THE STRUCTURE OF GREATNESS

The American story could not be told without acknowledging the contributions of its engineering genius. National Engineers Week, observed this week, celebrates the achievements of the men and women who have shaped our nation and, in particular, the work of an organization whose scope too often is underestimated.

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers is the largest engineering body in the world, with responsibilities that have expanded beyond the traditional military commitments for the Army, the Air Force and, occasionally, the Navy. Its civil works projects include river and harbor navigation, flood control and the development of natural resources.

The corps' first Chief, Col. Richard Gridley, fortified the American positions on Bunker Hill. After the Revolution, it organized and operated the Military Academy at West Point, until the Civil War period and for many years this was where all American engineers were trained.

Its interest in roads, waterways and harbors began during the War of 1812, and in 1824 Congress directed the corps to plan a national transportation system that would weld the Nation together.

Army Engineers surveyed the routes for the early railroads, made rivers and streams navigable. During the 1840s, Army Engineers sent missions out to explore, survey and map the West for the first time, for the resources it contained.

At the turn of the century the corps' Chief, Maj. Gouverneur J.Morison, was responsible for completing the Panama Canal, and Army Engineers still serve as Governors of the Canal Zone.

Between World War I and II, the Engineers embarked upon a vast water resources development and flood control program in our great river basins.

It was on the French engineers recruited by George Washington—Maj. Pierre L'Enfant—who laid out the city of Washington, and the Army Engineers built, completed or improved such notable structures as the Capitol dome, the Washington Monument, the Lincoln Memorial, the Library of Congress and Washington National Airport.

In time of war, the Engineers have been in the forefront of the fighting and Gen. Douglas MacArthur, himself a former Army engineer, described World War II as an engineer's war.

The Manhattan project, which developed the atomic bomb, was headed and manned by Army Engineers.

The Manhattan project, which developed the atomic bomb, was headed and manned by Army Engineers.

In peace as in war, the Corps of Engineers has helped to give the United States the structure of greatness, to help create the mobility which is so much a characteristic of Americans and, in keeping with the 1824 congressional mandate, to "weld the Nation together."

THE FOURTH NATIONAL ASSEMBLY OF CIVIL WAR CENTENNIAL COMMISSION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I wish to commend my colleague, the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. Cullen), for his construction of urging the National Civil War Centennial Commission to seek a change in the site of the meeting of the fourth national assembly of Civil War Centennial, which would take us from Charleston, S.C., to a site where segregation does not obtain. I also wish to associate myself with his request to the Head of the Executive, Gen. Ulysses S. Grant III in that same respect.

In so acting, the Senator from New Jersey was supporting the decision of the New Jersey Civil War Centennial Commission to withdraw from the assembly because a member of the New Jersey Commission is a Negro who, while attending the assembly, would be faced with South Carolina's segregation laws.

In my own State of New York a centennial commission has been organized, so we are not participating, and I have not been faced with this problem. However, I wish to applaud the Senator from New Jersey and to support him. I am sure it was difficult for the New Jersey Commission to decide to forgo participation in the assembly which is timed to coincide with the 100th anniversary of the firing on Fort Sumter in Charleston Harbor, for we all know of the tremendous zeal and enthusiasm which Civil War buffs bring to their causes.

I regret that the National Commission has not made the same difficult decision that the New Jersey Commission has made. While I recognize the historic significance of Fort Sumter in commemorating this centennial, I believe that there are broader issues so much concerned with the outbreak of the Civil War, which dictate that the condition which are in my opinion contrary to the principles of equality and freedom which were established a hundred years ago at the cost of so much blood and sacrifice by the brave men on both sides.

NEBRASKA BECOMES 32D STATE TO RATIFY DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA VOTING AMENDMENT

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, it is with pride that I call the attention of the Senate to the fact that Nebraska yesterday became the 32d State to ratify the so-called District of Columbia voting amendment.

This is the amendment to our Constitution which would permit residents of the Capital City of Washing- ton, D.C., to elect the President and Vice President of the United States.

A resolution of ratification was adopted by Nebraska's unicameral legislature yesterday by an overwhelming vote of 40 to 1. This means that if six additional States follow suit, the residents of the District of Columbia will have the long-merited privilege of casting votes for President and Vice President for the first time since the District was established in 1800.

