

the United States helps to preserve their independence and freedom, and under which individuals in those countries are helped to live a better life.

There is much to be pointed to in terms of accomplishment and achievement. When the Senate debates the foreign aid appropriation bill next week, it is my intention to outline for Congress and for the people—at least, for those who are willing to take the time to learn and to read—that the foreign operations of the United States, including our program of mutual security and mutual assistance, our so-called foreign aid program, represents the finest traditions, the highest quality, and the noble character of the American people.

Moreover, it indicates that our program works well, for the Soviet Union has had to engage in a massive foreign aid program of its own, if for no other reason than to compete with and to stand up against us. I think the best tribute to our foreign aid program, the best tribute to our oversea operations in terms of economic and technical assistance, is that the Soviet Union has had to engage in a similar program, lest it find itself without any attraction, without any influence, in any part of the world.

We have made mistakes. It is always our purpose to try to learn from our mistakes. But it is a gross error to judge a program only by the few instances of mistake of judgment or mistake of performance. One needs only to take a look at the programs to see what they are accomplishing, to see what their purposes are, and to see how their purposes are being realized.

I conclude these remarks concerning our total overall foreign aid program by a friendly reference to Mr. Fowler Hamilton, its Administrator, who has had a difficult time, who inherited a colossal mess, who took over an agency that was under attack in Congress and before the public, who found an agency the morale of which had slipped considerably, and who found considerable mismanagement.

In less than 1 year, Mr. Hamilton has revitalized that Agency under the direction of Congress and the President. He has brought in new personnel, established regional offices, mapped out a program of projects country by country and has carefully analyzed every project. He has coordinated the work of AID—the Agency for International Development—with the many other activities of the U.S. Government, so that today it can honestly be said that once again our foreign aid program is on the move, making progress, helping other countries, and helping the United States of America.

When we vote on the foreign aid appropriation bill, I hope Senators will keep in mind, and I hope their constituents will keep in mind, that more than 70 percent of the foreign aid appropriations—of all the foreign aid funds—are expended in the United States, aiding our own economy as well as aiding the economies of other countries.

I also hope we shall remember that the best testimonial to the success of this program is that not a single coun-

try—save one, namely, Cuba, which did not have any of our foreign aid—has slipped into the Communist orbit and into the hands of the Communist powers since the advent of our foreign aid.

Foreign aid has been one of the powerful factors in our program of national security. Many persons forget that when they discuss this program. Too many persons have talked about it as a giveaway program, and too many Members of Congress have attempted to ridicule it by seeking to point out a few examples of ineffectiveness or of possible corruption or mismanagement, and to have them held up to the public in headlines.

There is hardly a home in America with which one could not find some fault; and if there were a desire to destroy a home, that could be done by giving headline publicity to the difficulties which inevitably arise in the homes of all people, in lodges, in churches, or in any other programs. Such could be done in connection with any program when, in some particular, someone has not been as efficient as he should.

After all, ours is a representative government, not a government of saints or sinners, not a government of genius or of stupidity. It is a government of people; and we seek to do the best we can with the personnel and talent available.

In the days ahead we shall have quite a struggle over our foreign-aid program. As one who has carefully examined the program in the Foreign Relations Committee, and has spent hours at the committee's hearings, and as one who, as a member of the Appropriations Committee, has repeatedly met with the Government officials responsible for the administration of the program, I have examined this program with meticulous care, because I wanted to see it effective. I want to get every bit of good we can get from every dollar that is expended.

It seems to me that when one measures the program from the point of view of the overall good done and in terms of the great tasks we face, it is clear that the program has served us well, particularly in view of the fact that much of the aid goes to countries with little experience with modern society and modern representative government. It is an uphill fight, but we are making steady gains.

Therefore, Mr. President, I shall do all I can to support the foreign-aid program in every way possible.

THE WILDERNESS BILL

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the first anniversary of the Senate's passage of the Wilderness Act has now passed. After 5 years of consideration, controversy, and compromise the wilderness bill was overwhelmingly approved by the Senate on September 6, 1961, by a vote of 78-8.

