

Its value went below 50 cents compared to 1940 some time ago. And this means we have robbed the widows, orphans, coal miners, pensioners, social security beneficiaries, old-age assistance people, and untold millions of others out of their patrimony or income or standard of living.

This disgrace upon the dollar has now settled like a shameful dunce cap even upon the head of the once respected Government bond so that today it is selling at less than 85 percent of its face value or par value. People apparently no longer have full faith in the Government bonds of our country.

While anyone may entertain his own opinion about the cause of all this disgrace and humiliation, yet I feel that it basically lies in the deficit Government financing we have been practicing in almost every year during the past generation of our recent history. What is deficit financing? Well, it is simply putting out more than you take in. Uncle Bill Provins ran a country store a few miles from my hometown. Some drummer asked him about his markup and his net income. He said, "I don't know nothing about them things but I do know when I buy a hat for \$3 and sell it for \$5, I ain't lost nothing." Well, I myself am not an economist or financier, but I do know when we put out more than we take in we are doing deficit financing and disgracing the dollar and robbing the

widows and workers of our country and all the income receivers, both big and small, throughout the whole land.

One of the easiest and best ways to stop deficits and deficit financing is to stop most of this foreign aid right now. Some high Government officials recently stated that we would have to continue foreign aid indefinitely and maybe for the next 50 years or so. It is the only way, they claim, to stop Russia and prevent the spread of communism. I do not agree at all. But if we are planning to keep on with this foreign aid over an indefinite period, then we should change the motto on all our coins and make that motto "In foreign aid we trust" instead of our present motto, "In God we trust." Where did we ever obtain the insipid notion that America could be sustained or helped or defended by foreign aid? This overall program has already cost the American taxpayers about \$70 billion over the past 14 years. It has done nothing for our country but cause disgrace to the dollar, flight from our Government bond, inflation of our grocery bills, robbery of our common people, embezzlement from our pensioners and workers, and continuation of high taxes upon every American that makes his bread in the sweat of his face. While Great Britain and Japan both were reducing taxes in recent times for their own people, we had to continue all of our tax burdens, transportation tax,

telephone tax, income tax, gasoline tax, and all the rest, so we could help Great Britain and Japan reduce their own taxes upon their own people. A total of \$3 billion of foreign aid money has actually gone to foreign powers so that they could reduce their national debts and balance their budgets, and yet to extend this kind of aid we ourselves had to borrow the money that was needed. We have also given more than \$2 billion to foreign governments that were and are unfriendly to the United States, including the Soviet Union, Yugoslavia, and Poland.

Mr. Speaker, paraphrasing the remark of Patrick Henry, I know not what course others may take but as for me, give me something for Albany—Kentucky—ahead of Afghanistan, something for Harlan ahead of Hindustan, and something for London, Ky., ahead of London, England. And, in conclusion, it is now almost the Fourth of July and I wish to say that I do not apologize for being an American instead of an internationalist or for favoring the motto, "In God we trust," over the current song of many, "In foreign aid we trust."

Let us return to sanity and let us lift our pitiable dollar out of disgrace up to a returned respectability. Let us shake off our old sackcloth and ashes and say, "Hurray for America—I am proud to be an American and to stand for Americans as long as the world stands."

## SENATE

MONDAY, JUNE 15, 1959

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O God who dwellest in light unclouded, Thou knowest what is in the darkness; Thou seest that in the murkiness of our fog-shrouded days, we, Thy children, move in a confusion of light and shadows, and that amid encircling gloom we are not certain of the way we should take.

Amid the perplexities of such an hour in human relations, save those who must speak for the people from dealing in agitation without vision, passion without poise, heat without light.

Somehow, Thou God of radiance undimmed, in whom is no darkness at all, we who are pilgrims of the night must find in Thee what we fail to find in the broken lights of man—a clearer understanding of the basic facts and forces of the exploding world about us.

O Thou God of our salvation, who knoweth the end from the beginning, send forth Thy light of truth and love and duty in whose clarity we may walk and in the splendor of which we may labor on, until the evening finds us unashamed and unstained.

We ask it in the holy name of the One whose "I am the Light", steadies our faltering feet. Amen.

## DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,  
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,  
Washington, D.C., June 15, 1959.

To the Senate:  
Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD, a Senator from the State of Montana, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARL HAYDEN,  
President pro tempore.

Mr. MANSFIELD thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

## THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, June 12, 1959, was dispensed with.

## LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be the usual morning hour; and I ask unanimous consent that statements in connection therewith be limited to 3 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered. Morning business is in order.

## ORDER DISPENSING WITH CALL OF THE CALENDAR

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the

call of the calendar, under the rule, be dispensed with today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DODD in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

## PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS ENTITLED "MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1959"

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], I submit a resolution to provide for the printing of additional copies of part 1 of the hearings entitled "Mutual Security Act of 1959." I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Foreign Relations one thousand eight hundred additional copies of part 1 of the hearings entitled "Mutual Security Act of 1959."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 132) was considered and agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I also submit a resolution to provide for the printing of additional copies of part 2 of the hearings entitled "Mutual Security Act of 1959." I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved*, That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Foreign Relations one thousand eight hundred additional copies of part 2 of the hearings entitled "Mutual Security Act of 1959."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 133) was considered and agreed to.

#### FARM INCOME—RESOLUTION

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the McPherson County Farmers Union at its regular meeting adopted a resolution urging that Congress enact legislation which would give the farmer his fair share of the national income.

I ask unanimous consent that this resolution be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the farm price situation has shown no improvement; and

Whereas farm income in relations to non-farm income is below parity; and

Whereas this not only works a severe hardship on farm families but also on the business firms in farm towns and cities: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the McPherson County Farmers Union in session this 8th day of June 1959 urge the Congress to enact legislation which will increase farm income; and be it further

*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be mailed to Senators ANDREW SCHOEPPEL and FRANK CARLSON and Congressman ED REES.

ARVID MATTSO, President.  
ART E. GUSTAFSON, County Secretary.

#### REGULATIONS ISSUED BY FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION—RESOLUTION

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the radio broadcasters of Kansas are greatly concerned over the regulations issued by the Federal Communications Commission in regard to political broadcasts as interpreted by the Commission under section 315 of the Federal Communications Act.

At a recent State meeting of the organization, they adopted a resolution in regard to these regulations, and I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD.

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

Whereas radio broadcasters have been concerned about the Federal Communications Commission regulations pertaining to political broadcasts and whereas section 315 has caused many broadcasters concern as to what they can and cannot do, the Kansas Association of Radio Broadcasters meeting in its annual convention at Wichita on May

24, 1959, unanimously resolves that the Senators and Representatives from Kansas be urged to support the bill introduced by Senator HARTKE of Indiana pertaining to section 315 of the Federal Communications Commission rules and regulations. The resolutions committee chairman is hereby instructed to so advise the Senators and Representatives from Kansas.

KANSAS ASSOCIATION OF  
RADIO BROADCASTERS,  
THAD M. SANDSTROM,  
WIBW, Topeka, Chairman, Resolutions  
Committee.  
JIM MCKENNEY,  
KMDO, Fort Scott.  
CLEM MORGAN, KWSK, Pratt.

#### PUBLIC POWER NEEDS OF NORTHEASTERN STATES—RESOLUTIONS

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, the electric power rates in the northeastern region of the United States, including the State of Ohio, are the highest in the Nation. It is time that we take steps to develop the electric power resources of this area as has been done in other regions.

The American Public Power Association representing over 800 local publicly owned electric utilities just recently concluded their annual convention.

This convention adopted two resolutions designed to provide the people of the Northeastern States with low cost electricity.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these two resolutions, entitled "Northeastern Power Administration" and "Transmission of Niagara Power" be printed in the RECORD.

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

##### NORTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

Whereas there are interstate power projects presently existing in Northeastern United States whose responsibility transcends State lines; and

Whereas Corps of Engineers surveys in recent years indicate there are many undeveloped hydroelectric sites feasible of development in this area; and

Whereas there is a vital need for further study and coordination of these projects for maximum development of the region's resources; and

Whereas this area is the only section of the country without a Federal agency for an overall resource study, and electric rates in the area are among the highest in the Nation; and

Whereas the Secretary of the Interior under authority of the Food Control Act of 1944 has created the Southeastern Power Administration and Southwestern Power Administration, and has a similar authority and responsibility with respect to the northeastern region of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the American Public Power Association urges the Secretary of the Interior to establish a Northeastern Power Administration, similar to the Southeastern and Southwestern Power Administrations, to make a comprehensive study of the region's electric power resources northeast from and including the Ohio River Valley, for maximum orderly development of the region's natural resources in the public interest.

##### TRANSMISSION OF NIAGARA POWER

Whereas Congress authorized the Federal Power Commission to issue a license for the Niagara Falls powerplant under a manda-

tory condition that up to 170,000 kilowatts of the power output be made available to public and cooperative electric systems of Ohio and Pennsylvania; and

Whereas no Federal transmission lines exist for transmitting this power into these States; and

Whereas private utilities have indicated that they are not willing to wheel this power; and

Whereas the intent of the Congress will not be carried out unless transmission lines can be provided; and

Whereas the Secretary of the Interior apparently does not have adequate legislative authority to build a transmission line or arrange for wheeling Niagara power: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the American Public Power Association urges that Congress amend the Niagara Act so as to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to build transmission lines or otherwise arrange for the transmission of Niagara power so that the intent of Congress can be carried out.

#### POLITICAL BROADCASTS—RESOLUTION

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, on May 24, 1959, at Wichita, Kans., the Kansas Association of Radio Broadcasters unanimously adopted a resolution urging support of a bill introduced by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE] pertaining to political broadcasts.

Thad M. Sandstrom, the president of the association, has sent the resolution to me, and I present it to the Senate, and ask that it be appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas Radio Broadcasters have been concerned about the Federal Communications Commission regulations pertaining to political broadcasts and whereas section 315 has caused many broadcasters concern as to what they can and cannot do, the Kansas Association of Radio Broadcasters meeting in its annual convention at Wichita on May 24, 1959, unanimously resolves that the Senators and Representatives from Kansas be urged to support the bill introduced by Representative HARTKE of Indiana pertaining to section 315 of the Federal Communications Commission rules and regulations. The resolutions committee chairman is hereby instructed to so advise the Senators and Representatives from Kansas.

KANSAS ASSOCIATION OF RADIO  
BROADCASTERS,  
THAD M. SANDSTROM,  
WIBW, Topeka, Chairman, Resolutions  
Committee.  
JIM MCKENNEY,  
KMDO, Fort Scott.  
CLEM MORGAN,  
KWSK, Pratt.

#### CONTINUED FEDERAL AID FOR VOCATIONAL EDUCATION—RESOLUTION

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, at a recent convention in Green Bay, Wis., the Wisconsin Association for Vocational and Adult Education adopted a resolution expressing strong opposition to the administration's proposal to discontinue Federal aids for vocational education under the Smith-Hughes and George-Barden acts.



Wisconsin has been extremely proud of the pioneering work that has been done in this field in our State, dating back to 1911. Our State's vocational school program today is one of the strongest in the Nation. Every community of 5,000 or more population maintains a local vocational school, offering programs of vocational education for youngsters who drop out of the academically oriented public high schools, for those who want to take vocational training after graduating from high school, for adults who wish to develop an avocation or hobby, and for those who require vocational rehabilitation after suffering physical disabilities.

In Wisconsin and other States, the Federal aid programs have greatly aided the development of these vocational and adult education programs. This is a fine example of the kind of Federal aid that more than repays its own investment by training the men and women to take more effective parts in the economic development and progress of our Nations.

Mr. President, I therefore ask unanimous consent that the resolution of the Wisconsin Association for Vocational and Adult Education be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the program of vocational education in Wisconsin has had as a primary objective the development of the skills of the working youth and adults of our State; and

Whereas the program of vocational education in Wisconsin has been developed with the assistance of Federal aids allotted to the State under the provisions of the Smith-Hughes and George-Barden Acts; and

Whereas the elimination of Federal aids for vocational education under the Smith-Hughes and George-Barden Acts would result in discontinuance of some established vocational education training programs which are essential to the basic economy of our Nation and would hinder the development of needed new programs; and

Whereas the elimination of Federal aids for vocational education would weaken the industrial, business, and agriculture training structure of our country, the strength of which is so essential to successful competition with the Communist world; and

Whereas President Eisenhower in his 1959 budget message to the U.S. Congress has recommended the elimination of Federal aids for vocational education under the Smith-Hughes and George-Barden Acts beginning on July 1, 1960, and has stated that legislation will be introduced into the 1959 session of Congress to accomplish this objective: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the Wisconsin Association for Vocational and Adult Education conference assembled in Green Bay, Wis., on Friday and Saturday, May 1 and 2, 1959, take action vigorously opposing the recommendations of President Eisenhower for the elimination of Federal aid for vocational education beginning on July 1, 1960; and be it further

*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the Honorable Dwight Eisenhower, President of the United States, Washington, D.C., to all Wisconsin congressional representatives, and to the Honorable Gaylord A. Nelson, Governor of Wisconsin.

## RESOLUTIONS OF VERENDRYE ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE, INC.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I present a series of resolutions adopted at the annual meeting of the Verendrye Electric Cooperative, Inc. I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolutions were received, appropriately referred, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

### "RESOLUTION 2

"Whereas for more than 50 years the preference clause in Federal power laws, giving preference to nonprofit and rural electric systems, has been an important influence in insuring the continuation of a healthy competition in the electric industry; and

"Whereas over 400 of the rural electric systems are dependent either directly or indirectly upon Federal power projects for their power supply; and

"Whereas constant attempts are being made to weaken the preference clause by such devices as the Case amendment and the Niagara limitations enacted in the 85th Congress: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That we reaffirm our strong support for the preference rights of nonprofit, consumer-owned electric systems and express our complete opposition to any repeal, watering down, or evasion of the preference clause; and be it further

*Resolved*, That we strongly oppose any and all attempts to weaken or destroy the preference clause and recommend enactment of legislation to remove the effects of the Case amendment to the Rivers, Harbors, and Flood Control Authorization Act of 1958."

### "RESOLUTION 6

"Whereas the Verendrye Electric Cooperative, Inc., assembled in annual meeting this 8th day of June 1959, hereby wish to thank Senators LANGER and YOUNG for their support of REA legislation in the past and ask them to continue to do everything in their power to facilitate the program of REA."

### "RESOLUTION 7

"Whereas we urge the enactment by the States and the Federal Government of legislation to protect the territory of the rural electric systems and their unrestricted right to serve in that territory: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That Verendrye Electric Cooperative of Velva, N. Dak., urge our State and National Government to carry through such legislation."

### "RESOLUTION 8

"Whereas the 2 percent REA interest rates are under attack as being a subsidized rate; and

"Whereas there is no basis in fact or theory that this 2 percent rate is a subsidized rate, for over the years the REA has accrued a net income to the U.S. Treasury from lending operation of some 48 million; and

"Whereas the Congress entered into contract with the rural electric cooperatives in 1944 to lend them money at a fixed 2 percent interest charge if the rural electricies would provide complete and continuing area coverage (to serve all new consumers and provide adequate service to existing consumers) which the cooperatives are admittedly doing; and

"Whereas any increase in the REA interest rate would for all practical purposes destroy

and eliminate the rural electric cooperative program: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Verendrye Electric Cooperative oppose any increase in interest rate."

### "RESOLUTION 10

"Whereas the Verendrye Electric Cooperative, Inc., duly assembled in annual meeting this 8th day of June 1959 are not satisfied with results of the vote on the Humphrey-Price bill: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That we ask reintroduction of the same legislation in the next session of Congress and urge all of our Senators and Representatives to support the bill."

To the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

### "RESOLUTION 5

"Whereas the present and future development of the Nations resources will require careful long-range planning and a substantial investment; and

"Whereas the failure to protect and use these resources is resulting in costly floods, loss of valuable top soil and loss of much needed water power; and

"Whereas the Federal Government does not have a long-range program for protecting and using its natural resources; and

"Whereas Senator MANSFIELD and others have introduced Senate Resolution 48 calling for a study of national water resources: Now, therefore, let it be

*Resolved*, That we commend Senator MANSFIELD and urge the U.S. Senate to adopt Senate Resolution 48."

To the Committee on Public Works:

### "RESOLUTION 3

"Whereas the Tennessee Valley Authority which has done a remarkable job of serving their area for a period of 25 years; and

"Whereas it has been proved that they have served their people well under the handicaps of constantly asking for appropriations for enlarging and modernizing their facilities: Now, therefore, let it be

*Resolved*, That we ask our Senators and Congressmen to support TVA self financing plan as introduced in H.R. 3460 by Congressman JONES, of Alabama, ABERNETHY, of Mississippi (H.R. 3462) and others."

## RESOLUTION OF AMERICAN VETERANS COMMITTEE

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, a resolution adopted at the 12th national convention of the American Veterans Committee, favoring the adoption of Senate Resolution No. 17, favoring the establishment of an inter-American regional development bank. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

### INTERNATIONAL RESOLUTION 1

Whereas the continued existence of free institutions rests on the unity of the free nations of the West, yet serious division within NATO and the Atlantic Community threatens the peace and security of the West, and such division among the Western democracies is a primary objective of the Soviet foreign policy; and

Whereas the international affairs platform of the American Veterans Committee adopted at its 10th national convention urged that some of the best minds from the Western democracies be assembled for the express

purpose of exploring just how, and to what extent, it might be possible to create the unity which is essential for us all: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That we, the 12th national convention of the American Veterans Committee, do endorse Senate Concurrent Resolution 17 (H. Con. Res. 107-108) which resolved:

1. That the legislatures of the other democratic governments of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization shall be invited to name delegates to meet in a convention with delegates from the United States and from such other democracies, wherever situated, as the convention may invite, to explore and to report as to what extent their people might, within the framework of the United Nations and in accord with the basic principles of the Constitution of the United States, achieve more effective and democratic unity in advancing their common economic and political affairs, their joint defense and the aims of world peace and individual freedom.

2. That the convention should be composed of leading representative citizens officially appointed on a nonpartisan basis but free to explore the problem fully as individuals without being officially instructed or able to commit their governments.

Adopted May 17, 1959.

#### RESOLUTION OF LOCAL 207, NATIONAL FEDERATION OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES UNION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, a resolution adopted by Local 207, National Federation of Federal Employees Union, relating to a comprehensive health insurance plan. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the National Federation of Federal Employees Union, Local 207, is concerned about legislative action pertaining to S. 94, the comprehensive health insurance plan, which was proposed by the Civil Service Commission; and

Whereas local 207 feels that a medical and surgical health plan would be beneficial to both recruitment of new employees and morale of present employees; and

Whereas because of increased costs in health programs and such programs still do not cover all contingencies: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That National Federation of Federal Employees, local No. 207, go on record as favoring immediate action by the Senate Insurance Subcommittee of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee on S. 94.

Dated this 11th day of June 1959.

RICHARD R. BAUER,  
President, Local No. 207.

#### REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 506. A bill for the relief of Borislav Petrovich (Rept. No. 387);

S. 1241. A bill for the relief of Sirvart Kasabian (Rept. No. 388);

S. 1297. A bill for the relief of Salim Menashi Ellahoo Reuben (Rept. No. 389);

S. 1601. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Erika Elfriede Ida Ward (Rept. No. 390);

S. 1613. A bill for the relief of Matilda Kolich (Rept. No. 391); and

S. 1647. A bill to amend section 4083, title 18, United States Code, relating to penitentiary imprisonment (Rept. No. 392).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

S. 1369. A bill for the relief of Yukie Arita Hale (Rept. No. 393).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments:

S. 1430. A bill for the relief of Agostino Aresco (Rept. No. 394);

S. 1533. A bill for the relief of Ho Rim Yoon (Rept. No. 395); and

H.J. Res. 323. Joint resolution to facilitate the admission into the United States of certain aliens (Rept. No. 396).

#### BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. MANSFIELD (for himself, Mr. COOPER, Mr. MURRAY, and Mr. NEUBERGER):

S. 2167. A bill to amend chapter 3 of title 18, United States Code, so as to prohibit the use of aircraft or motor vehicles to hunt certain wild horses or burros on land belonging to the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. FULBRIGHT (for himself, Mr. McCLELLAN, Mr. BUSH, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. SPARKMAN, and Mr. THURMOND):

S. 2168. A bill to amend the Navy ration statute so as to provide for the serving of oleomargarine or margarine; to the Committee on Armed Services.

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

By Mr. MURRAY (for himself, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. CANNON, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. DWORSHAK, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. KERR, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. MOSS, and Mr. SCHOEPPPEL):

S. 2169. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code relating to adjustment upward of the import duties on lead and zinc; to the Committee on Finance.

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

By Mr. NEUBERGER:

S. 2170. A bill to authorize a 10-year program of grants for construction of medical, dental, and public health educational facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 2171. A bill for the relief of Ronald L. Jorgensen;

S. 2172. A bill for the relief of Kenneth G. Boelke; and

S. 2173. A bill for the relief of Mrs. John Slingsby, Lena Slingsby, Alice V. Slingsby, and Harry Slingsby; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

S. 2174. A bill to permit M. Margaretta Van Horne to file application for a patent to certain land in Florida; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BUTLER (for himself and Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware):

S. 2175. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, in order to eliminate the 6 percent differential applying to certain bids

of Pacific coast shipbuilders; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey:

S. 2176. A bill for the relief of Antonio Abele Tarabocchia; and

S. 2177. A bill for the relief of Peter J. Waterton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIRKSEN (by request):

S. 2178. A bill to amend titles I, II, and III of the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; and

S. 2179. A bill to amend section 1915 of title 28, United States Code, relating to proceedings in forma pauperis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. DIRKSEN when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas:

S. 2180. A bill for the relief of Paul Pesthy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'MAHONEY:

S. 2181. A bill to amend the Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 2182. A bill for the relief of Andrew J. Metcalf; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio submitted a concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 49) extending greetings to Kent State University on the occasion of the 50th anniversary of its founding, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the above concurrent resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. YOUNG of Ohio, which appears under a separate heading.)

#### RESOLUTIONS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas submitted the following resolutions, which were considered and agreed to:

S. Res. 132. Resolution to print additional copies of part 1 of the hearing "Mutual Security Act of 1959"; and

S. Res. 133. Resolution to print additional copies of part 2 of the hearing "Mutual Security Act of 1959."

(See the above printed in full when submitted by Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, which appear under a separate heading.)

#### PROHIBITION OF USE OF AIRCRAFT OR MOTOR VEHICLES TO HUNT CERTAIN WILD HORSES OR BURROS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in the past I have received small bits of information about the inhumane methods used in capturing wild horses and burros which roam certain public lands.

It is not a very pleasant picture. Recently more detailed information has come to my attention, including photographs showing the extreme cruelty being inflicted on these animals which are driven by low-flying planes from their retreats in the high mountains. The most disgraceful means are used, the animals are tortured until they tire and are easily towed away in trucks to canneries where they are made into pet



food. Because of humane considerations and for the protection of a gradually disappearing species something must be done to prevent this sort of thing.

State legislation will not stop this cruelty. The State of Nevada has a law outlawing the pursuit of wild horses and burros with motorized equipment, but the State has no control over these practices on the vast areas of Federal land within the State. This is a situation similar to that in other Western States.

There is a real public demand for legislation to control these practices on Federal lands. Therefore, Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and my distinguished colleagues, Senators COOPER, MURRAY, and NEUBERGER, I am introducing a bill which would prohibit the use of aircraft or motor vehicles to hunt certain wild horses or burros on land belonging to the United States. The approval of this proposed legislation would not prevent either capturing or killing by humane means the animals in question when this is really necessary. This proposed legislation is designed to eliminate the unnecessary cruelty to these symbolic animals of the old West.

The Department of the Interior has estimated that no more than 20,000 of these animals are left in the entire West. When I was a boy, in one county in Montana alone there were more than 20,000 horses. Since World War II, in Nevada alone, some 100,000 horses have been butchered by these cruel means.

The nationwide movement to protect the horses has grown from the efforts of Mr. Velma Johnston, of the Double Lazy Heart Ranch in Wadsworth, Nev., and of Nevada animal protective societies and humanitarians who have worked together as a result of first-hand experience.

Legislation is needed on both State and Federal levels if we are to save the mustang, if Congress does not take action soon then they will become extinct.

Mr. President, I ask that this bill lie on the desk for 4 days so that other Senators who may wish to join in sponsoring it will have an opportunity to do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Montana.

The bill (S. 2167) to amend chapter 3 of title 18, United States Code, so as to prohibit the use of aircraft or motor vehicles to hunt certain wild horses or burros on land belonging to the United States, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MANSFIELD (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### REMOVAL OF RESTRICTIONS ON USE OF MARGARINE BY THE NAVY

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I introduce a bill, for appropriate reference, on behalf of myself, my colleague, the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], the Senator from Connecti-

cut [Mr. BUSH], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND].

The bill I am introducing will clear up the last direct Federal restriction on margarine, eventually save the taxpayers many millions of dollars, and benefit the Navy.

The bill amends the Navy ration statute to insert the words "margarine" or "oleomargarine." It gives the Navy permissive authority to buy margarine for table use, which authority is not now explicit in the statute.

The Navy Department itself has for some time indicated it wanted this legislation. Butter cannot meet the Navy's needs for a nutritious spread suitable to all of the extremely variant conditions under which our Navy operates throughout the world. The Navy has stated that a saving of some \$1 million a year could ensue if it could use margarine as an alternate to butter when needed.

There is no valid reason why the Navy or any other branch of the armed services should not be given simple freedom of choice to buy what foods it needs, within the structure of the present ration statute. The omission of margarine in that statute today is discriminatory and restrictive. Today, more margarine than butter is being used in the United States.

In 1950 the Congress removed the old Federal taxes on margarine, and in 1949 it refused to restrict the Army's purchase of margarine. Surely this principle of freedom of choice should apply to the Navy also.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2168) to amend the Navy ration statute so as to provide for the serving of oleomargarine or margarine, introduced by Mr. FULBRIGHT (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

#### ADJUSTMENT OF IMPORT DUTIES ON LEAD AND ZINC

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for the adjustment upward of the import duties on lead and zinc. Eighteen of my colleagues, namely, Senators ALLOTT, ANDERSON, BENNETT, BIBLE, CANNON, CARLSON, CHAVEZ, CHURCH, DWORSHAK, GOLDWATER, GRUENING, JORDAN, KERR, MAGNUSON, MANSFIELD, MONRONEY, MOSS, and SCHOEPPEL have joined me in the sponsorship of this bill. I call attention to the fact that this sponsorship is bipartisan.

The lead and zinc mining industries of this country are in dire straits as the result of worldwide overproduction of the two minerals. Ores and concentrates produced by foreign miners who, in many countries, are paid a mere pittance, overhang the market in such quantities as to threaten the livelihood of every lead and zinc miner in the United States.

Action taken by the President last September in setting up a schedule of import quotas for lead and zinc has proven to be inadequate to solve the problem of protecting these vital American industries and the workers employed in them from the unfair competition of foreign labor, which in some instances is paid less than one-twelfth as much as the American miner receives.

Industry leaders have advised that if the adjustments in duties provided in this bill are enacted, they, together with the presently operating import quotas, will provide the economic assistance necessary to assure the continuance of these industries and their employees as a part of the American taxpaying community.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may remain at the desk for 3 days, so that other Senators may have an opportunity to join in sponsoring it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Montana.

The bill (S. 2169) to amend the Internal Revenue Code, relating to adjustment upward of the import duties on lead and zinc, introduced by Mr. MURRAY (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

#### CONSTRUCTION GRANTS FOR MEDICAL SCHOOLS ESSENTIAL TO MEET FUTURE HEALTH CARE AND RESEARCH DEMANDS

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize a 10-year program of grants for construction of medical, dental, and public health educational facilities to assist in insuring our country of a supply of physicians, dentists, teachers, and scientists adequate to meet the health care and medical research need which the United States faces in the decades immediately ahead.

My bill is a companion measure to H.R. 6906, introduced in the House of Representatives by Representative JOHN E. FOGARTY, of Rhode Island, for many years a vigorous leader in the field of medical legislation. I submit Representative FOGARTY's proposal today so that it may receive simultaneous consideration in the Senate.

Mr. President, despite the well-recognized status of our academic institutions as the roots from which medical progress stems, circumstances have been allowed to develop which, if not remedied, may seriously curtail the supply of trained people which must be provided to meet projected demand for medical care, research, and teaching. Funds are urgently needed for construction of medical and health education facilities and incentive programs to encourage entrance by young men and women into training in these fields.

#### NEW NEEDS PRESS MEDICAL SCHOOLS

Without expanded facilities, our medical schools cannot graduate enough

qualified doctors to maintain the present U.S. ratio of 130 physicians to every 100,000 persons. Broken down, that amounts to 1 doctor for every 750 people. It is clearly not in the public interest for this ratio of physicians and patients to decrease. To maintain it, the output of doctors will have to reach 8,700 by 1970. This would be a 1,900 increase over the present annual graduation rate.

By 1970 there will be 220 million people in the United States. Of those, 110 million will be over 65 or under 20 years old. This group of young and advanced in age will account for nearly three-quarters of the 26 percent population increase in the next 10 years. These are the age groups that are so often victims of the yet to be conquered diseases at which basic research grants are aimed.

With a rising percentage of older people in our population, pressures will continue to mount for increased emphasis on research and treatment in chronic and degenerative diseases. Medical research supported by tax funds is necessarily and properly influenced by such needs. But if we hope to meet these demands, our research facilities must be adequately staffed. It is primarily through our medical school graduates that we can expect to find the key to continued progress in these fields. Research and education are inseparable twins.

#### EDUCATIONAL DEMAND ALSO RISES

Along with the increased demand for medical care and research, we can expect the demand for medical education and training to grow. By 1970, the Bayne-Jones report suggests that the college age population will jump from its present 15 million to 26 million. Motivated by strong social and economic incentives, at least 6.4 million of these young people can be expected to reach college. This, compared to our 1958 college enrollment of 3.5 million, will surely place added admission burden on the medical schools unless more teaching and lab space is provided. Earlier this year I introduced legislation which would amend the National Defense Education Act of 1958 to permit forgiveness, of up to 50 percent, of loans granted under the program to persons who enter medical research. Success of this program would mean not only an addition to the number of trained researchers but also a larger student load for the Nation's medical schools.

The bill which I am introducing today is based on the premise that the Nation's standard of health and medical research effort is intrinsically interlocked with the ability of our institutions of higher learning to produce trained personnel in the field of medicine. Without provision of adequate facilities, the schools will be unable to support the enlarged medical framework required to meet new needs.

#### TWO PRINCIPAL PROGRAMS OFFERED

Like all other elements of higher education, the medical schools are finding it increasingly difficult to live on their endowments, State aid, and gifts. If the Federal Government can finance research in cattle disease and crop conditions, it seems only reasonable to believe

that equal consideration should be given to helping to educate the men and women who in effect may control our lives.

Mr. President, here is how the proposal which I introduce today would assist in carrying out this goal.

First, it would create a \$50 million a year, 5-year program of matching grants for expansion, improvement, and modernization of medical, dentistry, and public health schools already in operation.

Existing facilities can be improved. This is at best a stopgap expedient. Experiments are now in progress involving a shift of teaching responsibilities between universities and medical schools which may help reduce the time required to produce physicians. If these experiments germinate, the basic preclinical courses such as anatomy, biochemistry, microbiology, and pathology could be taught in the universities, thus providing students to fill the existing clinical facilities of the medical schools, which are too often not fully utilized.

By improving existing medical school facilities and teaching methods, we can increase the present output of physicians by about 700 annually.

#### PROVIDES \$100 MILLION FOR NEW FACILITIES

Second, the bill authorizes expenditure of \$100 million in a 10-year program of grants for construction and maintenance of new medical schools.

As previously pointed out, 1,900 more physicians than are presently being graduated will be needed in 1970, according to projections made by the authoritative Bayne-Jones report. If existing medical schools can provide only 700 of that number, about 1,200 additional doctors must be produced by new schools of medicine, dentistry, and public health.

The average medical school graduates about 90 students a year; a minimum of 14 and as many as 20 new medical schools will have to be built to maintain present standards of medical excellence.

To meet this need, and with the knowledge that about 10 years typically elapse between the planning of a school and production of its first graduates, it is clear that construction of these new schools will have to begin in the immediate future. Similar reasoning applies in the case of dental and public health training institutions. Moreover, the specialized facilities required for health education must be viewed in the perspective of the much larger total demand for construction of all kinds of facilities for higher education.

A new medical school requires a capital investment of from \$35 to \$50 million. The total cost of new medical school construction required to sustain today's population-physician ratio would range between \$500 million and \$1 billion. The \$100 million of aid this bill provides is not a panacea, but without it we may face the severe danger of a decline in our medical services.

#### MAXIMUM HEALTH EFFORT DEMANDED

We are currently competing with a monolithic society where all interests—public and private—are governmentally

canalized into a single course of action. The Soviets have oriented their human resources in medicine so that 70 percent of the Soviet doctors are women. By contrast, only 6 percent of the doctors in the United States are women.

The personnel techniques of the Russians may be criticized, but the release of men for other jobs and the utilization of women in a field where their natural proclivity for human kindness can be put to best advantage is a lesson we might well learn.

We need not emulate the Russian's mechanism for accelerating public health programs. But we will be foolhardy and negligent if, with our vast resources of technology and talent, we do not utilize means available to the Federal Government to promote the physical well-being of all our citizens.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at the conclusion of my remarks the text of my bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the text of the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2170) to authorize a 10-year program of grants for construction of medical, dental, and public health facilities, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. NEUBERGER, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, 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 this Act may be cited as the "Health Educational Facilities Construction Act of 1959".*

#### National Advisory Council on Health Educational and Research Facilities

SEC. 2. Paragraph (1) of section 702 of the Public Health Service Act is amended by inserting "Educational and" immediately after "Health".

SEC. 3. (a) The heading of section 703 of the Public Health Service Act is amended by striking out "Research facilities" and inserting in lieu thereof "educational and research facilities".

(b) (1) The first sentence of subsection (a) of such section is amended by striking out "Research Facilities" and inserting in lieu thereof "Educational and Research Facilities", by striking out "the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service who shall be Chairman, and" and inserting in lieu thereof "the Surgeon General, who shall be Chairman, the Commissioner of Education, and", and by striking out "twelve" and inserting in lieu thereof "sixteen".

(2) The second sentence of such subsection is amended by striking out "Four" and inserting in lieu thereof "Six" and by striking out "eight" and inserting in lieu thereof "ten".

(3) Clause (1) of the third sentence of such subsection is amended by inserting "medical or dental schools or" before "institutions". Clause (2) of such sentence is amended by striking out "research" and inserting in lieu thereof "research or teaching".

(c) Paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (b) of such section 703 are amended by inserting immediately after "this title", each time it appears, the following: "and title VIII".



*Grants for Health Educational Facilities*

SEC. 4. The Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C., chapter 6A) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new title:

**"TITLE VIII—HEALTH EDUCATIONAL FACILITIES CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM"**

"SEC. 801. The Congress hereby finds and declares that—

"(a) increased demand for health services and health research necessitates the expansion and improvement of existing health educational facilities;

"(b) steadily increasing tuition fees and increasing contributions from private citizens, associations, funds, and foundations and from the health professions themselves have proven insufficient to provide the necessary capital funds required for such expansion and improvement;

"(c) it is, therefore, the policy of the Congress to provide funds for construction of health educational facilities for our public and nonprofit medical, dental, and public health schools, thus insuring the continued production of an adequate number of properly qualified and trained physicians, dentists, teachers, and research scientists.

*Definitions*

"SEC. 802. As used in this title—

"(1) The term 'Council' means the National Advisory Council on Health Educational and Research Facilities established by section 703.

"(2) The terms 'construction' and 'cost of construction' include (A) the construction of new buildings and the expansion, remodeling, and alteration of existing buildings, including architects' fees in excess of amounts granted under section 803(c)(3), but not including the cost of acquisition of land or off-site improvements, except in the case of existing structures suitable for use as health educational facilities, and (B) equipping new buildings and existing buildings, whether or not expanded, remodeled, or altered.

"(3) The term 'nonprofit', as applied to a school, means a school owned and operated by one or more nonprofit corporations or associations no part of the net earnings of which inures, or may lawfully inure, to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual.

"(4) The term 'medical school' includes two-year schools and means a school providing training leading to the degree of doctor of medicine or osteopathy, approved or accredited by a recognized body or bodies approved by the Surgeon General after he has obtained the advice and recommendation of the Council, except that a new school which (by reason of no, or an insufficient, period of operation) is not, at the time of application for a grant to construct a facility under this title, eligible for accreditation by such a recognized body or bodies, shall be deemed accredited for purposes of this title if the Surgeon General finds, after consultation with the appropriate accreditation body or bodies, that there is reasonable assurance that the school will, upon completion of such facility, meet the accreditation standards of such body or bodies.