I hope indeed that the legislatures of the required number of States will soon follow Nebraska's course in the very near future.

CHANGE IN U.S. POLICY ON COLONIALISM

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the points in the Rec ords an article entitled "U.S. Shifts on Colonialism; Backs U.N. Angola Inquiry," published in the New York Times for today, March 16, 1961.

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

U.S. SHIFTS ON COLONIALISM; BACKS U.N. ANGOLA INQUIRY

BY RICHARD T. BULLEN

UNITED NATIONS, N.Y., March 16.—The United States joined Asian and African states today in opposing Portugal's handling of its colony in Angola, Mr. Stevenson said in a surprise speech by Adlai E. Stevenson, chief U.S. delegate in the Security Council. Mr. Stevenson's spokesman read a statement from the Eisenhower administration's policies in past debates on colonialism.

The declaration was read from the immediate business at hand—a resolution by Liberia, Ceylon and the United Arab Republic calling for an inquiry into racial discrimination that took place in Angola last month.

The resolution was rejected by a vote of 5 in favor, 0 against and 6 abstentions, the United States and the Soviet Union joined the three sponsors in supporting the resolution.

A resolution requires seven affirmative votes for adoption in the Security Council, although a negative vote by any of the five permanent members—the United States, the Soviet Union, Britain, France and China—serves as a veto.

After the Stevenson speech, a jubilant Liberi an delegate hailed it, predicting that it would 'wreverberate throughout Africa and the world."

Mr. Stevenson spoke after Britain, Nat ionalist China, Ecuador and Chile had said they would not support the three-power inquiry thereby insuring its rejection. They argued that it had not been proved that a threat to peace and security existed.

The U.S. delegate, however, took the position that unless remedial measures were taken, more disorders would occur with dan gerous consequences.

Citing the former Belgian Congo as an example, Mr. Stevenson declared that the imposition of the condition of Angola's independence, which conditions do not exist for the Angola of tomorrow.

In recent months the United States had come under heavy fire from Asian and African states for its record of voting with the colonial powers on resolutions affecting the new nation states.

The peak of anti-U.S. feeling was reached after the Republican administration last December would not support a resolution in Assembly calling for steps to give independence to nonself-governing territories. The measure was passed by a margin of 5 to 0, with the United States abstaining, along with Portugal and other colonial powers and South Africa and the Dominican Republic.

The U.S. decision to differ with its traditional allies Britain and France and to support the African and Asian case on Angola was reported to have been made known to the delegation only a few hours before the Council met today.

At the time the Soviet Union was the only member certain to support the sponsors, while it was clear that Britain and France would take Portugal's view that the Council had no legal basis to intervene in Angola. Portugal regards the territory, with its 4 million people, as an overseas province.

Mr. Stevenson's remarks were made in a council chamber crowded with African delegates attending as spectators. His audience noticed a noticeably more attentive as he went along.

He declared that the United States, as a friend of Portugal would be remiss if it did not take that step, until all Portuguese territories must be accelerated for the political, social and economic advancement of all inhabitants toward self-determination.
"The best course of action for Portugal and the best course of action to promote the interests of the people of Portuguese territories is through cooperation with the United Nations," Mr. Stevenson added.

Turning to the three-power resolution, he added, "In the room, the head of our Delegation in the United Nations, Mr. Stevenson, added that the interests of the people of Portuguese territories are threatened because, having served in the United Nations, I know that Adlai Stevenson would not have made the statements he made yesterday if they were in conflict with the position taken by this administration."

Mr. Stevenson took a position yesterday on the so-called Angola or Portuguese question exactly contrary to the position of the United States, which has been taking in the United Nations. It was a position which, unfortunately, our delegation had to take last year under the direct instructions of the previous administration in the State Department and the previous occupant of the White House.

It is interesting to note that the position in support of the Portuguese in the Security Council was upheld by the United Kingdom, Nationalist China, Ecuador, and Chile. But for once, the United States got on the side of the angels in the United Nations, because Mr. Stevenson made it perfectly clear that the colonial policies of Portugal threatened peace in Africa and threatened peace elsewhere in the world. Stevenson made it clear yesterday that he would not go along with the legal fiction of Portugal that the people of African territories would not have any colonies; all they have are overseas metropolitan provinces, by its own definition.