This achievement was a tribute to the leadership and reasonableness of the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON]. As chairman of the

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, he sponsored S. 174 in this 87th Congress. He also saw it through the Interior Committee and secured the modifications required to accommodate it adequately to the many groups affected by this legislation. The Senator from New Mexico nevertheless managed to do this in a form adequate for the purposes of the legislation. The distinguished Senator has been widely and rightly commended for this accomplishment.

A recent editorial in the *Living Wilderness* commented:

Wilderness proponents realize that the Senate act goes too far in some respects in permitting nonconforming uses of wilderness and includes some procedural inconsistencies, but they also recognize that in general it is a sound and constructive measure which can greatly improve present conditions and establish a sound national policy and program.

Mr. President, it is regrettable to see wilderness proponents who are now defending this Senate act, with its many compromises, described as extremists who have demonstrated that they have no desire to compromise, and to see the proponents of wilderness preservation charged with refusing to debate the question of accommodating competing uses.

To emphasize the extent to which the proposals of wilderness proponents had been modified let me recall some of the features of our original revised proposal for establishing a national wilderness preservation policy, but which were greatly changed—and with our concurrence, as we willingly and eagerly sought a consensus that would be truly national.

We proposed, for example, the establishment of a permanent national wilderness preservation council. This has been dropped entirely.

We proposed a national wilderness preservation system that would include at once all the wilderness, wild, primitive, and canoe areas in the national forests; all the national parks and monuments with roadless areas as large as 5,000 acres; all the wildlife refuges and ranges with roadless areas as large as 5,000 acres; and also areas within Indian reservations and within various kinds of Federal lands that might be designated by their administrators in prescribed circumstances.

Mr. President, the Wilderness Act as passed by the Senate provided for establishment within the wilderness system of only the national forest, national park system, and wildlife areas. Furthermore, for all the park and wildlife areas and for the primitive areas within the forests the act as passed set up a 10-year review program for permanent establishment of the system. And for any other areas to be set up as wilderness a separate act of Congress would be required.

Our original proposal set up strict requirements for protecting areas as wilderness. These also were greatly modified with regard for users of the areas for commodity purposes as seemed justified. For example, we originally proposed to prohibit mining entirely; the act as

passed permitted prospecting that would not destroy the wilderness and mining that might be permitted by the President on his determination that it would be in the national interest.

Thus, in many ways that I could further point out, the proponents of wilderness preservation compromised, modified, and clarified their proposed wilderness legislation to accommodate their own concepts to those of others. The result was the outstandingly reasonable measure for which I have so many times commended the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] for sponsoring and seeing through committee and the Senate—with some further accommodating amendments, I may add.

In the opinion of 78 Senators the measure, thus carefully developed, will adequately protect user interests, as well as serve the national interest in having a wilderness system. It did not entirely represent what reasonable conservation groups would like. The proposal differs substantially from that which I originally introduced. It is truly a measure of democratic compromise, yet one that still maintains its original principles and purposes.

President Kennedy has supported this act and has urged its passage. Earlier this year he declared:

We must protect and preserve our Nation's remaining wilderness areas. This key element of our conservation program should have priority attention. I therefore strongly urge the Congress to enact legislation establishing a National Wilderness Preservation System along the lines of S. 174, introduced by Senator ANDERSON.

I am sure the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in the other body also has given earnest consideration to this proposal. It has obtained testimony in hearings, both here and in the West. It has debated it in subcommittee and committee sessions. However, when its substitute version of the wilderness bill was ordered reported, it failed to reflect the fundamental objectives expressed in the Senate act. Accompanying this substitute measure was a resolution calling for the bill to be brought to the floor under suspension of the rules, thus limiting floor debate and amendment.

Let me describe briefly the wilderness provisions of the House committee's substitute bill. It dropped entirely the Senate concept of a national wilderness preservation system. It gives protection at once to only the "wilderness," "wild," and "canoe" areas of the national forests. It requires a separate act of Congress to establish any other area as wilderness. It permits mining to continue in the wilderness which would be protected, permits it to continue for 25 years. It requires any wilderness areas that would be established to be reviewed every 25 years.