"(5) The term 'dental school' means a school which provides training leading to the degree of doctor of dental surgery, or an equivalent degree, approved or accredited by a recognized body or bodies approved by the Surgeon General after he has obtained the advice and recommendation of the Council.

"(6) The term 'public health school' means a school which provides comprehensive professional training, specialized consultative services, and technical assistance in the fields of public health and in the administration of State and local public health programs.

"(7) The term 'health educational facilities' includes educational and related re-

search facilities in medicine, dentistry, and public health.

*Authorization of appropriations*

"SEC. 803. (a) To assist in the construction of health educational facilities, as provided in this title, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated—

"(1) \$50,000,000 for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1959, and each of the four succeeding fiscal years for grants for the expansion and improvement of existing schools of medicine, dentistry, and public health; and

"(2) \$100,000,000 for the period beginning July 1, 1959, and ending June 30, 1969, for grants for the construction of new schools of medicine, dentistry, or public health.

"(b) Sums appropriated pursuant to this section shall remain available until expended.

"(c) No such grant shall be in excess of 50 per centum of the cost of construction with respect to which it is made, except that—

"(1) in the case of new schools, grants may be made in an amount not to exceed 66⅔ per centum of the cost of construction; and

"(2) in the case of existing schools, grants may be made in an amount not to exceed 66⅔ per centum of that portion of the costs of construction found by the Surgeon General to be reasonably attributable to expanded capacity for freshman enrollment; and

"(3) upon application of any medical, dental, or public health school, a grant of not to exceed \$25,000 may be made for the purpose of preparing initial plans with estimates for the proposed new construction.

"(c) In the case of existing schools, no grant or grants shall be made to any one medical school in excess of \$3,000,000 or to any one dental or public health school in excess of \$1,000,000 for the total five-year program authorized in this section, exclusive of amounts granted under subsection (b)(3) of this section.

*Applications by medical, dental, and public health schools for grants*

"SEC. 804. Any new or existing public or nonprofit medical, dental, or public health school desiring a grant under this title may file an application therefor with the Surgeon General for the fiscal year in which such grant is desired. Such application shall contain such information as the Surgeon General may by regulation prescribe and shall contain adequate assurances that the school will be operated as a public or nonprofit institution and comply with all provisions of this title and regulations promulgated pursuant thereto.

*Grants for construction*

"SEC. 805. (a) The Surgeon General, in accordance with regulations, and upon the recommendation of the Council, shall determine from time to time the amount to be paid to each medical, dental, or public health school from appropriations under section 803 and shall certify to the Secretary of the Treasury the amounts so determined. Upon receipt of any such certification, the Secretary of the Treasury shall, prior to audit or settlement by the General Accounting Office, pay in accordance with such certification.

"(b) Not to exceed 20 per centum of the amount of any grant for a new school may, at the discretion of the applicant, be allocated to permanent endowment for the cost of maintenance of the new facility.

*Regulations*

"SEC. 806. All regulations under this title with respect to payments to medical, dental, or public health schools shall be made only after obtaining the advice and recommendation of the Council.

*General provisions*

"SEC. 807. Nothing in this title shall be construed as authorizing any department,

agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any control over, or prescribe any requirements with respect to, the curriculum or administration of any medical, dental, or public health school, or the admission of applicants thereto."

*Technical amendments to Act of July 1, 1944*

SEC. 5. (a) The Act of July 1, 1944 (58 Stat. 682), as amended, is hereby further amended by changing the number of title VIII to title IX and by changing the numbers of sections 801 to 814, inclusive, and references thereto, to sections 901 to 914, respectively.

(b) Section 1 of the Public Health Service Act is amended to read as follows:

"SECTION 1. Titles I to VIII, inclusive, of this Act may be cited as the 'Public Health Service Act'."

**AMENDMENT OF TITLES I, II, AND III OF IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT**

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend titles I, II, and III of the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes.

The bill would carry out the recommendations for amending our immigration laws which were made by the President in his budget message to the Congress on January 19, 1959.

It is substantially the same as the administration's bill, introduced in the 85th Congress, by former Senator Watkins of Utah and cosponsored by several other Senators, with the exception that certain provisions which were incorporated in the act of September 11, 1957, have been eliminated.

The measure is discussed in detail in the explanation and section-by-section analysis which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the explanation and section-by-section analysis will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2178) to amend titles I, II, and III of the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The explanation and section-by-section analysis presented by Mr. DIRKSEN are as follows:

**EXPLANATION AND ANALYSIS OF THE PROVISIONS OF THE BILL "TO AMEND TITLES I, II, AND III OF THE IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES"****SECTIONS 1, 2, AND 3**

These sections of the bill would provide moderate revisions in the quota system. The system would be brought up to date. Equitable distribution of additional quotas would be provided. Four regional quota pools would be established to which unused quota numbers would be assigned. Mortgages on quotas would be eliminated. New political entities would be protected against decreases in quota. The ceiling of 2,000 on the quotas within the Asia-Pacific triangle would be removed.

Under the existing law the annual quota of 154,657 is computed by taking one-sixth of 1 percent of the white population in 1920, less Western Hemisphere immigrants and their descendants. If the total population in 1920 had been used for this computation, the quota figure would have consti-

tuted one-seventh of 1 percent. The bill applies the latter percentage to the 1950 total population of the United States as defined in the act. The result is an annual quota of 219,461, or an increase of 64,804.

Under the bill the existing quota of 154,657 would continue to be allocated as at present, but the present maximum sub-quota allocation of 100 to each colony would be raised to 200. With respect to the allocation of the quota over and above 154,657 the legislation would provide for an increase in the quota for each minimum quota area. This increase would be from the present 100 to 200. With respect to the allocation of the remainder of the increase in the quota authorization the bill would provide an important new feature designed to recognize actual immigration since the quota act of 1924. This would be accomplished by providing for the distribution of the remainder of the increase in the total quota, to the several quota areas so that there will be assigned to each quota area that proportion which the immigration to the United States since July 1, 1924, and up to July 1, 1955, from that area bears to the total immigration from all quota areas.

Another significant change proposed is to provide for utilization of unused quota numbers. Under existing law failure to use in the year all of the quota allocated to a particular area results in its being wiped out. It is not carried forward into the next year. The bill would establish a separate quota pool for each of four regions, Europe, Asia, Africa, and Oceania, as described in the proposal, to which the unused quota numbers of the respective regions would be assigned for redistribution. Quota numbers thus assigned would be available for use only during the period of 1 year following their assignment. Such quota numbers would be made available only for allocation within the respective regions and only to qualified immigrants eligible for a preference status under paragraphs (1), (2), (3), and (4) of section 203(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

The bill further proposes to delete entirely the ceiling of 2,000 imposed on the minimum quotas within the Asia-Pacific triangle. The law now provides that any increase in the number of minimum quota areas above 20 shall result in a proportionate decrease in each minimum quota so that the sum total of all minimum quotas within the Asia-Pacific triangle shall not exceed 2,000. As 20 minimum quotas of 100 each have already been established within the Asia-Pacific triangle, the creation of any additional minimum quotas within the triangle would require a proportionate reduction in the quota of each of these 20 countries. The proposed amendment, by removing the ceiling, would prevent such erosion of the minimum quotas within the triangle.

Looking ahead to probable political changes in the administrative arrangements of several areas, including the West Indies Federation, the bill would also assure to such a new political entity an immigration quota of not less than the total of subquotas or minimum quotas now comprising the area. Upon the recent merger of Syria and Egypt, each of which countries had a minimum quota of 100, the new quota for the larger quota area was reduced to 100 per year. The proposed amendment would prevent such a result.

The bill also would incorporate into the basic statute the provisions of Public Law 85-316 which removed the mortgages imposed on the annual quotas.

#### SECTIONS 4, 5, AND 6

These provisions of the bill would revise and clarify existing parole authority covering the emergency admission of aliens into the United States. Also, procedures would be provided under which a designated number of aliens who have been paroled into

the United States might adjust their immigration status to that of a lawful permanent resident. Aliens paroled into the United States and who are presently here in an indefinite status include aliens admitted for emergency reasons or for reasons of public interest.

Section 4 grants the President power to authorize the parole by the Attorney General into the United States of refugees selected by the Secretary of State. Refugees are defined in the bill to include (1) persons who have been forced to flee from Communist territory or from a country in the Middle East because of persecution or fear of persecution based on race, religion, or political opinion, or (2) victims of war, political upheaval, or natural calamity who are unable to return to their former homes. The number of refugees who could be paroled annually may not, under the proposal, exceed the average number of aliens who have been permitted to come to the United States each year since June 25, 1948, by special acts of Congress (approximately 68,000). Parole would be granted by Presidential proclamation to refugees living in non-Communist countries. The Attorney General would be authorized, in the absence of such proclamation, to parole annually not more than 10,000 such refugees.

Section 5 sets up a procedure whereby the immigration status of parolees may be adjusted to that of a lawful permanent resident. The Attorney General could grant such adjustment of status in his discretion after the alien has been in the United States for 2 years and if the applicant is of good character and if the adjustment would not be contrary to the national interest. A report of the Attorney General's action if favorable would be submitted to the Congress. Unless the Congress disapproved, the alien's entry would be recorded as of the date of the alien's last arrival in the United States. If the Congress did not approve the administrative action, the Attorney General is to require the departure of the alien from the United States.

Section 6 provides that the number of aliens whose status may be adjusted under section 5 shall not exceed in any fiscal year the average number of aliens authorized to be admitted to the United States for permanent residence each fiscal year between June 25, 1948, and July 1, 1957, by any special public acts of Congress enacted during that period.

#### SECTIONS 7, 8, 9, AND 10

These sections of the bill would provide the necessary administrative authority to take care of hardship cases. The purpose of these provisions is to reduce the need for private immigration legislation which over the years has grown to staggering proportions. The President and Congress would thus be relieved of unnecessary and intolerable burdens in this field. A more suitable means would be provided for the consideration of applications for relief and a basis would be established for the uniform treatment of all cases.

Section 7 of the bill would vest in the Attorney General discretionary power to admit to the United States aliens with close relatives in this country, regardless of a technical statutory ground of inadmissibility. The same benefits are made available to war veterans and to functionaries of religious organizations. However, the bill provides that no relief shall be accorded aliens whose presence here would be dangerous to the safety and security of the United States. Similarly, section 8 of the bill vests discretionary authority in the Attorney General to withhold institution of deportation proceedings, to cancel such proceedings if instituted, and to adjust the status of deportable aliens to that of permanent residents. This discretionary power to grant relief is likewise limited to aliens

who have close relatives in this country, war veterans and religious functionaries.

It is further provided that there shall be an annual ceiling of 5,000 on all cases in which the Attorney General may exercise the authority provided by sections 7 and 8, and that in each case there shall be an appropriate charge against the quota.

#### SECTION 11

Existing law requires that certain aliens who have been excluded or deported from the United States may not reapply for admission unless the Attorney General first grants permission to do so. This is an unnecessary and expensive complication in our immigration procedures and should be eliminated since there are now ample safeguards in the law against the readmission of unqualified aliens. Particularly is this true when consideration is given to the documentary requirements in the statute which contemplate a preliminary screening by a consular officer before the alien receives a travel document. Allied provisions in the statute require prosecution of aliens who have returned to this country without having obtained the necessary permission from the Attorney General. This section of the bill would provide for repeal of these requirements.

#### SECTION 12

The act contains provisions permitting the Attorney General and the Secretary of State to waive the requirement of travel documents in certain instances on behalf of non-immigrant aliens. The exercise of this power in individual emergency cases is now limited to those which are "unforeseen." The quoted word is unnecessarily restrictive and should be eliminated. The provisions of this section of the bill would effect this desirable change.

#### SECTION 13

This section codifies into section 212(d) (7) of the basic Immigration and Nationality Act the effect of the recent statutes, Public Law 85-508, granting statehood to Alaska, and Public Law 86-3, granting statehood to Hawaii.

#### SECTION 14

In prescribing the procedures for the conduct of hearings before special inquiry officers of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, to determine eligibility of persons to enter the United States (so-called exclusion hearings), existing law provides that such hearings shall be conducted by a special inquiry officer. The law does not specifically provide for the assignment of an additional officer to present evidence at such hearings. In regard to deportation proceedings the existing statute provides for the assignment of an additional officer to present the Government's case. In order to remove any doubt as to the authority of the Attorney General to assign an additional officer to perform the prosecutive functions in exclusion cases, in his discretion, where he deems such procedure to be desirable in particular cases, express statutory authority should be provided. This section of the bill would remove any doubt as to the authority of the Attorney General to make such assignments of examining officers in exclusion cases.

#### SECTION 15

There has been a tremendous increase in air and surface travel throughout the world and many aliens traveling from one foreign country to another find it necessary to pass through the United States. Under contracts authorized to be entered into between the Attorney General and operators of transportation lines such aliens may be exempted from certain documentary requirements of the Immigration and Nationality Act. However, they must undergo the examination and inspection required of aliens generally,



resulting in some instances in their exclusion or deportation. The enforcement of this requirement has resulted in severe hardship as well as loss of good will and unnecessary expense to both the Government and the operators of transportation lines where the aliens would otherwise pass through this country in direct transit. To alleviate this unfortunate situation authority should be vested in the Attorney General to dispense in his discretion with this requirement in individual cases. Section 15 of the bill would accomplish this purpose. The guarantees entered into by the Attorney General with the aliens and the operators of transportation lines, it is believed, would provide ample safeguards.

#### SECTION 16

This section would provide that deportation proceedings may be instituted otherwise than by a warrant of arrest. Under a practice of long standing, deportation proceedings have been instituted by a physical arrest of the respondent. Such action has been regarded on occasions as being unduly harsh, particularly when the alien is a child of tender years, or is of advanced age, or for some other reason is not likely to abscond. Although section 242(b) of the present law prescribes the deportation hearing procedure, it does not specify the manner in which such proceedings must be initiated. The Department of Justice has recently adopted the practice of commencing a deportation proceeding with an order to show cause, reserving a physical arrest for those cases in which custody and detention of the alien is regarded as necessary in the public interest or safety. While this procedure is regarded as being entirely within the contemplation of the law, enactment of this section would afford an unmistakable statutory sanction for this less drastic procedure.

#### SECTION 17

This section would liberalize those provisions of existing law granting special naturalization benefits to alien members of the Armed Forces and to certain alien veterans, and would consolidate and codify a number of related statutes. Existing law grants special benefits in this regard to aliens who have completed at least 3 years' peacetime honorable service in the U.S. Armed Forces. The advantages of the law however, are available only to those who were lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence. These requirements have the effect of denying benefits to many worthy soldiers who, because of oversubscribed quotas, or other reasons, are unable to obtain an immigration visa, and to those who, because of service connected disabilities, have been honorably discharged before completing the required 3 years' service. The proposed amendment would eliminate the requirement of lawful admission for permanent residence and would extend the benefits to those who were prevented from completing the necessary 3 years' service because of disabilities received while serving. In recent years the Congress has enacted a number of statutes providing special naturalization benefits for members of the Armed Forces. Separate statutes were enacted extending these special benefits to persons who served honorably in the Armed Forces during the Spanish-American War, during World War I, during World War II, and during the Korean conflict. This section would consolidate these separately enacted statutes and would make uniform the condition for naturalization although based upon service during different conflicts in which the United States may have been involved. Proper safeguards are contained in the proposal to limit the advantages of this new legislation to those who served in an active duty status, and were honorably discharged.

#### SECTION 18

(a) Under section 316 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, certain aliens who are employed by the U.S. Government or certain American firms or institutions, etc., may go abroad in the course of their employment without losing the residence prerequisites for naturalization. However, no provision is made for their alien spouses or children who wish to go abroad with them, but likewise desire to avoid endangering their eligibility for naturalization because of interruption of their U.S. residence. This causes unnecessary separation of families. It is believed that if an alien employee of the Government or of an American firm may receive the benefit of retaining his eligibility for naturalization because of the advantage to our national interest derived from his employment abroad, he should be permitted to bring with him his alien wife and children and they should be entitled to the same benefits. A similar provision, in respect to spouses, was contained in a former naturalization law (Act of June 29, 1938, 52 Stat. 1247). This proposal would benefit employees of the State Department and other governmental agencies as well as persons stationed abroad while serving in the Armed Forces. With respect to children, it is deemed appropriate that the benefits should be limited to the period before the child reaches the age of 23 years or it is married. This will result in the receipt of benefits only by those children whose sole purpose in being abroad is to remain in the household of their parent, who leaves the United States because of his employment.

(b) Under existing law a petition for naturalization must be filed in a naturalization court having jurisdiction over the petitioner's residence. This places an undue hardship upon many aliens now being inducted into the Armed Forces for military training. Although they are fully eligible for naturalization, having completed the necessary five years residence in the United States, etc., they find that their military obligations frequently cause them to be stationed in the United States far away from the State where they have their residence. In view of the obligations placed upon them by the Government, it appears equitable that persons actually serving in the Armed Forces of the United States should, while so serving, be exempt from the ordinary requirements as to place of filing a petition for naturalization. This proposal would accomplish that purpose by exempting persons in the Armed Forces from the requirement contained in section 310(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act as to the location of the naturalization court in which a petition for naturalization must be filed.

(c) Under section 316(a) of the present act a petitioner for naturalization under the general provisions of the law must establish 6 months continuous residence in a particular State immediately preceding the filing of his petition. For the same reasons as are given above in respect to (b), this requirement also places an excessive burden upon aliens now being inducted into the Armed Forces. Their military service makes it impossible for them to remain in any particular State for as long as 6 months in order to meet the general requirements applicable to other petitioners for naturalization, causing delay in their acquiring citizenship. In view of their military obligations, such persons, while actually serving, should be exempted from the ordinary requirement as to the 6 months' residence in a particular State at the time of filing a petition for naturalization. This proposal would accomplish that purpose by exempting them from that requirement contained in section 316(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

#### SECTION 19

Section 202 of the act deals with the determination of quotas to which immigrants shall be chargeable. This section would revise section 202 so as to grant an Asian spouse the benefit of the quota of an accompanying spouse, and permit the Asian spouse of a native of a Western Hemisphere country to be classified as a nonquota immigrant if accompanying, or following to join, such spouse.

#### SECTION 20

Section 203 of the act established the bases upon which immigration visas shall be allocated within the quotas. This section of the bill would carry forward the provisions of section 3 of Public Law 85-316 which accorded first preference status to spouses and children following to join as well as accompanying the spouse or parent who received first preference status by virtue of his special skills and abilities under section 203(a)(1)(A). In addition, the quota allocations would be revised by giving the fourth preference category, that is, brothers, sisters, sons, and daughters of citizens, a fixed 10 percent of the quota, in lieu of the present percentage of an undetermined leftover amount of quota numbers which the present statute permits. This change is regarded as desirable to make this preference a reality. Section 203(a)(2) of the act provides that parents of an American citizen are entitled to second preference quota status only if the petitioning citizen is at least 21 years of age. Subsection (a)(4), which affords fourth preference status to brothers, sisters, sons, and daughters of citizens, does not limit that preference status to such kin of citizens who are at least 21 years of age. This section would amend section 203(a)(4) so as to limit its operation to those cases in which the petitioning citizen is likewise at least 21 years of age. It would also amend the section so as to accord the same preference quota status to the spouse and child of such a brother, sister, son, or daughter of a citizen, if such spouse or child is accompanying or following to join the relative.

#### SECTION 21

The present act permits the Secretary of State to determine the amount of nonimmigrant visa fees on the basis of reciprocity. This section of the bill would vest the Secretary with a desirable discretion to deviate from this rule when politically or otherwise necessary in the national interest. It would also clarify the present statute with respect to the manner of computing the amount of such visa fees.

#### SECTION 22

Section 212(a)(9) of the act specifies the classes of aliens who shall be excluded from the United States because of criminal involvement. This section would amend section 212(a)(9) so as to clarify and incorporate within the basic act the pertinent provisions of section 4 of Public Law 770, 83d Congress, 68 Stat. 1145, which in effect, but not in form, modified section 212(a)(9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act with respect to aliens who have been convicted of or have admitted the commission of petty offenses.

#### SECTION 23

Section 221(f) of the act provides in part that an alien crewman may be admitted to the United States if his name appears on a crew list visaed by a consular officer, "until such time as it becomes practicable to issue individual documents." The quoted requirement for individual documents has proved to be most difficult of achievement and unduly burdensome. This section would delete the quoted matter, thus eliminating the requirement that all alien crewmen eventually must be in possession of individual visas.

## SECTION 24

Section 222 of the act prescribes the contents of a visa application. Subsection (a) deals with applications for immigrant visas and subsection (c) deals with nonimmigrant visas. Both require information as to race and ethnic classification. This section would eliminate this requirement since the terms are not susceptible of definition and have served no useful purpose in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

## SECTIONS 25 AND 26

Section 352 of the act sets forth circumstances under which naturalized citizens shall lose their citizenship by virtue of residence abroad. Sections 353 and 354 enumerate categories of persons to which section 352 shall not apply. Sections 25 and 26, respectively, of the accompanying bill, would extend to veterans of World War I and II or of the Korean conflict and to their spouses, children, and dependent parents, broader foreign residence privileges. The amendments would extend (1) to veterans of World War II, retroactively, the provisions of section 406(h) of the 1940 act; and (2) restore to veterans of World War I that part of the provisions of section 406(h) of the 1940 act which permitted World War I veterans to reside in the country of nativity or former nationality. The proviso to the proposed amendment contained in section 25 is designed to make clear what is thought to be the intent of Congress that the spouse, children, and dependent parents of such a veteran shall enjoy the same foreign residence privileges as does the veteran.

## SECTION 27

Section 223 of the act relates to reentry permits. Subsection (b) authorizes the Attorney General to issue reentry permits under certain circumstances. However, such permits shall be valid for not more than 1 year from the date of issuance and may be extended for periods aggregating not more than 1 year. This has resulted in hardships to certain alien spouses and children of servicemen stationed abroad for extended tours of duty. This section would add a proviso to the subsection to provide that "the Attorney General may in his discretion extend the validity of the permit of a spouse or child of a member of the Armed Forces of the United States stationed abroad pursuant to official orders for such period or periods as the Attorney General shall deem appropriate."

## SECTIONS 28 AND 29

Under the several methods of review available to them aliens clearly deportable, including many in the criminal classes, have been able to delay unduly their expulsion from this country. The purpose of these sections of the bill is to prevent the abuse of judicial process through the establishment of review procedures having uniformity, providing orderly venue and permitting the expeditious handling of such matters.

Historically, an order for the deportation of an alien could be challenged in the courts solely by habeas corpus proceedings, which were available to the alien only after he had been taken into custody pursuant to the order of deportation. In recent years, it has become possible, as a result of judicial decision, for aliens to obtain judicial review of an order of deportation upon its issuance. An equally divided Supreme Court on January 11, 1954, affirmed per curiam a holding that deportation orders issued under the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 are reviewable in actions for declaratory judgment as well as by habeas corpus. *Brownell v. Rubinstein* (346 U.S. 929 (1954)). Also, in a recent decision the Supreme Court held that deportation orders entered under the Immi-

gration and Nationality Act of 1952 can be judicially reviewed in actions for declaratory and injunctive relief under section 10 of the Administrative Procedure Act. *Shaughnessy v. Pedreiro* (349 U.S. 48 (1955)).

These several methods of review lack uniformity and are deficient with respect to such important incidents as the need for expedition, orderly venue and the avoidance of repetitious court proceedings. Legislation is necessary to resolve these problems effectively. It is believed also that such legislation should include a single statutory method of review specifically applicable to aliens subject to orders of deportation but who are not in custody pursuant to such orders.

Section 28 of the proposal would amend the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 (66 Stat. 163; 8 U.S.C. 1101), by adding to title II a new section 293. Paragraph (1) of subsection (a) of the new section would permit an alien in custody pursuant to an order of deportation to obtain judicial review of the order solely by means of habeas corpus. With respect to an alien not in custody but who is subject to an order of deportation issued after December 23, 1952, the proposal would provide a special single statutory method of review initiated by the filing of a petition for review in the appropriate U.S. district court.

Paragraph (1) of subsection (a) would further provide that deportation orders shall not be subject to judicial review except as provided in the bill. "Notwithstanding the provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act or any other law, including section 405(a) of this act." The purpose of this language is to insure that the specific provisions of the bill will not be overridden by the general provisions of existing law. It would also provide that a deportation order shall not be reviewed by the courts if the alien has not exhausted the administrative remedies for review available to him.

Paragraph (2) of subsection (a) would provide that "a petition for review may be filed not later than 6 months from the date of the deportation order or from the date of the enactment of this subsection, whichever is the later, except that no such petition or a petition for habeas corpus to review the validity of the order may be filed by an alien during the pendency of a criminal proceeding against such alien for violation of subsections (d) or (e) of section 242 of this act." This time limitation is important. It is proposed for two reasons: By placing pressure upon aliens subject to deportation to obtain judicial review within a reasonable period of time (or undergo the inconvenience of being taken into custody in order to obtain review in habeas corpus proceedings) it is hoped to facilitate the process of removing deportable aliens by reducing the number of last minute judicial proceedings. A further reason for the proposed change stems from section 242(e) of the act which imposes criminal liability upon an alien, in the criminal, subversive or immoral classes "who shall willfully fail or refuse to depart from the United States within a period of 6 months from the date of the final order of deportation under administrative process, or, if judicial review is had, then from the date of the final order of the court . . . whichever is the later."

Paragraph (2) of subsection (a) also deals with the problem of repetitious review proceedings by providing that "No petition for review or for habeas corpus shall be entertained if the validity of the deportation order has been previously determined in any civil or criminal proceeding, unless the petition presents grounds which the court finds could not have been presented in such prior proceeding or the court finds that the remedy provided by such prior proceeding was inadequate or ineffective to test the validity

of the order." This provision is designed to insure that an alien shall have only one judicial review of a deportation order, except in unusual circumstances. Cf. 28 U.S.C. 2255 and *United States v. Hayman*, 342 U.S. 205, which would seem to remove all doubt as to the validity of such a provision.

Occasionally, an alien subject to an order of deportation, and for whom the Immigration and Naturalization Service has arranged passage on a ship or a plane, will file a petition for a writ of habeas corpus and, when the ship or plane has departed will withdraw the petition. Paragraph (2) of subsection (a) would prevent such abuse of legal process by providing that no petition for review or for habeas corpus may be withdrawn without the consent of the Government and of the court in which it is filed.

Paragraph (3) of subsection (a) would provide that the Immigration and Naturalization Service shall be the named respondent in a review proceeding under the proposed bill. If the Service rather than a named official is designated as respondent, there will be avoided the frustrating issues of abatement and substitution which occur when a named respondent official is replaced by another. It would further provide that a petition for review of a deportation order shall be filed in the judicial district in which the administrative deportation proceeding was conducted. Venue has been defined in these terms rather than in relation to the alien's residence because a recently arrived alien often will not have a residence in the usual sense in any district. Alternative venue in the District of Columbia has been purposely omitted in order to eliminate the possibility of an undue concentration of cases in that district. Moreover, the present concentration of deportation review proceedings in the District Court for the District of Columbia would be diluted by the provision in paragraph (1) of subsection (a) that cases pending, unheard in any district court on the date of the enactment of the bill, shall be transferred for determination to the district court having jurisdiction to entertain a petition for review. The further provision of paragraph (1) of subsection (a) that a deportation order shall not be subject to judicial review if the alien has departed from the United States after the issuance of the deportation order, is intended to prevent an alien who has already been deported, perhaps many years ago, from challenging in the court the order for his deportation.

Paragraph (3) of subsection (a) also would provide for the service of a copy of the petition for review upon certain designated officials and would provide that such service would ordinarily stay the deportation of an alien pending determination of the petition, unless the court otherwise directs. Also, in view of the calendar congestion in some district courts, paragraph (3) of subsection (a) would provide for expedition of review proceedings by stating that "the hearing and disposition of a petition for review shall be expedited in the same manner as is required in habeas corpus proceedings." See 28 U.S.C. 2243. This provision recognizes that while every alien is entitled to his day in court, the national interest requires that such cases should be determined promptly.

Paragraph (3) of subsection (a) also would provide that the administrative findings of fact in deportation cases shall be conclusive if supported by reasonable, substantial, and probative evidence on the record considered as a whole. This is essentially the evidentiary standard contained in section 10(e) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended.

Paragraph (4) of subsection (a) would provide that claims of American nationality



raised in resisting deportation shall be presented to the courts only in review proceedings under this proposal or in habeas corpus proceedings, and that such claims shall not be determined by the courts in any other way, as in proceedings under section 360 of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952. The purpose of this provision is to force into a single judicial proceedings all of the issues raised in a deportation proceeding, rather than to permit a claim of citizenship to be raised separately, perhaps for purposes of delay.

Paragraph (5) of subsection (a) would provide that in criminal prosecutions under subsections (d) or (e) of section 242 of the Immigration and Nationality Act the validity of deportation orders may be challenged only by a motion before trial, such motion to be determined by the court without a jury and upon the administrative record, rather than in a judicial trial de novo. (See *Cox v. United States*, 332 U.S. 442, under the Selective Training and Service Act.) This motion remedy would be made exclusive. Thus, the motion having been determined by the judge before jeopardy attached, the Government may properly be given a right to appeal from a determination that the deportation order underlying the criminal proceeding is invalid.

Paragraph (6) of subsection (a) would specifically provide that the mere availability of judicial review as distinguished from the actual commencement of review proceedings, will not require the Attorney General to refrain from deporting an alien or release an alien from compliance with the surveillance and departure requirements of subsections (d) and (e) of section 242 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. It would further provide that nothing in the proposed bill shall interfere with the Attorney General's present authority under subsection (c) of section 242 to detain an alien.

Until recently it was thought that an order excluding an alien from admission to the United States could be reviewed in the courts only by habeas corpus. However, the U.S. Supreme Court held on December 17, 1956, in *Brownell v. Tom We Shung*, that such orders may be judicially reviewed in actions for declaratory judgments as well as in habeas corpus. It is believed that since an alien who has been excluded is ordinarily held in custody habeas corpus provides a wholly adequate remedy for the judicial review of exclusion orders, and accordingly subsection (b) of the proposed section 293 provides that habeas corpus shall be the exclusive method for judicial review of such orders.

#### SECTION 30

Section 6 of the act of September 11, 1957 which authorizes the admission of certain immigrants notwithstanding their affliction with tuberculosis will expire on June 30, 1959. The proposed amendment would preserve this authority on a continuing basis subject to such safeguards as the Attorney General may impose after consultation with the Surgeon General of the U.S. Public Health Service.

#### SECTION 31

This section repeals those provisions of existing law relating to naturalization of soldiers and veterans, made necessary by the restatement and codification of that naturalization law as contained in this bill.

#### AMENDMENT OF UNITED STATES CODE, RELATING TO PROCEEDINGS IN FORMA PAUPERIS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend section 1915(a) of title 28, United States Code, which

section relates to proceedings in courts of the United States without prepayment of fees, costs, or security under certain circumstances.

Specifically, section 1915(a) provides that any court of the United States may authorize the commencement, prosecution, or defense of civil or criminal litigation, including appeals, without prepayment of fees, costs, or security by a citizen who makes affidavit that he is unable to pay such costs or give security therefor.

It is the view of the Department of Justice that it would be consonant with the ideals and policies of the United States to afford indigent aliens the same privileges of proceeding in forma pauperis as is now afforded citizens.

This legislative proposal would accomplish this desirable result by changing the word "citizen" to "person."

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the submission of this recommendation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2179) to amend section 1915 of title 28, United States Code, relating to proceedings in forma pauperis, introduced by Mr. DIRKSEN, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### MINERAL LEASING ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1959

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Mineral Leasing Act by providing a new measure, to be called Mineral Leasing Act Amendments of 1959.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2181) to amend the Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920, introduced by Mr. O'MAHONEY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the recent filing by the Department of the Interior of several contests alleging violations of the limitations on the amount of land any person may hold by way of oil or gas leases or options on the public lands has caused confusion amounting almost to chaos in the exploration and production of oil and gas in the public land States.

The Secretary of the Interior is, of course, right in taking vigorous action to prevent violations of the law, whether committed by fraud or by mistake. The disposition of such cases, however, in administrative and court hearings, requiring, as will be inevitable, months if not years to accomplish, will threaten a severe public loss, for the public land States and their school districts, as well as the Federal Government itself, derive substantial revenues from the royalties paid for production on public lands.

#### BILL WILL CLARIFY MINERAL LEASING ACT

I am, therefore, introducing a bill today which is designed to clarify the law, to remove roadblocks to the continued

development of oil and gas lands, to facilitate the handling of contests by the Department of the Interior, to provide for the relief of persons who, though involved as defendants in the pending contests, are in fact innocent of violations, and at the same time to punish law violators who have knowingly sought to hold more land than Congress intended.

#### PROCEEDINGS AGAINST ALLEGED VIOLATORS FILED

Three contests have been filed by the Department of the Interior in the Federal land offices at Billings and Cheyenne involving more than 200 parties—some of them individuals, some of them corporations, lease brokers, and operating oil and gas companies—are all involved. It is alleged that the defendant applicants have failed to declare their holdings as required by the law, that some of the applicants were dummies acting for others and thus knowingly participated in an effort to evade the law.

The contests were filed in the local land offices, but defendants have contended that any proceedings leading to cancellation or forfeiture should be filed in the courts. In these circumstances, the determination by the courts of the proper procedure, the taking of depositions, the holding of hearings in the land offices, and the trial of cases in the courts might easily continue for several years before final determination. It thus seems necessary, in the interest of all concerned, to clarify the law so that the pending cases may be concluded as speedily as possible and future violations prevented.

#### BILL WOULD PROTECT INNOCENT LEASEHOLDERS AND STRENGTHEN ACREAGE LIMITATION

The act I propose will be cited as the Mineral Leasing Act Amendments of 1959. The provisions of the present law which need clarification are contained in sections 17 and 27. These sections, therefore, have been rewritten to preserve as much as possible of the present language while making changes to produce the desired results.

The main proposals are as follows:

First. To make the primary term of all oil and gas leases 10 years and so long thereafter as oil or gas is produced in paying quantities.

Second. To provide that no person, association, or corporation shall hold more than 246,080 acres in any one State by option or lease except in the States of Alaska or Hawaii.

Third. To provide that no option for an oil or gas lease shall extend for more than 3 years without the prior approval of the Secretary, that no person, association or corporation shall hold any such option at any one time on more than 200,000 acres of land in any one State except Alaska and Hawaii, and that, until exercised all options shall be charged to both parties.

Fourth. To require the filing in the local land offices of notice showing the number of acres under option, the names of all parties and their interests and obligations.

Fifth. To provide that violations may be proceeded against by the Secretary in administrative proceedings but that in the event the Secretary has reason to

believe that fraud has been committed, he may request the Attorney General to institute proceedings in the U.S. district court.

Sixth. To authorize the court if fraud is found to declare the violator ineligible thereafter, either permanently or for a lesser period, to hold any lease or other interest in land under the provisions of this act.

Seventh. To give to any party to a contest the right to have the proceedings against him dismissed upon the showing that he acquired his interest in good faith without violation of the law, and

Eighth. Finally, that any person who has been found in any of these proceedings not to have violated the law or to have been guilty of fraud "shall have the right to have his interest extended for a period of time equal to any period during which development rights were suspended with respect to his interest."

#### FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF KENT STATE UNIVERSITY, OHIO

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, the year 1960 will mark the 50th anniversary of the founding of Kent State University, a State-supported institution of higher learning in northeastern Ohio.

This great university has, over the years, enabled some 90,000 young people of my State and of other States of the Union to obtain a higher education which, by reason of economic conditions and other factors, they might otherwise have found it impossible to obtain.

Kent State University has dedicated itself, to the fullest possible extent, to the development of our Nation's most priceless heritage, our human resources.

