

1960

concern you, as individual citizens and thoughtful Americans, and as members of a great international organization dedicated to fostering world understanding in no less than 116 nations. I personally feel this deep concern as a father and a grandfather who cares, like each of you, about the kind of world our children and their children will inherit and inhabit. I also happen to be an elected official responsible for the safety and well-being of more than 16.5 million citizens of the greatest State of the Union. My concern, therefore, is official as well as personal.

The facts before us permit no one to be either serene or complacent. For the fate of our freedom—yours and mine and America's—is decisively affected by the fate of freedom in the world at large.

Everywhere we look across this world in which we live, the forces of freedom are under siege and in danger.

It is so in Cuba, just 90 miles from the American mainland—and it is so in Japan, on the far side of the globe. It is so in those divided nations whose internal borders are among the most cruel scars of the cold war: Germany, Korea, Vietnam. It is so with a country whose whole conduct can bend before Communist pressure—as with Japan; or with a city whose very life must suffer Soviet threat—as with Berlin.

The forces of freedom, in short, are in historic trouble.

We, as Americans, cannot waste time merely lamenting this fact. Nor must time be wasted in confusing or exploiting the fact for partisan purposes in domestic politics. The great question is: What can we do about it?

I say that there is a great deal that we Americans can do about it—and we can do it with greatness.

We can make freedom a dynamic and irresistible force throughout the world.

Before we talk about “we,” the Nation, let us talk specifically about “we,” the individual citizens, such as you and I. We individual Americans are not helplessly remote from the arenas where great problems and great perils must be met. I can demonstrate this simply and concretely to you.

Only 4 days ago, the controlling majority in the U.S. House of Representatives attacked the mutual security appropriation as if wielding an ax. By the time the ax had finished its indelicate surgery, the money available in fiscal 1961 for strengthening our allies, along all the frontiers of freedom, had been slashed by \$590 million.

I am pleased and proud that an even more drastic cut was prevented by the leadership of an upstate New York Congressman, JOHN TABER, at the head of a coalition largely of Republicans. We can thank him and them.

But we cannot afford the damage that was done. The mutual security appropriation is now before the Senate. I strongly urge you to wire or write your Senators immediately to support vigorously the restoration by the Senate of the House cuts—to restore the full amount requested by President Eisenhower. The restoration of these cuts is vital to the strengthening of the forces of freedom. This is a vital task in which each one of you can help.

Action in this area, however, is essentially a holding action. If freedom is really to become a dynamic and irresistible force in the world, free men and free nations must join together in a truly great design—a design to assure that our deepest spiritual and political values shall live and thrive.

Where do we begin on this great design? Very simply, it seems to me that we have to start with the problem of organization. This means political organization in the most full and creative sense. It means

organization of our own Government. And it means organization of a host of free nations.

Two great and explicit challenges and needs are involved:

First, we must give to the Government of the United States a structure so cohesive, so efficient, so strong that it can both inspire and execute the policies and programs necessary in a world of revolutionary change.

Second, we must lead and encourage the free nations to develop and deepen their bonds with one another so that regional alliances can grow into working confederations.

I am speaking now of historic steps, of giant strides to be made both within our own Government and among the governments of all freedom-loving peoples. They are realistic and practical steps.

Let us look at both areas of action. There is nothing new about efforts to improve the organization of the Federal Government. Two Hoover Commissions studied aspects of this need at length, and they achieved important reforms during the Truman and Eisenhower administrations.

I was intimately concerned with the subject for 5 years as chairman of President Eisenhower's Committee on Government Organization. In addition, I participated in the last two reorganizations of the Defense Department.

Spurred by ever-changing world conditions, a Senate subcommittee under Senator JACKSON, of Washington, is now investigating the policymaking machinery of our National Government.

The significant fact today is the growing public awareness of the urgency of getting major improvements made—and made fast—in this area. For we have lately faced plain and serious evidence of the inadequacy of our Government machinery. We have seen this with the unfortunate U-2 incident. We have seen this with the unhappy fate of the President's plans to visit Japan. Both occurrences have warned us that there is something seriously wrong with the working of the decisionmaking processes of our Government.