It is very easy to show that Portugal has territories within the meaning of sections 73 and 74 of the United Nations Charter, because we put to them once again, as I did in the United Nations last fall, these three questions:

First, do they rule and exercise dominion, dominion, control, and subjugation over millions of indigenous people in foreign territories?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Oregon has expired.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Oregon be granted 2 more minutes.

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

Mr. MORSE. Does Portugal exercise dominion and control over an indigenous population? We took judicial notice that the answer is "Yes."

Second, is that indigenous population a population of high tension in the world? We took judicial notice that the answer is "Yes."

Third, does that high tension threaten the peace of the world, or at least peace in that area of the world in which the indigenous population lives?

We took judicial notice that the answer is "Yes."

The result is that no matter what Portugal administers as territorial policy, she has territories, and the indigenous population of these territories is becoming a threat to the peace of the world.

The clear duty of the United Kingdom, which is the leader, unfortunately, in the world today, is to recognize United Nations jurisdiction over those areas of high tension in the world, so that peace can be maintained.

Mr. Stevenson has agreed in the past that at least the United States has taken a position in the United Nations in support of the principle of self-determination, of which we have boasted throughout our glorious history, but on which we have turned our backs in the United Nations during the last 8 years of administration in this country.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I feel certain that the motion of Senator from Oregon to extend the time of the Senator from Oregon agree with me that while we are calling upon the United Kingdom, France, and other nations among our allies to give consideration to the liberation of colonies, it would be a rank travesty if we forgot to call upon the Soviet Union to liberate the captive nations of Europe and the people who live within the borders of the Soviet Union.

Everyone knows there are captive nations in Europe which are subject to the domination of the Soviet Union. Everyone knows that there are people within the boundaries of the Eastern and Soviet Republics who are dominated by the Soviet Government. They are an indigenous population; they are subject to exploitation.

The Hungarians, of whom I spoke yesterday, and who yesterday were celebrating their 113th anniversary of independence, also fall in that category.

Moreover, I should say that we would be remiss unless we recognized the fact that the United Kingdom has followed a course under which 16 nations have been given independence since 1945, and that France has given independence to 15 nations.

I join with the Senator from Oregon in the hope that a transition will take place. I am sure the Senator from Oregon, like me, will believe that independence simply cannot be granted. Belgium granted independence to the Congo when more properly a trusteeship should have been established. All these questions must be explored before a course can be followed.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I am glad to yield.
Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I shall have to request the regular order at this time.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I dislike to find myself in disagreement with my good friend, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse], with those enlightened views on most subjects I agree and which I have always sought to emulate.

But in his recent statement on the United Kingdom, I think he has been a little harsh.

I am not saying that on the contrary, the United Kingdom has adopted a very enlightened policy toward its former colonies. It has liberated them, given independence to India, Ceylon, Malaya, the West Indies Federation, Nigeria, Ghana, and is in the process of liberating others, after giving them an admirable tutelage in government as a preparation for self-rule.

In that connection, I may say that at the present time Australia, part of the British Commonwealth, is making plans to give independence to Western Samoa. So the question of colonialism is not so simple.

I may say that once I occupied a uniquely favorable position to become aware of the multiple aspects of colonialism, in that I was the head of the U.S. agency which had supervision of the Philippines. Certainly the United States recognized for self-rule.

I may say that once I occupied a uniquely favorable position to become aware of the multiple aspects of colonialism, in that I was the head of the U.S. agency which had supervision of our Federal relations with the then Terri-
sage of the Davis-Bacon Act. It is the reason why Congress on several occasions has applied the provisions of this Act to work which is being performed by Federal construction programs, such as airports, housing, and highways.

The amendment to the Davis-Bacon Act which I have jointly coauthored would rectify this inequity by requiring the Secretary of Labor to take into account in his determination of the prevailing wage the contractor's payment to helpers employed in the same occupation, retirement, and apprenticeship funds. Mr. President, I think it is imperative that this Congress bring the Davis-Bacon provisions into conformity with the practices of modern labor-management relations.

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

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield to my distinguished colleague and friend.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I consider it a rare privilege to work on the legislation with the Senator from California. We have joined together in an effort to improve the Bacon-Davis Act. We are going to do everything we can this time to bring about prompt action by the Congress.