Mr. President, I submit a concurrent resolution felicitating and congratulating Kent State University, of Ohio, on this outstanding achievement, and ask that it be appropriately referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Moss in the chair). The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 49) was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

Whereas May 19, 1960, marks the fiftieth anniversary of the founding of Kent State University as the State-supported institution of higher learning in northeastern Ohio; and

Whereas during this half-century Kent State University has evolved from a normal school of forty-seven students to a university of more than seven thousand, offering diverse programs in education, the arts and sciences, and business administration on both the graduate and undergraduate levels; and

Whereas Kent State University was a pioneer in the development of extension centers remote from the central campus, thereby reaching thousands of students who might not otherwise have been able to gain advanced training so necessary to the well-being of our society and democratic government; and

Whereas Kent State University has directly educated nearly ninety thousand of the Nation's youth and has indirectly enriched the lives of countless thousands more; and

Whereas the university has dedicated itself to the fullest possible development of our Nation's most priceless heritage, our human resources: Therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress hereby extends its greetings and felicitations to Kent State University on the occasion of the fiftieth anniversary of its founding, and joins with the people of the United States in expressing its recognition and appreciation of the service which Kent State University has rendered to the State of Ohio and to the Nation in making available to Americans in every walk of life the benefits of higher education. The Secretary of the Senate shall prepare a suitable copy of this resolution and present the same to the president of Kent State University.*

#### CONSOLIDATED FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION ACT OF 1959— ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the orders of the Senate of June 9, and June 12, 1959, the names of Senators CHAVEZ, YOUNG of North Dakota, MUNDT, BENNETT, LANGER, BRIDGES, LAUSCHE, CARLSON, GOLDWATER, CASE of South Dakota, BEALL, and CAPEHART were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 2144) to simplify, consolidate and improve the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture with respect to loans to farmers and ranchers, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. ALLOTT on June 9, 1959.

#### NATIONAL MINERALS POLICY—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF JOINT RESOLUTION

Under authority of the order of the Senate of June 9, 1959, the names of Senators MANSFIELD, CHURCH, and CANNON were added as additional cosponsors of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 107) expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to a sound national minerals policy, and directing the Secretary of the Interior to take certain action in furtherance of such policy, introduced by Mr. MURRAY on June 9, 1959.

#### INTERNATIONAL PUBLIC HEALTH AND MEDICAL RESEARCH YEAR— ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF RESOLUTION

Under authority of the order of the Senate of June 5, 1959, the names of Senators BARTLETT, CARROLL, CHAVEZ, CHURCH, DOUGLAS, ENGLE, GREEN, GRUENING, HARTKE, HENNINGS, JACKSON, JAVITS, KENNEDY, LANGER, MANSFIELD, MCCARTHY, McNAMARA, MORSE, MOSS, MURRAY, MUSKIE, NEUBERGER, PROUTY, PROXMIER, SALTONSTALL, TALMADGE, WILLIAMS of New Jersey, YARBOROUGH, and YOUNG of Ohio were added as additional cosponsors of the resolution (S. Res. 129) favoring continued efforts by all nations to strengthen cooperation in health and research activities submitted by Mr. HUMPHREY on June 5, 1959.

#### 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. KEATING (for Mr. MARTIN): Statement prepared by Senator MARTIN entitled "American Fair Play: What's Happening to It?"

By Mr. NEUBERGER: Article entitled "John Foster Dulles: A Profile in Courage," written by Senator KENNEDY, and published in the American Weekly for June 14, 1959.

#### NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON PROPOSED LEGISLATION RELATING TO SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. PROXMIER. Mr. President, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Small Business of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, I wish to announce the commencement of hearings on proposed legislation now pending before that subcommittee. The proposed legislation consists of the following bills:

S. 1340, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, to provide for disaster loans to small business concerns which suffer economic injury due to federally aided highway construction programs.

S. 1351, introduced by Mr. BEALL, to authorize assistance under the Small Business Act of 1953 to certain small business concerns displaced as a result of urban renewal activities under the Housing Act of 1949.

S. 1609, introduced by Mr. JAVITS, to provide assistance to small business concerns to facilitate adjustments made necessary by the foreign trade policy of the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 1666, introduced by Mr. LANGER, for himself and Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, to amend the Small Business Act of 1953 to include within the definition of a small business concern certain agricultural enterprises.

S. 1777, introduced by Mr. CLARK, for himself and Mr. JAVITS, to authorize assistance under the Small Business Act to small business concerns displaced as a result of urban renewal activities under the Housing Act of 1949.

S. 1879, introduced by Mr. SALTONSTALL, for himself and Mr. SPARKMAN, to amend the Small Business Act, and for other purposes.

S. 2032, introduced by Mr. SPARKMAN, to amend the Small Business Act.

S. 2139, introduced by Mr. SALTONSTALL, to amend the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, and for other purposes.

Hearings will begin on Monday, June 22, 1959, with testimony by the Administrator of the Small Business Administration, Mr. Wendell B. Barnes, and will be followed thereafter by testimony of other witnesses.

All persons who wish to appear and testify at hearings on these bills are requested to notify Mr. J. H. Yingling, chief of staff, Committee on Banking and Currency, room 5300, Senate Office Building, telephone Capitol 4-3121, extension 3921, as soon as possible, and in any event, before the close of business on June 22, 1959.

Mr. President, the New York Times of August 17, 1958, described the record of the 85th Congress on small business



legislation with this headline: "Small Business Hits the Jackpot—New Legislation Goes Long Way in Providing Tax and Financing Relief."

The press, the small business community, financial writers, and many professional observers were generous in their praise of the manner in which the 85th Congress acted to improve the outlook for the Nation's small business concerns.

One of the principal acts of the Congress was the formulation of the programs under the Small Business Investment Act.

Roger Babson's Washington newsletter characterized this act as follows:

This is a bold step that strikes at the heart of what is perhaps the biggest problem facing small business today: lack of equity capital and difficulty in getting long-term loans.

This legislation was firmly based upon a study by the Federal Reserve Board, at the request of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, which disclosed that there was a gap in the existing structure of financial institutions—that there was no organized source to provide long-term money to small concerns.

The act provides, first, for long-term loans and equity-type capital to small businesses, credit which is not available through commercial banks; second, long-term loans to State and local development companies; and, third, grants to State agencies and activities for research and counseling in the management, financing, and operation of small businesses.

The program is administered by the Small Business Administration under an appropriation made this year of \$50 million, to be supplemented by further appropriations in the years ahead of up to \$200 million.

The principal feature of the act contemplates the formation of new private financial institutions to function as small business investment companies. These companies must receive SBA approval, or licensing, in order to operate under the act. They are also subject to examination. Their licenses depend upon the need for the type of financing they will provide in the proposed area of operation, and such other factors as the character and ability of the proposed management.

Each company must have an initial paid-in capital and surplus of at least \$300,000. However, the SBA is authorized to lend them up to \$150,000, which amount can be considered as part of the required initial capital. In addition to this initial capital, small business investment companies may borrow funds. SBA can lend an additional amount of up to 50 percent of their capital and surplus. Small business investment companies may supply funds to small businesses in two basic ways: First, by the purchase of debenture bonds convertible into stock of the borrowers at the option of the investment company; and second by long-term loans.

In separate legislation, Congress also gave these companies certain tax benefits. It provided that investors in the companies may treat losses in such companies as ordinary deductions from in-

come, rather than as offsets against capital gains. The companies themselves may treat their losses on convertible debentures or stock of small business concerns in the same way, that is, as an ordinary deduction. The investment companies are also entitled to a 100 percent deduction on dividends received on an investment in a small business concern.

For the past few years, State and local development corporations have been organized and financed by public spirited citizens interested in the industrialization and diversification of their State and local economies. However, the committees of the Congress who have been watching these developments, and the studies which have been made by the various Federal agencies concerned, have shown that their sources of capital were drying up, and that the progress which they had been making in recent years in local development was in danger of coming to a halt. Therefore, the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 provided for loans to these companies which funds, in turn, may be loaned to small business borrowers.

Let me emphasize that both of the features of this act which I have discussed place emphasis on private management of the organizations and local control over the use of the funds provided.

Another feature of this act which holds out hope of great benefits to small business is the provision for grants to State agencies and to colleges and universities for research and counseling in business finance and management. It was pointed out in studies which led up to enactment of this bill that often a small business enterprise is created by a person or a group of persons who may be quite capable in one line of business endeavor, but who have not the time nor the resources to develop all the talents and to acquire all the knowledge necessary to a growing enterprise in a competitive economy. Often financial difficulties of these companies have resulted from a management or technical deficiency which additional funds alone could not solve. While large businesses may overcome these difficulties by hiring executives or obtaining professional advice, small businesses are often not able to do so, and even when able, may not be informed as to the type and accessibility of the assistance which they need. While there are many Federal Government research programs such as those of the Department of Commerce and the Small Business Administration itself, and there is a large amount of information available locally, there is difficulty in bringing this information to bear on a particular business problem at the proper time. Conceivably, this program of research and counseling in small business problems could be as fruitful to this segment of our economy as the program of agricultural research and extension has been to the farm economy. At any rate, it is a very promising step forward.

As I have said, the Small Business Investment Act was hailed as a great step forward in meeting the needs of small

business. The program attracted widespread interest on the part of persons and organizations who indicated a desire to form small business investment companies.

Wendell B. Barnes, Administrator of the Small Business Administration, testified on June 3, 1959, that from September 1958 through January 31, 1959, the Small Business Administration answered 13,000 letters and inquiries on the program, and in January alone answered 8,000. Notwithstanding the widespread interest in the act, the record of accomplishment under it is, I think, disappointing. As of June 3, Small Business Administration had received 79 proposals from organized small business investment companies, had given preliminary approval to 38 such proposals, and had actually licensed 13 companies. I do not at this time seek to assess responsibility for this disappointing record.

However, it is my purpose, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Small Business of the Committee on Banking and Currency, to undertake an examination into the operation of this program, as well as the other programs administered by the Small Business Administration, in addition to the specific legislative proposals which I have mentioned.

I take this means publicly to invite the testimony of witnesses who have been interested in the establishment of small business investment companies and who have been either successful or unsuccessful in the formation and operation of such companies.

I hope that the subcommittee can develop from this testimony and from its own deliberations whatever amendments will be required to make the Small Business Investment Act carry out the purposes for which it was intended.

In conclusion let me say a word about the role of small business in our economy. Small firms play a vital role in the maintenance of active competition, upon which our economy is based. They perform great services in the area of innovation and stimulation of the economy by the development of new ideas, new products, and new processes. Perhaps most important of all is that their existence provides opportunities for individualism of the owners and entrepreneurs. In a society which is growing in the direction of great and powerful organizations, it is more and more important that we preserve the opportunity for the individual businessman to develop his own economic future in his own way. Otherwise, the economy and the political scheme in which it operates will tend to centralized uniformity and to the stifling of initiative and autonomy. A healthy small business community helps to provide stability and moderation in the economy, in politics, and in society in general.

I hope that, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Small Business, I can make some contribution to the health of this vital element of our economy.

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

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I extend to the Senator from Wisconsin every good wish

in undertaking the hearings which he has just informed the Senate he is about to inaugurate. In my opinion such an investigation could provide a very promising program of assistance to small business.

The Senator from Wisconsin will recall that the sponsor of a Senate bill, the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], and the chairman of the Select Committee on Small Business, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], expressed the hope that such legislation would offer assistance to small business in an area where it was most vitally needed, the area of long-term loans and equity financing.

I hope the Senator from Wisconsin will soon be in a position to tell the Senate how this very important, promising program has been working in practice, because, as the Senator has indicated, this is a matter which affects not only one city or State, but really the Nation as a whole.

Again I commend and congratulate the Senator for the announcement which he has just made.

Mr. PROXMIER. The Senator from Montana is exactly correct. Legislation to assist small business can be of very great benefit to small business, for the simple reason that it is not working as rapidly as most of us had hoped it would. I am delighted that the Senator from Montana has indicated his very real interest in these hearings.

#### INFORMATIONAL MEDIA GUARANTEE PROGRAM OF THE U.S. INFORMATION AGENCY

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, the time has come for the United States to take more vigorous action to make our life and culture better understood abroad, especially in the new nations of the world. The Soviet Union is becoming ever more effective in this field, with its touring teams of performing artists and its expanding subsidized exports of published materials, not infrequently in the English language.

We are already doing a considerable amount in this field, with the student exchange programs and other activities of the State Department and the U.S. Information Agency. There is one area, however, in which I believe we could greatly increase our effectiveness at very small cost and in a manner which has few of the disadvantages of direct Government action—which frequently is discounted abroad as propaganda. This is the area of facilitating, through normal channels of trade, the export of American published materials and other informational media. American business firms and nonprofit groups are already doing a magnificent job in this field wherever it is possible for them to operate commercially. American book exports have grown from a level, measured in wholesale prices, of less than \$5 million a year before World War II to over \$60 million, last year. American periodical exports have also greatly increased in the postwar period—especially exports of scientific, technical, and scholarly journals, and the overseas foreign language

editions produced locally, such as the international editions of Reader's Digest. American motion picture showings abroad have grown in about the same magnitude as domestic showings.

This is excellent, so far as it goes. These American materials are made available abroad at no cost to the Government; the foreign consumer buys what he has enough interest in to pay for; and there is no tinge of Government propaganda. The drawback is that there are important areas of the world where this private enterprise operation will not function at this time. A good many countries, especially the new and underdeveloped ones, are so short of foreign exchange, especially dollars, needed for economic development purposes that dollars are not available for the import of American books, periodicals, and other informational media.

For some 10 years we have had a device for dealing with this problem—the informational media guarantee program. Under this program, the U.S. Government makes it possible for U.S. materials to be sold in dollar-short countries for local currencies, which, in turn, are purchased by the U.S. Government for its own use in those countries. In this way, over a 10-year period some \$150 million—at retail prices abroad—of U.S. exports of informational media have been made possible, at a cost to the U.S. Government of between \$10 and \$16 million, or about 10 cents on the dollar.

There was an original authorization of \$28 million for this program, in a revolving fund. Because of losses, this amount has gradually been reduced to a point where the program cannot function without a replenishment of the revolving fund by new appropriations. The Congress authorized such appropriations last year, and the President recommended an appropriation of \$7 million at that time. Unfortunately, the other body cut out this item entirely, and it was only possible for the Senate conferees to salvage \$2.5 million in conference. This made possible a program of about \$10 million in wholesale export terms during the current fiscal year, which means about three to four times that amount in retail prices abroad. This year the President's budget recommended an appropriation of \$3.5 million, which the House has reduced to \$2.5 million. This would make possible in the next fiscal year a program considerably smaller than the one in the current year, and probably only about one-third of the size of the export demand for American materials in the 12 countries in which the program now operates: Burma, Chile, Indonesia, Israel, Pakistan, the Philippines, Poland, Spain, Taiwan, Turkey, Vietnam, and Yugoslavia. In addition, there are other countries to which the program ought to be extended, but for which the present revolving fund is totally inadequate.

The appropriation for this program is now before the Senate Committee on Appropriations. I trust that now that it has been reviewed, our committee will authorize an amount which will make it possible for this activity to be car-

ried on in a vigorous way. As the report of a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations under the chairmanship of the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] pointed out last year, this is an exceedingly valuable and useful program which aids a number of foreign-policy objectives. For example, we have a great asset in the English language, which is becoming ever more popular abroad as a second language, and even in some cases a first language. We are helping this development by the English language teaching program of the U.S. Information Agency. We ought to capitalize on it further by making available to these users of the English language in other countries the American books, periodicals, and other materials which they are so eager to be able to purchase and use. It is noteworthy in this connection that an increasing volume of subsidized Soviet publications is being offered in many of these countries in our own language—English.

Without in any way deprecating the importance of many of our other valuable programs in this general area which are being carried on by the State Department and the U.S. Information Agency, I sincerely believe we are overlooking a great opportunity in not making maximum use of the informational media guarantee program which is at the same time so inexpensive and so effective. I do hope that the Congress will take advantage of the opportunity which is open to us to go ahead strongly in this field.

#### TRIBUTE TO SENATOR JOHNSON OF TEXAS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on June 11, an interesting article by Mr. Richard L. Strout was published in the Christian Science Monitor. It has to do with the many and varied responsibilities which confront the Senate majority leader, the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON]. Mentioned in the article is the citation which was given to the majority leader when he was awarded a well-deserved honorary degree by Brown University in Providence, R.I. It reads as follows:

When the Executive and the legislature are divided, anything or nothing can happen. As majority leader of the Senate you have used your political strength in the national interest to make it possible for moderates of both parties to join with you to do the possible and to seek the best. Your skill as a politician has been notable, but you have subordinated politics to national interest, the service for which you will be best remembered.

I think this is an appropriate citation, because it indicates the majority leader's position when there is a division between the executive and the legislative branches of the Government. It is well to note and to emphasize the part of the citation which states that the majority leader has used his "political strength in the national interest," and, also "to do the possible and to seek the best."

It is well to note, further, that in the concluding sentence of the citation,



Brown University has this to say of Senator JOHNSON:

You have subordinated politics to national interest, the service for which you will be best remembered.

Here, in brief, is a summation of what the majority leader has been trying to do in a responsible manner in the past three Congresses, as well as in the present Congress. Attacks have been made upon him from time to time, and from various quarters; but the proof of achievement is always in the record made, not in the assumptions which critics make.

There has been, for example, an obvious and premature attempt, in recent weeks, to try to define the values of this Congress on the basis of the amount of legislation passed. In this respect, comparisons have been made with the 80th Congress. The record, I believe, will indicate that a greater quantity of legislation was passed in the first session of the 80th Congress than in the first session of 86th Congress to date. If we are going to judge Congresses by the amount of legislation passed, however, we shall use a wrong and dangerous criterion for measurement. Not the quantity of legislation passed, but the quality of the legislation is what marks the effectiveness of a particular Congress and, for that matter, a particular political party.

If this Congress is to be judged on the basis of the quantity of legislation passed, then I think it only fair for partisans to recognize that not only are they asking for more legislation, but they are also asking for more public expenditures, at a time when they are staking their whole case on their alleged fiscal responsibility and frugality.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article by Richard L. Strout be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

**TIGHTENING OF POLITICAL TENSION—AN  
INTIMATE MESSAGE FROM WASHINGTON  
(By Richard L. Strout)**

Democratic Majority Leader LYNDON JOHNSON has a lot of critics. Some in his own party in Congress blame him for not making a more direct attack on President Eisenhower. Senator JOHNSON is adamant. "Bob Taft," he says in so many words, "always said you had to attack something. He made his points by attack—Truman, Communists, New Dealers. But that," he adds, "just isn't the way I operate."

Senator JOHNSON is firm. Politically he may be right, he may be wrong. But he has held verbal sniping down to a rather remarkable minimum so far. In and out of season he has told audiences that he believes voters in 1960 will judge his party on its legislative record. They did that in 1958, didn't they? he asks.

Brown University just gave an honorary degree to LYNDON JOHNSON. It is interesting to note the citation. With the exception of what, I have no doubt, is some excellent Latin, it reads as follows:

"When the Executive and the legislature are divided, anything or nothing can happen. As majority leader of the Senate you have used your political strength in the national interest to make it possible for moderates of both parties to join with you to do the possible and to seek the best. Your skill as a

politician has been notable, but you have subordinated politics to national interest, the service for which you will be best remembered."

The difficulty of maintaining this posture is great; it may be impossible; it may not even be wise. The Founding Fathers created the dilemma when they left the door open to split government. At Baltimore this week Mr. JOHNSON accused some Republicans in Congress of trying to sabotage the work of Congress to discredit the Democratic majority.

To Mr. JOHNSON it seems plain enough. He is trying to do something that is good for the country—and his party. But to achieve a constructive legislative record he is faced, on one hand, with all sorts of Democratic pressure groups and, on the other, with the threat of a veto. Speaking of some Republican opponents, he charged in Baltimore that "unless they control an institution of government, they will not let that institution work."

It is difficult to maintain balance in such a situation. Mr. Eisenhower tossed Mr. JOHNSON an uncomfortable chore on Monday. The bond market is demoralized; the country faces the biggest peacetime debt in history, and Mr. Eisenhower asked Congress for an emergency increase in the debt ceiling and higher interest rates on long-term Government bonds and on savings certificates.

The chore probably has to be done. But there is always the partisan squabble of who's to blame. Democracy would not be in working order if a situation like this did not create a legislative debate. And debates engender heat.

Mr. JOHNSON's attempt, to quote the Brown University citation, to subordinate "politics to national interest," was not made easier by the juxtaposition of the Republican congressional \$100-a-plate dinner on the same evening that the President made his financial request.

Partisan dinners require partisan speeches. There will be more as time passes; indeed the 2d session of the 86th Congress may not do much except deliver them. President Eisenhower's speech was relatively mild. He warned his GOP hearers not to be deceived by declarations that there are "no differences between our parties." The difference he defined as follows:

"Except for the support of some discerning Democrats, it is the Republican Party that fights for responsible, sensible fiscal policy in Government, as urged in the recommendation of the administration."

This statement brought hearty applause and was appropriate enough for the occasion. After all, it acknowledged that there are "some discerning Democrats."

But anybody who senses the present Washington atmosphere notes a tightening of the political tension. It is not certain how much longer moderates of both parties will join with LYNDON JOHNSON "to do the possible."

**ENGINEERS AND PUBLIC POLICY—  
ADDRESS BY SENATOR ANDERSON**

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, on last Saturday the able and distinguished junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] delivered the principal address at the annual commencement exercises of the Georgia Institute of Technology in Atlanta. Speaking on the topic "Engineers and Public Policy," he made an eloquent and inspiring presentation of the role of the engineer as "our first line of defense in the world race for control and use of nuclear power." He painted a graphic word picture of the problems and challenges of the world of

the future which was enthusiastically received by his audience, and I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the text of his remarks be printed herewith in the body of the RECORD.

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

**ENGINEERS AND PUBLIC POLICY**

(Commencement address by Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON at the Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, Ga., June 13, 1959)

President Harrison, members of the board of trustees, members of the faculty, distinguished guests, and members of the graduating class:

I am honored to be here today. I have the greatest respect for the forward-looking work of this school. You are fortunate to have had the fine training available here under the guidance of your able president and faculty. My visit is to urge this school and this class to go forward with good works.

To be sure that my talk here today could not be regarded as political, I have omitted from the advance text three paragraphs which I would be delinquent in my duty if I did not read to you.

Georgia has in the Senate of the United States two of the ablest and finest Senators that any State in the Union can boast. DICK RUSSELL, who is my superior on the Atomic Energy Committee, is as fine a friend and as competent a Senator as that distinguished body knows. He is regarded by all as representative of the finest traditions of the Senate, and he is a model toward which younger Senators can aspire.

HERMAN TALMADGE came in on trial because he replaced a Senator for whom many of us had genuine admiration and affection. I am happy to testify, after a too short an acquaintance with Senator Talmadge, that he has proved to be a man of great talent and ability, of extremely sound judgment and of fine personal characteristics. I predict that his tenure of office in the U.S. Senate will be long and fruitful, and that Georgia will become as proud of him as he is proud of the State which sent him there.

You graduate today into a world of accelerating change.

It is a world in turmoil. In Africa and in Asia man's natural instinct for freedom is being fulfilled—not all at once, and not always peacefully.

It is a world of mounting population. In a short 40 years the earth's population will more than double. That means new pressures in many places.

It is a world of nuclear power. The atom gives us either the power to destroy the world or to build a richer, and a better life.

It is a hungry world. Underdeveloped peoples are struggling to raise themselves out of poverty, disease, and hunger, while our own country struggles to overcome its food surpluses.

It is a competitive world. We are faced with the unrelenting challenge of the Soviet Union.

The challenge is military, of course, but it is also economic, educational, psychological, political, and cultural. There is a total challenge, requiring from us a total response.

In short, this Nation is engaged in the greatest competition ever undertaken by a free country. We are up against the most enormous problems of our history. We must use all our resources and use them wisely. And of all our resources, the richest are the minds and spirits of free men.

We should be putting our best brains to work on the crucial issues of national policy.

The fact is, however, that much of our brightest talent is lost to the national ef-

fort. We do not enlist—as we should—the full help of the scientist in general, and in particular, the engineer.

This situation is not unique to any one administration. My remarks apply to what is a national problem—a national shortcoming.

Since sputnik, we have made some progress in mobilizing our best scientific talent. We now have, at the highest level, a Special Assistant to the President for Science and Technology, and a Science Advisory Committee which is trying to develop a national plan for exploring and expanding the frontiers of science. We have recently established a National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

But progress so far is piecemeal and stop-gap. We still have much to do to make effective use of scientific and engineering talent—in the interest of a national policy of survival.

Congress, as well as the executive branch, requires scientific counsel. I now serve on several committees which must utilize the advice of scientists—on finance, on interior, on aeronautical and space sciences, and on atomic energy. But perhaps the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy offers the most instructive examples of how Congress requires the help of the scientist and the engineer.

This committee, composed of nine members of the Senate and nine from the House of Representatives, was established by the Atomic Energy Act of 1946. Its original function was to be a watchdog for Congress and the public over a super-secret operation of great importance to the national defense. Over the years it has also become a creative policymaker both in the military field and more recently in the area of civilian uses of atomic energy. Many of its members have worked in these fields for a longer period of time than most of the members of the Atomic Energy Commission or many of its senior officials.

This reservoir of experience is an enormous advantage.

But of equal significance has been the abiding faith of many members of the Joint Committee in the ability of our scientists and engineers to harness the tremendous energy of the atom for our military defense and peaceful development.

This faith, backed by experience, led the committee to advocate with others the development of the H-bomb, to support the *Nautilus* project for a nuclear-propelled submarine, to recommend acceleration of the civilian atomic power program, and to increase basic research and engineering facilities.

In all its work the committee must rely on advice from experts. Let me suggest four examples:

First, should we now move ahead with a \$105 million linear accelerator or a \$200 million particle accelerator?

Accelerator development has been keenly competitive in this country. Several years ago a group of midwestern universities got together a group called MURA, which proposed to construct the world's largest accelerator. But Stanford's suggested linear accelerator—to be built in California—has apparently beaten out other types. Should we take Stanford's program—or MURA's—or call a plague on both their houses and have neither? Congress must decide. In that decision, the testimony of physicists and engineers will be indispensable.

Second, should we authorize alterations in the Shippingport reactor to take it up to 150,000 kilowatts in power?

Last week the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy reported out an authorization bill for AEC expenditures. It carried \$5 million for additional work at the Shippingport plant of the Duquesne Power & Light Co. The reactor there is owned by the Government,

the generating equipment by the distributing company. Adm. H. G. Rickover had proposed that the Government spend \$5 million to raise the capacity of that plant from 100,000 kilowatts to 150,000 kilowatts. This expenditure would be over and beyond the budget estimate.

The Government already has \$100 million invested in the reactor. Should it spend \$5 million more to give us further data on the commercial possibility of a pressurized water reactor in the development of electricity from atomic power? The engineer can help us to an answer.

Third, should the new \$125 million reactor at Hanford, Wash., be a single-purpose plutonium reactor or a reactor convertible to electricity?

If the demand for plutonium suddenly drops off because of a disarmament agreement, 300,000 kilowatts or more of electricity might be generated by a converted plant, and fed into the Northwest power grid. Thus part of the cost of the plant would be salvaged. Even if the demand for plutonium should not drop off, the Congress might vote to add the convertible feature in order that the surplus heat might be utilized rather than wasted. The sale of this heat in the form of power might cut the production cost of plutonium by a third, possibly cut it in two.

Do we spend the additional \$25 million to make the reactor convertible, or do we save it? To deal with this type of problem Congress must draw on the advice of competent engineers.

Fourth, should a new carrier for the Navy be propelled by conventional or nuclear power?

On the one hand, the designer of the nuclear submarine thinks it would be a waste of money and effort to build the conventionally powered ship. On the other hand, the Navy says that to make it a nuclear carrier would add \$120 million to the \$260 million the Navy now plans to devote to it. Do you spend this \$120 million, or save it? Here again the engineer is the adviser to the Congress, and his judgment is essential.

Granted, the need of advice from scientists and engineers—there are some very real difficulties in practice.

For one thing, scientists and engineers with equal competence, objectivity, and integrity come up with different ideas and conflicting counsel. This has been the case, in all the examples I have just cited. As a result, the politician must constantly choose between divergent scientific advice. To make any sort of sensible decision we ourselves often have to go deeply into the technical aspects of a problem.

Furthermore, the scientist himself may not distinguish clearly between technical judgments and political judgments. There is a crop of what I am compelled to call "political scientists"—some of whom have large reputations and many followers, and are becoming known as "opera stars." I must say, however, that engineers, by and large, by reason of their nature and training, have not put themselves in the "opera star" category.

Our effort to obtain full information on the fallout problem has been plagued by confusion among scientists between technical advice and political judgment.

For example, the General Advisory Committee of the AEC recently issued a report on the atomic fallout problem. This report was submitted in the middle of hearings being conducted by the Special Subcommittee on Radiation of the Joint Committee. You might be interested in reading this report, for its conclusions strike me as unscientific reporting. This report gave no consideration to the extent and effects of the future testing of nuclear weapons. It also minimized the effects of weapons tests to date and ignored the problem "hot spot" areas in our

North Central States. I might add that these were among the problems we were tackling in our congressional hearings. The people of America—yes, of the world—have a right to better information on fallout and to have it soon.

Or take the case of our Aircraft Nuclear Propulsion (ANP) program—on which the Government has spent almost a billion dollars. We on the Joint Committee have thought that if this large amount of money is to produce any results, we should at least aim the early flight of an experimental prototype aircraft.

Yet each time the decision is almost reached to move to the prototype state, some new scientific committee set up to review the program gets cold feet.

A classic example occurred in 1958 when a group went to the main ANP laboratory near Cincinnati and spent about 2½ hours reviewing the general progress and problems of the project. As a result of this very brief review, together with an analysis of past reports which were directed to a different objective, the group recommended that the Government should not press forward with the project to the flight prototype stage. The question which we on the Joint Committee asked was: "How can scientists and engineers make such a recommendation with so brief a review of the problem from a first-hand standpoint or even from the standpoint of a review of reports?" I might add that we are still asking this question concerning the ANP program.

Some of the questions I have mentioned concern the pure field of science. Many of them, however, would beckon the engineer to aid in the making of public policy. I have separated—in that sentence—the engineer from the scientist.

Dr. J. R. Killian, Jr., whom I regret to see leave his post as Special Assistant to the President for Science and Technology, first called my attention to the fact that engineers make up a profession separate from science.

"Engineering," Dr. Killian reminded me, "is concerned with applying science to the use and convenience of man. The engineer's work usually has a social and economic objective. The work of the scientist may be directed primarily at increasing our understanding of nature. While scientists and engineers each have separate professional functions to perform, they are increasingly dependent, one upon the other. Modern science requires the great instruments such as radio telescopes and high-energy accelerators which the engineer comes to create, whereas the engineer is increasingly dependent upon the new ideas which flow out of the work of the scientist."

That statement explains better than a thousand words my interest in this graduating class.

You are needed in the service of the Nation.

Take the problem that now presses on us so urgently: nuclear weapons testing. Our country is now observing in the testing of nuclear weapons a 1-year moratorium which will expire this October. Is that moratorium to be modified to apply to future atmospheric tests—or will it be continued from year to year on a temporary basis?

This is in part a political problem—but it is also an engineering one. What we do in the future can depend in no small degree on the work the engineers can do for us—by way of developing, testing and evaluating nuclear detection devices.

I am not satisfied to use as our sole criterion the findings of an underground shot in an isolated area of Nevada. I believe that the nuclear detection devices which may be called upon to measure both surface and underground explosions should be evaluated not by one country but by some



international organization or under an agreement by the three nations which currently comprise the nuclear club.

Lacking the wise handling of this problem, we will probably see the nuclear club expanded in the next few years to include France, Red China, and a half dozen other nations. Then the problems of control will be vastly magnified—and every problem of agreement gravely complicated.

Let me say this in conclusion:

As you move out into your careers you are bound to have many contacts with our National Government.

This is in sharp contrast to college students of my generation. I was only dimly conscious of the existence of a National Government. Washington was worlds away from the Dakota prairies. Our mayor was the biggest man I knew. I was in a church school which raised most of its money by persuasion and prayer. Aid to education meant setting aside part of the proceeds of a wheat crop.

You have only to look at the budget of your own university or of any other university in the land to find that one-third to more than one-half of its expenditures are financed in one way or another by the Federal Government. Many of the engineering and industrial corporations where you may seek and find employment have a substantial part of their operations financed through Government contracts with the Department of Defense, the Atomic Energy Commission, and the new National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

I hope each of you will find your way to some useful form of teamwork—with Government—in the interest of better public policy.

We can do little about some of our problems without awaiting Soviet cooperation, or without relying on friends and allies abroad. But the wise use of our talent is within our own control. This is one thing each of us can do something about without depending on anyone else. Talent is a homegrown product that we can cultivate and use wisely, if we wish.

Today represents one task completed. May it also—for the ultimate welfare of our land—mean a new responsibility assumed—the pursuit of knowledge, not only throughout your lives but throughout the lives of those who dwell beside you in a world that knows discord and dissension but looks hopefully—and ever shall—to a final peace.

#### HANDOUTS FOR EDUCATION

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, about a week ago the Cincinnati Board of Education took a course of action which in my opinion is so wholesome, constructive, and unprecedented that it should be brought to the attention of the Members of the Senate. The action taken by the Cincinnati Board of Education was, by a majority vote, to refuse the sum of \$110,000 to which it was entitled as a Federal grant under the National Defense Education Act of 1958. The board met in session. A majority of the board voted that Cincinnati would take care of its own school problems and would not accept the Federal aid tendered to it.

I think that course of action is one of such significance that it should be brought to the attention of the Nation. In these days when local and State governmental units, aided by public officials, are expounding the theory that the Federal Treasury is bottomless and that all governmental units, and frequently private enterprises, can turn toward it for financial aid, one ought to find great en-

couragement in this noble act of the Board of Education of Cincinnati. I think we are going to learn soon that we cannot keep coming to the Federal Treasury without end, unless we finally throw the Federal Treasury into such a state that it will require the combined efforts and sacrifices of the people of our country to reestablish the strength of that Treasury. Constant spending of more money than we have can only lead us to the poorhouse. That principle is applicable to the Federal Government exactly as it is applicable to the State and local governments and to private individuals.

Mr. President, I have in my hand an editorial which was published in the Cincinnati Enquirer of June 5, 1959, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

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

#### HANDOUTS FOR EDUCATION

When a school board majority turns down the offer of a Federal handout, or even a matching fund, it's news. Yet that is the indicated policy of the Cincinnati Board of Education, thanks to the sound judgment of Messrs. Edwin Becker, Stanley McKie, Homer Toms, and Sam Todd, in preferring to sacrifice immediate profit for ultimate gain.

Involved here was participation in a Federal matching fund program which would have made \$110,000 in Federal money available to the Cincinnati public schools under the National Defense Education Act of 1958. There would, no doubt, have been an immediate gain in improved mathematics and science teaching equipment, in foreign language "laboratories" and additional guidance counselors, all of which are needed. But the greater purpose is the preservation of local control of public school education. The school board majority is right to be cautious about any Federal foot in that doorway.

Two arguments were made by members who favor the matching arrangement, the school board president, Dr. Fred Heinold, and Charles I. Westhelmer. One is that Cincinnatians are going to be taxed anyway for the program so why not get Cincinnati's share? That is, of course, the lure so frequently used, and so frequently ending in outright Federal control. As a matter of fact, Cincinnatians pay Federal taxes for all kinds of things which they never expect to enjoy themselves. Our motorists contribute to building Federal highways across remote States where they never expect to drive. The "get-your-share" argument is a perilous and also a deceptive lure.

The other argument is that Cincinnati accepts Federal aid for school lunchrooms, so why not take it for teaching improvements? There is, however, a great deal of difference in principle between feeding young bodies and feeding young minds in a democracy. To accept Federal aid in school lunchrooms from a Government with colossal food surpluses on hand, and for the benefit of children whose parents cannot afford to pay for proper lunches, is one thing. To accept it for teaching programs, in a community which can pay and always has paid for them, is quite different.

Over the years the Cincinnati taxpayer has responded generously to the requests of our school authorities, with the result that we now have a fine public school educational setup here. But once let that taxpayer get the idea that Uncle Sam is footing the bill, or even half of it, and no tax levy or bond issue would stand a ghost of a chance at the polls.

#### NOTICE OF INTENTION TO DISCUSS THE NOMINATION OF LEWIS L. STRAUSS TO BE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I rise to make a brief statement.

In the hope that a quorum of the Senate may be present tomorrow, it is my intention to take the floor, when I can get it, on Tuesday, immediately after the morning business, for the purpose of discussing with my colleagues the pending Strauss case. I have every hope that among those who will gather will be all the Democrats, including the majority leader, who are reading the RECORD to determine what position they will take in this matter, and also all Republicans, because I believe the issues in this case rise above all partisan considerations.

The conflict which has thus far taken place over the confirmation of the nomination of this Presidential nominee to become head of the Department of Commerce and a member of the Cabinet has been mistakenly presented to the public as a petty partisan plan to harass the President or a purely personal conflict of little importance. It is neither of these.

We face a deep constitutional crisis involving the right of the people to know what the Executive is doing in the ordinary processes of managing the Government.