Deeply as we may regret these facts, we can and must welcome the quickened public concern that they have provoked. This concern encourages me to believe that important reform can now be achieved—and I am confident that a great deal of such reform will have the full support of the President.

I feel deeply, therefore, that the Congress should make necessary Government reorganization its first order of business in the next session. For the blunt truth is that the present structure of the Federal Government is simply not properly geared to support the President in developing and executing policy, thoughtfully and purposefully, in the complex areas of national security and foreign affairs.

This governmental structure moves slowly, even sluggishly, to meet a world of swift-moving change. It tends to be stiff and static when it should be quick, alert, and creative.

If any citizen imagines, for example, that our Department of State exercises sole and supreme authority in the operation of our foreign policy, this citizen is very much mistaken. The defining and operating of such policy involves almost a legion of governmental departments and agencies—State, Defense, CIA, ICA, USIA, and very often Treasury, Commerce, Labor, Agriculture, along with innumerable interdepartmental agencies. To reconcile and coordinate their policies and actions, a host of committees, including the National Security Council, has been established.

The weaknesses of such a way of operating are becoming obvious. It verges on a system of government by committee. Committees, by their very nature, tend to reach the least bold or imaginative position. The result is the lowest common denominator among several varying positions, in the name of agreement.

How do we make sure that, in the making of important national decisions, the controlling consideration is the supreme interest of the United States—and not the rival interests of competing agencies?

I strongly urge that two important and practical steps be taken immediately: (1) The post of First Secretary of the Government should be created to assist the President in the exercise of his authority in the whole area of national security and international affairs. This official, with status above the level of Cabinet officers, would derive his authority from the President and act on his behalf. He would have statutory designation as Executive Chairman of the National Security Council. He would be empowered to represent the President, in international matters, on the prime ministerial level. He would be supported by a staff of his own. He would be empowered to reorganize and use the whole interdepartmental planning machinery of the Government in this area, including programs for controlled disarmament.

While the Secretary of State continued in charge of the day-to-day conduct of diplomacy (and represented the Government on the foreign ministerial level), the First Secretary would, under the President, inspire and direct the defining of long-range purposes, the policies working toward them, and the coordinated action needed to execute these policies.

2. A similar clarification of authority in the area of defense planning and organization is especially necessary. The most effective and efficient defense organization is indispensable to the whole defense of freedom. I recommend the following: (a) The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff should be designated principal adviser to the Secretary of Defense and the President, and be responsible for the development of overall strategic doctrine. (b) The staff of the Joint Chiefs should be organized on a unified basis under the direct authority of the Chairman. (c) All officers above the rank of brigadier general or the equivalent should receive any promotions from the Department of Defense and be officers of the Armed Forces of the United States—not the individual service of their earlier careers. (d) The Secretary of Defense should be given full authority over all military research, development, and procurement.

Why are such organizational steps so urgently necessary?

It is not any marginal matter of simply making governmental machinery a little more efficient, a little more coherent, as all of us would like. It is the most critical matter of making this machinery able to cope with problems and challenges emerging with swiftness upon all sides—in an age of the deadliest of weapons, on an earth deeply divided against itself.

And only as our own Government is sensibly put in order can we proceed to the greater task of applying to the world of the free nations the same modern principles and practices that alone can give strength to the forces of freedom everywhere. This is the way to start building the kind of world we want.

Let us now look at the challenge of building this larger world—and of helping bring to it, too, purpose and organization.

I have spoken of developing confederations out of regional alliances. This is

July 15

neither a dream nor an abstraction. It simply suggests the logical and inevitable next step in the history of free nations.

We must face the fact that we have reached a point in history at which the Nation-State, standing alone, is becoming as obsolete as the city-state of ancient Greece or medieval Europe. No nation today, large or small, can meet the needs of its people or insure their security from within its own borders alone. We have already seen the peril of allowing Communist imperialism to pick off, one by one, the free nations standing in its path of aggression. We can see that the pattern of relationship between America and these other free nations must be something deeper and broader than a series of military alliances and bilateral treaties. There must be more lasting and rational political structure to these relationships.

