactly," Masland said. "This is a tremendous area for recreational purposes and there is ample opportunity for contiguous private development at both ends."

Masland, of Carlisle, Pa., is a manufacturer, homebuilder, and banker and has extensive farm holdings. He is a director of the Academy of Natural Sciences of Philadelphia and a number of large concerns.

He and his wife are staying here with Mr. and Mrs. Harry B. Lankford, 3402 Ocean Drive. Mrs. Masland and Mrs. Lankford are cousins.

SUPERIOR SITE

Cottam said during the tour that Padre Island "in my opinion is the greatest area in the Nation for a national seashore area."

Chappell, who drove a power wagon for the tour, said Masland and Cottam are the first persons he has taken on an inspection of the island "who really wanted to see it."

"Most of those I have driven went down about 6 or 7 miles and said they had seen enough," Chappell said. "These men wanted to see as much as possible and they spent all day doing it."

Judge Kennedy, who is a member of Governor Daniel's Padre Island Study Committee, explained developments on the State level as they pertain to the proposed park proposal. He told Masland he definitely is for a Federal preservation on the island.

Both Kennedy and Barnes, in whose precinct a portion of Padre Island lies, acted as guides for the visitors. Sun Oil Co. acted as host for the group at the firm's Yarbrough (Murdock) Pass station.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The bill (S. 4) was passed.

Mr. THURMOND. Madam President, I wish to have the RECORD show that I

voted against passage of the bill. I wish to have the RECORD further show that I voted against passage of the bill for the reasons expressed by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHEL]. I wish to be associated with the remarks the Senator made on that point.

I ask unanimous consent that these remarks may be printed in the RECORD immediately after passage of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from South Carolina? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. BIBLE. Madam President, I move that the vote by which the bill was passed be reconsidered.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Madam 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.

AUTHORIZATION FOR APPROPRIATIONS FOR ARMED SERVICES, 1963

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 9751) to authorize appropriations during fiscal year 1963 for aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels for armed services, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate at this time, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 11, 1962, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 10, 1962:

STATE DEPARTMENT

G. Griffith Johnson, of Connecticut, to be Assistant Secretary of State.

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officers to be placed on the retired list in the grade indicated under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3962:

To be lieutenant generals

Lt. Gen. Lionel Charles McGarr, O17225, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).

Lt. Gen. Arthur Gilbert Trudeau, O15513, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).

The following-named officers under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to positions of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in rank as follows:

Lt. Gen. Robert Jefferson Wood, O18064, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army), in the rank of general.

Maj. Gen. John Hersey Michaelis, O20328, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army), in the rank of lieutenant general.

Maj. Gen. William White Dick, Jr., O18384, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army), in the rank of lieutenant general.

Maj. Gen. Dwight Edward Beach, O18747, U.S. Army, in the rank of lieutenant general.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Kennedy Aid Protests Barring of Red Mail

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1962

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, when the Senate Judiciary Committee is considering the qualifications of Mr. Byron R. White to serve as an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court, they might do well to inquire into the statements made by him in a letter to Senator OLIN D. JOHNSTON, of South Carolina, under date of March 5, 1962.

As reported by the Associated Press, Mr. White as Deputy Attorney General objected to the House amendment prohibiting the distribution of Communist propaganda through the mails, setting out five principal reasons.

One of the reasons is, "Even assuming an adequate definition, the legal and administrative problems involved in enforcement would be so substantial as to raise serious doubts as to its legality and efficiency."

Mr. Speaker, at a time when the United States is spending some \$62 billion to defend itself from communism by force, can it be said that a few million dollars would not be well spent in hiring staffs to sort, sift, and dispose of propaganda intended to destroy this Nation from within?

Even 1 percent of the \$62 billion spent on defense from without could well be spent on defense from within. This would cost only \$620 million and would go a long way toward relieving unemployment.

Another reason given by Mr. White is, "It is inconsistent with the tradition of an open society which has characterized the history of this country and which the first amendment to the Constitution reflects."

Mr. Speaker, the Senate Committee on the Judiciary must determine what Mr. White means by this statement. Is this his own personal feeling, or is he just mouthing the opinion of the Attorney General, Robert Kennedy?

Is the Senate of the United States going to approve the appointment of an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court who would permit a "Trojan horse" to be wheeled into every library and home in the Nation?

Does this man believe that in order to have an "open society" we must permit lies and misinformation to be fed into the minds of our students and citizens, at the expense of the American taxpayers? Just what kind of thinking is this, Mr. Speaker? What kind of decisions might we expect from men going onto the highest court in the land who hold these beliefs?

Another point he made is, "It is apt to do substantial injury to the international objectives of the United States." I do not care to comment upon this statement. Suffice it to say that I sincerely urge the Senate committee to check carefully into the theory of an appointee for this high post who believes that to stop the pouring of tons of Communist propaganda into this country would be apt to do substantial injury to the international objectives of the United States.

The Associated Press report on this matter is as follows:

KENNEDY AID PROTESTS BARRING OF RED MAIL

The Kennedy administration feels that legislation aimed at keeping Communist propaganda out of the mails is "objectionable in its present form."

It was learned that this administration view was expressed in a letter written March 5 by Deputy Attorney General Byron R. White to Senator JOHNSTON, Democrat, of South Carolina. Senator JOHNSTON is chairman of the Senate Post Office Committee, which is considering the legislation.

Mr. White referred to a House-approved bill which would increase postal rates by about \$690 million a year.

In passing the measure, the House wrote in an amendment by Representative CUNNINGHAM, Republican, of Nebraska, to prohibit the Post Office from handling any mail that the Attorney General determines to be Communist political propaganda.

WHITE LISTS REASONS

"Even though we are sympathetic with the motivation for (the amendment)," Mr. White wrote Senator JOHNSTON, "the administration opposes its enactment in its present form for a number of reasons."

Mr. White listed these reasons for opposition to the amendment:

"1. It would deprive even those in our country who have a legitimate reason to receive foreign Communist political propaganda, however defined, of the opportunity to do so.

"2. It does not provide an adequate definition of Communist political propaganda.

"3. Even assuming an adequate definition, the legal and administrative problems involved in enforcement would be so substantial as to raise serious doubts as to its legality and efficacy.

"4. It is inconsistent with the tradition of an open society which has characterized the history of this country and which the first amendment to the Constitution reflects.

"5. It is apt to do substantial injury to the international objectives of the United States."

ADVANTAGE NOTED

In his 17-page letter, Mr. White said those with legitimate reason for receiving Communist political propaganda include teachers, students, specialists in Communist affairs, newspapers and newspapermen, libraries, and scientists.

Mr. White told Senator JOHNSTON the Cunningham amendment also would give Iron