I shall undertake to show by incontrovertible evidence that Admiral Strauss is an exponent of the un-American theory that public affairs should be conducted in secrecy by the executive branch whenever that branch or any part of it feels it is desirable to do so.

I shall undertake to say that a man who entertains the views of executive secrecy which Mr. Strauss has practiced and proclaimed is not qualified, in the public interest, to be the head of the great Department which, under the laws of Congress and the Executive orders of the President, exercises a pervasive influence over the entire scope of domestic and foreign commerce in which the people of this Nation are engaged.

If we place at the head of the Department of Commerce a man who will not tell Congress what he is doing, how shall we protect the people in their right to know what their Government is doing?

I shall undertake to say that Mr. Strauss has been shown by both his private and his public career not to be an advocate of competition, and that he is thus unsuited to be the Secretary of Commerce. If competition is, indeed, the life of trade, then the President should select as his nominee a candidate who is a known advocate of free competitive enterprise. That is not the situation, as I shall show tomorrow, in the case of Mr. Strauss.

#### U.S. FISCAL POLICY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, one of the problems with which we shall be confronted in the very near future, as I understand the majority leader, is the question of extending the debt limit.

We shall also hear the arguments in relation to interest rates.

Already we have been entertained hour after hour on the subject of interest rates. I wish very briefly to read from an analysis which has come to my desk, from the Whaley-Eaton Service, under date of June 13, 1959. I think it points up in very good style the position which at least our friends of the Democratic Party have taken:

The interest rate controversy is developing along the expected partisan lines. Democrats see an opportunity to make a direct political issue out of the Treasury's request for freedom to price its long-term bond issues at the going open market rate. Their questioning of ANDERSON and MARTIN has brought out the fact, however, that the liberals are split three ways.

One group, ardent advocates of a permanent low interest level, fights to keep the present artificial ceiling at 4½ percent. Under existing market conditions this would be about as effective in holding down borrowing costs as King Canute's attempt to halt the incoming tides.

Another group demands a revival of the practice, abandoned in 1951, of Federal Reserve purchases of Treasury issues in the open market whenever they dip below par. This would create additional bank reserves without regard to the banking system's need for them and would be directly inflationary. So also would the proposal of a third faction, to require FRB to broaden its operations to buy medium and long terms.

The three embattled liberal groups may cancel themselves out when Congress finally makes its decisions. The confusion over techniques, technicalities, and tactics which they are causing will cool congressional ardor for any radical solution. But there will be ample opportunity for political name calling. It is significant that Senate Majority Leader JOHNSON, apostle of moderation on most other issues, is acting like a liberal on this question. He thus reverts to type as an easy-credit advocate.

The public probably neither understands nor cares much about the intricacies involved in these arguments. But it is aware that taxes are high and that bloated spending—voted by Congress—bars any reductions now.

No drastic changes in Treasury fiscal procedure are likely even when Congress gives it the greater leeway it is after. Investor confidence in long-term bonds will recover slowly. Meantime, new Federal issues will be confined mainly to the short terms, easily sold to banks.

#### INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS LEAGUE CONFERENCE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, this year again some 300 high school students of Oregon and southern Washington met on the University of Oregon campus for the 12th International Relations League Conference and discussed in roundtables U.S. foreign aid policy.

I have received a letter from Miss Irene Blumenthal, an instructor in the College of Liberal Arts of the University of Oregon, department of political science, enclosing a copy of the proceedings of the International Relations League conference conducted by those students.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter and the copy of the proceedings be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

UNIVERSITY OF OREGON,  
COLLEGE OF LIBERAL ARTS,  
Eugene, Ore., June 4, 1959.

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,  
U.S. Senator,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: This year again some 300 high school students from Oregon and southern Washington met on the University of Oregon campus for the 12th International Relations League Conference and discussed in roundtables U.S. foreign aid policy. I thought that you might be interested to know what our junior citizens are thinking about this subject and I am, therefore, including a copy of the IRL Bulletin which has summaries of the roundtable discussions. Next year we are planning to discuss U.S. policy regarding military alliances.

The conference always takes place at the end of February, so that we have not much of an opportunity to invite our Oregon legislators to address these students. Should your business bring you back to Oregon next year during this time, we would hope that you could find the time to attend our 2-day conference tentatively scheduled for February 26-27, 1960.

Respectfully yours,

IRENE BLUMENTHAL,  
Instructor.

[From International Relations League  
Bulletin, May 1959]

#### HUDSON'S BAY HIGH SCHOOL TAKES FIRST PLACE IN BEST OVERALL PROGRAM CONTEST

The judging of the best overall program contest took place at the executive board meeting, May 9, in Eugene, Ore. First prize winner was Hudson's Bay High School, Vancouver, Wash.; second prize winner, Lebanon High School, Lebanon, Ore.; and third prize winner, South Salem High School, Salem, Ore. The awards, which will be a collection of international relations books for the club's library, will be mailed to the recipients at a later date.

Hudson's Bay High School's participation in international relations activities contained high standards in their programs, outstanding speakers and fine topics. All this reflects a vital interest in international affairs. Their club attended the Southwest Washington Institute of International Affairs, as well as the conference at Eugene. Their specific programs included discussions and speakers on the following topics: "Should Foreign Aid Be Continued," "Resolved, That Nuclear Weapons Testing Should Be Outlawed," "Foreign Aid," "The Orient," "England," and "Israel."

Lebanon High School, second prize winner had a well-rounded program accentuated by an impressive scrapbook illustrating their achievements. Unique among contest entries was their own school handbook. Lebanon has developed a strong community-club relationship witnessed by substantial writeups in the local newspapers. Their main event was participation in an American Field Service banquet sponsored by members of the Lebanon community. The purpose of this banquet is to raise funds to send a Lebanon student abroad, and to bring a foreign student to Lebanon for a school year. Other highlights of their program were: a United Nations Day banquet including a speech entitled "The Layman's View of the United Nations"; and, a presentation by a former technical assistant from the United States to Iran.

South Salem's IR Club, third prize winners, began their year by writing to every source of material listed in the study guide. They felt that this material aided their study for the conference. It was through their

study that this group was prompted to launch the most energetic part of their program which was their preconference meeting. Six clubs were invited to attend. The preconference included roundtables and a speaker from Willamette University. South Salem's IR Club's activities did not end with the conference. They had a progressive dinner with a foreign foods theme. Russian, Chinese, Swedish, and American dishes were served. South Salem also submitted a scrapbook illustrating their activities.

The eight other questionnaires judged also presented interesting and stimulating programs which are briefly summarized as follows:

The Cleveland High School IRC included in their activities: A United Nations Assembly, a combined assembly with foreign students, a speaker from the World Affairs Council, and an international banquet, to which several other clubs were invited.

The Grants Pass IRC sponsored several service projects during the 1958-59 club year. Some of them were: Sending CARE packages to underdeveloped countries, selling UNICEF greeting cards, and sending current informative magazines to parts of Asia—this project was called "Magazines for Friendship." Their program was rounded out by an annual food picnic and several speakers.

One of the highlights in the Medford IRC program was their sponsorship of a young Czechoslovakian apprentice in West Germany through Foster Parents, Inc. The club has weekly meetings with discussion groups and speakers.

Roosevelt High School's IRC was busy raising money to sponsor an American Field Service student. They also participated in a program for a PTA meeting.

Although a new and small IR Club, the group at St. Francis High School in Eugene, Ore. carried on a fine program. After the Eugene conference, they shared their subject matter with the world history classes at their school by presenting a panel on the conference topic. Their other activities included a speaker on Nigeria and the sponsorship of an IRL breakfast.

The IRC of South Eugene High School included in their activities a UNICEF drive; a foreign student dessert with foreign students at the University of Oregon attending; publication of an IRC newspaper, the *Exposé*; and the raising of money to sponsor an exchange student.

The OEA-IR executive board agreed that all schools entering the competition should be commended on their fine programs and their interest in international relations. They expressed the hope that more clubs will enter the contest next year, and that all clubs will strive to formulate purposeful programs which will benefit the participants.

The entries from Woodrow Wilson High School and Fort Vancouver High School arrived after the judging had taken place.

C. M.

#### TIME TO THINK OF NEXT YEAR

Now is the time to start organizing your IRL Club for next fall. The present members can do much to assure continuation of an active international relations club. By organizing and maintaining a scrapbook of material or a good filing system, you will provide much assistance to your successors. The material you save each year will help to plan programs, organize meetings, and prepare delegates for the State conference.

Issues of the Bulletin should also be saved. They provide many suggestions for improving your club's program. The reports in the "Family Tree" offer you ideas tested and proved by other clubs.

The letters and materials you receive from the State office at the University of Oregon should receive your prompt attention if you wish to take fullest advantage of the opportunities offered. To be able to serve you and your fellow clubs, you must first aid us.



Deadlines are most important. This year several clubs found that they had to miss things because of their failure to meet their obligations and deadlines. Don't let this happen next year.

If you select responsible students for your club officers, your IRC will profit much by their leadership and service to you. Likewise, interest your friends in the International Relations Club, for an active and continuing membership is necessary. It's your club—make it a good one. (THE EDITOR.)

#### UNIVERSITY OF OREGON HOSTS STATE IRL CONFERENCE; GANGE KEYNOTE SPEAKER

Dr. John F. Gange, director for review and development for the Asia Foundation, opened the 12th annual conference of the Oregon High School International Relations League on Friday, February 27, with an address examining "Alternate Policies in American Relations With Underdeveloped Countries." Dr. Gange told the 312 representatives of 39 Oregon and southern Washington high school international relations clubs and guests that the problems of underdeveloped countries were not new nor necessarily overwhelming.

American security depends heavily upon the success or failure in our foreign aid programs, Gange emphasized. To raise the standard of living above merely subsistence means that capital must be available to these areas for more than merely short-term returns for private enterprise. Likewise, development for health advancement means a steep increase in population, resulting in further complications for these areas.

A step in the right direction, Gange advises, would be to educate our administrators, technicians, and diplomats in the culture and geography of the areas to be aided. A better understanding of the way of life of others would lessen frequent resistance met by the administration of U.S. foreign aid in many of the underdeveloped areas.

Following the opening speech, the delegates joined their respective roundtables. The first session for all panel groups was concerned with the main panel topic, "U.S. Foreign Economic Policy and Underdeveloped Lands." At noon the roundtables adjourned for luncheon and a business meeting presided by Reece Bader, IRL State president. A luncheon for advisers was held at the University Faculty Club.

In the afternoon panel discussions were dealing with their particular topics. The 16 roundtables of no more than 20 members met with a "resource person" from among the graduate students of the university.

The banquet in the Erb Memorial Union ballroom was presided over by IRL President Reece Bader. Dr. Robert D. Clark, dean of the College of Liberal Arts, welcomed the delegates in the name of the university. Entertainment was provided by the university singers and members of the Cosmo Club, performing colorful native dances. After the banquet, a mixer sponsored by Cosmo Club was held in the Dad's lounge of the Student Union.

Saturday saw the election of new State officers, following a lively election campaign. After lunch joint reports prepared by the roundtable panel chairmen and secretaries were presented, terminating the conference.

#### CONFERENCE ROUNDTABLE REPORTS

##### PANEL 1: THE PROBLEMS OF UNDERDEVELOPED COUNTRIES

The problems of underdeveloped countries presented many economic, political, and social problems for consideration.

After much discussion of what an underdeveloped country is, it was decided that these countries are characterized by a low standard of living, mass poverty, high rate of population increase, lack of food and other

essentials, few formal educational opportunities, low life expectancy, little industry, primitive agriculture, and underdeveloped natural resources. Although a country may be underdeveloped socially, politically, and economically, it still can have a highly developed culture.

Problems confronting underdeveloped countries were grouped into three categories: economic, political, and social. Education, both technical and academic, was the most discussed. It was generally agreed that all people should know how to read and write. Training personnel in the use of machines and equipment was also deemed important.

The first big step in educating and training these people is to learn their language, customs, and religions. Our technical advisors must be acquainted with their way of life before they can hope to solve any of these countries' problems. It was the general opinion that needed changes must come gradually.

Other problems discussed were: the need for transportation of goods, the fact that aid seldom reaches the common people, the U.S. tendency to prescribe what a country needs rather than leaving the choice to its people, too much redtape involved in administering aid, expressions of superiority by Americans when living or visiting abroad, and the health and housing problems. Many suggestions for ways to remedy these problems were offered but no definite conclusions were reached.

##### PANEL 2: OUR STAKE IN THE FATE OF UNDERDEVELOPED COUNTRIES

Our panel decided that stake means interest. Underdeveloped countries are those which have mass poverty not merely as the result of temporary misfortune. Social organization and production methods were found obsolete. We decided that the underdeveloped areas include Africa, South America, the Middle East, southeast Asia, and Eastern Europe.

Our interests in these areas are divided into three main topics: political, economic, and military. These are all interrelated and we concluded that military considerations are the outgrowth of economic and political interests. The purpose of our foreign aid in these areas is to bolster our security, establish a humanitarian reputation for us and to provide us with economic gains by increasing markets for our goods and services while meeting needs for raw materials.

In the area of economic aid, we should help to expand the development of natural resources, industry, and trade. We should further private investment and the exchange of ideas. Stimulating education among the people to develop their resources and capital will result in more educational funds being made available through taxation of the increased productivity.

It is to our advantage to maintain security through the containment of communism while raising the standard of living elsewhere in the world. In order to achieve this, it is necessary to train our foreign service personnel in the history and cultural background of the nation as well as providing them with a speaking knowledge of the local language. It is also necessary to have a knowledge of economics and other social sciences. This will further our understanding between these areas and the United States of America.

The Soviet Union is subtle, when infiltrating a country. Only when successful do the Soviets advertise their accomplishments. However, America enters with a big brass band and declares itself the savior of the country. The Soviet Union gives the people more what they want, while we give what we think they need.

In the military field our purposes are threefold. We wish to fight communism, gain allies, and protect countries from the ex-

cesses of their own nationalism. We also find that the United States must often decide between the friendship of the old colonial powers and the rebellious colonies. We should adopt a new policy, that is offensive instead of defensive. It is said that the United States is never interested in an area until the Communists are there. We should work in specific areas instead of chasing the U.S.S.R.

We believe our interests in underdeveloped areas could best be attained by:

1. Adopting a more equitable form of aid.
2. Formulating one program instead of many.
3. Better educating our diplomatic service.
4. Bringing capital to the people of the country.
5. Encouraging private investment in foreign countries.

Submitted by John Aylmer, Dorothea Engle, Sandra Hall, Sally Sloan.

##### PANEL 3: TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE IN UNDERDEVELOPED COUNTRIES

We decided to view the problem of technical assistance in underdeveloped countries in the light of humanitarian interest rather than in the interests of private enterprise or other concerns.

For the purposes of our discussion, we defined technical assistance as assistance in skills and training; an underdeveloped country is characterized by a lack of industrial growth. We discussed the need for technical assistance and the various technical assistance programs of the U.S. Government agencies and private enterprises abroad.

The Soviet Union likewise engaged in technical assistance programs to underdeveloped countries but these programs are exclusively government administered. We then discussed the means by which technical assistance is given to underdeveloped areas on a multilateral or bilateral basis, between government, private assistance, et cetera.

We discussed economic forces and conflicts as they relate to technical assistance programs in underdeveloped countries. Technical assistance in recent years from the ICA averaged about \$150 million annually, while technical assistance from U.S. private investors extended to businesses abroad from \$5 to \$6 billion in 1958.

Cultural differences exist between U.S. technical assistance administrators and the Asians, Africans, and South Americans whom they serve; whereas, the differences between the Soviet administrators and, at least, the Asian people are not as great. Conflict exists between the interests of the U.S. private investment and our humanitarian concern in the development of the underdeveloped countries. However, it was observed that U.S. private enterprise development in these countries is a part of their historical advancement.

Submitted by Jim Kindler, Shelley Brink, Chuck McFadden, Diane Lewis.

##### PANEL 4: INVESTMENT AND TRADE

The panel on Investment Trade discussed the various problems connected with this subject: illustrations of the past and present movements and future policy of the United States, possible solutions to the problems, and improvements in our program of investment and trade. In any such program which is undertaken, there should be more advance planning and coordination between the specialized areas of foreign aid. More effective dissemination of information is also needed. Trade should be widespread and include Red China. Disagreement arose as to whether a trade agreement with Red China should be negotiated immediately or be delayed.

These specific proposals were made: (1) common markets should be established where feasible (e.g. Latin America); (2) tariff rates should be lowered; (3) choice should be offered between a military draft

and a foreign aid service draft; (4) private investment through the citizens of the country should be encouraged; (5) investment treaties should be revised; (6) additional investment guarantees should be offered; (7) our tax structure should be revised to avoid conflicts between countries; (8) partnership between public and private investment should be encouraged so that the country's substructure will be more fully developed; (9) Government subsidization to private investors.

We realize that public opinion is a determining factor for the acceptance of proposals, but we feel that these suggestions would create an ideal situation. Furthermore we advocate an administrative body which would coordinate all phases of our foreign aid program, for we realize that unity is a necessity for success.

Submitted by Edith Brown, Carolyn Hansen, Carolyn Mencke, Judy McShatko.

#### PANEL 5: THE SOVIET UNION IN UNDERDEVELOPED COUNTRIES

The basic aim of U.S. foreign policy towards underdeveloped countries should be to promote the economic well-being of these countries while enabling them to maintain their independent status. The hope that these countries will become our allies in the cold war was discarded as being unrealistic.

In providing foreign aid, the Soviet Union aims at drawing them into the Soviet orbit. Russia carries out these aims by (1) using more technical assistance than direct economic aid, so that the people do not resent their help; (2) much publicity for their aid; (3) offering to help in the form of trade, without immediate stipulation of the terms. It was also decided that Russia would accept these countries' neutrality, if it meant preventing them from becoming allies of the United States.

The form of government of the Soviet Union, their culture and geography give it certain advantages in the technique of dispensing foreign aid. For example, their dictatorial government enables the Soviets to send help almost immediately after the need arises, while the United States must go through several channels.

It appears that the best way to offset these disadvantages and disclose the true Soviet purposes in giving aid, would be to channel development funds through the United Nations. The United States would profit more from such a move because of the Soviet Union's superiority in bilateral techniques. The principal obstacles to such a policy would be: (1) convincing Congress that such a policy is desirable and that funds for it should be appropriated; (2) to maneuver the Soviet Union into agreeing to channel their funds through the U.N. Perhaps the best way of achieving this would be to challenge them to participate in such a program. If refused, the political motives of Soviet foreign aid would be exposed and loss of prestige might act as a leverage to influence their policy.

Some doubt was raised whether such a policy would be feasible. In any event we felt that the United States should seize the initiative in an attempt to improve its own program and force Russia to fully expose its own.

Submitted by Sharon Woods, Mary Ann Ragland, Sue Williams, Jackie West.

#### PANEL 6: U.S. FOREIGN AID PROGRAMS

Our panel members thought that education both in our country and in other countries was our primary concern. We need to train our ambassadors in the language, customs, and religion of those countries we wish to aid. With more education we would be able to reach the common man and get more results with this aid. We also need to educate our own people so that they know what and why we are giving foreign aid.

This could be done by television commercials, articles in newspapers, international relations courses, and easily understood literature.

We also felt that there should be more emphasis placed on technical assistance rather than military aid. A foreign aid program administered by the United Nations was judged to be the best solution. A good foreign trade policy is also important. Of course, the big problem here would be how currency payments would be made. Under the U.N. plan there would be less strings attached. This would bring better feelings of those who accept the aid. And finally, this plan should be a long-range policy, giving the underdeveloped countries time to get more results.

In discussing this topic we did not try to actually solve the problem of our foreign aid programs but rather attempted to point out some improvements that could be effected.

Submitted by Dave Mulder, Irene Daschell, Judy Wolfe, Sandra Thomas.

#### PANEL 7: ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT IN AFRICA

During our discussions we found the entire Continent of Africa to be underdeveloped. Nevertheless, we also realized that Africa has a great potential. This area has vast natural resources in addition to an old and diverse culture.

We also found two distinct parallels between Africa's problems and our country's history. First, there is the very apparent and pressing problem of racial discrimination. Africa is the home or host to nearly every known race of man. While the Negroid racial types are both more numerous and by reason of tenure have the best claim to being indigenous, other races have long been identified with the continent.

Three types of racial situations are prevalent in Africa: (1) Relationships among indigenous peoples; (2) relationships between Africans and Europeans; and (3) relationships involving Asian and other ethnic groups. However, we also agreed that Africa's problems are internal and that America should treat them as such. Our support of anticolonial movements will not win African allies for us, as Suez well illustrated. And yet America cannot plead neutrality when South Africa elbows its African majority aside. We can expect nothing better than neutrality in return when we seek to rally the support of Africa's peoples to the free world. Africa remains to be convinced that the American concern for freedom embraces the black man as well as the white.

As our second parallel, we found that Africa is struggling under the yoke of colonialism just as America did. The overall trend has been toward well organized demands for an end to colonialism. Of course, exceptions are evident, such as the Mau Mau of Kenya, the open terrorism in Algeria, and the disturbances in the French Cameroons. Inevitably, however, as more and more African countries secure independence, America is being confronted by a very real dilemma. Can the nationalist governments in weak and underdeveloped states be counted on to maintain stable governments, adequate defenses, and economies which remain open to the West?

The following questions were also discussed by the panels: Why does the United States give aid to Africa? Is it a sincere desire to help the peoples of Africa, or is it only—because if America didn't, Russia would? Many Africans feel that the latter is the case, and they resent it. As we discussed the motives of America's foreign aid programs, we wondered if, perhaps, the Africans are not justified in their belief. The underlying theme of both panels, however, appeared to lie in an area other than just the giving of aid. American aid to Africa invariably took the form of "helping Africans to help themselves."

Submitted by Bill Freck, Nancy Albin, Beverly Killam, Bob Patterson.

#### PANEL 8: ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT IN SOUTH AND SOUTHEAST ASIA

American policy in south and southeast Asia must gain the cooperation and understanding of the under-developed nations involved to realize its objectives. We must develop an appreciation of national cultures and philosophies, a tolerance of political objectives, and a realization of the immediate problems of these areas. Culture and philosophies differ from those of the West and even widely among the countries of this region. Enlightened administrative methods must be cognizant of the problems of these countries; they are not the same as those of the West and must, therefore, be met and solved differently. The rise of nationalism and the desire for self-determination must be recognized.

An organization such as the United Nations was thought desirable to administer and distribute aid and investment. Aid from a multilateral body does not insult the pride of nationalism. Political disagreements with the United States must be resolved on this point. The recipients of our aid must be carefully chosen. Prosperity, not arms, give rise to free enterprise. Educated people realize the dangers of communism. The need for and love of their own way of life is stronger than capitalism or communism.

Seeking to make more effective use of our foreign aid in southeast Asia we could (1) improve our diplomatic service and appointment system; (2) improve the general standard of living and thereby halting the spread of communism—not an ultimate aim, but a desirable result; (3) increase the exchange of students and teachers; (4) further public knowledge about and understanding of a country's problems; (5) administer governmental low-interest, long-term loans through a multilateral agency to develop projects of a public nature (i.e., dams, roads, agricultural extensions, etc.) followed by industrial development by private enterprise again distributed through a multilateral, nonpolitical organization.

An increased emphasis on economic aid coupled with our present policy of military assistance is necessary for the mutual welfare of our Nation and the underdeveloped lands of south and southeast Asia.

Submitted by Leigh Hess, Steve Beckham, Bill Koons, and Jim Compton.

#### OF GENERAL INTEREST

##### GRANTS PASS HIGH SCHOOL

The Grants Pass chapter of the International Relations League is sponsoring a student tour to the International Exposition Trade Fair to be held in Portland, starting June 10. The tour is open to any Grants Pass High School student who is willing to help raise the money for transportation, lodging, and other expenses. Money-raising projects, such as cake sales, bottle drives, rummage sales, and the selling of Oregon Centennial seals and Reader's Digest subscriptions, have all been planned so that individual expenses will be as low as possible. The students on this tour, which begins June 10, will stay 2 days at the fair.

On March 17 at their last meeting, the I.R.C. featured Miss Jessie Hughes from Portland as guest speaker. Miss Hughes showed slides and told the members of her experiences in a student work camp in the French Cameroons.

##### ROOSEVELT HIGH SCHOOL, PORTLAND

Roosevelt High School held its annual American Field Service Assembly on April 2, 1959, for the assembled student body. Each I.R.C. member represented a nation of the world and throughout the day wore the appropriate costume for that nation.



Such countries as Bulgaria, Lithuania, Scotland, Ireland, Germany, Greece, and Italy were represented. Two of the exchange student guests were Damajanti Kartasmita from Indonesia, who danced for the assembly, and Gursan Cumbus, who wore a Turkish costume and explained differences between the Moslem and Christian religions. After the assembly, a new money-raising project was introduced. The sale of token shares of stock to help finance the trip of an American field service foreign student was explained and set into motion as of that date. The shares of stock are available from any IRC member. \$565.65 of the \$650 has been received. The remainder of the day was spent in taking the students to classes and helping them get acquainted with Roosevelt High.

#### SOUTH EUGENE HIGH SCHOOL

South Eugene High School's I.R.C. has been working hard to raise the \$650 necessary for an American field service student. Car washes, bake sales, movie ticket sales, and PTA and Rotary Club financial help has brought in \$400. Speakers at club meetings have talked to the group about the Union of South Africa, Nepal, and the United Nations. The South Eugene delegates, like many others, expressed their enjoyment of the State I.R.L. conference.

Recently they held a tea to which they invited foreign students from the University of Oregon.

#### OREGON CITY SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL

The Oregon City I.R.C. three times has sponsored "Guess for a Day"—a program in which an American field service student from another country is invited to the school for an entire day. The student visits classes, goes to lunch with club members, goes to a student's home for dinner, and is the guest speaker at the club meeting in the evening. The club members provide private transportation for the guest. This program has proven to be very satisfactory, because these foreign students seem delighted with the program. Faculty and students enjoy meeting them and exchanging ideas.

The semester's main activity was the I.R.C. variety show, "Varieties of 1959," in which a full evening (April 9) of dancing, singing, instrumental music, and pantomimes was presented. The proceeds go to the foreign student exchange fund.

An excellent idea that shows the club members' eagerness for achievement is a small mimeographed booklet to be used as a guide. It includes the following: the purpose of the club; a list of its officers and members; and a detailed account of meetings, complete with lists of committees for refreshments and programs. An attractive brown and yellow cover encloses this helpful booklet.

#### JEFFERSON HIGH SCHOOL, PORTLAND

Jefferson's I.R.C. has begun making preparations for next year's club. With prior announcements and invitations, a meeting was held in a member's home on April 2. The club's purposes and activities were explained to prospective members. Included in the evening's program were reports from delegates to the State conference. A meeting is now being planned to form a tentative activity scheduled for the fall term.

Jeff's Miss Oenone Shaw, one of the organizers of Oregon's IRL 12 years ago, has decided to work only in a supervisory capacity with the two new, ambitious advisers, Mr. Robert Henderson, and Mr. Forrest Dalrymple. Miss Shaw deserves special recognition for her outstanding achievement as an IRL adviser.

#### FORT VANCOUVER HIGH SCHOOL, VANCOUVER, WASH.

The Southwestern Washington Institute of International Affairs held its fifth annual

conference at Clark Junior College in Vancouver, Wash., on April 3 and 4. Approximately 150 high school students and 15 foreign students met for the 2 days to discuss technical assistance in Asia. Dr. Warren Tomlinson, of the College of Puget Sound, and Frank Williston, of the University of Washington, were guest speakers.

The Vancouver Council of Student Exchange is sponsoring its annual farewell for the foreign students and the students who will spend a year or a summer abroad. This banquet will be held on May 21.

April 30 the I.R.C. will have a program on Russia. The Reverend John Soltman, a local minister, will present the complete set of slides he took on his recent trip to Russia.

#### CLEVELAND HIGH SCHOOL, PORTLAND

March 17 was the date of Cleveland's I.R.C.-sponsored American field service assembly. Jean Arnett, who recently returned from Holland, and Jean McCarthy, who spent last summer in Turkey, shared the time showing slides and telling of their experiences.

During April the individual chapters of Cleveland's IRC met. During one meeting a potluck dinner was held with clubs from Roosevelt and Franklin High. Sirkka-Lisa Lankinen, dressed in her provincial Finnish costume, told the gathering of 35 students about her country.

At the other April meeting Mary Mikolavich, a teacher at Cleveland, told the group about her European trip, illustrating her talk with slides.

Since this is my last "family tree," I would like to thank everyone for helping to make my term in office so enjoyable. At the top of my appreciation list are Mr. Birger Brandt, Miss Irene Elumenthal, and the members of the OEA-IRL executive committee. I am also grateful for the cooperation of the clubs sending me information about their activities.

DONNA DEY ROBINSON,  
IRL Vice President.

#### MINUTES OF THE CONFERENCE MEETING

The first business meeting of the 12th annual IRL conference was called to order by Reece Bader, president.

Nomination and acceptance speeches were given for the candidates for IRL State offices. Anne Morse, State IRL historian, introduced the following nominees for historian: Elouise Folles, Corvallis; Linda Lou Kiser, Lake Oswego; and Bill McCord, Hudson's Bay. Kathy Leslie, State IRL secretary, introduced the following candidates for secretary: Dean Lokken, Lebanon; Carolyn Mencke, Medford; and Judy Wolfe, Franklin. Donna Robinson, State IRL vice president, introduced Rick Biles, South Salem, and Pete Steen, Albany, for the office of president. Harvey Berenson, Woodrow Wilson; Doug Nohlgren, North Salem; and Bill Serres, Oregon City, were introduced by Reece Bader for the office of IRL State president.

It was announced that each delegation would be allowed one vote.

The meeting was adjourned at 1:24 p.m.  
KATHY LESLIE,  
State IRL Secretary.

#### MORNING MEETING, FEBRUARY 28, 1959

The meeting was opened in the Erb Memorial Ballroom at 8:15 a.m. for the purpose of electing officers for the coming year. The results were: Bill McCord, Hudson's Bay, historian; Carolyn Mencke, Medford, secretary; Pete Steen, Albany, vice president; Doug Nohlgren, North Salem, president.

The 1958-59 State officers thanked the IRL and the executive committee for their help throughout the year.

The meeting was adjourned by the president-elect, Doug Nohlgren.

KATHY LESLIE,  
State IRL Secretary.

#### AFTERNOON MEETING, FEBRUARY 28, 1959

The final meeting of the 12th annual IRL conference was called to order at 12:15 by President-elect Doug Nohlgren.

Reports were given by the discussion leaders summarizing what conclusions were reached at their respective roundtables.

Miss Blumenthal then gave a brief evaluation of the conference. She urged all clubs to cooperate fully with the IRL office at Eugene. She reminded the delegates to submit their scrapbooks so that the contest for the award to the club with the most active year-round-program could be carried out. The discussion leaders were reminded that a full report of their respective groups was due by April 20.

President-elect Doug Nohlgren announced that the topic for next year would deal with the various military alliances and the effectiveness of each.

The meeting was adjourned by the president-elect at 3 p.m.

CAROLYN MENCKE,  
State IRL Secretary-elect.

#### HERE ARE THE NEW OFFICERS

The following new officers were elected for the next school year at the recent IRL conference in Eugene. Best of luck in your term next year.

President: Doug Nohlgren, 260 North 13th Street, Salem, Oreg.

Vice president: Pete Steen, Route No. 2, Box 741, Albany, Oreg.

Secretary: Carolyn Mencke, 2141 East Jackson Street, Medford, Oreg.; Medford Union High School.

Historian: Bill McCord, 207 Evergreen Drive, Vancouver, Wash.; Hudson's Bay High School, Vancouver, Wash.

#### MINUTES OF THE OEA-IRL COMMITTEE, FEBRUARY 27, 1959, EUGENE, OREG.

The Oregon Education Association: International Relations League Committee meeting was called to order at 2:30 p.m. in Commonwealth Hall on the University of Oregon campus. Present were Kenneth L. Toner, chairman, Jacksonville High School; Irene Blumenthal, IRL executive secretary; Charles P. Schleicher, permanent representative on the committee; Dr. John F. Gange, director for review and development, the Asia Foundation; Miss Rice, Cottage Grove High School; Miss Trull, Grants Pass High School; Mrs. Smith, Medford High School; LeRoy Graymer, Hillsboro High School; Paul Deller, Klamath Falls High School; John Chamberlain, Monmouth Union High School; Reece Bader, IRL State president, Cleveland High School; Donna Robinson, vice president, Jefferson High School; Kathy Leslie, State secretary, South Eugene High School; Anne Morse, State historian, Lebanon High School.

The meeting was held to decide the topic for next year's IRL State conference.

It was decided that a model U.N. would not be held next year for the following reasons: a handicap in physical setup; students who were accomplished speakers were sent as delegates, not those knowing their subject; too much competition between high schools; and, too much parliamentary procedure. The model United Nations will probably be held every 3 or 4 years.

Next year's conference will center around roundtable discussions. Topics suggested were the following: Military alliances; further investigation into Asia, Africa, and Latin America; economic systems and their relationship in the cold war. Dr. Gange spoke to the committee about the advantages of military alliances as a subject. It was moved that the preliminary topic be "Are Our Military Alliances Obsolete?" subject to the approval of next year's board.

A great concern of the executive board is how to get more student organization and participation in the conference. Regional

organizations were discussed as a possible answer to the problem. John Chamberlain is to work with Miss Blumenthal to investigate the idea of regional representatives.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:30 p.m.

KATHY LESLIE,  
IRL State Secretary.

#### MINUTES OF THE OEA:IR COMMITTEE, MAY 9, 1959, EUGENE, OREG.

The Oregon Education Association: International Relations Committee meeting was called to order at 9:30 a.m., Saturday, May 9. Present were Kenneth L. Toner, chairman, Jacksonville High School; Irene Blumenthal, IRL executive secretary; Richard Barss, OEA:IR consultant, representative of the Oregon Education Association; LeRoy Graymer, Hillsboro High School; Charlotte Mirick, secretary, IRL office; Doug Nohlgren, State president, North Salem High School; Pete Steen, State vice president.

The first order of business was the judging of the entries for the best overall program contest. Miss Blumenthal reported that there were sufficient funds to award three prizes. The winning selections were made after careful review of the questionnaires and, in some cases, accompanying scrapbooks. First place was awarded to Hudson's Bay High School, Vancouver, Wash.; second place, Lebanon High School, Lebanon, Oreg.; and third place, South Salem High School, Salem, Oreg.

The nine schools submitting entries were: Cleveland High School, Portland, Oreg.; Grants Pass High School, Grants Pass, Oreg.; Hudson's Bay High School, Vancouver, Wash.; Lebanon High School, Lebanon, Oreg.; Medford High School, Medford, Oreg.; Roosevelt High School, Portland, Oreg.; St. Francis High School, Eugene, Oreg.; South Eugene High School, Eugene, Oreg.; and South Salem High School, Salem, Oreg.

The next order of business was the final selection of the topic for the 1960 conference. The tentative topic suggested at the February 27, 1959, meeting on military alliances was discussed. After review, it was decided to reconfirm this topic, suggested originally by Dr. John Gange, speaker at the 1959 conference. The topic had found general approval at the conference. The official conference topic decided upon is "Do Our Military Alliances Serve Their Purposes?" Mr. Graymer requested that a short bibliography be made available now. Miss Blumenthal agreed to have some references included in the spring bulletin.

Inquiries were made as to a possible date for next year's conference. Miss Blumenthal reported that the last week of February may be considered as a tentative date, but clearance must be sought from the student union board and conflicts with other high school events must be eliminated.

The study guide for next year was discussed as the next point. Miss Blumenthal said that a study by the foreign policy association on this topic might become available. This was found to be desirable. It was proposed that it be distributed in a study packet using an IRL folder and other information on the conference. If such a study from the foreign policy association is not available \$100 was allocated for writing a study guide. The matter was turned over to Miss Blumenthal for appropriate action.

Student officers were encouraged to plan meetings for next year in order to conduct current business and organize elections and meetings at the conference. Doug Nohlgren said that he tentatively planned to call one meeting in the fall, and the other just prior to the conference to take care of State officer nominations.

The problem of promotion of IR Clubs, especially eastern Oregon clubs, was discussed. The possibility of organizing regional units is still pending until Mr. John

Chamberlain, who was appointed at the advisers' meeting during the conference, to look into this matter, presents his report.

The business being completed, the meeting was adjourned at 12:30.

CHARLOTTE MIRICK,  
IRL Office Secretary.

#### INTRODUCTORY READING FOR NEXT YEAR'S CONFERENCE

Campbell, John C., "Defense of the Middle East," Harper Bros., 1958.