Furthermore, we know in the economic realm that we cannot indefinitely treat or support the many needy free nations as dependents upon America. Rather must we help them to evolve political and economic structures that sustain their own unity, cooperation, prosperity and strength.

Our great task, then, is to help build these structures, so that the forces of democracy throughout the world can be strong and purposeful, dynamic and confident. We must be concerned primarily with political associations. As the political structures are sound—and only thus—the strength needed for common effort and common defense will follow.

We are not and cannot be striving merely to meet crises on a sporadic basis—but striving to serve the needs and aspirations of free peoples everywhere on a continuing basis. We are not trying merely to baffle enemies of freedom. We are trying to build freedom itself—by building the structures in which it can live and thrive. These are the ideas and purposes beneath the regional concept of confederation.

The outlines of confederation are already present throughout the world. They exist in the Organization of American States, in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, in the Inner Six and Outer Seven of European trade, and other like associations. These can be starting points for the work ahead of us.

This work of moving toward confederation does not involve any superstates. Nor does it subtract from or conflict with the authority of the United Nations. Quite the contrary: Article 51 of the United Nations Charter specifically makes provision for regional associations, and the growth of these associations, would, in fact, add immeasurably to the strength of the United Nations.

The whole spirit and concept of confederation would be gradual and evolutionary. It provides occasion for firmer bonds between nations, joined in common effort on any level of national life—whether it be social, economic, or monetary; juridical, cultural, or military. Thus the principles of confederation can be applied at whatever level the parties agree to be in their mutual interest.

Let me try to put the idea of confederation into clear focus by proposing specific confederations, and the great tasks they would accomplish:

(1) A North Atlantic Confederation. What would this confederation actually do? It would strive to tighten all political, economic, military, and cultural bonds linking Great Britain, Western Europe, and North America. It would offer in the economic arena a larger framework within which to work toward resolving present conflict between the Inner Six and the Outer Seven. It would be dedicated to the ultimate achievement of free competition and free trade throughout its area. It would work toward greater unity of armed forces—a unity that, as it grew, America could recog-

nize by placing nuclear weapons under the command of NATO.

It would share among the prosperous Western nations the burden now falling largely upon America to bring economic assistance and technical training to underdeveloped areas—and it would inspire this essential help to be given as a joint undertaking.

It would work toward a single Western plan for enforceable programs of disarmament to be negotiated with the Soviet Union—rather than allow the Soviets to confront and exploit a variety of divergent Western programs as they do today.

Finally, it would be a confederation so strong and so confident as to be ever ready to enlarge its numbers to include any of the Soviet-controlled satellites wanting to break away from the Soviet system and to join a union of free nations clearly capable of defending themselves.

(2) A Western Hemisphere Confederation. What would this confederation do? It would give hope and help to the peoples of Latin America who today are the world's most rapidly growing population. It would make possible a kind of Marshall plan for Latin America that would work toward long-range industrial development and a hemisphere free-trade area, allowing a free flow of men and goods and money from Point Barrow to Tierra del Fuego. In my opinion, only action of this scope can check antidemocratic forces, spurred on by Communist influences from abroad, as are so evident in Cuba today.

It would join efforts everywhere to make the land serve the people, by supporting land reform wherever necessary and by fostering so great a joint project as an East Andes Development Authority. Such an authority could open up the fertile soils and abundant power along this great frontier reaching from Caribbean shores 3,000 miles southward through the heart of the continent.

It would inspire progressive social action on a broad front. It would quicken the growth of universities. It would encourage scientific research and development. And it would tackle such urgent social problems as the need to finance, through a hemispheric credit mechanism akin to FHA, a massive program of low-cost housing in the fast-growing metropolitan centers of the hemisphere.

(3) An African Confederation. What would this conference actually do? To begin with, it would respect and echo the spirit of African unity already voiced by African leaders who are themselves impatient with old forms of nationalism that have no real roots in Africa.