A notable feature of this substitute bill is its including as title I a separate piece of legislation dealing with the broad land-withdrawal policies of Congress. This title I has not been considered by the Senate in connection with the wilderness legislation. The added title has

been strongly opposed by the Departments of Agriculture and the Interior.

Mr. President, the Speaker of the House did not permit a suspension of the rules, for the purpose of bringing this substitute bill to the House floor under the circumstances in which the Members would not have an opportunity to debate or amend it. The Speaker has advised the Interior Committee chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Colorado, that the best procedure under the circumstances would be to go before the Rules Committee and request a rule for floor consideration.

Since that decision, the House Interior Committee has not convened; and I am informed that no meetings are now scheduled. Also pending in the House Interior Committee are a number of non-controversial measures, such as S. 77, establishing the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Historical Park; S. 1988, promoting the conservation of the Nation's wildlife resources on the Pacific flyway in the Tule Lake, lower Klamath and upper Klamath national wildlife refuges in Oregon and California; S. 3117, establishing the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation in the Department of the Interior and S. 543 providing for shoreline area studies.

Mr. President, I sincerely hope that action can be secured on the wilderness bill and these other conservation measures before Congress adjourns. I have followed for many years the attempts to preserve the remaining wilderness areas of our Nation. I have been one of the strong proponents of the need to protect this rapidly dwindling resource for future generations.

Mr. President, I think I can honestly say that for many years I took the lead in connection with this matter, and I realize how much criticism it can bring upon one. This job has been very difficult. We have come many miles in this battle, and I urge our colleagues in the other body to appreciate the high desirability for action this session.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article from the St. Louis Post Dispatch, for September 16, 1962, entitled "Fate of the Wilderness Bill," be printed in the RECORD at this point. I also ask unanimous consent that an editorial from the Living Wilderness be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Sept. 16, 1962]

FATE OF WILDERNESS BILL

(By William K. Wyant, Jr.)

WASHINGTON, September 15.—The difficulty of persuading the Nation to leave some small part of its scenery unspoiled so posterity can enjoy it is illustrated by the fate of the so-called wilderness bill, which the House will consider next week.

After years of work, conservative-minded Americans led by Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON, Democrat of New Mexico, got a bill through the Senate last September to safeguard 61,275,011 acres in a national wilderness preservation system. But the House Interior Committee, of which Representative

WAYNE N. ASPINALL, Democrat of Colorado, is chairman, is expected to bring before the House Monday a bill that conservationists consider a travesty—worse than nothing at all.

"It is a bill to protect miners, lumbermen and other enterprising patriots from rampant conservationists who are trying to give the country back to the Indians," Howard Zahniser, executive secretary of the Wilderness Society, told the Post-Dispatch sarcastically.

WOULD AVOID DEBATE

The Aspinall committee voted to request that its rewritten version of the Senate bill be brought to the floor with no chance for debate or amendment. Conservationists were working frantically this week to block this procedure. They think they can defeat it.

In the controversy over the measure, 22 national conservation groups and 58 State and local organizations are pitted against lumber, mining, grazing and other commercial interests that have striven to bend Congress's will in their favor.

The quarrel is not over whether new land, not now in Government hands, shall be denied for a while to the ax, the shovel and the bulldozer. It concerns remote back country already in the national forests, the national park group and the national wildlife refuge system.

What conservationists wanted to do was to throw up protections now, while there is still time, for more than 140 wilderness areas that are still largely out of reach of exploitation. Much of it is high, mountainous country in the west and in Alaska.

The conservationists say that they were not trying to change the situation but to pin it down, providing national guarantees against commercial depredation.

CONSERVATIONISTS' GOAL

"Our basic thesis," said Zahniser, who also is vice chairman of the Citizens Committee on Natural Resources, "is that only those areas will be preserved as wilderness in our culture that are designated positively for use as wilderness—and protected as such by law.

"It is not just the greed of miners, which was being lampooned 60 years ago. It is the expansion of our population, the growth of roads and mechanization. Our culture is such that all these areas are destined to have some kind of value that will result in their exploitation and destruction."