Finletter, Thomas K., "Foreign Policy: The Next Phase," Harper Bros., 1958.

Furniss, Edgar S., Jr., "American Military Policy," Rinehart & Co., 1957.

Kennan, George F., "Russia, The Atom and the West," Harper Bros., 1958.

Salvadori, Massimo, "NATO: A 20th Century Community of Nations," Van Nostrand Co., 1957 (soft cover).

#### INTERNATIONAL TRADE—COMPETITION FROM SOVIET-PRODUCED MATERIALS

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. Mr. President, at the present time, the U.S. chemical industry is faced with a continuing oversupply of benzene which is manufactured by coking plants and petroleum refiners. In recent years the tremendous growth in productive capacity of our oil refining industry has out-stripped production of benzene from coking operations.

One of the reasons for concern in the petro-chemical field is a recently announced contract for the purchase of 54 million gallons of Soviet produced benzene, delivery to take place over a 2-year period at a total price of about \$13.5 million.

It is surprising to me and many others in the domestic industry that leading firms in American business are purchasing Soviet-produced materials and products when there exists in this country, in some instances, an oversupply of the same product readily available for use. The question may be asked what about the price? The U.S. domestic price is, perhaps, a little higher, but it is a price which reflects our Nation's high standard of living and the wage rates paid to free American labor employed in an American enterprise.

It seems foolish, indeed, to say that a firm does not have to pay in U.S. dollars. Whatever the consideration in another country's money, the transaction creates a favorable international trade position for the Soviet Union. That country obtains a consideration of value to it in exchange for the goods whether the consideration be dollars, or rubles; the result is a favorable credit balance for the U.S.S.R.

I am certain we are all aware of the heavy overtones for more trade with Russia which accompanied the recent visit of Soviet Deputy Premier Anastas Mikoyan's recent visit to the United States. He was a glib salesman, but I doubt that many persons in our business community were taken in, or fell for, his promotional efforts to obtain technical know-how, aid, and goods.

Personally, I am a Senator who believes in closely restricting our trade with Russia in certain fields. Before we engage in any deals we should know

precisely what effect the transaction will have upon our own country's industries and our economic position.

There can be no doubt that the Mikoyan visit to the United States did not produce one desired objective, that of increasing trade with the U.S.S.R. and Soviet-dominated countries. There are many competent observers who call the Mikoyan mission a failure.

While the Soviet Government, through various of its spokesmen, has threatened to wage an economic offensive against the free world, it appears to me that our businessmen are helping those leaders achieve their ends by participating in contracts calling for delivery in this country of Soviet-produced goods; yes, in many instances goods which may have been produced by Soviet slave labor.

We must realize that all international trade engaged in by the U.S.S.R. is calculated to further the objectives of that state. International trade is an instrument of foreign policy to be used to aid the U.S.S.R.

Recently we have seen instances of the Soviet Government having entered into active trading in goods within the Western Hemispheres. Price has little meaning in a State controlled industry. Materials can be sold at a low price specifically to break world or local area market prices.

The Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, of which I am the ranking Republican member, will soon begin to organize its inquiry into foreign trade. I shall follow that inquiry closely. I am suggesting several topics within this area which I consider to be worthy of committee study. In my opinion the status of our foreign trade is an area which has been too long neglected.

#### NEW TACTICS TO WIN OBJECTIVES—INTERVIEW WITH SENATOR HUMPHREY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, there appears in the June 10, 1959, issue of the Christian Science Monitor the text of an interview with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] conducted by Courtney Sheldon entitled "New Tactics To Win Objectives."

The interview reveals the exceptional qualities possessed by the distinguished Senator from Minnesota. He speaks, in this interview, with originality and with a courageous and wide-ranging intelligence on the major issues of domestic and foreign affairs which confront us.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the text of the interview.

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

#### NEW TACTICS TO WIN OBJECTIVES—A CAPITAL INTERVIEW WITH SENATOR HUBERT HUMPHREY

(By Courtney Sheldon)

(Third in a series of interviews on Capitol Hill to record the viewpoints of Senators SYMINGTON, KENNEDY, and HUMPHREY, each of whom is generally considered a serious prospect for the Democratic presidential nomination in 1960.)



WASHINGTON.—Minnesota Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, once a college professor in political science, twice elected mayor of Minneapolis, and now a leader of the northern liberal wing of his party, and the possible choice of that faction for the Democratic nomination next year—

Believes that a Soviet move toward an acceptable nuclear test ban agreement is one of the things that Khrushchev will make at a summit conference.

Recommends that the United States program its farm production 5 to 10 years in advance to help underdeveloped countries improve their diets and feed their hungry.

What issues do you feel the Democrats should concentrate on in 1960, Senator HUMPHREY?

Well, I think you will find that issues will vary in different areas of the country. In my part of the country, the utter failure of this administration's agriculture policy will still be an issue, for example.

A countrywide issue will be the failure of the administration to really plan economic growth. Now here is a difference, I think, between liberal Democrats and Republicans. Some of us believe in the broad outlines of national planning for economic growth.

I believe, for example, that we can't leave things to the accident of chance. I think that in the light of the kind of competition we are facing internationally from Soviet communism we have to make better use of our resources.

There are some limits to them and they ought to be programed and utilized. At the same time we must provide the widest opportunity for individual decision within that great national plan. We do, however, need goals to strive for—objectives to accomplish.

Now on international affairs what issues of consequence do you anticipate?

Well, here the Republicans take fixed positions and try to hold them without getting into the field of maneuver and using new tactics to win objectives.

We haven't won anything. We have been lucky to hang on. The same administration that tried to repudiate the doctrine of containment, which we had for a period after the Soviets were pressing so hard in Western Europe, has embraced containment even more than the previous administration.

It has been incapable of understanding the social revolution that is going on in the world. Conservative government, by its nature, tends to embrace the status quo. It approaches change with fear and timidity.

Would you favor more or fewer periodic summit meetings just to exchange views?

I would favor more. I wish we could make these summit meetings a little less of a circus or bazaar. Meetings of heads of state would be better if there were not quite so much headline attention until something was done.

You favor more contacts with the Soviets all along the line, such as yours with Khrushchev?

I wish you could see the volume of letters that comes every time any American, including myself, meets with the Soviets. You'd think that somehow or other we were going to catch political leprosy.

It seems to me we have more to gain from meeting with them than they have from meeting with us. And I enjoy the idea of intellectual competition, as well as political and psychological competition.

I like to have the opportunity of telling the Soviets a little about the way of our life, and doing it in a friendly and polite manner, and I think it is a good idea for them to see our country. They live under gross misconception as to what American life is all about. This misconception could lead to dangerous miscalculations.

Do you feel that we have gone too far or not far enough in our offers to the Soviets on a nuclear test ban agreement?

I really believe that in the past few months we have been very sincere and have gone quite a way with the Soviets on a policy of trying to reconcile differences. I had a feeling in January that maybe we were being a little too stiff. That has been changed.

While bringing to the attention of the Geneva delegations the new scientific data, we have demonstrated a willingness to adapt ourselves to this new material and to give the Soviets an opportunity to join with us in further scientific research for better means of inspection.

I hope that Soviets will come around ultimately and I think they will. I believe this is one of the things that Khrushchev will do at a summit conference.

If that did not come about, would you favor unilateral banning of atmospheric tests?

Yes. Atmospheric tests, I would. I believe we have nothing particularly to gain in atmospheric tests militarily and we have a great deal to lose, both psychologically and possibly in health.

We can do these tests underground. We can do them at extraordinarily high altitudes which is a much safer process from a human health point of view.

Now on the farm problem, is there really any feasible long-range solution?

A sound national agricultural policy must be based on expanded soil conservation; adequate farm credit; continued research not only in production but in uses of food and fiber; a price support or income protection system designed to aid the family farm production pattern—with definite ceilings on the total of commodity loans or payments to any one farm producer.

Farm price supports should be extended only when farmers accept production and marketing controls; there should be no supports for products or producers who fail to comply with necessary production regulations.

And finally the means of income protection or price supports should be varied—whatever works best for any commodity or producer. By this I mean the Secretary of Agriculture should be authorized to use crop loans, compensatory payments, purchases, extended credit, and even retirement of unneeded acres.

Production plans must include not only the domestic and normal export needs, but also food and fiber for strengthening our foreign policy in the food deficit areas, plus food for the needy at home—possibly the use of food stamps for those on social security plus others who receive all too inadequate allowances.

I believe that this Nation would be better served by an agriculture of smaller units. I suggest that we look upon this production of food and fiber as a great economic asset in the cold war and that we utilize it as part of a definite international economic aid program; that we work with the underdeveloped countries and see what their food deficits are, and then start to help these countries improve their diets and feed their hungry.

This programing of farm production for international use should be done 5 to 10 years in advance so that the recipient nations and our farm people can plan on it.

#### FLAG DAY

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, Sunday was celebrated all across America as Flag Day. June 14 has a special and historical significance for all Americans, because it was on that day in 1777 that the Constitutional Congress adopted a resolution designating the Stars and Stripes as our flag—the flag of freedom.

Since that time, our proud flag has flown over the scene of every battle our Nation has fought for democracy and freedom. It has become a revered symbol of our independence and of the liberty we hold so dear.

The importance of our flag to all Americans is emphasized by the fact that the pledge of allegiance to the flag is learned by our schoolchildren as soon as they are old enough to memorize it. We in New York State are especially proud that the author of the pledge, Francis Bellamy, was a citizen of our State.

Just as the pledge of allegiance has served to inspire millions with dedication to our flag, so that flag has throughout the world come to symbolize the patriotism and freedom which are the hallmarks of America. A constituent of mine, Mr. H. Zuckerman of 455 Schenectady Avenue, Brooklyn, N.Y., has sent me a verse entitled "Flag of Freedom," to commemorate Flag Day. I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD, following my remarks.

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

#### FLAG OF FREEDOM (By H. Zuckerman)

Flag of freedom  
Flag of freedom  
O thou glorious emblem of the free!  
Flag of freedom  
Flag of freedom  
Beaconlight for all humanity.  
Our guardian o'er the land and o'er the sea,  
The shrine of our devotion; unity!  
Flag of freedom  
Flag of freedom  
Liberty our watchword e'er shall be!  
Flag of freedom  
Flag of freedom  
We all pledge our allegiance to thee!

#### SOLUTION NEEDED TO CRISIS IN LEAD AND ZINC INDUSTRY

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, the domestic lead and zinc industry is in a perilous economic position, caused in great part by the continuing high level of lead and zinc imports from abroad. I am, therefore, pleased to join with the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and other Senators in sponsoring proposed legislation which might save the industry from threatened extermination, in the interest of both our national security and the economy of our mining States.

The main feature of the bill is a 4-cent import tax which would be imposed whenever the U.S. market prices for lead and zinc fell below the peril point level of 15½ cents a pound for lead and 13½ cents a pound for zinc.

The lead and zinc industry has gone through a troublesome period since the end of the Korean war. On May 21, 1954, the Tariff Commission made a unanimous finding that imports were seriously injuring the lead and zinc industry, and recommended increased duties on such imports in the interest of the national security. At that time, the price of lead was 14 cents and the price of zinc was 10¼ cents. Yet, today the price of lead is 12 cents and the price of zinc is 11 cents, which as a combina-

tion is below the 1954 level. This, coupled with rising costs of doing business, has all but ruined the domestic lead-zinc industry.

Government stockpile buying and various barter arrangements firmed up prices from January 1956 to May 1957, but the discontinuance of this program saw a sharp drop in lead and zinc prices. To relieve the serious situation, the Eisenhower administration, in August of 1957, proposed the imposition of a sliding scale import tax when U.S. prices were below 17 cents for lead and 14½ cents for zinc. This proposal passed the Senate by a 70 to 12 margin, but was rejected in the House 159 to 182 near the end of the 1958 session of Congress.

Meanwhile, the Tariff Commission, on April 24, 1958, made its second unanimous finding of injury, and all six Commissioners recommended increased import duties. Three of the Commissioners recommended that quotas be imposed in addition to the duties. Thereafter, the President, on September 21, 1958, imposed quotas on foreign imports of lead and zinc, but without import duties. The prices then were 11 cents a pound for lead and 10 cents for zinc.

Unfortunately, the quotas have not worked out as well as had been hoped. This may have resulted because the President's proclamation only limits imports to 80 percent of lead and zinc imports during the base period 1953 to 1957. That portion of the Tariff Commission's recommendations dealing with quotas proposed that imports be limited to 50 percent of imports during the base period. To put it another way, the President's order allows 135,000 more tons of lead and 195,000 more tons of zinc to be imported each year than the Commission recommended.

At the same time that prices have failed to firm up appreciably under the quota program, lead and zinc stocks on hand in this country have leaped upward to 215,000 tons and over 200,000 tons, respectively. The normal level of lead stocks would be about 70,000 tons, and zinc about 75,000 tons. Moreover, the year 1958 recorded the lowest mine production of lead in 60 years and the lowest zinc production in 26 years.

The serious effect of the depressed condition confronting our lead and zinc industry in Utah is reflected by the fact that the average number of men employed in the industry in 1948 was 3,118; in 1957 it was 1,410; today the number of men working is estimated to be about 1,100. There were 21 lead and zinc operators in Utah in 1948, 9 in 1957, and only 3 today. At least one of the companies still operating is suffering continuous operating losses and only remains open because it would be more expensive to shut down.

The national interest requires that we reverse this ruinous trend.

#### EFFECT OF HIGH INTEREST RATES ON HOUSING CONSTRUCTION

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the first bitter national economic fruits of the hard money, high-interest rate policy are reported in the papers this morning. Last month housing starts hit a seasonally adjusted low for this year. In the

teeth of the alleged boom we are having, this dropoff in home construction may be very significant.

I wish to make it perfectly clear that the figures for May also showed that it was the best May in the past 4 years. However, the trend is downward.

Everyone who has observed the housing industry knows that it is highly sensitive to interest rates. Climbing interest rates greatly increase the cost of financing home building. For example, for every 1-percent increase in interest rates for a home that is financed over a 25-year period, there is an increase equivalent to a 12½-percent hike in the cost of the house.

There are few social needs more urgent than housing for American families.

There are still millions of Americans out of work.

Home construction has been a vital bellwether of our economy. When it thrives, the economy thrives. When it falters, recession is likely to follow.

This news should be emphatic warning to the administration and the Congress, that high interest rates are already developing such danger to our economy that it would be foolish to approve of the administration's request to break the more than 40-year 4¼-percent statutory limitation on long-term bonds.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article in this morning's Wall Street Journal reporting the fall-off in housing starts be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

**RATE OF PRIVATE HOME STARTS HIT 1959 LOW IN MAY—BUT RATE IS BEST FOR MAY IN 4 YEARS—DECLINE IS AGAINST SEASONAL TREND—OTHER HOUSING FIGURES MIXED**

WASHINGTON.—The annual rate of private home starts dropped last month to the lowest level of the year, although it was the highest for May in 4 years, the Labor Department reported.

The seasonally adjusted annual rate of private homes begun in May fell to 1,340,000; 1,390,000 the month before. The May rate, however, was the highest for that month since 1955, when the annual rate was 1,318,000.

Other indicators of housing construction activity showed mixed results for May. The Federal Housing Administration said it received 38,200 applications for its mortgage insurance on proposed new homes—off 900 from the 39,100 received the month before but up from the 34,558 received in May 1958. The Veterans' Administration reported requests for appraisals of new homes to be bought through GI loans rose to 20,738, up 9.9 percent from the 18,875 received in April but well below the 29,170 received in May 1958.

The Labor Department's report on home building activity showed actual public and private home starts in May of 134,000, down from 137,000 the previous month but up from 108,500 in May 1958. This decline, the agency said, ran counter to the usual April-to-May seasonal increase of moderate size. The actual number of private home starts alone in May declined to 130,600 from 133,200 in April.

One reason for the abnormal decline in total starts between April and May, housing experts said, was builders' uncertainty over the fate of the housing legislation pending in Congress. That bill contains new mortgage insuring authority for the Federal Housing Administration.

The seasonally adjusted annual rate of private starts, when averaged for the first 5 months of this year, amounted to 1,377,000 units, up from the relatively low rate of 975,000 for the like period last year.

A total of 30,700 homes were started in May under the Federal Housing Administration's mortgage insurance program, the Agency said in its report. This was up from 30,100 in April and 22,065 in May 1958.

Applications for mortgage insurance on existing homes, the FHA said, slipped in May to 50,100 from 52,500 in April. A total of 55,448 such applications were made in May of last year.

Requests for Veterans' Administration appraisal of existing homes dropped to 8,243 in May from 8,327 in April, the agency said in its monthly summary. In May of last year, the VA received 12,157 such requests. Another measure of GI housing activity, applications for home loan guarantees, dropped 4.6 percent in May to 16,787 from 17,597 in April. In May a year ago, the agency received only 8,705 of these applications.

Actual starts under the VA program dropped 7 percent in May to 10,255 from 11,022 in April. Starts totaled 6,043 in May 1958.

#### DELETERIOUS EFFECT OF HIGH INTEREST RATES ON LONG-TERM GOVERNMENT BONDS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, among the most serious victims of the President's request to shove up interest rates on long-term Government bonds would be the local communities all over America who are already having trouble borrowing money to build schools and streets, hospitals, and municipal buildings.

America needs this construction. There is still enough idle plant capacity and manpower to build the necessary construction without creating any inflationary demand on scarce resources. But the President's demand for an interest rate hike will enormously increase the cost of this construction. In many cases it will become prohibitive. Where a city goes ahead, borrows the money, and engages in construction anyway, the rising interest cost is sure to mean an increase in local property taxes.

Mr. President, my home city of Madison, Wis., the university city and State capital, has an outstanding reputation for the fiscal soundness and reliability of its government. Its obligations have been top grade for a long time. I have just heard from its very able mayor, Ivan Nestingen, who has written me about the consequences of high interest rates to Madison's municipal financing, and the threatening impact of the President's request to permit the Federal Government to enter competition for long-range money by taking the 4¼-percent ceiling off long-range bonds.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this letter from Mayor Nestingen be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point.

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

MADISON, WIS., June 11, 1959.

The Honorable WILLIAM PROXMIRE,  
U.S. Senator, Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR PROXMIRE: Recent news accounts have indicated President Eisenhower is proposing elimination of the interest rate



ceiling on U.S. savings bonds and other bonds. I want to take this opportunity in behalf of the city of Madison of expressing strong objection to the proposal and requesting your opposition to it.

The policy of the Federal Government with respect to methods of financing has given rise to increasingly high interest rates to be paid by municipalities on any borrowing for needed local improvements, whether such improvements be for schools, highways or other local needs. Our most recent bond sales have shown a marked increase in interest rates, and the market continues to rise. The direct effect of the results of the policy of the current national administration has been to drive the interest rates up for needed local borrowing with a direct adverse effect on the already hard-hit property taxpayer. The proposal of President Eisenhower to eliminate the ceiling on interest rates on U.S. savings and other bonds will have a further adverse effect on interest rates local governments must pay.

I hope that your office will support any efforts to defeat the elimination of the ceiling on those interest rates.

Respectfully yours,

IVAN A. NESTINGEN,

Mayor.

#### THE OPPORTUNITY OF ABUNDANCE

Mr. PROXMIER. Mr. President, several weeks ago I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article by Robert G. Lewis entitled "The Poverty of Abundance." Today I ask unanimous consent to place in the record a second, brilliant article in the same series by Lewis, this one entitled "The Opportunity of Abundance."

Mr. President, Robert G. Lewis was my administrative assistant until last April when he left to take a top agricultural coordinator job with the Governor of Wisconsin, Gaylord Nelson.

I urge my colleagues to read this article by Bob Lewis. No one has a deeper or more comprehensive understanding of the farm problem and I am sure no one writes more eloquently or persuasively about it.

Here is a challenge to this Congress and a solution to the greatest economic paradox of this generation. It deserves careful and thoughtful scrutiny.

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

#### THE OPPORTUNITY OF ABUNDANCE

(By Robert G. Lewis)

(This is the concluding installment of a two-party survey of the plight of American agriculture. The first, entitled "The Poverty of Abundance," appeared in the May issue. Mr. Lewis, long a participant in farm activities and a student of farm problems, is currently special agricultural coordinator for Wisconsin's Gov. Gaylord Nelson. He served on the staff of Senator WILLIAM PROXMIER, of Wisconsin, until recently.—THE EDITORS.)

The American industry which has scored the most outstanding gains in efficiency during recent years is, by all popular judgments, sickest of all the industries in our entire economy. Yet few will deny that it is incomparably superior in technology and productivity to its counterparts anywhere else in the world.

In the past decade its workers have increased their output per man-hour three times as much as workers in the rest of our economy. Yet they alone of any important economic group have suffered an outright decline in real income, while the rest of us

enjoy substantially higher buying power than we did 10 years ago.

This sick industry is agriculture. Farm families are locked in an economic treadmill which condemns them to an inexorable speedup drive. They must strive individually for ever higher efficiency and output in order to survive against the competition of all their fellows. Yet the greater their individual successes, the deeper becomes the economic misery into which they dig themselves as a group.

The cost of Ezra Taft Benson's struggle against this phenomenon of soaring farm efficiency gives him the unflattering distinction of having spent more money than the combined outlays of all the previous Secretaries of Agriculture in 97 years.

Yet the usual limited view of the problem as one of inadequate farm incomes and burdensome Federal spending completely overlooks other important facets where the administration's failures are equally monumental. It ignores the opportunity our food abundance gives us to influence the direction of our changing world, the problem of wise resource use, and the profound and disturbing changes that are occurring in our economic and social structure.

Unhappily, the failure of criticism by the political opposition has been almost as great as the administration's failure of policy and action. This largely explains why the easily foreseen farm program chaos was scarcely noticed by the public until it had grown to mountainous dimensions.

But the task of criticism has demanded uncommon courage as well as commonsense. It has had to overcome popular and sanctioned myths about the nature of our economic system, myths which command exceptional emotional support.

In the first place, the wistful yearning for a "natural" farm economy in which automatic forces of the marketplace would regulate farm prices and farm production is totally unrealistic. Farm production increases inexorably as farmers race each other to adopt technological advances, and the supply of farm products characteristically outruns demand. The farmers' natural state is chronic depression; the harder and more efficiently farmers work, the worse their economic situation becomes as a group.

Even more important, conventional misconceptions about the rest of our economy raise imposing barriers against realistic criticism. Contrary to the sanctioned doctrine, there is virtually no price competition anywhere in the American economy excepting in agriculture. Most prices are not determined competitively in the marketplace; they are set instead by a profoundly different process which has come to be known generally as "administered pricing."

Dr. E. G. Nourse, formerly chairman of President Truman's Council of Economic Advisers, provided a descriptive definition of this process in his testimony before the Senate Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly July 7, 1957, suggesting that—

"In a sense, the expression 'administered prices' is a misnomer or carries a faulty emphasis. To speak of 'administered resources' might better point the issue. It would focus attention on the fact that giant corporations are making administrative decisions that activate or withhold the use of the economy's capital plant or funds and that massive labor unions set 'withholding prices' on large and strategic blocks of the Nation's labor supply."

In a widely circulated statement entitled "Steel and Inflation: Fact Versus Fiction," the United States Steel Corp. aptly delineated the unique character of the farm economy:

"Actually, almost all prices in our economy are set by administrative action. This is true for the giant automobile industry and the smallest retail store. The most important exceptions are the prices of many farm products in the commodity exchanges and in

the produce markets and the price of securities . . .

"A review of the components of [the Bureau of Labor Statistics wholesale price index] shows that relatively few products are market price determined . . . about 12 percent of the wholesale price index appears to be in the market price category."

The contrast between agriculture and the rest of our economy both describes the essence of the American farm problem, and suggests the direction for its solution.

To use Dr. Nourse's phrase, there is no purposeful "administration of resources" in agriculture. Farm production is almost as unplanned as the sun and the rain. The resources that are spent each year upon farm production bear no sensible relationship to the market demand for farm products.

But generally unseen in the sound and the fury, as 40 years of national farm policies collapse in a final crescendo of frustration, powerful forces are moving swiftly to put a halt on the wild farm economy. It will be tamed once and for all—and probably surprisingly soon. American agriculture will be remodeled in the image of Dr. Nourse's concept of administered resources and administered prices.

Two competing forces are racing each other for the prize of controlling the new agriculture. Either private farm-related business and financial interests will extend their control vertically down to the farm, or the farmers themselves, with the aid of Government, will adapt agriculture at last to the administered resources concept under control of the farmers and Government. The controlling agency will be empowered to decide with relative effectiveness how much food is to be marketed and at what price.

The key factor in the race is capital. A tremendous volume of capital is flowing into the farm-food industrial complex to exploit opportunities for technological advance at every stage. The struggle to control the capital that is constructing this new unified farm-to-retail-store farming and marketing system is the true major internal conflict in agricultural policy today. The source of this capital is essentially the same regardless of who will control it eventually. It comes largely from consumers, in the prices they pay for food.

The sentiment of farmers is crystallizing impressively in favor of reorganizing their economy to conform to the administered resources concept which they perceive everywhere around them:

National Master Herschel Newsom, of the Grange, and National President James Patton, of the Farmers Union, have never sounded more alike than in their present pleas for bargaining power for the farmers.

The Corn Belt's new National Farmers Organization is attempting to form bargaining units with the power to make binding contracts with processors.

The National Federation of Milk Producers has developed a self-help plan for a nationwide system of enforceable milk quotas for each dairy farmer.

Many other specialized organizations are seeking, by one means or another, to achieve the power to control the market supply of their product in order to maintain favorable prices.

Farm organizations continue to plug for schemes to eat up the surplus. But in doing so they realize increasingly that proposals to subsidize food consumption of low-income persons, however desirable as social policy and for market expansion, do not offer a longrun solution to the farm problem.

The most ambitious of the food stamp plans under consideration would subsidize additional food purchases for about 15 million people to the extent of \$100 each per year. Part of the subsidy, however, would merely displace present public welfare aid and food expenditures. The increase in ag-

gregate demand for food indicated by Department of Agriculture studies might immediately raise farm prices—and farmers' net income—by \$2 to \$4 billion a year. But this healthy improvement would be short-lived. Farmers would promptly invest most of their new gains in technological advances, and farm output would overtake the added demand within 2 or 3 years.

The idea of letting food prices decline freely in the market and making Government payments to farmers to restore their incomes has similar shortcomings. The idea arose from seriously distorted conceptions of what the Brannan plan was all about. Brannan's political foes did little to present a balanced view of his proposals, and Brannan himself, shrinking from the charge of regimentation of the farmer, failed to give proper emphasis to his proposals for controlling supplies. Without effective controls, a direct payments scheme would quickly bog down under enormous Government costs. Direct payments can be a useful tool but should not be mistaken for a farm policy.

The Secretary of Agriculture's role as spokesman and policy leader for agriculture has obscured the significant developments in farm organization objectives. To all appearances, Benson continues to push agriculture down the blind policy alley of "natural" adjustment by curtailing Government action.

The retreat of the Government, however, does not leave a vacuum. Fundamental structural changes are already being made and nonfarmer business interests are dominant. The emerging pattern is generally called vertical integration. It is accurately described as "centralized control from top to bottom" of the industrial complex that extends all the way from farm supplies through farming itself and on to food processing and retailing.

The primary impetus for vertical integration comes from technological advances in farming and food processing and the development of giant food marketing concerns. The big chainstore, for example, wants broilers or bacon tailored to fit the requirements of standardized pricing, handling, packaging, advertising, and retailing policies. Mass-produced factory products readily fit these requirements, but hogs and chickens grown on millions of farms under a multitude of breeding, feeding, and handling practices are far from uniform. The chain store's solution is to extend its managerial authority back to the farms to insure standardization—and on its own terms.

The power to control raw material costs—including the return to the farmer—is likewise important. And substantial efficiencies can be realized by up-to-date production methods and shortcutting the processing-distribution stages.

The farmer's status under vertical integration is a far cry from the idealized image of the independent yeoman, sturdily competing against several million of his fellows for whatever price the capricious market allows him. A team of Agriculture Department researchers and marketing specialists recently brought the subject down to earth with this description:

"Vertical integration may vitally affect the role of the farmers . . . Contract arrangements may leave producers with little more than general land management and caretaker functions. . . . Livestock production contracts vary from arrangements involving control of only a few decisions to contracts virtually relegating the producer to a pieceworker role."

The farm organizations' awakening interest in bargaining power is tagged along weakly behind the swift advance of business interests toward domination of an integrated agriculture-business complex. The farmers' handicaps are severe. Farm organizations and cooperatives are ridden with rivalries,

factionalism, and bureaucratic narrow vision. No commanding farm leadership of universal appeal has appeared on the scene.

The requirements for adequate farm leadership are monumental. The task calls for tradition-shattering human adjustments and a large degree of unity among millions of individuals, as well as hard-headed business capacity.

But most critically important of all, farmers today lack the capital resources that are required for an aggressive battle to keep control over their own destinies. Their powerful rivals, in contrast, can draw abundantly and cheaply from the pocketbooks of consumers. The food firms' cut of the retail food dollar is an administered price and their profits have grown prodigiously even as farmers' returns have dwindled. Big corporations can readily supplement their huge profits with low-cost capital from the Nation's leading financial sources for their aggressive drive to gobble up little competitors and advance toward control of the integrated agricultural economy.

Seen in this context, the retreat of the Federal Government from the battlefield of farm policy amounts to active intervention on the side of business domination of agriculture. The severe deflation of farm prices which has occurred under Benson's generalship has deprived farmers of the essential means to defend their economic independence. Farm leaders cannot lead because their troops have empty stomachs. And Benson himself, in singular contradiction of his appointed role as the unifying champion of the farmers' cause, turns his back and marches off the battlefield.

Probably more important in the long run than Benson's position, however, are the ideas of those rural Democrats who would undoubtedly become the architects of national farm policy in a Democratic administration after 1960. Democratic farm bills before Congress are diverse in scope and method, but substantially alike in principle. They foretell powerful and positive intervention by a future Democratic administration to help farmers administer the farm economy. Coordination and leadership from the Department of Agriculture is essential; this accounts for the improbability of any important policy shift at this time.

The principal methods envisioned include Government programs controlled by referendum balloting by farmers and administered by farmer committees to keep farm production in reasonable balance with demand at satisfactory prices. Only small-scale Government spending is planned. Self-financing stabilization funds to induce individual farmers to comply with controls and to remove remaining surpluses from the market are prominent features of many of the embryo plans.

The multiplicity of diverse but interrelated commodity problems now demanding attention will force farm programs of the future to be increasingly complex. They will require far more from farmers than the simple biennial chore of voting for the right side. Far more reliance is likely on commodity-by-commodity marketing agreements and orders, to regulate quality standards and implement merchandising efforts. Farmers will need to muster impressive business initiative and imagination to develop farmer-owned vertically integrated cooperative enterprises which supplement and extend the services of Government programs. They will need to tend carefully to the business of selling as well as to their traditional singleminded urge to produce.

Revolutionary adjustments are ahead for the American farmer—in production and marketing methods, in decision-making procedures, even in personal psychology. He faces the alternatives of working out these adjustments for himself, through democratic procedures in collaboration with his fellow

farmers and the Government, or having them forced upon him by powerful corporations. The impressive resources of agrarian democracy—farm organizations, farm cooperatives, farm program committees—afford the best hope for survival of the farmers' economic independence against the imposing threat of big business domination.

A farm economy administered on behalf of farmers could readily raise and maintain farm prices as high as consumers would tolerate. This would solve the farm income problem and substantially eliminate the need to support farmers at Government expense. But the new problems it would create would dwarf the burdens of today.

For one thing, it would become apparent immediately that much of our farm surplus is needed after all. School lunch programs, families on public assistance rolls, and welfare institutions now receive hundreds of millions of dollars worth of surplus foods. If anything, these outlets should be greatly expanded rather than retrenched. Similarly, billions in the form of farm surpluses have been used throughout the world to construct airports, roads, and other defense installations, and to maintain fighting forces.

Some farming resources should be shifted out of food production to other uses which are more valuable. More leisure time for farm people is desirable. Many unneeded farm workers would find ready jobs in expanded consumer services and trades right in rural communities if farm living standards were raised. And millions of acres of unneeded farmland could be developed for intensive recreational use with imaginative direction.

But these ready outlets and alternatives for farm production would be swamped quickly. Present-day supply and demand relationships indicate that about a 5-percent cut in farm output would achieve a satisfactory current balance. But this overlooks a factor of stunning proportions.

Any substantial increase in farmers' incomes would generate a powerful forward surge in farm technology. This would occur, too, if business-controlled capital were to move into farming on a big scale. Experts speculate that farm output could be increased 40 percent if all farmers followed the best farming practices that are already known. It is reasonable to conjecture that in the 10 years ahead, output per man-hour in farming could easily double the past decade's impressive 84-percent increase.

American agriculture is potentially capable of pouring out an unsuspected volume of farm commodities, at steadily declining unit costs. Farmers' incomes could be raised fairly soon to parity with nonfarmers—roughly double the present level—at farm commodity prices below those of today.

There are two big "ifs" in this dramatic equation: First, if farmers can obtain capital, principally through prices related in a rational manner to their costs, to enable them to invest in technological advances designed to their unit cost of production. Second, if markets or other outlets are available for a maximum volume of farm output.

The true potentials of American agriculture demand an entirely new perspective. If the farm problem is solved as a farm problem alone, regardless of who controls the reorganized industry, it will result in staggering underemployment and waste of farming resources.

The American steel industry operated at 50 to 30 percent below full capacity throughout 1958, the auto industry well under half capacity, in order to maintain the "administered prices" set by corporation managers. There is no reason to expect that a General Farming Corporation would want to behave differently from General Motors.

It is almost inconceivable that the public conscience could tolerate waste on the scale that would result if farming were managed



like other industries. Yet the waste of idle fields and dispossessed or underemployed farmers is not essentially different from the waste of idle factories and industrial unemployment. Under the soil bank, farmers were paid some \$2 billion in 3 years to destroy crops and leave fields unplanted. This spectacular effort of planned waste, sponsored by Ezra Taft Benson and enacted by a Democratic Congress, is history's greatest reversal of the wisdom of Joseph of Egypt. It destroyed enough potential grain to provide bread for the Nation's entire population for more than a year, enough cotton to make a new summer suit for every one of our 65 million jobholders. Still the soil bank concept survives; Senator HOMER CAPEHART in April presented a much-heralded Republican farm plan including a new and bigger billion-dollar-a-year soil bank.

Policies of the past and the present fall far short of reconciling the demands of conscience and our true national interests with the real potentialities of our economy. In an age of massive political and social upheaval that is remaking the civilization of man—with drastic implications for our own place in it—food is both a dynamic engine of economic change and a crucial lever of political power.

After 40 years of communism, the major campaign promise in the Soviet Union—and a most extravagant one at that—is in 7 years to achieve enough to eat.

Red China's great leap forward is in more danger of faltering for want of carbohydrates and protein to energize its driven masses than from any prospect of serious revolt.

Hunger has become a goad to revolution among a billion people in the newly awakened nations. But it remains a bar to progress. Most of the people of the world live their lives on the edge of hunger, chained to an endless treadmill of poverty, struggling year in and year out for enough food barely to survive, scarcely able to produce ahead of the needs of swiftly increasing human stomachs to accumulate the capital needed to achieve modern industrial civilizations.

Moved by the disturbing irony of too much food in a world of widespread hunger, far-seeing men in many countries have called for the use of surplus food on a massive scale to build modern economies in the underdeveloped areas of the world.

The most urgent capital needs are for relatively simple public works. Roads, bridges, water systems, sanitation facilities, schools—these are the basic foundations for a chain reaction of economic advances toward modern, prosperous economies. Human labor is the primary element in their cost, and an assured supply of food and very little else is all that is needed to pay it.

For example, thousands of India's tiny villages have absolutely no road connections to bigger towns and cities. If the village farmers produce an occasional surplus of farm crops, there is no way to trade it in the city for the tools and implements which could greatly increase their productivity. They are condemned to plod out their days like generations before them, without hope beyond bare subsistence, under the constant threat of crop failure and famine from year to year.

But the treadmill of poverty can be broken with surplus food from America. Village farmers can be paid in food to work at constructing a road to the city instead of tilling their subsistence farms. They can carry earth and stones in hand-made baskets, a familiar Asian device. When the year is over, they will have eaten their wages instead of the yield from their own farms. But they will have the road to show for it—a capital improvement that can launch a dynamic chain of economic advances.

Or surplus food and cotton can be used to pay the village farmers to build a school-

house, then to pay both teachers' wages and pupils' subsistence while the productivity of the village's human resources is enriched.