With the cooperation of the North Atlantic Confederation, it would then begin with the most urgent task before the newly free African peoples, that of providing skills and training to millions just learning to govern themselves and to direct their own economies.

It would establish specific institutes of training in these subjects, from civil administration and auditing to telephone communication and roadbuilding. These institutes could largely be financed by the combined resources from public and private sources.

These, then, are some concrete examples of work to be done. The challenges are no less great in the Middle East and the Far East. Here, too, the rewards of working confederations can be enormous—for the cause of freedom. Ultimately, effective confederation can mean the proving that freedom can work—and that the needs and aspirations of free peoples everywhere can be met by bold and imaginative leadership of the free world.

This is a cause to challenge the greatness of America—to stir its people—to inspire its leaders.

This is a time in history when the skeptics and the cynics must not be allowed to make us shy from great endeavor, boldly conceived and bravely executed. Nor can we be turned aside by oversimplified warnings in terms of costs and expenses—warnings that, while seeming to be realistic, take little account of the facts.

We must remember the basic truth that only as the free nations of the world share in growth and strength can they share cost. Only as world productivity expands can the free peoples find a more sound and just source of help than the income of the individual American taxpayer. Only as the American economy grows in size and strength can it fulfill the opportunities of freedom and meet the challenge of communism. And this growth of ours can come only in a world whose productivity is speeding and whose economy is expanding.

The practical and the ideal are thus not at odds with one another. They are one and the same. And they must join to do what is more than desirable—they must do what is utterly and vitally necessary for the survival of freedom. We can hope to do this only with political structures in the world that can give both form and force to the principles of human dignity and individual worth.

What must be proven is that free citizens and free nations have the will and the wisdom to be as creative in this 20th century as our own American Founding Fathers were in the 18th century. Then freedom on this continent was at stake. Today it is freedom throughout the world. And the size of our designs and our purposes must match the size of the perils that challenge us.

I am confident that we can—as we must—build on this scale of greatness. I deeply believe in particular that the youth of America are ready and eager for the great adventure that can lie ahead. Let us begin this adventure by building those political structures throughout the world which will enable free peoples to live in peace and know justice. Let us begin it with the zeal and courage of our forefathers.

We have nothing to lose but our fears. We have the future of freedom to win.

Captive Nations Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG
OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, a year ago the Congress adopted a resolution calling upon the President to proclaim "Captive Nations Weeks." This was done and the proclamation has been renewed this year. In the week of July 17, 1960, we will again observe Captive Nations Week.

The Soviet Union, whose fondness for branding other nations as imperialists represents the depths of hypocrisy and deceit, has forcibly thrust its evil Communist doctrine upon more than 20 nations throughout the world. It has subjugated these nations by force and subversion and created a Communist empire of nations which are, in truth, captives. We think of the fate of Hungary, Poland, East Germany, Czechoslovakia, the Baltic States, Bulgaria, and many more.

If these captive nations could choose, they would choose independence and

1960

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A5983

freedom rather than Communist subjugation. For no nation has ever freely chosen communism. Who would prefer bondage to freedom? This evil system has gained power only by violence, subversion, deceit, and force.

We in the United States are well aware of the sentiments of these captive peoples. We understand and support their aspirations for liberty and independence. We know that so long as any nation is oppressed and subjugated, no nations can be entirely free.

The captive nations resolution last year caused great consternation in the Soviet Union for it struck an area which the Communists anxiously desire to keep submerged. They know the captive nations represent a major weakness in the Communist system. Instead of the great monolithic system which the Communists pretend exists, the Communist empire is held together by chains.

We have faith that the desire for freedom and independence will not remain suppressed indefinitely by brute force. The United States supports the cause of freedom everywhere and the right of self-determination for all peoples. We look forward with hope to the day when these noble principles will again prevail in the captive nations of the world.

Captive Nations Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, by resolution of this Congress, and by proclamation of the President, July 17-23 is Captive Nations Week.

This solemn occasion is a truly historic one. The value and impact of the resolution was clearly demonstrated last July, when, as we recall, its passage evoked an explosive and vituperative reaction from Nikita Khrushchev.