The territory the conservationists want to protect, or keep the way it is, includes 6,822,400 acres of "wilderness," "wild" and "canoe" areas and 7,852,958 acres of primitive area in the national forests.

It includes a potential of more than 22 million acres of roadless country in the national park system—not formally designated as wilderness at present—and possibly more than 24 million acres in wildlife refuges and game ranges.

Zahniser said that none of the land that conservationists presumed to be wilderness is open to timber operations at present. The same is not true of mining, which is permitted, generally speaking, under laws dating from 1872.

"The opposition of the lumbermen proved one thing," said Zahniser. "You do need the legislation. The lumber interests said we didn't need it, but this proves they did have designs on it."

He pointed to the testimony of Joe Hughes, who has a logging and sawmill business at Foresthill, Calif. Hughes appeared last November when the subcommittee headed by Representative GRACE FROST, Democrat of Idaho, held hearings at Sacramento.

JOBLESS ISSUE RAISED

Mrs. FROST asked Hughes why he thought passage of the conservationist-backed Sen-

ate bill would cause unemployment, in view of the fact that no timber cutting was allowed in the wilderness areas in question.

"I had in mind an estimated billions of feet of timberland that would be included in the wilderness area, according to the reading I have done on it," said Hughes.

Mrs. Frost then asked Hughes whether he had in mind that lumber operators might at some future time be able to get into some of the present national forest wilderness or primitive areas, now closed to them.

"Yes," said Hughes. "I think the lumbermen as a whole would like to think we can harvest that timber before it dies or is lost to us."

Under the House substitute bill, which conservationists say "substitutes exploitation for preservation," mining could continue for 25 years. Moreover, wilderness areas would be reviewed every 25 years by 10 Federal agencies to determine whether their status should be changed.

The substitute bill would designate less than 7 million acres as wilderness—just the wilderness, wild, and canoe areas in the national forests. Other lands would require separate acts of Congress.

In the Senate bill, a wilderness system would be established including the 14,675,358 acres of wilderness-type areas in national forests. It would permit the President to consider for preservation about 61 million acres, subject to rejection by Congress.

REVIEW IS DISTASTEFUL

The 25-year review is distasteful from the conservationist viewpoint because it would mean that each quarter century the wilderness would have to run the gauntlet. Governors of States and county politicians would have to be consulted. Pressures would be endless.

"This proposed review is as dubious in a wilderness act as it would be in a marriage vow," said Zahniser. "The House bill includes hazards that do not exist now."

Zahniser and other conservationists believe that they stand for the majority of Americans against a small but effective minority of commercial interests. This week they sent each Member of Congress a reprint of an article by Senator ANDERSON supporting his Senate bill.

"The main point," Zahniser said, "is that time is short." The lovely Three Sisters primitive area in Oregon contained no marketable timber when it was established in 1937. In the 1950's the Forest Service moved to reclassify it as wilderness, but in doing so took out 53,000 acres of timber for logging.

"There was a great controversy in which the late Senator Richard Neuberger, Democrat, of Oregon, took the side of right and justice," Zahniser said, "but in the end the decision went to the powersaw." Time had run out in the Three Sisters.

[From the Living Wilderness, spring to summer 1962]

WILDERNESS BILL CRISIS

When the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives on August 30 not only voted to report favorably on a substitute wilderness bill, instead of a measure that could be approved by wilderness advocates, but also adopted a resolution instructing the chairman to try to get the rules suspended so as to prevent debate or amendment by the House of a measure so much in need of amendment, the committee created the latest and greatest of the numerous crises with which the 6-year struggle for congressional action for wilderness preservation has been punctuated.

It is a crisis to which many conservation leaders responded at once with protests to Speaker of the House JOHN W. McCORMACK and urgings that he not permit suspension of the rules for this purpose but rather help see that the wilderness bill is brought before the House with provision for adequate consideration and amendment as the Members of Congress may see fit after debate.