These are oversimplified examples, but they illustrate the basic principles behind a worldwide development plan utilizing America's vast food supply potential. Labor constitutes a large share of the cost of the most urgently needed capital projects. Additional workers must be recruited directly from farming, which adds to the pressure on already inadequate food supplies. Foods advanced as part of the investment in capital projects can be used to cover a major share of the labor cost, and will in turn absorb an equivalent share of the new purchasing power generated thereby. With careful planning, as United Nations studies have demonstrated, there need be no impairment of regular markets; the extra food supplied will merely offset the new demand generated by the employment of workers who otherwise would remain in subsistence farming—or starve.

Surplus commodities, of course, will need to be accompanied by additional foreign exchange and local currencies to meet other consumer and capital demands arising from large-scale projects. The investments furnished from America—in surplus crops and in money—can be advanced in a combination of loans and grants.

Under Public Law 480 the United States has sent billions of dollars worth of surpluses to foreign countries. It has accomplished much but its value is severely limited—both practically and psychologically—by the temporary get-rid-of-the-surplus rationale. Obviously, long range commitments and planning are essential; the enthusiasm for building a needed bridge is bound to be dampened if there is any chance that food supplies might be cut off in midstream.

But the impressive bipartisan support for Public Law 480 and for more ambitious proposals definitely puts a genuine food-for-peace undertaking well within the range of political feasibility. Even President Eisenhower has embraced the slogan, at least, and recently set up a committee to study the plan.

The food-for-peace concept enjoys strong international support too. The Canadian Government has announced it will push for a world food bank in forthcoming discussions. International pooling of farm surpluses to finance economic development projects would undoubtedly have occurred years ago but for the unwillingness of the United States, which controls the biggest surpluses, to participate.

International planning and cooperation are essential for full success. Long-range production and trade patterns, and the interests of farmers in the underdeveloped countries themselves, must be given fair and constructive consideration. Senator HUMPHREY's comprehensive and imaginative food-for-peace bill calls for immediate unilateral action by the United States and provides for negotiating with other countries for international participation.

No one can reasonably doubt our enormously important stake in the massive revolutions that are shaking a billion people awake from blank misery. They are rapidly assuming large roles in world power where they counted for nothing barely decades ago. Military alliances with American-armed regimes ruling nakedly primitive economies provide only stopgap, short-run security at best, and probably not even that. Economic development does not automatically assure friendly political and cultural relationships but it is the indispensable base on which cooperation can be built. And the efforts of the Communist bloc to isolate America as a minority in a hostile world should provide the convincing spur to act as conscience and national interest direct. As one farm leader

remarked satirically: "The only thing worse for us than the curse of farm surpluses would be for the Reds to have 'em."

The outpouring of low-cost farm products that American farms can provide is at once the world's most elemental need for building economic progress and the cheapest contribution the United States has to give. It will make little difference in real cost to taxpayers and consumers whether our agricultural potential is constricted to the narrow limits of conventional market demand at administered high prices, or expanded boldly to full abundance at the low unit costs that are attainable. The real cost will be largely wasted unless it is invested imaginatively to secure our future—wasted in senseless soil-bank fiascoes, in underproductive farming resources, in displaced farm labor entering the growing pool of chronic unemployed in a stagnating national economy.

With a foreseeable \$10 to \$15 billion of farm surpluses to provide a powerful initial impetus, and with almost unbelievable potential productivity to sustain a dramatic assault upon poverty, illiteracy, and disease, America's farms can be a key to national greatness and world leadership in the terrible, wonderful era in which our children will live.

#### JOHN FOSTER DULLES—A MAN OF MORAL PURPOSE

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, from 1948 to 1952 the United Kingdom was represented in Washington by Sir Oliver Franks, who formerly was professor of moral philosophy at Oxford University. He is a man of very sensitive nature and of profound wisdom and discrimination. He wrote for the Sunday Times, of London, an article entitled "A Man of Moral Purpose," relating to the late Secretary of State John Foster Dulles.

This excellent article, I believe, should be brought to the attention of all Members of Congress and to the people of the Nation as a whole. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

#### A MAN OF MORAL PURPOSE (By Sir Oliver Franks)

The death of John Foster Dulles brings with it two thoughts for most of us. There is admiration for the high courage with which he faced the inevitable advance of his fatal disease, a courage heightened by the fact that his illness was a matter of public interest and its progress therefore registered by detailed journalistic comment. And there is also a far wider appreciation of his work as Secretary of State than existed a year or two ago, not springing from sympathy with his illness, but from recognition of his abilities and of his growth in office.

How should one judge John Foster Dulles as Secretary of State? Did his achievement really rest on his quality as an expert or as a politician or as a statesman?

Dulles was clearly a very great expert in foreign affairs. Knowledge of the subject and interest in it ran in his family and he himself had spent the greater part of a lifetime acquiring knowledge of the international scene. He was also quite a considerable politician for, despite difficulties, he held his own with Congress and its committees. If it is a test of world statesmanship decisively to influence the broad trend of affairs, Dulles passed this test.

I doubt whether an appreciation of Dulles in these roles satisfactorily catches and

judges the essential quality of his work as Secretary of State. John Foster Dulles belonged to a type with whom we are no longer familiar. We are accustomed to expect the holders of high public office to be socially well adjusted. We are taught that political leaders will be at ease with themselves and with others, skilled, too, in putting others at their ease, always approachable and likable. John Foster Dulles was not like this. As Secretary of State he was austere and rather aloof, obviously immensely well-informed but a little awkward in manner, driving himself and pursuing his policies with a steady singleness of aim possible only to one who knew where he stood with God and man.

Three or four centuries ago, when Reformation and Counter-Reformation divided Europe into armed camps, in an age of wars of religion, it was not so rare to encounter men of the type of Dulles. Like them, in vigorous and systematic reflection he had come to unshakable convictions of a religious and theological order. Like them, he saw the world as an arena in which the forces of good and evil were continuously at war. Like them, he believed that this was the contest which supremely mattered.

This is not just a fanciful analogy. I am sure that John Foster Dulles believed that he had been called to be Secretary of State at a time when the world was again divided into armed camps by moral beliefs and metaphysical doctrines. It was in this light that he conceived the struggle between communism and the free world. He saw international political issues in moral terms because in the end he saw them as theological.

Such a position gives a man of ability great strength of purpose; it may also expose him to certain weaknesses. How does anyone act whose basic convictions about the world and his duty in it are settled once and for all? For such a person the business of thought and action is not a tentative exploration by trial and error of what is expedient; it is a deductive exercise, which by applying known principles to the facts shows how to move to the pre-established goal.

In my conversations with him I thought Dulles' mind essentially worked in this way. It was for these reasons that he did not depend very much on the advice of the State Department. What he wanted from his officials was current factual information about the state of the world. He worked out the application of his principles in lonely reflection and discussed the results only with a very small circle of intimates. So it was not accidental that he seemed austere and rather aloof; it was a consequence of his method of work.

At the same time this endowment of belief gave him a large consistency. He never swerved from the broad course dictated to him by his convictions. In this lay the secret of the great and increasing power he exerted in the counsels of the nations until illness struck him down. Fortified by the trust of his President he was a formidable figure, as patient as he was knowledgeable. He knew where he wanted to go and he possessed and exercised power.

Perhaps for the same fundamental reasons his outlook on foreign affairs was sometimes too rigid. He saw the great issue between East and West so clearly that in his later years in the State Department he did not seem able to develop constructive policies about the rapidly growing importance of the North-South problem, the relations between the industrialized nations and the developing and underdeveloped nations to the south of them. No doubt in some ways these two great problems are interrelated; in others they are not, and we are all the losers because Dulles was not able to give a positive formulation to the attitude of the United States on his second world issue.

The same reasons again may lie behind a long, serene and affectionate family life. Here, and in the society of his friends, Dulles had plenty of zest and pleasure in living. Because he knew his destination he was a happy traveler.

### A BLIND SPOT IN OUR FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I have received from a very fine gentleman of Grafton, N. Dak., the Honorable Mowat G. Fraser, now the chief of the bureau of higher and adult education, Connecticut State Department of Education, a very well written article entitled "A Blind Spot in Our Foreign Policy."

Mr. President, as Congress well knows, I have been opposed to foreign aid in any form. However, for the information of the Members of Congress who are to vote on the mutual security bills that are pending, I ask unanimous consent that this very fine article be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks, because it points out significant weaknesses in our foreign affairs.

This can best be illustrated by this one quotation:

We now help them develop military and economic strength, but we leave them helpless to resist dictatorship propaganda.

Recent history has repeatedly warned that unless a considerable majority of adults are educated in the ways of democracy by discussion, reading, and practice, a nation will tend to become a dictatorship in an economic or military crisis.

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

#### A BLIND SPOT IN OUR FOREIGN POLICY

(Mowat G. Fraser, chief, bureau of higher and adult education, Connecticut State Department of Education)

A new educational need has arisen of great importance to our future as a Nation. Yet, to date, we have practically ignored it. It is to help the newer, uncertain nations of the free world become intelligent and enthusiastic about democracy. We now help them develop military and economic strength. But we leave them helpless to resist dictatorship propaganda. As a result, some day soon these nations may come to prefer dictatorship to freedom—and to use against us the power we have helped them attain.

Recent history has repeatedly warned that, unless a considerable majority of adults are educated in the ways of democracy by discussion, reading, and practice, a nation will tend to become a dictatorship in an economic or military crisis. This happened even to the German Republic. It happened to the Chinese. On the other hand, it has not happened in nations where almost all voters can discuss civic affairs and experience the basic freedoms, as in most leading countries of the free world.

#### I

Take, for example, one of the most friendly and enthusiastic of the new democracies: Korea. From 1910 to 1945 it vividly learned the disadvantages of Japanese dictatorship. In the Korean war it learned those of Russian and Chinese communism. It also discovered the advantages of association with the free world—the ample military support and instruction; the \$200 million for reconstruction from the United Nations; the \$300 million of economic aid per year for the past 3 years from the United States; and

the assistance of numerous private missions. Furthermore, more than 3,000 of its military personnel have had 6 months of special training here. An even larger number of its students attend college here now, and many thousands preceded them in the past 70 years since Korea first welcomed our missionaries.

Korea also has had 10 years of experience with political democracy. All adults vote and an opposition party expresses opinions freely. It has, too, a nationwide elementary school system, secondary schools in every city, and 60 colleges and universities.

Could this experienced and befriended country become a dictatorship a few years hence, after our aid dwindles and a crisis develops? Let us look at the other side of the picture.

Case studies of rural districts, where 16 million of South Korea's 23 million people live, show that usually 95 percent of the adults are defenseless against propaganda. They know almost no geography or history. They have no reading matter whatever. They have no radios, because of no electricity. They have at most a fourth-grade education, which for everybody over 21 was in the Japanese language, no longer used. Furthermore, most of these limitations obviously hold for a good third of the city dwellers as well.

What of the rising generation? Seventy percent of the youth leave school before the seventh grade. Most rural pupils leave before the fifth. Although there are 2 million youths of college undergraduate age, only 80,000 students are enrolled in all higher educational institutions combined.

How secure is democracy when an overwhelming majority of the voters are so ignorant?

#### II

This great majority have scarcely been touched by the many efforts being made to enlighten the Korean public. Very few of the leaflets and papers distributed by government ministries reach rural homes. The movies of the U.S. Information Service reach villages only briefly, if at all, and depict only America and the United Nations. The literacy movement begun by Frank Laubach is being continued by only a handful of people, in Seoul and Taejon. After 3 years of planning, the fundamental education teams of UNESCO experts have worked in fewer than a dozen of Korea's 2,000 townships. The American International Cooperation Administration's community development is confined to making material improvements in a few pilot communities; its technical education is only for specialists in industry and agricultural colleges or agencies. Teams of university students visit a few villages each year, and these only during vacations.

Two movements have wider, continuous contacts. Hundreds of 4-H clubs have been enthusiastically organized, but do not try to educate adults in civic affairs. By far the most effective adult-education movement is that of the Christian missions whose hundreds of churches have reached 3 million people and whose schools enroll 120,000 pupils.

Each of these movements is helpful, even inspiring. But all together they hold no promise of meeting the urgent civic education need before it may be too late.

What could be done? Four things especially. More education teams like those of UNESCO—enough to visit each township or city district for one week every year—are clearly the basic need. Bringing experts on agriculture, health, home economics, and community and national affairs, along with documentary movies, they have already proved their ability to attract whole village populations hour after hour, day after day, in proper season. In a very few years, 5 such teams for each of the 10 provinces, could



greatly increase the interest, information, and experience of most Koreans in civic affairs. They could begin to make Korea a real democracy.

Such teams could readily be developed. Universities now develop somewhat similar teams which are well received. If salaries of \$100 per month and some demonstration equipment could be provided, almost 300 team members could soon be put to work and maintained for \$500,000 per year. Transportation and housing would undoubtedly continue to be supplied by the Government through its ministries, armed forces, and schools.

These stimulating but brief visits, to be sure, are not enough. Worthwhile movies, trucked to villages in U.S. Information Service style, could help to maintain interests among people of all ages, abilities, and backgrounds. Reading material also are needed throughout the year. Small libraries, centered in schools rent free, could serve both pupils and adults at low cost. The widespread eagerness to learn, in addition to the education teams, would supply the necessary motivation. Finally, objective, weekly current-event newspapers in simple Korean, like similar papers in our own American schools, are also probably essential.

These four projects—community education teams, mobile movies, local libraries, and current-event newspapers—it is estimated, could be initiated and maintained at high level throughout the nation for \$2 million a year. Could Korea itself finance them? Not yet. Its Ministry of Education can hardly keep open the compulsory, fee-charging primary schools. In the beginning this nationwide adult education would require foreign support. In a very few years, however, a people as capable and proud as the Koreans could undoubtedly carry on by themselves.

### III

All this—the prevalent ignorance and the potential effectiveness of these four projects—is true of almost all of the newer member nations of the free world in the Orient, the Middle East, Africa, and Central and South America.

Why, now, do we ignore this great need which must be met if the ultimate success of our military and economic aid is to be assured? Apparently for three reasons. We believe that it would cost too much. Actually, in Korea it would cost far less than 1 percent of our current economic aid there; in all countries, a relatively small sum. Secondly, we believe that it would interfere in a nation's internal affairs and, therefore, be unwelcome. In reality, these nations are eager for it. The interference probably would be nil; for each nation could stop it at will, and our aim would or should be, not propaganda, but the kind of knowledge and experience which any democratic government wants in its citizens.

The main reason for our indifference seems to be simply tradition. Except temporarily or as our part in U.N. projects, we are accustomed to give foreign aid, if at all, only for economic or military purposes. In all the recent discussion of aid to the Middle East, for instance, educational aid has not even been considered, although ignorance there is greater than in Korea.

With the help now being given them, the world's new democracies can become real ones if only they get a little aid in developing nationwide programs of civic education. Most influential Americans seem to agree with this need—but fail to take steps to meet it. Perhaps the increasing propaganda of Communist nations, which have obviously seen the vacuum, will stir them to act in time.

## FORGING A NATIONAL STRATEGY— ADDRESS BY SENATOR JACKSON

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, on June 13, 1959, the able and distinguished junior Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] delivered a most thought-provoking address to the 12th annual conference of the Military Government Association, held in Washington, D.C. Senator JACKSON discussed in his speech the challenge with which we are faced during this period of cold war, and his remarks should stimulate in each of us a desire to reappraise our national process of policymaking. I ask unanimous consent that the text of this address be printed in the body of the RECORD.

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

### FORGING A NATIONAL STRATEGY

(Address by Senator HENRY M. JACKSON, member, Senate Armed Services Committee, Senate Government Operations Committee; chairman, Military Application Subcommittee, Joint Committee on Atomic Energy)

Mr. Chairman and friends, I should like to express my appreciation for this opportunity to address you tonight. I have great respect for the professional and constructive work of the Military Government Association. Many of us in Congress rely heavily on your help in promoting national defense and in developing more effective ways to discharge this Nation's international responsibilities.

I know of no more congenial group before which to discuss the tasks of statesmanship in this dangerous age.

When a Hitler strikes for world domination, free men spring to arms in defense of their liberties, and they fight with an irresistible will to victory. Time and again, free men have proven their magnificent ability to unite in response to a military challenge.

Today, free men face a more ingenious foe than the storm trooper. The Soviet confronts us with a test of will even more difficult than the battlefield. They are betting that we do not have the staying power to win the long, drawn-out competition of the cold war.

The Soviet rulers think in terms of power. Superior power, they believe, will eventually prevail. In every way, on every occasion, they seek to expand and consolidate their strength, confident that small gains here and there, at the margins of conflict, will determine the fate of the world.

The Kremlin favors settlements that will unsettle things and that will add up, in time, to a Communist world order. By a kind of Gresham's law of politics, bad political currency drives out good. It takes two to make peace, but only one to make trouble. Or, to change the figure of speech, we cannot hope to win the international game of fox and geese if we always allow the Russians to play the role of the fox.

In short, the Russians are determined to play the game of power politics, and we cannot choose not to play. The only course open to us is to play it better or to lose.

The issue that predominates over all others in our national life is this: Can our free society marshal its strength to defend and preserve our way of life against the total challenge of the Communist states? I think you will agree that we cannot take for granted that the answer will be yes.

I hasten to add that this is not a partisan matter. Democracy is at trial for its life. Neither party has a monopoly of wisdom or

a monopoly of errors on this great issue. My remarks apply to what is a national problem—a national challenge.

As events have been moving, we are losing the contest. We are on the defensive almost everywhere.

We have been outdistanced militarily. We are now not even striving for equality in the advanced weapons system, although superiority in these weapons was and is the key to maintaining an overall military balance with the Soviet Union. By our own decision, we have accepted second place in the intercontinental ballistic missile race, and the fateful implications of this decision are hardly being discussed publicly.

We are being overtaken industrially and scientifically, the fields in which our head start seemed to make the contest most one-sided in our favor.

We have been outmaneuvered politically in one vital area after another. In the Middle East, for example, which is the arena of our most recent reverses, it takes either a fool or a genius to see anything but disaster ahead.

And finally, we have never been in the same league with the Russians in the psychological war of wits and words.

The meaning of all this is clear. Our power, and the power of the free world as a whole, is declining in relation to the power of the Soviet Union and the Communist bloc. The process is cumulative and accelerating.

The result of this process can be predicted with something like scientific precision. The cumulative effect of growing Soviet power and declining American power will be a progressive loss of ability to influence events, and a chain reaction of defeats for freedom.

Why is our Nation falling behind in the contest?

We have been repeatedly warned by committees of distinguished citizens that we must pull ourselves together—or fail. Sometimes the warnings are dramatic enough to create a brief stir in the press and public—but they are quickly and quietly forgotten. The tragedy is that we are not acting upon our knowledge. It is the all-too-familiar tragedy of the failure of will.

The most important question we face as a Nation is why? Why are we failing to do what we should do—to survive?

I will not pretend that I can give a full answer in this short speech tonight. But I would call your attention to what I think may be our fundamental trouble: We lack a coherent and purposeful national strategy to win the cold war.

There is no grand plan that sets forth in simple terms what we have to do to survive, and why.

Witness the shotgun approach to weapons problems—doing a little of everything, backing and filling on critical new projects—with no basic plan to guide our effort.

Witness the stop-gap handling of foreign aid—year after year adopting the familiar program—hoping because it worked once it will work again.

Witness the sporadic response to each new crisis—ad hoc committees here, pro tem bureaus there—but no overall plan for a sustained response.

The fact is that few Americans have any idea of what our duty is. It has not been articulated clearly and boldly. Our people are never shown the whole package of effort that is required—their enthusiasms are not aroused nor are their powers engaged.

We could learn from British experience in the 19th century. Then every man understood the importance to England of free trade, of freedom of the seas, of a strong Navy, and of an able civil service to operate the vast empire. Most young men trained from childhood to contribute to the purposes England had to fulfill. As a result,

the British people sustained a prodigious national effort.

We could also learn from our experience in the two world wars. Then the Nation knew what it was trying to do, what was demanded of it, and why. This made possible the marvelous unity, energy, and vitality displayed by free men in time of war.

The nub of the matter is this: Faced with a deadly challenge, a democracy must have a strategy to meet it—a strategy which is the supreme organizer of our strength.

Lacking it, our efforts are like Humpty Dumpty after the fall. The wonder is whether all the kings' horses and all the kings' men can ever put us together again.

Our needs in this respect can be briefly summarized:

First, we must understand that the cold war is a war, the outcome of which will be victory or defeat for the free way of life.

Second, we must understand that we are making our big investment in defense in order to buy time to carry out a positive program for creating a peaceful world. Our real job is to win the cold war.

Third, we must define our short- and long-run goals in meaningful terms. What is the road to the success we seek, and what obstacles stand in the way?

Fourth, we must plan a national policy to move toward our goals, including a master program of requirements and priorities.

Fifth, we must develop the military, political, economic, scientific, and related capabilities required for success; and

Sixth, we must use these capabilities skillfully and stubbornly until the foundations of a peaceful world order have been securely established.

To do these things would be to forge a national strategy for the cold war and to wield our power as a mighty sword in the cause of freedom.

I believe the effort to develop such a strategy, and the public discussion accompanying the effort, would do much to create the unity of purpose and the national will needed for success.

How can we get such a grand strategic plan?

Of course, leadership is vitally important. There is no wholly adequate substitute for it. The American people, furthermore, have shown time and again that they will respond to dynamic, vigorous, plain-spoken inspired leadership.

But we cannot afford, and should not try, to rely wholly on leadership. We must also improve our methods for developing an adequate national strategy and for winning public support for it.

I believe that both Congress and the executive branch should now give intensive study to the organization of the Federal Government for survival in the contest with world communism, including the procedures of the National Security Council.

We should tackle this central issue of our time: How can a free society so organize its human and material resources as to outperform totalitarianism?

Obviously, all study of this issue should be conducted in a nonpartisan manner. We are interested not in destructive criticism but in constructive reform.

Let me say that the experience of your own membership in civil affairs military government can be very helpful in such a review. Of all people, you know how good organization helps the performance of a vital public function, and how poor organization hurts.

Our national policymaking machinery has not been subjected to careful examination since it was created by act of Congress in 1947. It is time to study it in the light of our experience during these 12 crisis-laden years. At times it seems to have functioned

rather well. At other times, it seems to have functioned poorly.

In any event, it has failed to produce the kind of national strategy our world position now requires. It should be possible to find out why.

In theory, the machinery of the National Security Council should do the job. The Planning Board plans and proposes new policies and programs. In its preparatory work, the various departments and agencies are consulted and make known their views. The agreed conclusions of the Planning Board are submitted to the NSC, which serves in an advisory capacity to the President. The President decides. The policies and programs are then carried out under the watchful eye of the Operations Coordinating Board. The President presumably has a clear and consistent policy to present to the Congress and to the American people.

The procedure seems as sound as the dollar—but then the dollar is also a bit inflated these days.

There are a few simple questions we should ask:

What is the present structure for formulating and implementing national policy?

What is it supposed to accomplish?

Is it doing it?

In what areas are there grave shortcomings?

Why is this the case?

What improvements should be made?

There is one operating concept that especially needs review—that is the concept of completed staff work. According to this concept, the Planning Board has done its job well when its proposals are accepted without change by the NSC and the President.

I have serious doubts about the merit of this approach to policymaking. It seems to me that the important decisions are always difficult decisions, involving a choice between several possible courses of action, each of which has advantages and disadvantages.

I wonder to what extent the Planning Board fully analyzes the advantages and disadvantages of alternative courses of action and presents this analysis to the NSC. How often are the NSC and the President confronted with sharply defined issues so that they are compelled to make, as they should, the hard choices?

For example, did the NSC ever fully consider the impact on American prestige of permitting the Russians to register scientific firsts in the intercontinental ballistic missile, and in orbiting a satellite?

Has the NSC debated the alternative ways this Nation could support and finance an increased defense program?

Has the NSC debated whether or not to make it a goal of national policy to increase the rate of growth of our gross national product from 2 or 3 percent to 5 or 6 percent a year?

Has the NSC discussed whether or not we should allocate a rising proportion of our total output to public purposes, domestic and foreign?

These represent some of the tough but crucial issues which the NSC and the President must resolve. I am convinced that meaningful and firm decisions cannot evolve without vigorous discussion of alternative courses of action.

You may not find it surprising that a Senator should take this point of view. Seriously, however, one of the great merits of the Senate as a legislative body is that issues are debated—and clarified in the process. I do not suggest that the NSC should resolve its will by a vote. But I do suggest that the President is more likely to make meaningful decisions, which can be translated into

purposeful, hard hitting action, after vigorous debate rather than without it.

There is some reason to believe that the proposals prepared by the Planning Board are written in such generalities that they may mean one thing to one department and quite another thing to another department. The effort to reach agreement at too low a level—that is, at the Planning Board level—may mean that agreement is purchased at the price of clarity.

This is but one of many questions that require study. Where one will come out is, of course, not yet foreseeable. Perhaps we will be agreeably surprised. But it is my strong belief that careful, sustained study will bring forward helpful suggestions to improve our processes for the making and implementation of an integrated national policy.

One hundred and seventy million Americans are committed to the ideals of democracy, individual liberty, justice, and free institutions. But devotion to principle alone will not see us through. One hundred and seventy million Americans must also be dedicated to the means for preserving these ideals.

We have proved that we can meet the urgent demands of a hot war. Now we must prove that we can sustain the grueling, tedious, continuing tasks of the cold war.

This type of conflict is a wholly new experience for the American people. The Soviet objective is the same as in a hot war—to defeat us. But Moscow relies on limited actions, indirect threats, and diffuse challenges—hoping not to arouse us to action.

This is the strategy of protracted conflict—the technique whereby weaker powers, in time, gain the strength to overcome stronger ones.

It is far more difficult for a free society to generate the effort for this kind of conflict than for the dramatic clashes of a hot war. The Soviets know this—and are counting on it.

It is all the more essential, therefore, that we have an understandable plan for victory.

Clearly our people cannot be dedicated to vague programs, or respond enthusiastically to a host of conflicting demands. We must know whether we are going and how we are going to get there. We must have a grand strategy for survival.

In closing, let me say simply this:

With such a strategy I believe freedom can prevail.

The earth today is an arena of clashing systems of order. But the idea of freedom is by all odds the most potent idea in history. And free men have the mental and material resources to build a world community which makes room for all peoples who wish to live in peace.

Granted, the unrelenting encounter with the Kremlin tests our ability to the limit. Surely, this is a worthy test of our national quality. A better and a stronger America can emerge from this struggle.

I believe America can and will meet the challenge.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, has morning business been concluded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Dodd in the chair). Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

#### AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the



consideration of Calendar No. 379, Senate bill 2094.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2094) to authorize appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill which had been reported from the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, with amendments, on page 4, line 9, after the word "Reactor", to strike out "Test" and insert "Testing"; on page 12, line 19, after the word "technology", to insert "There are also authorized to be appropriated such additional funds as may be necessary for the operation of such reactor prototypes, as provided in subsection 111(a)(1) of Public Law 85-162"; and on page 13, line 22, after the word "authorization", to strike out "proposed" and insert "proposal"; 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—*

SEC. 101. PLANT OR FACILITY ACQUISITION OR CONSTRUCTION.—There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with the provisions of section 261a.(1) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, the sum of \$165,400,000 for acquisition or condemnation of any real property or any facility or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion, as follows:

(a) SPECIAL NUCLEAR MATERIALS.—

Project 60-a-1, modifications to production and supporting installations, \$10,000,000.

Project 60-a-2, prototype installations, gaseous diffusion plants, \$1,000,000.

Project 60-a-3, central computing building, Oak Ridge, Tennessee, \$1,650,000.

Project 60-a-4, reactor air filters, Savannah River, South Carolina, \$5,000,000.

Project 60-a-5, additional raw water line, Paducah Kentucky, \$810,000.

Project 60-a-6, water plant expansion, 100 K area, Hanford, Washington, \$5,000,000.

Project 60-a-7, modifications to reactor disassembly basins, Savannah River, South Carolina, \$1,600,000.

(b) SPECIAL NUCLEAR MATERIALS.—

Project 60-b-1, cylinder storage area, Paducah, Kentucky, \$500,000.

Project 60-b-2, increased cooling water capacity, Savannah River, South Carolina, \$5,000,000.

(c) ATOMIC WEAPONS.—

Project 60-c-1, weapons production, development and test installations, \$10,000,000.

Project 60-c-2, special processing plant, phase II, Mound Laboratory, Ohio, \$3,800,000.

Project 60-c-3, test and environmental installations, Sandia Base, New Mexico, \$1,000,000.

(d) ATOMIC WEAPONS.—

Project 60-d-1, storage site modifications, \$1,500,000.

Project 60-d-2, materials storage vault, Los Alamos, New Mexico, \$133,000.

(e) REACTOR DEVELOPMENT.—

Project 60-e-1, modifications to experimental breeder reactor Numbered 1 (EBR-1), National Reactor Testing Station, Idaho, \$1,000,000.

Project 60-e-2, portable gas-cooled reactor prototype, National Reactor Testing Station, Idaho, \$2,500,000.

Project 60-e-3, alterations, modifications and additions to MTR-ETR utility, technical and support installations, National Reactor Testing Station, Idaho, \$2,000,000.

Project 60-e-4, hot cells, \$2,500,000.

Project 60-e-5, chemical processing plant area utility modifications and improvements, National Reactor Testing Station, Idaho, \$750,000.

Project 60-e-6, reactor support installations, Nevada Test Site, \$500,000.

Project 60-e-7, nuclear test plant, Army Reactor Experimental Area (AREA), National Reactor Testing Station, Idaho, \$5,000,000.

Project 60-e-8, modifications and additions for test installation for project Pluto, \$2,000,000.

Project 60-e-9, research and development test plant additions and modifications for project Rover, \$4,800,000.

Project 60-e-10, general support installations and utilities expansion, Argonne National Laboratory, Lemont, Illinois, \$4,300,000.

Project 60-e-11, national circulation test plant, National Reactor Testing Station, Idaho, \$18,500,000.

Project 60-e-12, alterations to Shippingport reactor facilities, \$5,000,000.

Project 60-e-13, experimental organic-cooled reactor, \$6,000,000.

Project 60-e-14, experimental low temperature process heat reactor, \$4,000,000.

Project 60-e-15, power reactor of advanced design capable of utilizing nuclear superheat, to be undertaken either as a cooperative project or conducted solely by the Atomic Energy Commission, \$11,000,000.

(f) REACTOR DEVELOPMENT.—

Project 60-f-1, miscellaneous modifications and additions, Argonne National Laboratory, Illinois, \$1,000,000.

(g) PHYSICAL RESEARCH.—

Project 60-g-1, project Sherwood Plant, \$1,000,000.

Project 60-g-2, accelerator and reactor modifications, Brookhaven National Laboratory, New York, \$1,950,000.

Project 60-g-3, transuranium laboratory, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Tennessee, \$1,200,000.

Project 60-g-4, physics building, Lawrence Radiation Laboratory, California, \$2,000,000.

Project 60-g-5, 10 Mev tandem Van de Graaff accelerator, Oak Ridge, Tennessee, \$2,400,000.

(h) BIOLOGY AND MEDICINE.—

Project 60-h-1, installations for support of biomedical research projects in atomic energy, \$3,000,000.

(i) ISOTOPES DEVELOPMENT.—

Project 60-i-1, high-level radiation development laboratory, \$1,600,000.

Project 60-i-2, radioisotope process development laboratory, \$1,500,000.

(j) ISOTOPES DEVELOPMENT.—

Project 60-j-1, radioisotope production area expansion and modification, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Tennessee, \$300,000.

(k) COMMUNITY.—

Project 60-k-1, high school additions, Los Alamos, New Mexico, \$485,000.

Project 60-k-2, real estate development, Los Alamos, New Mexico, \$240,000.

Project 60-k-3, housing alterations, Los Alamos, New Mexico, \$1,000,000.

(l) GENERAL PLANT PROJECTS.—\$30,882,000.

SEC. 102. LIMITATIONS.—(a) The Commission is authorized to start any project set forth in subsections 101 (a), (c), (e), (g), (h), and (i) only if the currently estimated cost of that project does not exceed by more than 25 per centum the estimated cost set forth for that project.

(b) The Commission is authorized to start any project set forth in subsections 101 (b),

(d), (f), (j), and (k) only if the currently estimated cost of that project does not exceed by more than 10 per centum the estimated cost set forth for that project.

(c) The Commission is authorized to start a project under subsection 101(1) only if it is in accordance with the following:

1. For community operations, the maximum currently estimated cost of any project shall be \$100,000 and the maximum currently estimated cost of any building included in such project shall be \$10,000.

2. For all other programs, the maximum currently estimated cost of any project shall be \$500,000 and the maximum currently estimated cost of any building included in such a project shall be \$100,000.

3. The total cost of all projects undertaken under subsection 101(1) shall not exceed the estimated cost set forth in that subsection by more than 10 per centum.

SEC. 103. ADVANCE PLANNING AND DESIGN.—

There are hereby authorized to be appropriated funds for advance planning, construction design, and architectural services, in connection with projects which are not otherwise authorized by law, and the Atomic Energy Commission is authorized to use funds currently or otherwise available to it for such purposes.

SEC. 104. RESTORATION OR REPLACEMENT.—

There are hereby authorized to be appropriated funds necessary to restore or to replace plants or facilities destroyed or otherwise seriously damaged, and the Atomic Energy Commission is authorized to use funds currently or otherwise available to it for such purposes.

SEC. 105. CURRENTLY AVAILABLE FUNDS.—

In addition to the sums authorized to be appropriated to the Atomic Energy Commission by section 101 of this Act, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Atomic Energy Commission to accomplish the purposes of this Act such sums of money as may be currently available to the Atomic Energy Commission.

SEC. 106. SUBSTITUTIONS.—Funds authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used to start any other new project for which an estimate was not included in this Act if it be a substitute for a project or portion of a project authorized in subsections 101(a), 101(b), 101(c), and 101(d) and the estimated cost thereof is within the limit of cost of the project for which substitution is to be made, and the Commission certifies that—

(a) the project is essential to the common defense and security; and

(b) the new project is required by changes in weapon characteristics or weapon logistic operations; and

(c) it is unable to enter into a contract with any person, including a licensee, on terms satisfactory to the Commission to furnish from a privately owned plant or facility the product or services to be provided in the new project.

SEC. 107. AMENDMENT OF PRIOR-YEAR PROJECTS.—Section 101 of Public Law 85-590 is amended as follows:

(a) By striking therefrom "Project 59-d-10, gas-cooled power reactor, \$51,000,000" and substituting therefor "Project 59-d-10, flexible experimental prototype gas-cooled reactor, \$30,000,000."

(b) By striking therefrom "Project 59-e-11, high flux research reactor, Brookhaven National Laboratory, design, engineering and advance procurement, \$1,000,000" and substituting therefor "Project 59-e-11, high flux research reactor, Brookhaven National Laboratory, \$10,000,000."

(c) By striking therefrom "Project 59-d-12, design and engineering study of heavy water moderated power reactor, \$2,500,000" and substituting therefor "Project 59-d-12, design and development, heavy water moderated power reactor, \$4,500,000."

SEC. 108. PROJECT RESCISSIONS.—(a) Public Law 85-162 is amended by rescinding therefrom authorization for a project, except for funds heretofore obligated, as follows: Project 58-e-12, liquid metal fuel reactor experiment (LMFRE), \$17,500,000.

(b) Public Law 506, Eighty-fourth Congress, as amended, is further amended by rescinding therefrom authorization for a project, except for funds heretofore obligated, as follows:

Project 57-d-3, forty-eight-inch heavy particle cyclotron, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, \$459,000.

SEC. 109. COOPERATION WITH EUROPEAN ATOMIC ENERGY COMMUNITY.—

There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Atomic Energy Commission, in accordance with the provisions of section 261 a. (2) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, the sum of \$7,000,000, in addition to the sum of \$3,000,000 previously authorized under section 3 of Public Law 85-846, which shall be available for carrying out the purposes of section 3 of Public Law 85-846, providing for cooperation with the European Atomic Energy Community.

SEC. 110. COOPERATIVE POWER REACTOR DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM.—

(a) Section 111 of Public Law 85-162, as amended, is further amended by striking out the figures "\$155,113,000" and "\$175,113,000" in subsection (a), and inserting in lieu thereof the figures "\$135,113,000" and "\$155,113,000", and by striking out the figure "\$2,750,000" in clause (2) of subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof the figure "\$3,600,000"; by striking out the date "June 30, 1959" in clause (3) of subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof the date "June 30, 1960".