The forthcoming observance will poignantly portray to the Nation as well as to the world, the plight of the nations who live in Soviet captivity. These nations, let us recall, do not just exist outside of the Soviet Union, where the heavy hand of Russia systematically exploits the resources and relentlessly treads upon the liberties of the valiant peoples of central Europe. The U.S.S.R. itself is built upon the captivity of 100 million non-Russian people who endure, in secret rebellion, the excesses of the Soviet Empire.

Let us remember that, despite the tactics of the police state, and despite merciless attempts at russification, these peoples also struggle to retain the vestiges of their national identity. Brute force, which has achieved a surface unity, has at the same time only strengthened the will of the people for self-determination and freedom.

The depth of the desire for liberty was tragically demonstrated by the revolts in

Poland and the bloodbath of Hungary. The people of the captive nations have never accepted the Soviet tyranny, nor have they forgotten the priceless freedom that once, however briefly, was theirs.

I anticipate that the week of July 17 will bring demonstrations, rallies, and parades throughout the Nation. By these observances Americans will give heart and courage to the peoples in captivity and will remind the world, as well as their oppressors, that we have forgotten their suffering no more than they have forgotten their precious dream of freedom.

When President Eisenhower issued the captive nations proclamation, he stated that such observances shall take place each year "until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world." Let us hope and pray that, with God's help, we shall soon see the day when the need for a Captive Nations Week exists no more.

Our Region Needs Debate on Water Problems, Too

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN A. CARROLL

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an article from the Denver Post of June 26, 1960, entitled "Our Region Needs Debate on Water Problems, Too."

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

OUR REGION NEEDS DEBATE ON WATER PROBLEMS, TOO

The Senate Select Committee on National Water Resources has not completely sifted the millions of words of expert and amateur testimony it has taken this past year.

But one fact has already become apparent, as the adjoining article indicates.

What the committee calls the "Southwest" water region of the country, which includes Colorado and the vast area served by the Colorado River, is on its way to becoming the "water crisis" area of the Nation in the next 40 years.

Here are the challenging figures:

Today this nine-State region (Arizona, California, Colorado, Kansas, Nevada, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Texas, and Utah) has a population of roughly 30 million. Its water use, including farm irrigation, averages out to about 2,475 gallons per person per day.

This current level of water use is supplied primarily from surface runoff water in our rivers and streams. The region has less of such runoff than any other in the country.

For the area as a whole this supply can be estimated at anywhere from 196 down to 120 million acre-feet per year, depending on whether you look at the best years or the poorest. The average has been as low as 120 million acre-feet in drought periods.

Now, taking the Bureau of the Census high-range population projections for the same region, we can expect about 89 million people by the year 2000. California and

southern Arizona are expected to be one of the great urban areas of the Nation.

This is substantially more than our "best years" average supply, and almost twice the average for the driest 10-year period in the region's history.

Suppose we allow a 1,600-gallon-a-day average use figure in the great Southwest of 40 years from now (and that's only two-thirds of present per capita use).

Even so, the Senate has been told, the region will have to almost double its water storage capacity at very high costs and engage intensively in every known and hoped-for method of water conservation and development to achieve that lower per capita use supply. Some of the possibilities are listed in the adjoining article.

These water figures must force the leaders of our area to ask themselves hard questions, many of them going against the grain of regional tradition and sentiment.

For example, is the day already here when we can no longer afford the use of an acre-foot of water for farm irrigation because growing cities and industries need it more, and will yield more over-all economic growth to the region?

Can we ever again afford to use a good reservoir site for a one-purpose development, say power alone, or city water supply alone?

Can western water law, based on the first-come, first-served principle of ownership, continue to be the framework for our water development when, as a region, we can see shortages that will affect great communities so clearly ahead?

Can any force except the Federal Government coordinate and push the comprehensive and extremely expensive programs of development that the experts tell us will be not just desirable but essential?

These are only a few of the tough questions beginning to emerge at meetings of regional water experts.

But they must become interesting questions to the layman, too, for 40 years is not a long time. It's probably within your lifetime and certainly within that of your children.