By midafternoon of the day of the committee's action, Spencer M. Smith, secretary and full-time representative of the Citizens Committee on Natural Resources, the conservationists' task force for legislation, wired Speaker McCORMACK strong protests.

"Shocked," said Dr. Smith's telegram as reported to us—"shocked at the action of the House Interior Committee in reporting out the substitute wilderness bill in unacceptable form. Bill represents sad distortion of the measure passed by the Senate and urged by President Kennedy. Committee's further action in requesting that measure be brought to the floor with no chance for debate and amendment is further shocking. Urgently hope the leadership can deny this unreasonable request in order that this measure can receive full House consideration."

Ira N. Gabrielson, chairman of the citizens committee, president of the Wildlife Management Institute, widely known as Mr. Conservation, in another wire that same afternoon told the Speaker that the committee's "request to bring up the substitute wilderness bill under suspension of rules is unacceptable to the Nation's conservationists."

"The committee's substitute is grossly inadequate," said Dr. Gabrielson. "Eliminating the opportunity for floor debate and amendment is unfair to all interested House Members," he charged.

Admittedly the committee had not only done violence to the legislation but also by delay and the rules-suspension procedural maneuver had created serious difficulties for wilderness advocates so late in a congressional session. Yet the conservation leaders who so long and earnestly had worked through many other difficulties were quick to rally. Undoubtedly their supporters throughout the country will likewise rally with protests and urgings to their Congressmen, and the end result may well be a strengthening of the wilderness legislation's prospects.

"We have just entered the arena in the House in which we can fight," Representative JOHN SAYLOR, of Pennsylvania, told a reporter for the National Wildlife Federation's Conservation Report soon after the committee had adjourned. "Under the committee system," said Congressman SAYLOR, pioneer champion of the wilderness bill, himself minority leader of the Interior Committee, "with an adverse committee, we can do nothing until we have a bill reported. Now we have one. It is far from what we want. But we are not through. We have just begun to fight where we do have a chance."

Perhaps—who knows—the surprise attempt to prevent debate and amendment will rather by the very shock of the maneuver and its reverberations only insure earnest debate and encourage amendment.

In fact, there arises the strong conviction on the part of many that the soundest procedure from the viewpoint of by far the great majority of the Members of the House would be a restoration of the Senate-passed Wilderness Act, S. 174, and its passage. Wilderness proponents realize that the Senate act goes too far in some respects in permitting nonconforming uses of wilderness and includes some procedural inconsistencies, but they also recognize that in general it is a sound and constructive measure which can

greatly improve present conditions and establish a sound national policy and program, while the tone of the substitute bill, as Ernest Dickerman of the Smoky Mountains Hiking Club has said in a detailed analysis, "is consistently negative with respect to the preservation of wilderness."

The many conservationists in the House of Representatives, and their constituents throughout the Nation, who wish to see a sound and enduring national wilderness preservation system do face a crisis. There is little time. There is none to lose. Yet the opportunity for worthy action is still alive. And the prospects are challenging.

ROSH HASHANAH

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, with coming of Rosh Hashanah and the high holidays that usher in the New Year, the thoughts of men of good will everywhere turn to the Jewish people, to their long history of suffering heroically borne, and to their stubborn attachment to the ideals of strict morality, intellectual integrity, religious faith, and cultural identity.

America must never forget that Jewish heroes were involved in the founding of our Nation, and have fought bravely in every one of our wars. Neither must America forget that Old Testament principles, treasured and handed down to us by Jewish people through the ages entered into the thinking of those who formed our colonies, those who spoke and worked for our national independence, and those who devised our Federal Constitution.

It is therefore to no strangers or guests among us, but to brothers, that we speak when we bid the Jewish people of America "Happy New Year" at the start of the year 5723. We respect and admire these centuries of Jewish achievements and contributions.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. May I be advised as to whether or not there is to be a session tomorrow?

Mr. HUMPHREY. There is.

Mr. SPARKMAN. At what time will the Senate convene?

Mr. HUMPHREY. It will meet at 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

Mr. SPARKMAN. What will be the order of business?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Some minor bills on the calendar. The Senate is expected to proceed to the consideration of the