(b) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Atomic Energy Commission, under the terms and conditions of section 111 of Public Law 85-162, as amended, the sum of \$55,500,000 for use in a program not to exceed \$65,500,000, to be available for the Commission's cooperative power reactor demonstration program. Without regard to the provisions of clause (3) of subsection (a) of section 111 of Public Law 85-162, no funds or waiver of use charges authorized by this subsection shall be available on projects already approved under the power demonstration reactor program or on other nuclear power projects already under construction. In connection with such program, the Commission is authorized to waive its charges for the use of special nuclear materials and heavy water for research and development and for a period of not more than five years after initial criticality of the reactor.

(c) Funds appropriated to the Commission pursuant to the authorization contained in subsection (b) of this section shall be available to the Commission for the purpose of supplementing its Third Round power reactor demonstration program to include financial assistance to public and private organizations for research and development in connection with the design, construction, and operation of power reactor prototypes based on established reactor technology. The Commission shall consider, but not be limited to the following types:

(1) One such plant may be a boiling water prototype reactor in the size range from 50,000 KWE to 100,000 KWE, and

(2) One such plant may be a prototype reactor in the intermediate size range.

Under this subsection, and without regard to subsection (f) of section 111 of Public Law 85-162, the Commission is authorized to use funds, not to exceed \$5,000,000 in the aggregate, to provide research and development assistance in support of unsolicited proposals from the utility industry to construct nuclear powerplants.

(d) Funds appropriated to the Commission pursuant to the authorization con-

tained in subsection (b) of this section shall be available to the Commission for the purpose of reinstituting and supplementing the Second Round of its power reactor demonstration program to provide for the development, design, construction and operation of two reactor prototypes in accordance with subsection 111(a)(1) of Public Law 85-162 and which shall be based on established reactor technology. There are also authorized to be appropriated such additional funds as may be necessary for the operation of such reactor prototypes, as provided in subsection 111(a)(1) of Public Law 85-162. The Commission shall consider, but not be limited to the following types:

(1) One such reactor prototype may be a small power reactor which will be designed to make a significant contribution to the achievement of economical power in a small size nuclear powerplant; and

(2) One such reactor prototype may be in the intermediate size range.

(e) In the event the Commission solicits proposals for any prototype under subsection (c) or (d) of this section, but no satisfactory proposal is received, the Commission may, if the project is still deemed desirable, proceed with design, construction, and operation of such prototype at a Commission installation and funds authorized by subsection (b) shall be available for the purposes of this subsection (e).

(f) Funds appropriated to the Commission, pursuant to the authorization contained in subsection (b) of this section, and authorized for the Third Round of the Commission's power reactor demonstration program shall be available to the Commission for use in a cooperative arrangement to provide financial assistance for research and development in connection with the design, construction, and operation of an advanced, high temperature gas-cooled experimental power reactor in accordance with the basis for an arrangement described in the program justification data submitted by the Commission in support of its authorization proposal for fiscal year 1960: *Provided*, That, in the event the parties enter into such a cooperative arrangement and proceed with research and development and there is a unilateral abandonment of the research and development or of the construction of the plant for reasons other than (a) a contract amendment under which the Atomic Energy Commission approves such abandonment, or (b) causes beyond the control of the contracting parties and without their fault or negligence (including inability to obtain necessary licenses or regulatory approvals or adequate liability insurance coverage), the Commission shall be reimbursed by the party abandoning the project for its expenditures for research and development under the arrangement except to the extent that the Commission determines that any such expenditures have resulted in the acquisition by the Government of property, patents, or other value.

SEC. 111. The Commission is authorized to enter into cooperative arrangements with any person or persons for participation in the development, construction, and operation of the experimental low-temperature process heat reactor authorized under project 60-e-14 of section 101(e) of this Act, and the utilization of the steam generated by the reactor plant. Under such arrangements—

(1) the Commission is authorized to obtain the participation of such person or persons to the fullest extent consistent with the Commission's direction of the project and ownership of the reactor;

(2) the reactor plant may be constructed upon a site provided by a participating party with or without compensation;

(3) the reactor plant shall be operated by, or under contract with, the Commission, for such period of time as the Commission determines to be advisable for research and development purposes and for such additional period as the Commission may determine to be necessary in the best interest of the Government. Upon the expiration of such period, the Commission may offer the reactor plant and its appurtenances for sale to a participating party or parties at a price to reflect appropriate depreciation, but not to include construction costs assignable to research and development, or the Commission may dismantle the reactor plant and its appurtenances.

(4) the Commission may sell steam to a participating party at rates based upon the present cost of, or the projected cost of, comparable steam from a plant using conventional fuels at the reactor location.

(5) any steam sold shall be used for industrial, manufacturing or other commercial purposes, or for research and development related thereto, but shall not be used for the generation of electric power for sale. The participating party or parties shall provide facilities required for such utilization of the steam generated by the nuclear plant.

SEC. 112. In the event the Commission constructs a power reactor under the authorization of project 60-e-15 of section 101 or subsection 110(e) of this Act at an installation operated by or on behalf of the Commission—

(a) the electric energy generated may be used by the Commission in connection with the operation of such installation and the Commission is authorized to make necessary adjustments in its contract with the power supplier at such installation to provide for the interchange of reactor generated power into the transmission system of the supplier;

(b) the Commission is authorized to obtain the participation of private, cooperative, or public organizations to the fullest extent consistent with the Commission's direction of the project, ownership of the reactor, and utilization of the electric energy generated; and

(c) the power reactor constructed shall be operated by, or under contract with, the Commission, for such period of time as the Commission determines to be advisable for research and development purposes and for such additional period as the Commission may determine to be necessary in the best interest of the Government. Upon the expiration of such period the Commission may offer the reactor and its appurtenances for sale to any public, private or cooperative power organization at a price to reflect appropriate depreciation but not to include construction costs assignable to research and development, or the Commission may dismantle the reactor and its appurtenances.

SEC. 113. DESIGN AND ENGINEERING STUDIES.—The Commission shall proceed with design and engineering studies to include, but not be limited to, the following:

(a) prototype reactor for nuclear tankers;

(b) reactor for remote military installations; and

(c) other reactor types.

The Commission shall submit reports on the studies under (a) and (b) of this section to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy by April 1, 1960.

SEC. 114. Subsection 153(h) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, is amended by striking out the date "September 1, 1959" and inserting in lieu thereof the date "September 1, 1964".

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.



The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the call of the roll be rescinded.

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

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, Senate bill 2094 authorizes appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission for the fiscal year 1960 program. The bill has been reported unanimously by all members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, both the Senate and the House Members, on both sides of the aisle. The bill is scheduled to be considered in the House today.

Section 101 of the bill authorizes \$165,400,000 for construction at AEC plants. The bill follows the format of authorization acts for prior fiscal years, in that it lists each project authorized as a line item, under subparagraphs entitled "Special nuclear materials," "Atomic weapons," "Reactor development," "Physical research," "Biology and medicine," "Isotopes development," "Community," and "General plant projects." The bill covers construction and improvements for our entire atomic energy program, both military and peaceful uses.

The Joint Committee, and its Subcommittee on Legislation, held extensive hearings on this bill, and on each project included in the bill. The Joint Committee approved every project requested by the AEC. In addition, the committee concluded that the program could be improved by the addition of funds in certain areas. Therefore, the Joint Committee increased the funds for the biology and medicine program—project 60-h-1, on page 5 of the bill—for new construction projects to increase research into the effects of fallout. In addition, the Joint Committee added three new projects under reactor development and two new projects under physical research; and I should like to briefly summarize them:

Project 60-e-11, the first project added by the Joint Committee, authorizes a natural-circulation test plant at the National Reactor Testing Station, in Idaho, for \$18,500,000. Admiral Rickover requested this project, and the hearings developed that it was only a matter of timing within the Commission and the Bureau of the Budget, and that the project would be requested next year, in any event. Admiral Rickover believes that we could save some time and get started sooner if this project could be authorized this year. The project would be a land-based prototype for research to simplify and advance our nuclear-submarine propulsion plants by the elimination of many pumps and valves, and thus make possible lighter and cheaper submarine plants for the future. After hearings on the evidence, the Joint Committee concluded that this project should be added in this year's bill, in order that Admiral Rickover may go forward as soon as possible with this important new development.

Project 60-e-12, also added by the Joint Committee, authorizes \$5 million for alterations to the Shippingport reactor facilities. As indicated in the

committee report, at the top of page 9, this authorization is contingent upon corresponding action by the Duquesne Power & Light Co. to provide an increase in the necessary turbogenerating facilities, at an estimated cost of approximately \$15 million, to it. If the Duquesne Power & Light Co. takes this action, and if the Congress authorizes this \$5 million project, the output of the Shippingport reactor would be increased from 100,000 electrical kilowatts, currently scheduled under the second core, to 150,000 electrical kilowatts. The Joint Committee believes that the information thus obtained from operation at full power output could be of great value to the overall civilian power-development program.

Project 60-e-15, also added by the Joint Committee, is for a power reactor of advanced design, capable of utilizing nuclear superheat, to be undertaken either as a cooperative project or conducted solely by the AEC, at an estimated cost of \$11 million. As indicated in the committee report, at pages 9 to 10, the committee believes this an important type of development for more effort in our reactor-development program. This project may be undertaken either as a cooperative project or conducted solely by the AEC, and it is intended that the Commission shall exercise its best judgment in its determinations as to the technical feasibility of the project and in the selection of the location of the reactor, the contractors, and the type of arrangement.

The two physical research projects added by the Joint Committee are projects 60-g-4 and 60-g-5, listed on page 5 of the bill. The two projects are described on pages 17 and 18 of the Committee report. As indicated there, project 60-g-4, physics building, Lawrence Radiation Laboratory, Calif., \$2 million is needed for office space, laboratory area, and special research facilities to accommodate the activities of 200 to 250 scientific personnel. Project 60-g-5, is for a 10 Mev tandem Van de Graaff accelerator at Oak Ridge, Tenn., at an estimated cost of \$2,400,000. As stated in the committee report, there is a pressing need by scientists at Oak Ridge for this equipment in order to continue their research into the structure and interaction of atomic particles at high-energy levels. Also, as mentioned in the committee report at page 19, the President has recently requested authorization of \$105 million for construction of a 2-mile linear electron accelerator near Stanford University, California. The committee was unable to include this project in this bill, because it needed time to obtain more information, but we hope to hold hearings on it in July.

Other sections of the bill are fully discussed and analyzed in the Committee report, which is available to all Members of the Senate, together with the hearings, which are 696 pages in length, and are entitled "AEC Authorizing Legislation, Fiscal Year 1960." I might, before closing, mention particularly two other sections of the bill—section 109, pertaining to cooperation with Euratom, and section 110, pertaining to the coop-

erative power reactor demonstration program.

Section 109 of the bill authorizes the appropriation of \$7 million, in addition to the \$3 million authorized last year, which shall be available for the Euratom research and development program. The Joint Committee did not recommend the full additional amount of \$14 million requested by the Commission, but felt that \$7 million would be adequate at this time. The reasons for the Joint Committee action are set forth fully in the Committee report at pages 14-16. The report discusses the developments within the last year, and the fact that the program has not gone forward as rapidly as its supporters had hoped that it would. It then mentions the timetable for approval of projects by the Joint Board; and, at page 16, the report states as follows:

Under this timetable, therefore, the Joint Committee and the Congress must review the Euratom program again early in calendar year 1960. Under these circumstances the Joint Committee felt it appropriate that only \$7 million research and development assistance be authorized at this time for the general research and development program, and that more funds could be requested and considered at the time the specific reactor projects are submitted to the Joint Committee in January or February.

In the meantime the Joint Committee hopes that the Euratom program will go forward rapidly and continue to gain momentum.

Section 110 of the bill pertains to the cooperative power reactor demonstration program. It reduces by \$20 million amounts previously authorized for the program, and it provides a new authorization of \$55,500,000 for this year's program, together with a \$10 million authorization for waiver of charges for the use of nuclear fuels and heavy water.

After reviewing the current status of the atomic power program, the Joint Committee recommended increasing the funds by \$16 million above the amount requested by the Commission. This includes authorization of an additional reactor under the Second Round and one under the Third Round. The Joint Committee did not authorize the funds for use in the construction grant concept requested by the Commission. As indicated at pages 12 to 13 of the committee report, the Joint Committee considered various alternatives, and decided that the matter needed more study and review, and might be reconsidered next year.

In subsection 110(f), the Joint Committee also authorized research and development assistance in connection with the design, construction, and operation of an advanced, high-temperature gas-cooled experimental power reactor. According to the basis of an arrangement already submitted to the Joint Committee, this is the proposal of the General Dynamics-Philadelphia Electric Co., and some 52 other participating privately owned utilities. After reviewing this matter carefully, the Joint Committee decided to add a proviso, found on the bottom of page 13 and at the top of page 14 of the bill, to the effect that if the private parties should unilaterally aban-

don the project, for reasons other than a contract amendment approved by AEC, or causes beyond their control, the Commission shall be reimbursed by the party abandoning the project for its expenditures for research and development.

After careful consideration, the Joint Committee decided that the abandoning party should be entitled to an offset to the extent that the expenditures have resulted in the acquisition by the Government of property, patents, or other value. With the addition of this proviso, the Joint Committee believes that the public interest will be better protected in providing the research and development funds for this project, and that the proviso should encourage the party to go forward and definitely construct the reactor. It is a promising type of reactor, in my opinion, and I hope that construction will go forward, but the public interest should be protected in the event private parties should decide to abandon the project, and therefore, the Joint Committee added the proviso.

Finally, it should be mentioned that section 113 provides for certain design and engineering studies considered important by the Joint Committee and for reports on certain of these studies to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy by April 1, 1960.

The final section of the bill, section 114, amends subsection 153(h) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, by extending the so-called compulsory licensing provision of the basic Atomic Energy Act for another 5 years, from September 1, 1959, to September 1, 1964. The Commission has requested this extension, and the Joint Committee has held hearings on the subject and believes it should be included in this bill. Other amendments to the patent provision in the Atomic Energy Act are still pending before the Joint Committee, and it is intended that these amendments will be considered further and action taken on them at a later date. However, because of the proximity of the September 1, 1959, date, the Joint Committee believed it advisable to include this part of the patent amendments in this bill. By extending the compulsory licensing provision for another 5 years, I believe the public interest will be better protected on providing opportunity to compel licensing of an atomic energy patent, under the conditions and safeguards of the act, if necessary to help advance the program. Because of the huge investment of the taxpayers, I believe that this provision is a desirable one to have for another 5-year period.

Mr. President, I have summarized briefly some of the more important sections and provisions in this bill. All of the remaining provisions are thoroughly discussed and analyzed in the committee report, and further information is contained in the hearings, which I have mentioned, and which are 696 pages in length.

There are four minor committee amendments to the bill as listed on page 1 of the committee report. These amendments are technical in nature, are supported by all members of the Committee, are explained further in the re-

port, and have either been requested by, or are acceptable to, the AEC.

Mr. President, when I introduced the AEC authorization proposal by request on February 26, 1959 (S. 1194) I indicated that I had some reservations as to its adequacy. I believe the bill before the Senate is a considerable improvement. Whether it is sufficient to keep us in the atomic power race with the British and the Soviets is a difficult question. I hope it will. It certainly gives the AEC, under Chairman McCone, considerable flexibility within established limitations to proceed with a forward-looking program.

I am happy that all members of the committee could find agreement on the bill this year, and I hope that the Commission will go forward in a spirit of co-operation, and with some vigor and enthusiasm, to carry out the provisions of this bill and provide our country a dynamic atomic energy program.

Mr. President, I urge all members of the Senate to support the bill, with the minor amendments approved by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the minor amendments, which have been submitted and are covered in the report, be agreed to en bloc, if that is satisfactory to the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New Mexico? The Chair hears none, and without objection the committee amendments are agreed to en bloc.

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

Mr. ANDERSON. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. I wish to congratulate the able Senator from New Mexico upon the cool-headed, temperate, but effective leadership he has provided for the Joint Committee in this year, 1959. The bill which was reported without opposition is a significant stride into the future. As the Senator knows, the bill does not go quite so far or so rapidly as I would prefer, but it is, I repeat, a significant stride and one in which the able chairman of the Joint Committee can justifiably take pride.

Mr. ANDERSON. I thank the distinguished Senator from Tennessee. I only wish to say to the Senator that, as he well knows, the bill was reported as a result of 2 months of hard work.

I would praise the vice chairman, Mr. DURHAM, the able Representative from California, Mr. HOLIFIELD, chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. PRICE, Mr. VAN ZANDT and other House Members for their great part in regard to the bill. These members of the Joint Committee, concerned about the proposed legislation stayed steadfastly at their tasks.

I wish to say that the Senator from Tennessee has stated what is typical of what has been going on in the committee. We have been trying hard to reach an agreement. We have constantly attempted to see if it were not possible for the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission and the members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy to find themselves in general agreement.

I wish to pay tribute to the members of the Joint Committee, but I certainly wish to pay tribute also to the members of the Atomic Energy Commission and most particularly to its chairman, Mr. McCone, for the very fine fashion in which the Commission has handled its end of this work. At all times Mr. McCone has been anxious to try to find a meeting place. I am glad that the effort on his part found a response among the members of the Joint Committee, including the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] who would have gone farther than we went in the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I feel that the bill, S. 2094, to authorize appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission for the fiscal year 1960 program, should be supported.

The distinguished chairman of the committee, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], has already explained the principal provisions of the bill, and the committee report further describes and analyzes the individual projects and each section of the bill. I am happy to say that Members on this side of the aisle fully support the bill in the form recommended by the Joint Committee.

Although we may have some reservations about a few provisions in the bill, and had hope that certain types of authority requested by the Commission might have been included, the different points of view among our Members were thoroughly discussed within the committee, and a compromise reached. We support the bill in the form recommended by the committee, with the minor amendments recommended by the committee.

Mr. President, there are in the bill a number of projects which were added by the Joint Committee and which were not in the budget estimates, which I personally, at the outset, thought were not essential at this time. However, considering all the factors involved, and the discussions which were had; considering the fact that these items in the bill, which were not included in the budget estimates, are desirable, whether or not they are essential; I and other members of the committee who felt that way finally decided we would go along with the bill as it is now reported. I want to make clear, Mr. President, that the items which exceed the requests and were not included in the budget estimates are in my opinion desirable—at least eventually—for aggressive development of the atomic energy program. The objection which was raised was that those items were not included in the budget estimates and were not requested at this time.

Mr. President, the committee report at pages 17 to 19 urges full support of the other programs authorized by the Congress last year which have not yet been fully funded, and we also hope for consideration of the Stanford accelerator project, as requested by the President, as soon as possible at this session.

Mr. President, in view of the detailed hearings by the Joint Committee, which



have been printed, and its Subcommittee on Legislation, the unanimous support of all members of the committee, and the detailed explanation by the Senator from New Mexico, I urge my colleagues to approve S. 2094, together with the minor amendments approved by the Joint Committee.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I desire to say that the statement made by the able Senator from Iowa is typical of the way we have had help throughout the entire consideration of this bill.

Mr. President, there were two new members of the committee this year, the able Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and the able Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT]. Those Senators should be praised for their constant attendance at the sessions of the Joint Committee and their attempts to make sure they made their greatest possible contribution. I would not want the Record to be closed without complimenting the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] and those on his side of the aisle, who worked so hard to have a good bill reported.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill 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, and the question is, Shall it pass? [Putting the question.]

The bill (S. 2094) was passed.

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may suggest the absence of a quorum without losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Connecticut? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DODD in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

#### NOMINATION OF LEWIS L. STRAUSS TO BE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the nomination of Lewis L. Strauss to be Secretary of Commerce.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Lewis L. Strauss to be Secretary of Commerce?

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I rise in support of the confirmation of the nomination of Lewis L. Strauss to be Secretary of Commerce.

My remarks this afternoon will be largely confined to what I call his performance in life, and particularly his performance in public life.

As I reviewed the record of the hearings upon his nomination which were conducted by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, my heart grew heavy. Slander based on double or triple hearsay was given free rein to besmirch the name of a man who has served his country faithfully and well in posts of great responsibility.

The ordeal of Lewis Strauss has ominous and tragic implications for the future of the United States.

In these difficult and dangerous times, when this Nation and the free world face great and growing challenges from the Communist bloc, we need men of his character, courage, ability, and patriotism to serve in the Government of the United States.

But the campaign of character assassination against Admiral Strauss inevitably will make it extremely difficult to recruit outstanding and successful men for public service.

What man of normal sensitivity would wish to expose himself to the kind of deliberate persecution and defamation which Lewis Strauss has endured.

I say to the Senate that it will bring disgrace upon itself if it permits such tactics to succeed. Irreparable damage to the reputation of the Senate as an institution will result if his nomination is not confirmed by a substantial majority.

I have known and admired Admiral Strauss for 25 years. Few men have made such a distinguished record, both in business and public life.

It is an impressive record of performance. Lewis Strauss has served in posts of great responsibility during the administrations of four Presidents; namely, Woodrow Wilson, Franklin D. Roosevelt, Harry Truman, and Dwight Eisenhower. Could such a record of distinguished public service have been made by an enemy of the people, as Lewis Strauss has been called on the Senate floor?

Mr. President, we in the Senate pride ourselves on the freedom of speech we enjoy in this Chamber, but I was shocked when the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], in effect called Lewis Strauss a traitor. For calling a man an enemy of the people is equivalent to accusing him of treason.

When freedom of speech is so abused it becomes unbridled license, and I fear it reflects more discredit upon the speaker than upon the person who has been slandered. The performance of Secretary Strauss itself demolishes the statement of the distinguished Senator from Oregon.

Secretary Strauss' public service began during the Wilson administration when he was secretary to Herbert Hoover, then U.S. Food Administrator and Chairman of the Commission for the Relief of Bel-

gium. Mr. Hoover has known Lewis Strauss intimately for more than 42 years, and has seen many men perform in Government.

What is former President Hoover's appraisal of Lewis Strauss?

In a letter to the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, Mr. Hoover says of Lewis Strauss:

There has never been in our public service a man so unpolitical, so dedicated, and so able in his tasks, as to command such approvals and commendations upon the completion of every task assigned to him.

Could this be said of an enemy of the people of the United States? To ask the question emphasizes the contemptible nature of the language which has been applied to Secretary Strauss.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of Mr. Hoover's letter, which appears on pages 830 and 831 of the hearings may be printed in the Record at this point in my remarks.

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

NEW YORK, N.Y., May 9, 1959.

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON,  
Chairman, Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I believe it is my duty to present to the committee my knowledge of Secretary Lewis Strauss, whose confirmation is before your committee.

I have known Mr. Strauss intimately for more than 42 years—ever since he was 19 years of age. During most of my service under President Wilson, Mr. Strauss served as my secretary. He served in Washington during almost the entire period of American participation in World War I and in Paris during and after the peace negotiations. He won the respect and admiration of the men with whom he had need to deal during that time. President Wilson often spoke highly of him to me.

Upon the completion of this service, he entered business life in New York where he rose to a high position and respect in the business world from his ability and integrity. And during these years he took part in the direction of the great American enterprises in compassion by relief of famine and pestilence in many countries.

At the coming of the Second World War, he was called for active duty in the Department of the Navy in February 1941. He served for 4 years under President Roosevelt, and the following year under President Truman. His service in this period was so highly valued that he received the unique distinction for a civilian—the rank of rear admiral, an appointment which required the approval of President Truman and the Senate.

In October 1946 Mr. Strauss was called back into public service by President Truman as a member of the Atomic Energy Commission. To take on this assignment he sacrificed his high business positions. Upon his resignation in early 1950, he was publicly commended by the President for his service.

And in June 1953 he was again called into public service by President Eisenhower as Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission. He was confirmed by the Senate. He served the Commission until his completion of the statutory 5-year term. Upon completion of that work in 1958, he received the highest of public commendation by President Eisenhower and was awarded the Medal of Freedom. President Eisenhower's confidence in Mr. Strauss' abilities and integrity, after 5 years of association with him, is further attested by his appointment as Secretary of Commerce.

Here is a man who has served with unvarying commendation under both Democratic and Republican Presidents.

There has never been in our public service a man so unpolitical, so dedicated, and so able in his tasks, as to command such approval and commendations upon the completion of every task assigned to him.

I served 8 years as Secretary of Commerce. I can say without reservation that Lewis Strauss is the best man who could be selected for that position.

But over all other qualifications, he is a deeply religious man whose integrity is fixed in conscience and religious faith.

Your faithfully,

HERBERT HOOVER.

Mr. BUSH. Between the two World Wars, Lewis Strauss was associated with the New York investment firm of Kuhn, Loeb & Co. I will say with respect to that firm that for 60 or 70 years it has been one of the great banking firms. It had much to do with the early development of the West. It is a fine and distinguished firm, which has lent constructive aid to the development of the United States over a period of a great many decades.

Mr. President, it appears that some people believe that political gain can come from attacks upon Wall Street and by smears against persons who have worked in that financial center. As one who spent most of his business life in banking, I have experienced some of that myself since my entry into public life. Lewis Strauss has also endured the same kind of attack by smear and innuendo.

But I say, Mr. President, that honesty and integrity are indispensable requirements for success in banking. Millions of dollars may depend on a man's word given in a quick telephone conversation. In the years he spent in Wall Street Lewis Strauss' reputation for honesty and integrity was unquestioned. He could not have been a partner in the banking firm of Kuhn, Loeb, & Co. had it not been that his reputation for honesty and integrity was unquestioned at all times. It still is unquestioned.

Ten months before Pearl Harbor, Lewis Strauss was called to active duty as an officer in the U.S. Naval Reserve. He served throughout the war in posts of great responsibility, and participated in the development of the atomic bomb.

What was the Navy's judgment of his performance of duty as an officer of the Navy? Lewis Strauss was successively promoted through officer grades to the rank of rear admiral, being one of the first Naval Reserve officers to reach that rank.

The Navy awarded him the Distinguished Service Medal; and the Legion of Merit with Gold Star in lieu of a second award. The Army awarded him an Oak Leaf Cluster in lieu of a third award.

Surely, these decorations, not lightly awarded, bespeak volumes concerning the patriotic dedication and devotion to duty which marked Lewis Strauss' active service in World War II.

In 1946, Admiral Strauss was appointed a member of the first Atomic Energy Commission. What was his record of performance in that highly responsible post?

My immediate predecessor in the Senate was the late Brien McMahon, who served as the first chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and whose magnificent efforts in this whole field are well known to many Members of the Senate, especially to those who knew him personally.

There was a cordial relationship between Brien McMahon and Lewis Strauss. They worked closely together on matters of extreme importance to the national security, including the momentous decision, against determined opposition, to proceed with the development of the hydrogen bomb.

What was Brien McMahon's appraisal of Lewis Strauss' performance in this exacting assignment?

When Lewis Strauss retired from the AEC, in April 1950, Brien McMahon wrote him a letter in which appears this paragraph:

I regret to see you leave the Commission. Your service to the Commission and, hence, to the country has been invaluable. You are leaving the Commission a going concern, vigorous and alert. I bespeak the sentiments of the members of the Joint Committee when I say to you that we all hope you will consent to serve as a consultant to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. We will thus be able to avail ourselves of your advice, which is appreciated by every member of the committee, regardless of party.

Following his retirement from the AEC in 1950, Admiral Strauss served as adviser on several occasions to congressional and executive agencies studying and reporting on production and procurement problems for the Department of Defense.

Soon after President Eisenhower took office in 1953 Admiral Strauss was appointed a special assistant to the President and later in the same year became Chairman of the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission by appointment of the President, confirmed unanimously by the Senate.

What has been the President's appraisal of the performance of this man? In July 1958 President Eisenhower presented to Lewis Strauss the Medal of Freedom. He is 1 of only 15 persons whose achievements have been considered significant enough to merit this award, the highest civilian decoration our Government can bestow. The late John Foster Dulles was the most recent recipient, receiving the decoration for his untiring services in waging the peace as Secretary of State.

I can assure the Senate that this medal is not given to "enemies of the people."

Why did President Eisenhower award the Medal of Freedom to Admiral Strauss? Here is the citation which accompanied the medal:

To Lewis L. Strauss for exceptionally meritorious service in the interests of the security of the United States.

During a crucial period, he has provided leadership, resourcefulness, judgment, and courage equal to the immense demands and promise of the atomic age.

His direct contribution to the security of the United States and other free world nations has been outstanding. He was an effective supporter of the development of thermonuclear technology at a time when a less determined and imaginative course

might have resulted in severe damage to our security and that of the free world. He initiated a long-range detection system for atomic explosions which adds both to our safety and to our hopes for successful disarmament negotiations.

Equally significant has been his work in helping build the long-term security that comes of devoting the atom to works of peace. Under his guidance, peaceful use of atomic energy for power, research, healing, agriculture, and production has made remarkable progress. He has played a great part in bringing to reality the international scientific conference on peaceful uses, and the atoms for peace program, now being put into effect through the International Atomic Energy Agency.

Through his wisdom and foresight, his country enjoys greater security today and greater hopes for genuine peace in the years ahead. In recognition of his distinguished service, I take pleasure in awarding the Medal of Freedom to Lewis L. Strauss.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

During Admiral Strauss' tenure as Chairman of the AEC there were many significant advances in this Nation's atomic capabilities. Of them, I wish today to discuss briefly only one, the successful development of nuclear propulsion for naval ships.

Vice Adm. Hyman Rickover was the man who was directly in charge of the successful effort to develop the first nuclear powerplant, installed in the submarine *Nautilus*, the forerunner of a fleet of nuclear-propelled boats that are creating a revolution in naval warfare.

Admiral Rickover recently was presented a special gold medal for his achievements by our able colleague, the distinguished junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], on behalf of Congress. I am proud to say that I supported the bill which the junior Senator from New Mexico introduced for the purpose of creating this award for Admiral Rickover.

The able Senator has been one of the most vigorous of Secretary Strauss' opponents, but I think he would agree with me that Admiral Rickover is an outspoken, refreshingly candid man who does not hesitate to speak bluntly about his associates, if, in his judgment, they merit such speech, or to withhold praise if unmerited.

And what is Admiral Rickover's appraisal of Secretary Strauss' contributions to the development of nuclear propulsion?

Admiral Rickover has given his consent to my quoting on the Senate floor a letter he wrote to Lewis Strauss while aboard the U.S.S. *Skipjack* during her sea trials earlier this year. I will read the letter in its entirety for the information of the Senate. I have a photostatic copy of the letter before me. It reads:

U.S.S. "SKIPJACK" (SS(N) 585),

Care of Fleet Post Office,

New York, N.Y., at sea, submerged,

March 10, 1959.

DEAR MR. STRAUSS: We are returning to New London, Conn., from sea trials of the U.S.S. *Skipjack*, our first nuclear-powered, streamlined, single-screw attack submarine. The ship successfully met all her trials, surface and submerged, and attained the highest speed ever made by any submarine. We were at sea for 2 days during which the *Skipjack* steamed 192 nautical miles on the surface, and 510 miles submerged.



I am writing you because I know how interested you are and how much you always helped our program. I want you to know that your understanding and help were just as significant in creating this revolutionary submarine as the efforts of the designers and builders.

Respectfully,

H. G. RICKOVER.

I submit that Admiral Rickover would hardly have written such a letter to a man who could be fairly classified as an "enemy of the people" of the United States. Those of us who have observed the career of Admiral Rickover regard him as a highly critical man. He is very critical of inefficiency. He is very critical of poor performance. But here he finds himself writing to Admiral Strauss in the most commendatory way, and saying to him that he wants him to know that he, Admiral Rickover, feels that the help and understanding of Lewis L. Strauss were just as significant in creating this revolutionary submarine as were the efforts of the designers and builders of that submarine.

It is very significant to me that Admiral Rickover, who has worked so closely with Admiral Strauss, and whom our friend the Senator from New Mexico has sought to honor with a special congressional medal—and I was happy to join with him in that effort—should have such opposite views to those held by the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. President, I have referred to the opposition to Secretary Strauss which has been expressed by our distinguished colleague, the present Chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. It has pained me, as I know it has other Senators, that the able Senator's views are so adamantly held. It is not pleasant to differ with the Senator, for whom we all have the greatest respect for many reasons.

But I think it must be pointed out that the junior Senator from New Mexico is only one of five men who were chairmen of the Joint Committee during the time that Lewis Strauss served on the Atomic Energy Commission.

Against the Senators' charges that Mr. Strauss has failed to cooperate with him, the Joint Committee, and the Congress, must be weighed the appraisals of his work made by the other four chairmen.

I have already placed in the *Record*, a paragraph from a letter written by the first chairman, the late Senator Brien McMahon, in behalf of the Joint Committee, praising Mr. Strauss' service during his first term on the AEC and inviting him to become a consultant to the Joint Committee. Secretary Strauss was held in very high esteem by Senator McMahon, as I have already pointed out.

The second chairman was our colleague, Senator BOURKE HICKENLOOPER, who submitted a statement to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce testifying to the fine cooperation he received from Lewis Strauss, and who is supporting the nominee.

The third chairman, former Representative Sterling Cole, cabled Secretary Strauss on May 5, 1959, to confirm "existence cordial relationship with you as Chairman AEC and I, chairman Joint Committee."

The fourth chairman, Representative CARL T. DURHAM, offered to appear before the committee. Here I refer, of course, to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, which held the hearings on the nomination of Mr. Strauss. Representative DURHAM indicated that had his offer to appear before that committee been accepted, he would have testified to a cordial and cooperative relationship with Mr. Strauss for a period of more than 20 years.

It seems evident that the views of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] concerning Secretary Strauss have resulted from an unfortunate clash of personalities, the reasons for which are difficult to comprehend.

I shall not detain the Senate by reviewing all the other aspects of the reasons which have been advanced by opponents of Secretary Strauss during the hearings for denying confirmation of his appointment.

I have confined my remarks today to what I would call the performance of Secretary Strauss in posts of responsibility which have been entrusted to him by four Presidents of the United States in his long and wonderful career.

It is apparent that some of the reasons which have been advanced by the opponents of Secretary Strauss arise from differences in political philosophy.

Proponents of public power, for example, violently disagree with his view, which I, myself, share, that the development of commercially useful nuclear power can be best advanced by the participation of private industry.

Admiral Strauss, throughout his career, has demonstrated a zeal for security, a zeal for protecting this Nation's atomic secrets against espionage. He is accused by some of our friends who are opposed to him of being too secretive.

He has been accused of "vindictiveness" because while he was Chairman of the AEC the security clearance of Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer was withdrawn. I shall not review that sad unfortunate affair, except to note that Lewis Strauss was only one of nine persons whose official positions required them to pass on the revocation of the security clearance. And of the nine, seven decided that it should be withdrawn.

As to whether Admiral Strauss is a vindictive man, as he has been accused of being, eloquent testimony to the contrary has been given by the widow—now remarried—of the world-famous scientist, Dr. John von Neumann. In a letter to Chairman MAGNUSON, of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, Klara von Neumann-Eckhart expressed her "deep moral obligation to speak of those facts which are known to me first-hand to be true." I have the full text of the letter in my hand at this moment. These paragraphs are especially significant:

Admiral Strauss supported in every possible way the appointment of John von Neumann as the second scientific member of the Atomic Energy Commission. This after my late husband had appeared as a witness for the defense of Dr. Oppenheimer. Admiral Strauss respected and admired John's scientific knowledge and, by putting all personal controversies aside, proved his

sincere interest in the intellectual advancement of the United States.

John von Neumann was taken ill a few months after his appointment to the Atomic Energy Commission. During his long, fatal illness, Admiral Strauss made every possible effort to seek out his advice whenever it was medically permissible and later, when the end was nearing, Mr. Strauss spent many hours at his bedside, with no possible self-seeking interest, but with every sign of true compassion and friendship.

Perhaps my remarks have no bearing on the present hearings, but I do not believe that a man whose integrity and sincerity are questioned, could ever behave in the selfless, decent manner such as Mr. Strauss has manifested in the case of one of the scientists, John von Neumann.

I think that is about the finest piece of testimony we could possibly have with respect to this nomination.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the letter to which I have referred may be printed at this point in the *Record*.

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

LA JOLLA, CALIF., May 22, 1959.

Senator WARREN G. MAGNUSON,  
Chairman, Senate Interstate Commerce  
Committee,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MAGNUSON: Hoping that you will not consider this letter an imposition, I would like to be permitted to say here a few words in connection with the confirmation hearings for the Cabinet post of Secretary of Commerce of Adm. Lewis L. Strauss, which have been recently conducted by your committee.

I am the widow of the late John von Neumann, who died in 1957 while serving as one of the scientific members of the Atomic Energy Commission under the chairmanship of Admiral Strauss. I strongly believe that had he lived, John von Neumann, a respected and well-known member of the scientific community, would have asked to be permitted to appear as a witness for Admiral Strauss at the present hearings. I realize that I have no right to quote a man's views who cannot speak for himself anymore, but I feel a deep moral obligation to speak of those facts which are known by me first hand to be true.