If we now need a great national debate on foreign policy and purpose, as our best thinkers are urging, clearly, too, within our region we must embark on serious and organized public discussion of resources problems, especially regarding water.

Otherwise our regional contribution to the great national purpose, whatever it may turn out to be, is in danger of becoming increasingly ineffective.

Hon. Tom Martin, of Iowa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR.

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, a statement by me on the retirement from the Senate of the Honorable THOS. E. MARTIN, of Iowa.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HENNINGS ON THE RETIREMENT OF HON. TOM MARTIN, OF IOWA

I wish to join with my colleagues in the Senate and House of Representatives in expressing regret that my friend, TOM MARTIN,

A5984

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

July 15

is retiring from the Senate this year. Specializing in matters dealing with taxation, agriculture, and national defense, he has made many steady, significant, and lasting contributions in these areas.

He is a man of courage, integrity, and understanding. A good and solid citizen with human sympathy, he has served exceedingly well the people of America and his constituents in Iowa. The people of Iowa whom he has represented for 22 years, as well as his fellow Members of Congress, will miss his honorable and constructive service.

TOM MARTIN has left an indelible imprint on the destiny of the Nation. Modest, firm, and skillful, he has been faithful in his devotion to Congress. He typifies the public servant who comes to Congress and diligently attends to business without seeking publicity or headlines. He has worked untiringly to protect the liberties of our Nation.

As he retires to private life, he carries with him the continuing admiration and affection of his colleagues on both sides of the aisle. I fully understand and respect his desire to return to private life after so many years of dedicated public service. He has earned the best of everything. I wish for him and for his loved ones many more years of good health, great happiness and success.

Open Land for Metropolitan Areas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, the preliminary results of the 1960 national census indicate that about 80 percent of our Nation's population growth is concentrated in metropolitan areas. And, already, nearly two-thirds of our people reside in these huge and spreading urban-suburban complexes.

Moreover, all the evidence points to an increased trend in this direction—bringing all of us inevitably closer to the day when we shall be overwhelmed by the multitude of unsolved problems arising from metropolitan living, unless immediate and well-coordinated action is taken.

Mass transportation, slum clearance, urban renewal, highways, water resources, and air pollution—these are among the better known challenges facing the governing bodies at local, county, State, and Federal levels with jurisdiction over metropolitan areas.

There is another problem, however—directly related to all the others—which is rapidly reaching the critical stage. This is the need to preserve and develop what remains of the open land in metropolitan regions, in order that present and future needs for the economic, recreational and social resources of open space may be met.

The Regional Plan Association, a private and nonprofit group which has worked effectively to alert the New York-New Jersey-Connecticut metropolitan area to the need for cooperative planning and action in many of these fields, recently published a report on the need to save our open land.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a news story from the New York Times which describes the association's report and recommendations together with an editorial from the Newark Evening News which clearly and forcefully points up the issues at stake.

The article and editorial follow:

[From the New York Times, June 30, 1960]
REGION GETS PLEA FOR UNUSED LAND—PLAN GROUP BIDS COUNTIES SAVE 220 SQUARE MILES

(By John C. Devlin)

Conservationists, alarmed by the increasing roar of bulldozers, pleaded yesterday for a campaign to set aside 220 square miles of open land in the New York metropolitan area for the good of this generation and future ones.

A report by the Regional Plan Association supported by leading conservation groups, said "unbridled metropolitan expansion" was the crux of the problem.

The report, which included 140 photographs of existing natural assets, said that proper planning and land acquisition was needed not only for the economic and emotional health of the area, but also as an aid to flood control and the protection of water resources necessary to meet the demands of an exploding population.

The specific locations of the tracts recommended for acquisition were not identified in order to prevent speculators from buying them.

However, included are 30 tracts of less than 100 acres and three with more than 5,000 acres. Most of them—104—fall in the 100-to-299-acre category. It was recommended that 20,000 more acres outside the New York region also be acquired.

The report—the third or fourth to be made by the association—is only a survey. Recommendation to municipalities, counties, the three States affected and the Federal Government, will be contained in a final report to be published later.