The amendments which we have suggested are amendments which have met with the approval of experts in labor-management relations; and I am confident they will be of benefit to the country.

I thank the Senator from California for his leadership on the other side of the aisle. I only hope I may do as well on this side of the aisle.

CHANNEL ISLANDS A HISTORIC NAME

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, from time to time it is, I support, desirable, and, on occasion, necessary to break with the past and to change practices and habits, in the interest of making progress.

But, as a Californian, I vigorously object to any willy-nilly, "off-with-the-old-on-with-the-new" concept of discarding and, on occasion, necessary to break with the past and to change practices and habits, in the interest of making progress.

I was not only interested, but more than a little surprised, that former Postmaster General Summerfield was accused, in this speech, of throwing tinsel into the eyes of Congress. This, to me, seems a downgrading of Congress, for surely there must be some discerning members of the Democratic Party who would not be bedazzled by the tinsel, if tinsel there were.

My distinguished colleague refers also to what he termed a "snow" job having been perpetrated on Congress and the people by the former Postmaster General. I am wondering if he is not, perhaps, he thought that a snow job if we see one. It is my personal belief that the snow job is the one political weapon that this Democratic administration will recommend and what action will be taken by the Democratic majority in each House to rectify this longstanding problem.

THE POSTAL SERVICE

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, as the ranking Republican member of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee, I was much interested in the remarks on the postal service made March 7 by my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from South Carolina (Mr. Johnston), chairman of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

I was not only interested, but more than a little surprised, that former Postmaster General Summerfield was accused, in this speech, of throwing tinsel into the eyes of Congress. This, to me, seems a downgrading of Congress, for surely there must be some discerning members of the Democratic Party who would not be bedazzled by the tinsel, if tinsel there were.

My distinguished colleague refers also to what he termed a "snow" job having been perpetrated on Congress and the people by the former Postmaster General. I am wondering if he is not, perhaps, he thought that a snow job if we see one. It is my personal belief that the snow job is the one political weapon that this Democratic administration will recommend and what action will be taken by the Democratic majority in each House to rectify this longstanding problem.

OBJECTIVES

Mr. President, my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from South Carolina, quotes President Eisenhower on the objectives he laid down when he assumed office. There were three objectives or goals set up by Mr. Eisenhower to the Postmaster General. I quote them:

First, give the American people the kind of postal service they must have in a growing economy.

Second, reduce the postal deficit through economies and application of modern management techniques.

Third, persuade the Congress to complete the job of balancing the postal deficit by relieving the Department of subsidy burdens, by reimbursing us for charges for services to other agencies, and by adjusting postal rates to offset postal costs.

Let me call particular attention, Mr. President, to that third point:

Persuade the Congress to complete the job of balancing the postal deficit by relieving the Department of subsidy burdens, by reimbursing us for charges for services to other agencies, and by adjusting postal rates to offset postal costs.

Mr. President, postal deficits are not something new. They will not end overnight. Nothing can or will happen overnight. Nothing can or will happen overnight. Nothing can or will happen overnight. Nothing can or will happen overnight. Nothing can or will happen overnight. Nothing can or will happen overnight. Nothing can or will happen overnight. Nothing can or will happen overnight. Nothing can or will happen overnight. Nothing can or will happen overnight. Nothing can or will happen overnight. Nothing can or will happen overnight.

Mr. President, as the ranking Republican member of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee, I was much interested in the remarks on the postal service made March 7 by my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from South Carolina (Mr. Johnston), chairman of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

I was not only interested, but more than a little surprised, that former Postmaster General Summerfield was accused, in this speech, of throwing tinsel into the eyes of Congress. This, to me, seems a downgrading of Congress, for surely there must be some discerning members of the Democratic Party who would not be bedazzled by the tinsel, if tinsel there were.

My distinguished colleague refers also to what he termed a "snow" job having been perpetrated on Congress and the people by the former Postmaster General. I am wondering if he is not, perhaps, he thought that a snow job if we see one. It is my personal belief that the snow job is the one political weapon that this Democratic administration will recommend and what action will be taken by the Democratic majority in each House to rectify this longstanding problem.

TERMINUS OPERATION

The Post Office Department has a tremendous job. It handles more mail than all of the rest of the world combined.

In 1960, 64 billion pieces of mail flowed through some 41,000 postal facilities servicing practically every home and re-