The survey, entitled "Nature in the Metropolis," was prepared by Dr. William A. Niering, an ecologist and associate professor of botany at Connecticut College, New London.

It was released by Griffith B. Harris, First Selectman of Greenwich, Conn., and Otto L. Nelson, vice president of the Regional Plan Association, and cochairman of its park, recreation, and open space project, which is sponsoring the series.

The association is nonprofit. Thirty years has provided leadership in the coordination of the development of the region and in the encouragement of county and municipal planning. It works in cooperation with the metropolitan regional council, an informal voluntary forum of the chief executives of the region's counties, cities, and towns.

POPULATION CREATES PROBLEM

Mr. Harris said the essence of the problem was that the 7,000 square miles in the region was only 25 percent developed today but that it faced "unprecedented" developments as the population rose. The tri-State metropolitan region, while now having a population of 16 million people, is expected to encompass 8 million more persons within the next 25 years.

This region extends roughly 50 miles from New York City and embraces 22 counties, principally in North Jersey and in the lower Hudson Valley area. It also includes Fairfield County in southwestern Connecticut.

Dr. Niering reported that "nature is more varied in the New York region than in any other metropolitan area of the country." He described it as "a natural bounty" with "fast dwindling resources."

But, he added, "Participation in such natural area activities as hiking, bird-watching,

hunting, fishing, camping, and boating is outstripping population gains by far.

"This fact is borne out by the steady increases in attendance records, equipment sales, licenses issued, and by mere observation. There is a great trek to the woods, waters and wetlands because nature provides the best setting for relief from urban living."

Furthermore, he said, "these areas provide an invaluable teaching facility which is vitally needed by the region's schools, colleges, and universities."

"As outdoor laboratories," he said, "they add a true element of life and dynamism to the science curriculum and make studies really meaningful."

As an example of an economic asset, Dr. Niering cited the commercial fishing industry. More than 600 million pounds of fish and shellfish worth in excess of \$20 million have been taken from the coastal waters of New York and New Jersey, he said.

"It is now well established biologically that these resources are dependent upon and are intricately associated with tidal marshes as well as the estuaries and surrounding bays," he said.

Dr. Niering's survey backs up a recent proposal of Governor Rockefeller to spend \$75 million on parks and recreation. Next November the voters will have an opportunity to vote on a bond issue needed to finance this program.

"Green areas for parks and recreation purposes in our State are disappearing so rapidly that it is frightening," the Governor said.

The report also comes in the wake of recent census figures that indicate showing a growing exodus of urban people to the suburbs.

Conservation, Dr. Niering said, "is not often associated with the built-up portions of our Nation."

"Yet in this era of unbridled metropolitan expansion it has become a critical urban problem," he declared. "Conservation, after all, is for people, and in the tri-State metropolitan region—the largest concentration of people in the United States—the need to conserve open land has become a matter of urgency," he said.

The 64-page report is divided into these sections:

A description of the region's natural features, with photographs and text devoted to the shoreline, the Atlantic Ocean, beaches, and dunes, salt marshes, bays and ponds, and uplands with their woodlands, farmlands, and wetlands.

A report on the need for conservation, with sections on recreation, wildlife study, the protection of commercial fishing resources, the need to combat floods, water shortages, and air pollution.

A study of conservation practices and areas that have already been established in the region by public and private interests.

A report on the amount of land needed for conservation.

Photographs, many of them dramatic, show typical flora and fauna of the region.

Copies are available at the Regional Plan Association offices at 230 West 41st Street. The price is \$3.

[From the Newark (N.J.) Evening News, July 1, 1960]

OPEN LAND

The Regional Plan Association is addressing itself to one of the great public needs of our time—the preservation of open space. All of us hope to leave something to our children and grandchildren and work hard to do so. But at the same time we are making little effort to conserve their natural heritage. If we go on letting factories, real estate developments, highways, and airports cover every inch of the metropolitan area, our descendants are going to suffer a deprivation for which they will not forgive us.

In the metropolitan area embracing New Jersey, New York, and Connecticut much