Admiral Strauss supported in every possible way the appointment of John von Neumann as the second scientific member of the Atomic Energy Commission. This after my late husband had appeared as a witness for the defense of Dr. Oppenheimer. Admiral Strauss respected and admired John's scientific knowledge and, by putting all personal controversies aside, proved his sincere interest in the intellectual advancement of the United States.

John von Neumann was taken ill a few months after his appointment to the Atomic Energy Commission. During his long, fatal illness, Admiral Strauss made every possible effort to seek out his advice whenever it was medically permissible and later, when the end was nearing, Mr. Strauss spent many hours at his bedside, with no possible self-seeking interest, but with every sign of true compassion and friendship.

Perhaps my remarks have no bearing on the present hearings, but I do not believe that a man whose integrity and sincerity are questioned, could ever behave in the selfless, decent manner such as Mr. Strauss has manifested in the case of one of the scientists, John von Neumann.

Sincerely yours,

KLARA VON NEUMANN-ECKHART.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, one of the scientists who appeared against Secre-

tary Strauss charged that he was too security-conscious.

Lewis Strauss' reply appears on page 861 of the record of the hearings. He said:

Gentlemen, I confess to that charge. I do not know how one can be too security-conscious where the security and well-being of the Nation can easily rest on violations of security. I do not underestimate the interest of the Russians in our scientific programs nor the degree of zeal with which they have pursued our secrets to supplement their own intensive scientific program.

I do not for one moment doubt that the Soviets would cruelly use any advantage they might gain from stolen secrets to threaten, to bully, to even destroy our country.

If such an attitude makes Lewis Strauss an "enemy of the people," it is a label many men would be proud to wear.

I say to the Senate that if Admiral Strauss has been wrong in his judgment on certain issues involved in the field of security, he erred on the side of the United States. For this, he should be commended rather than condemned. He has erred on the right side, if at all.

In summary, Mr. President, the nomination should be confirmed in refutation of the slanders which have been spread about Lewis Strauss.

It should be confirmed in vindication of the Senate's own reputation for fairness and objective judgment.

It should be confirmed to place the Senate's stamp of approval on a man whose record of effective patriotism and public service, over a period of 40 years, has had few, if any, equals.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have listened with great interest to most of the speech which has just been made by the Senator from Connecticut. As the Senator from Connecticut knows, I have a very high regard for his sincerity of purpose on all issues which he discusses in the U.S. Senate.

Later this week, I shall speak at some length in opposition to the Strauss nomination, and the subject of my speech will be: "An Enemy of the People."

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I listened to that statement by the Senator from Oregon with very deep regret. I ask the Senator to reconsider it very closely before he gives such a title to his speech. I think this is one of the most tragic things which has happened in the Senate since I have been a Member. I regret very deeply that the Senator from Oregon intends to pursue that subject. I hope he will be willing to let it drop.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, when I consider a man to be so lacking in character that I believe, under the advice and consent clause of the Constitution I must oppose him, I must do so on the basis that I think such a man is truly an enemy of the people.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the

amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 5915) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for other purposes, and that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 34 to the bill, and concurred therein with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 6596) to encourage and stimulate the production and conservation of coal in the United States through research and development by creating a Coal Research and Development Commission, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

#### HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 6596) to encourage and stimulate the production and conservation of coal in the United States through research and development by creating a Coal Research and Development Commission, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Moss in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

#### NATIONAL SEASHORE PARKS

As in legislative session,

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on March 25, I was pleased to accept an invitation of my colleague to be a cosponsor of Senate bill 1526, to establish the Oregon Dunes National Seashore Park, in the State of Oregon, and for other purposes.

Mr. President, I am very much pleased to be a cosponsor of the bill. I believe in its long-term objectives.

I think it is important that we preserve for future generations areas along our coastlines in the United States which will assure access to the ocean by the general public. I think we can do so by way of a series of Federal parks and State parks and in some instances municipal parks, without doing irreparable harm to local economic interests. In fact, I think the establishment of such parks will prove to be of economic benefit to the areas where located, because those parks can be great recreation attractions to thousands of tourists who will visit them each year.

Mr. President, I am a firm believer, as I am sure my colleague is, in the right of the people to petition their Government and to have an opportunity to present their objections to any proposed piece of legislation.

I have received a great deal of mail from my State raising objections to our bill, S. 1526.

Mr. President, a similar bill was introduced in the House of Representatives on April 10 by Representative PORTER. For the purpose of this brief discussion, I ask unanimous consent that S. 1526 and H.R. 6260 be printed at this point in my remarks.

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

S. 1526

A bill to establish the Oregon Dunes National Seashore in the State of Oregon, and for other purposes

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That, in order to preserve for the benefit, inspiration, and use of the public certain unspoiled shoreline in the State of Oregon which possesses scenic, scientific, and recreation values of national importance, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized, as provided herein, to establish the Oregon Dunes National Seashore.

Sec. 2. The Secretary of the Interior may designate for inclusion in the Oregon Dunes National Seashore not to exceed thirty-five thousand acres of land and such adjoining waters and submerged lands as he finds are required for the national seashore. Lands designated pursuant to this section shall consist of not more than thirty-four thousand six hundred and sixty acres, referred to as Oregon Dunes, and lying between the Sluslaw and Umpqua Rivers in Lane and Douglas Counties; and not more than three hundred and forty acres, referred to as Sea Lion Caves, in Lane County, lying approximately seven and one-half miles north of the Sluslaw River.

Sec. 3. (a) Within the exterior boundaries designated by him, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to procure, set aside, and develop in such manner as he finds to be in the public interest, the land and waters, or interests therein, that he considers necessary to assure adequate preservation and public use of such areas in furtherance of the purposes of this Act. The Secretary may procure said land and water, or interests therein, by donation or by purchase with donated or appropriated funds, and such authority to purchase with donated or appropriated funds shall include authority to condemn under the provisions of the Act of August 1, 1888: *Provided*, That land owned by the State or its political subdivision within the boundaries selected by the Secretary may be procured only with the concurrence of the State or political subdivisions. Any Federal land within the boundaries selected by the Secretary shall be transferred to the Department of the Interior for administration as a part of the national seashore: *Provided further*, That the Federal Government or agency having administration over such land shall agree in advance to such transfer.

(b) When the Secretary finds that land has been procured by the United States in sufficient quantity to afford an administrable unit, he shall declare the establishment of such national seashore by the publication of notice thereof in the Federal Register. Following such establishment, and subject to the aforesaid acreage limitation, the Secretary may continue to acquire lands for the national seashore as authorized in this Act.

(c) The administration, protection, and development of national seashores pursuant to this Act shall be exercised by the Secretary of the Interior, subject to the provisions of the Act of August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535; 16 U.S.C., 1952 edition, secs. 1-4), as amended and supplemented, relating to the national park system, and in accordance with other laws of general application relating to



that system as defined by the Act of August 8, 1953 (67 Stat. 496; 16 U.S.C., 1952 edition, Supp. V, sec. 1c), except that authority otherwise available to the Secretary of the Interior for the conservation and management of natural resources may be utilized to the extent he finds such authority will further the establishment and preservation of the national seashore.

SEC. 4. There are authorized to be appropriated such funds as may be required to carry out the purposes of this Act.

#### H.R. 6260

A bill to establish the Oregon Dunes National Seashore in the State of Oregon, and for other purposes

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That, in order to preserve for the benefit, inspiration, and use of the public certain unspoiled shoreline in the State of Oregon which possesses scenic, scientific, and recreation values of national importance, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized, as provided herein, to establish the Oregon Dunes National Seashore.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Interior may designate for inclusion in the Oregon Dunes National Seashore not to exceed thirty-five thousand acres of land and such adjoining waters and submerged lands as he finds are required for the National seashore. Lands designated pursuant to this section shall consist of not more than thirty-four thousand six hundred and sixty acres, referred to as Oregon Dunes, and lying between the Siuslaw and Umpqua Rivers in Lane and Douglas Counties; and not more than three hundred and forty acres, referred to as Sea Lion Caves, in Lane County, lying approximately seven and one-half miles north of the Siuslaw River.

SEC. 3. (a) Within the exterior boundaries designated by him, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to procure, set aside, and develop in such manner as he finds to be in the public interest, the land and waters, or interests therein, that he considers necessary to assure adequate preservation and public use of such areas in furtherance of the purposes of this Act. The Secretary may procure said land and water, or interests therein, by donation or by purchase with donated or appropriated funds, and such authority to purchase with donated or appropriated funds shall include authority to condemn under the provisions of the Act of August 1, 1888: *Provided*, That land owned by the State or its political subdivision within the boundaries selected by the Secretary may be procured only with the concurrence of the State or political subdivisions. Any Federal land within the boundaries selected by the Secretary shall be transferred to the Department of the Interior for administration as a part of the national seashore: *Provided further*, That the Federal department or agency having administration over such land shall agree in advance to such transfer.

(b) When the Secretary finds that land has been procured by the United States in sufficient quantity to afford an administrable unit, he shall declare the establishment of such national seashore by the publication of notice thereof in the Federal Register. Following such establishment, and subject to the aforesaid acreage limitation, the Secretary may continue to acquire lands for the national seashore as authorized in this Act.

(c) The administration, protection, and development of national seashores pursuant to this Act shall be exercised by the Secretary of the Interior, subject to the provisions of the Act of August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535;

16 U.S.C., 1952 edition, secs. 1-4), as amended and supplemented, relating to the national park system, and in accordance with other laws of general application relating to that system as defined by the Act of August 8, 1953 (67 Stat. 496; 16 U.S.C., 1952 edition, Supp. V, sec. 1c), except that authority otherwise available to the Secretary of the Interior for the conservation and management of natural resources may be utilized to the extent he finds such authority will further the establishment and preservation of the national seashore.

SEC. 4. There are authorized to be appropriated such funds as may be required to carry out the purposes of this Act.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that an article from the Eugene Register-Guard of April 10, 1959, dealing with Representative PORTER's position on this proposed legislation be printed in the RECORD.

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

#### PORTER ALTERS COAST DUNES PARK STAND

WASHINGTON.—Representative CHARLES O. PORTER said Friday that he has decided to introduce in the House of Representatives Friday a bill to authorize the Oregon Dunes National Seashore because "this is a beautiful area which should be preserved for recreation purposes."

This was somewhat of a change of heart for PORTER who earlier this week said that if he had his way, he'd prefer creating a national park on the Oregon Coast at a less populated segment south of the Oregon dunes.

"All Curry County could well be a national park," PORTER said last Tuesday.

PORTER's decision to sponsor the bill came after a conference Thursday with Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, who is sponsoring the bill in the Senate.

"It's a wonderful area," observed PORTER. "A park will bring many tourists in there. I'm very familiar with that area from my boyhood up."

But PORTER indicated he thought it would be another year or more before Congress could enact the bill. He said he wants House subcommittee hearings held in Oregon on the issue late this summer.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on May 14, 1959, I sent to the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the chairman of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, a letter calling attention to the fact that there was considerable protest against our bill on the part of the local interests. I suggested that a Senate committee hearing be conducted in Oregon so that the protestors would have a right to petition their Government and be heard. In the course of that letter, I stated:

A local hearing would enable the 600 or more people living in the area which would be affected, as well as other interested Oregon residents, to give the committee the benefit of their views on this bill without the necessity of coming to the seat of government in Washington 3,000 miles away. This would bring the Congress to the people, and would eliminate the substantial expense and travel time involved for the many individuals who would like to testify.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire letter I wrote to the Senator from Montana be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

MAY 14, 1959.

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY,  
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, U.S. Senate.

DEAR JIM: During the past several weeks I have had a substantial volume of correspondence from Oregon on the subject of the Oregon Dunes national seashore bill, S. 1526. Some who have written to me express favorable attitudes with respect to the proposal of this bill; others register strong opposition.

In view of this conflict of local opinion upon a legislative proposal which I was pleased to cosponsor as a courtesy to my colleague, Senator NEUBERGER, I believe it would be most helpful for all concerned if the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs were to schedule a hearing on S. 1526 at the earliest possible date, preferably one to be conducted at some central location in Lane County, Oregon.

A local hearing would enable the 600 or more people living in the area which would be affected, as well as other interested Oregon residents, to give the committee the benefit of their views on this bill without the necessity of coming to the seat of government in Washington 3,000 miles away. This would bring the Congress to the people, and would eliminate the substantial expense and travel time involved for the many individuals who would like to testify.

I urge that a local hearing, as herein suggested, be scheduled for the very near future in order that the committee may have a thorough briefing concerning the desires of individuals affected, both within and outside the project area covered by the bill.

With best personal regards.

Sincerely,

WAYNE MORSE.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that certain newspaper articles bearing upon this issue and bearing upon my request for a hearing be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the Coos Bay World, May 18, 1959]

#### DUNES PARK HEARINGS POSSIBLE—FIELD HEARINGS MAY BE DESIRABLE

WASHINGTON.—The Senate Public Lands subcommittee may hold hearings this fall at Reedsport or Florence, Ore., on a proposal to establish an Oregon Dunes national seashore park, Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER (Democrat, of Oregon), said today.

NEUBERGER said a final decision on a hearing would not be made until the Senate Interior Committee analyzes all national park proposals presently pending. But he said "field hearings may be desirable in view of local protests against the bill."

NEUBERGER said it was "significant" that Interior Secretary Fred Seaton has recently sent to the committee legislation proposing three seashore parks with an authorization of \$15 million to acquire the lands.

"It is my understanding that the Interior Department regards Oregon Dunes and Sea Lion Caves as one of the three most fitting areas for inclusion, although this remains to be amplified when hearings are held," Neuberger said.

[From the Eugene (Oreg.) Register-Guard, May 19, 1959]

#### DON'T RUSH 'EM

Senators MORSE and NEUBERGER both urge that hearings be held, in this area, on Sen-

ator NEWBERGER's proposal for a nationally established recreation area in the dunes area south of Florence. That way, they point out, the people most directly involved in the proposal would have a chance to make themselves heard.

By all means, let's have such hearings. But let us not rush too hastily into them. Let us first know more about the proposal which, to date, is a nebulous thing. The bill, sponsored by the two Senators, sets out only a general idea. Specific proposals should be at hand to give both proponents and opponents a chance to argue from the same set of facts—something they have not been doing in all the preliminary argument.

Hearings should follow, not precede, more detailed study by the National Park Service. It might be that after the hearings, Park Service plans will have to be modified. But before they are modified, they must be formulated.

[From the Siuslaw Car, Florence, Oreg., May 22, 1959]

#### HEARING SET ON PARK ISSUE

Local citizens and others who are opposed to the National Park Service absorbing some 35,000 acres of this area for a seaside park, were urged today to back the effort of Senator WAYNE MORSE to having a Senate committee hearing held in Florence.

The Oregon Senator has written to Chairman JAMES E. MURRAY, head of the Senate Committee on Internal and Insular Affairs, urging that a meeting be held in the very near future. He stated that he had a substantial volume of correspondence on the park proposal, registering strong opposition.

In his letter Senator MORSE stated, "A local hearing would enable the 600 or more people living in the area which would be affected as well as other interested Oregonians, to give the committee the benefit of their views on this bill without the necessity of coming to the seat of government in Washington 3,000 miles away."

Earlier in the week Senator R. L. NEUBERGER who introduced the bill, advocated that a meeting of a subcommittee be held sometime in the fall in Portland.

Spokesman for the Western Lane Taxpayers Association, the local organization which is objecting to the 35,000-acre tract being returned to wilderness said that it is very desirable that the Senate committee hold a hearing here and that those who favored the move write to Senator MORSE approving his stand.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, June 5, 1959]

#### IS IT NEEDED?

TO THE CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR:

The question in regard to the proposed National Sand Dunes Seashore south of Florence, Oreg., a story about which you carried on May 5, is: Is it needed?

Anyone with a knowledge of the geography of this area and with information about the ownership of the land involved would, we feel sure, decide it is not needed. It is not fair to sit at a distance and theorize that a park is always beneficial.

A glance at a map of this district shows that most of the proposed 35,000-acre tract is already in public ownership and is being developed for public use. To start with, the ocean beaches are owned by the State. Then the U. S. Forest Service has a wide strip parallel with the beaches extending inland about a mile and a half. Most of the sand dunes are on this land. The service has several good camping sites in wooded areas with more in the planning stage.

Also west of Highway 101 which runs north and south, is part of the 522-acre

Honeyman State Park, rated as one of the best in the United States. This park borders on Cleawox Lake where excellent swimming beaches are maintained. The Forest Service, the county, and the State have good public roads leading to the ocean beaches, the sand dunes, and the lakes. This accounts for land west of Highway 101.

About half of Honeyman Park lies on the east side. Here camping sites and launching ramps have been constructed along the north shores of Woahhink Lake. It is considered doubtful if the National Forest Service would want to have this park within a park, although spokesmen for the Service admitted here that they do not have enough funds to keep up the parks already in the Service, Siltcoos Lake south of Woahhink, one of the most popular fishing lakes on the Pacific Coast, has public and commercial boat launching areas. These lakes, of course, are owned by the State of Oregon.

A large Boy Scout camp of 165 acres bordering on Siltcoos Lake is another tract of land preserved for troops throughout Oregon and which will remain in a primitive state. Scout officials have expressed concern as to the future of this camp, as it is the announced policy of park authorities to move everyone out of the proposed area in the event it becomes a park. It is admitted by these officials that it may take \$10 million to buy the homes of some 600 persons who have built all-year places around these lakes.

Aside from the eventual loss of homes, the proposed so-called seaside park would absorb 3,000 acres of a 10,000-acre tree farm established by Crown Zellerbach. This would result in a loss of jobs for many local persons. The company has gone to great expense to put this tract on a sustaining basis and, in addition, has provided excellent camping sites for tourists.

The day it was announced that Senator NEUBERGER, of Oregon, had introduced a bill to establish a park in this district all plans for new homes in the proposed area were laid aside. In the event that the park is established, the economy of Florence and other communities will continue to suffer as the population in the 35,000-acre tract declines. Taxes which go to maintain local schools, hospitals, fire, and port districts will be lost for all time.

Park officials make light of these losses by saying that the increase in tourist business in the summer will make up for them, but this is considered extremely doubtful, for the tourist season here is short; at least 9 months of the year it would be of no help. The sand dunes in the summer months are exposed to the cold northwest trade winds and it is doubtful if they will attract many visitors.

Finally, the people here are not so shocked at the prospects mentioned as they are at the fact that a Department of their own Government should, without consulting them, decide to move in and absorb them in the manner of an aggressor power. And this when there is no justification or need.

JOHN S. PARKER,  
Chairman, Committee on Information,  
Western Lane Taxpayers Association,  
FLORENCE, OREG.

MR. MORSE. Mr. President, my colleague on May 20, 1959, introduced what is known as the administration omnibus bill dealing with the subject "To save and preserve, for the public use and benefit, a portion of the remaining undeveloped shoreline areas of the United States, and for other purposes." I ask unanimous consent that this bill be printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the bill was 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 in order to save and preserve for purposes of public recreation, benefit, and inspiration, a portion of the diminishing shoreline area 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 national shoreline areas, including lakeshore areas, as set forth in section 2 of this Act.

SEC. 2. (a) The Secretary shall select not more than three seashore or lakeshore areas that he finds, after thorough investigation, possess national significance and usefulness because of their outstanding natural and scenic features, recreational and other public values, for purposes of this Act: *Provided*, That the total land area, not including submerged lands, to be acquired by the United States pursuant to this section shall not exceed one hundred thousand acres: *Provided further*, That before selecting such nationally significant areas, the Secretary shall obtain the advice of the Advisory Board on National Parks, Historic Sites, Buildings and Monuments, as well as the advice of the Governors of the particular States in which the areas to be selected hereunder are situated.

(b) Upon the selection of the aforesaid areas, the Secretary is authorized to procure, set aside, and develop in such manner as he finds to be in the public interest, the land and waters, or interests therein, that he considers necessary to assure adequate preservation and public use of such areas in furtherance of the purposes of this Act.

(c) When the Secretary finds that a sufficient quantity of land for each individual area has been procured by the United States for administration and public use, he may declare the establishment of and prescribe an appropriate designation for such area by the publication of notice thereof in the Federal Register. Following such establishment, and subject to the aforesaid acreage limitation, the Secretary may acquire additional lands for the national shoreline areas established hereunder.

(d) The administration, protection, and development of national shoreline areas pursuant to this Act shall be exercised by the Secretary of the Interior, subject to the provisions of the Act of August 24, 1916 (39 Stat. 535; 16 U.S.C., 1952 ed., secs. 1-4), as amended and supplemented, relating to the national park system, and in accordance with other laws of general application relating to that system as defined by the Act of August 8, 1953 (67 Stat. 496; 16 U.S.C., supp. III, sec. 1c).

SEC. 3. The Secretary may procure land and water, or interests therein, for the national shoreline areas authorized by section 2 hereof, by donation or by purchase with donated or appropriated funds, and such authority to purchase with donated or appropriated funds shall include authority to condemn under the provisions of the Act of August 1, 1888.

(b) There is authorized to be appropriated, for the procurement of land and interests therein, and incidental costs relating thereto, for the national shoreline areas authorized by section 2 hereof, the sum of \$15,000,000.

MR. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that certain newspaper clippings from Oregon, dealing with these various bills, be printed at



this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

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

[From the Eugene (Oreg.) Register-Guard, May 19, 1959]

#### SENATOR TO INTRODUCE SEASHORE AREAS BILL

An Eisenhower administration bill that would allow the creation of three national seashore areas by Executive order is expected to be introduced Wednesday in the U.S. Senate.

Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, in a telephone interview from Washington, D.C., told the Register-Guard Tuesday that he has been asked to sponsor the administration proposal.

The announcement came in the wake of what, in effect, amounts to a request for a delay until next year of Senate consideration of Senator NEUBERGER's own Oregon Dunes national seashore bill.

The administration bill asks Congress to authorize expenditure of \$15 million for acquisition of property for creation of 3 national shore areas.

Areas to be considered are not specified in the administration money bill. However, its terms leave selection of areas for national seashore development up to the Secretary of the Interior.

This means, according to Senator NEUBERGER, that—if the administration measure is approved by Congress—the seashores could be established by the Secretary of the Interior on the basis of recommendations from the National Park Service.

Five such areas, including the Oregon Dunes near Florence, have been recommended for national status by the Secretary's advisory board on national parks.

#### HEARINGS SOUGHT

Meanwhile, Senator NEUBERGER has asked the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to schedule hearings in Oregon on the Oregon Dunes bill, perhaps in the fall.

The Oregon lawmaker earlier had hoped to get hearings underway by June. The hearing delay will put off congressional action on NEUBERGER's bill at least a year.

However, NEUBERGER said that congressional action on his bill now may not be necessary where the Oregon Dunes are concerned.

"What we could do is pass the administration bill, which is actually an enabling act. Then we could hold hearings in Oregon in the fall to determine whether the Oregon Dunes are to be one of the three shore areas to get national status by Executive action," NEUBERGER said.

The Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee has not yet acted on NEUBERGER's request for subcommittee hearings in Oregon.

#### LOCAL OPINION

Local opinion will be important in determining whether the Oregon Dunes area is selected, the Senator added. "The administration will need expression of sentiment from a great many people before it acts."

NEUBERGER added that the Nation has "reached the point where the need for development of great national seashores" is widely recognized.

"They are going to be established," NEUBERGER said, adding that a small group of people should not be allowed to keep Oregon from participating.

"If a small group of people on the coast at Florence—through vituperative letters—are able to keep our State from participating in these national benefits, they alone will bear the responsibility," NEUBERGER said.

The most abusive letters on any issue currently before the committee are from

Florence area citizens who oppose seashore creation, NEUBERGER concluded.

[From the Eugene (Oreg.) Register-Guard, May 27, 1959]

#### NATIONAL SEASHORE BILL FACES PORTER OPPOSITION

(By A. Robert Smith)

WASHINGTON.—Representative CHARLES O. PORTER is opposed to the administration's national seashore bill because it would take the Oregon Dunes situation out of the control of Congress. PORTER said he will not sponsor the bill, as Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER is doing in the Senate, and will not go along with any effort to pass it this session of Congress as NEUBERGER proposes.

The Eugene Congressman said he wants "a specific bill with all the points in it so everybody can see what's in it and comment on it."

He said he particularly wants the boundaries of the proposed park clearly set forth in any legislation authorizing creation of a national seashore on the Oregon coast between Florence and Reedsport.

The administration bill would authorize the Secretary of Interior to select three coastal areas in the country and create national seashores there where he thinks appropriate.

"It should not be left to the discretion of the Secretary," PORTER said.

"I'm disturbed about allegations that business will be stopped in the area," PORTER said. "If I think this proposal is unfair, I think I can stop it in the House—and I will. This is no new attitude on my part. I think a national park in that area would be good. I think most of the problems can be settled. But it's important that the bill set forth the boundaries."

PORTER said he wants the decision on boundaries determined this year, not left in doubt for a long period that would cause uncertainty in the area. He said he has asked the National Park Service for all its reports on the plan. He said he hopes congressional hearings can be arranged in the dunes area this fall.

PORTER, NEUBERGER, and Senator WAYNE MORSE are all sponsors of the same bill to authorize specifically a national seashore that would embrace the Oregon Dunes and Sea Lion Caves. The boundaries are not described in the bill, but could be added after hearings are held.

[From the Portland Oregonian, May 28, 1959]

#### REPRESENTATIVE PORTER OPPOSES SENATE NATIONAL SEASHORE BILLS, DECLARES DUNES BOUNDARIES NOT SUFFICIENTLY CLEAR

WASHINGTON.—Representative CHARLES O. PORTER, Democrat of Oregon, is opposed to the administration's national seashore bill because it would take the Oregon Dunes situation out of the control of Congress.

PORTER said he will not sponsor the bill, as Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER is doing in the Senate, and "will not go along" with any effort to pass it this session of Congress, as NEUBERGER proposes.

#### DISCRETION GIVEN SECRETARY

The Eugene Congressman said he wants "a specific bill with all the points in it so everybody can see what's in it and comment on it." He said he particularly wants the boundaries of the proposed park clearly set forth in any legislation authorizing creation of a national seashore on the Oregon coast between Florence and Reedsport.

The administration bill would authorize the Secretary of Interior to select three coastal areas in the country and create national seashores there where he thinks appropriate.

"It should not be left to the discretion of the Secretary," PORTER said.

Congressman PORTER said he plans to hike over the dunes area to examine for himself the pros and cons of the matter, especially as to where the boundaries might be placed. He said he hopes to do this sometime in June.

"I'm disturbed about allegations that business will be stopped in the area," PORTER said. "If I think this proposal is unfair, I think I can stop it in the House—and I will. This is no new attitude on my part. I think a national park in that area would be good. I think most of the problems can be settled, but it's important that the bill set forth the boundaries."

PORTER said he wants the decision on boundaries determined this year, not left in doubt for a long period that would cause uncertainty in the area. He said he has asked the National Park Service for all its reports on the plan. He said he hopes congressional hearings can be arranged in the dunes area this fall.

PORTER, NEUBERGER, and Senator WAYNE MORSE are all sponsors of the same bill to authorize specifically a national seashore that would embrace the Oregon Dunes and Sea Lion Caves.

The Senate Interior Committee has nearly concluded hearings on a bill both Oregon Senators are cosponsoring with Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, Democrat of Illinois, to create an Indiana Dunes Seashore Park. The committee decided Tuesday to make an on-the-spot investigation of the area in June. This proposal is strongly opposed by National Steel Co. which owns land in this area on Lake Michigan, and the State of Indiana which proposes to build a harbor to give the State a port that would tie in with the St. Lawrence Seaway.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have received so much mail on this subject that I have prepared and am sending to those who are writing to me about it, a general letter in which I invite attention to the opportunity which I am sure will be theirs to discuss this matter at a public hearing in Oregon. In the letter I also indicate my desire to give careful consideration to their objections to the bill and my hope that we can work out a program for the setting aside of seashore areas for park purposes which will meet what I consider to be the right of future generations to have our generation give them the protection I think they desire, by way of park access to the ocean, and at the same time meet whatever meritorious objections can be raised in any hearing on this problem.

In the letter referred to I point out, for example, that, subject to evidence to the contrary which may be submitted, we certainly ought to set aside an area which is the habitat of the sea lions on the Oregon coast. I feel that this habitat should be treated as public property and the sea lions should be considered as wildlife belonging to all the people of the Nation. The general public should have the enjoyment of and the advantage of access to the sea-lion habitat area.

Also, I think other areas on the coastline should be set aside, for national park purposes.

I make clear in the letter that, in view of the objections I have received, I think we should give serious consideration to the question of whether it is necessary to set aside a large tract of

contiguous land for park purposes or whether a larger number of smaller tracts might be the pattern of any set-aside park program envisioned by the bill.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the general letter heretofore mentioned, be printed in the RECORD.

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

U.S. SENATE,  
June —, 1959.

Dear —: This will acknowledge your recent communication relative to S. 1526, the bill to establish the Oregon Dunes National Seashore. I was pleased to cosponsor this bill as a courtesy to my colleague, Senator NEUBERGER.

During the past several weeks I have had a substantial volume of correspondence from residents of Oregon relative to this legislative proposal. Some who have written to me express their strong support of the bill; others register firm opposition.

Because of this evident conflict of local opinion, I requested the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, to which the bill was referred, to schedule a hearing on the issue in the near future at some central location in Lane County, Ore. The committee has expressed an interest in scheduling Oregon hearings, but the time and place have not yet been determined.

In my letter of May 14 in which I asked Senator MURRAY, chairman of the Senate Interior Committee, to arrange for a local hearing on S. 1526, I expressed the view that there should be a hearing in Oregon, rather than Washington, D.C., because the 3,000-mile trip from Oregon to the Nation's Capital would involve substantial costs and a great deal of time for the witnesses. Also, I pointed out that a local hearing would give a much larger number of people living in the area of the proposed project, as well as other interested Oregon residents, an opportunity to make known their respective points of view and to answer questions posed by the committee.

The committee has not yet scheduled a definite date for hearings on S. 1526, but has assured me that there will be hearings before any action is taken on this bill or on any other national seashore bill. You may be sure that I shall continue to work for early hearings in Oregon at a location that will be convenient to the people who are most directly concerned with this legislative proposal.

Incidentally, many who have written to me on this topic assert that the language of the bill makes too broad a grant of authority to the Secretary of the Interior to designate up to 35,000 acres of land for the National Seashore. There appears to be considerable merit to this objection, and I think the committee should give serious consideration to an amendment that would exclude certain areas, which, upon the basis of evidence produced at the hearings, might properly remain apart from the dunes area.

Furthermore, I am far from convinced that the public interest would be served by setting aside a large tract of contiguous acres. We already have on the Oregon coast several areas set aside for public use. What I want to make certain is that future citizens of our State and Nation will have adequate access to the ocean for recreation purposes by preserving some of our sand dunes area for park purposes.

Also, I think that the caves habitat of the sea lions should be preserved as part of the area to be included in any national seashore park area.

I have many reservations about a seashore set-aside program that would do economic injustice to existing business and commu-

nity enterprises. Frankly, I believe we can accomplish the essentials of the bill my colleague introduced by adopting whatever amendment to it the public hearings I have suggested should prove to be desirable.

With kindest regards,  
Sincerely,

WAYNE MORSE.

Mr. MORSE. It seems to me, Mr. President, that such differences as may have developed between the author and the cosponsor of the Senate bill, or now between the introducer of the administration bill and the people in my State who are protesting, are differences only over matters of detail and not over the public interest objective which the two Senators from Oregon have in mind and which Representative PORTER has in mind with regard to his bill. All we seek to do is to take the steps necessary in our generation, for which I think we have the responsibility, to try to preserve areas which will benefit and serve the esthetic, cultural, and recreational needs of future generations of American boys and girls. These areas should be encompassed in a national park, to make it possible for the future citizens to visit the coast of Oregon and enjoy the great satisfaction all of us enjoy when we become a part of nature, as we all do when we go to the great national parks, and as we all do when we get away from the humdrum, pressure, and race of modern living and get much closer to our Creator. Whether we go to mountain retreats, along rushing streams far removed from civilization, or in great sand dune areas along a coastline, I am sure we find spiritual values that are too often lost in the midst of our complex civilization.

The two Senators have in mind the needs of our own and future generations. As to that objective we are in agreement. It may be that we will disagree with regard to details of implementing the objective.

I think it is very important that we have the benefit of the points of view, the objections, and such information and evidence as the protestors may wish to submit. That is why I urge local public hearings.

There is one phase of this problem which I have not discussed in my letter, because I thought it was best raised on the floor of the Senate and then referred to in the RECORD setting forth my position on it.

I am troubled in regard to the proposed legislation, as I have been with regard to other pieces of proposed legislation, insofar as it relates to that aspect of it which seeks to delegate broad power to the Secretary of the Interior. I have reached no final conclusion, but I think I should serve notice today, Mr. President, that before I can support either one of the bills in its present form I will have to be satisfied that this grant of discretionary power should be given to the Secretary of the Interior. I would prefer a revision of the proposed legislation, and I may in due course of time, after the hearings, offer amendments of my own which will provide for granting to the Secretary of the Interior the administrative duty of making rec-

ommendations to the Congress of the United States in respect to the specific areas which he would like to have converted into national parks.

I am always very wary of any legislation which seeks to grant discretionary power to administrators of government. I think it is very important that Congress retain a positive check in connection with any such legislation.

I am inclined to favor legislation which would only authorize the Secretary of the Interior to proceed with plans for the creation of such parks, but require him to obtain approval by Congress of the plans before he is authorized to proceed to take any legal steps to acquire the property.

I think it is very important that we maintain that kind of check on administrative officers of government, if we are to carry out what I consider to be our legislative duties in the Congress.

It does not follow from what I have said that I am in the least opposed to establishing such national parks. I only raise questions as to the proper procedure to be followed in bringing them into being.

Because I may favor certain amendments to the proposed legislation in regard to the matter of possibly limiting the size of the area in any particular locality to an acreage much smaller than the working of the bills at the present time would permit, it does not follow that I am opposed to establishing national parks. However, I insist that we have the duty of examining very carefully and thoroughly any proposal for establishing such parks. In my opinion, based upon my present knowledge, the approval by the Congress of the facts involved in this proposed legislation should be obtained in advance of any legal action taken by the Secretary of the Interior.

#### NATIONAL WILDLIFE DISEASE LABORATORY

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the bill (S. 2086) to provide for the establishment of a National Wildlife Disease Laboratory, was introduced by the Senators from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT and Mr. CARROLL] on June 1, 1959.

It is my opinion that such a laboratory is urgently needed, and I know that the ultimate benefits to the people would far outweigh the initial costs and the operating costs. There is a very great need throughout the Nation for intensive research in the field of wildlife disease and particularly with respect to the ever-increasing menace of chemicals upon our wildlife.

The plan provides that the laboratory envisaged by this legislative proposal shall be established at a land-grant college or university that has a recognized school of veterinary medicine and where graduate training in such research may be carried out. This would exclude our Oregon educational institutions, including our very fine Oregon State College at Corvallis, Ore. However, my office discussed S. 2086 with officials of Oregon State College, and they assured me that



the objective of the bill is excellent. They agree that the research should be carried on where graduate facilities are available, that there is a great need for such research, and that this area of research has long been neglected.

Oregon State College veterinary students are sent to other schools, such as Colorado State College, for advanced training, but it is clear to me many indirect benefits would accrue to the college and to the people of the State of Oregon through such research facilities.

For the foregoing reasons, Mr. President, I was pleased to include my name as a cosponsor of this measure.

Mr. KUCHEL. 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. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

#### LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of legislative business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Moss in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Thereupon, the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

#### FEDERAL RESPONSIBILITIES IN EDUCATION

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, President Eisenhower has on various occasions recognized the great importance of education in the United States. If the President's enthusiasm for better and more education in America, expressed so eloquently in words, were translated by him into action, the enormous prestige of his office would by this time have placed a new and brighter complexion on America's schools and America's schoolchildren. But unfortunately what the President says and what the President does, at least in the field of education, bear so little resemblance to each other that it suggests an area of conflict between the talking President and the acting President. The two seem to be at loggerheads.

Let me quote some of the beautiful things about education the talking President said, and then—later—let us contrast these with what the acting President did, or—better—failed to do.

#### FERVENT WORDS, INEFFECTUAL ACTION

Addressing the National Education Association back in 1957<sup>1</sup> Mr. Eisenhower said:

Our schools are strong points in our national defense. Our schools are more important than our Nike batteries, more necessary than our radar warning sets, and more powerful even than the energy of the atom.

In his state of the Union message on January 16, 1959, Mr. Eisenhower spoke not only of the importance but also the grave shortcomings and urgent needs of education in our country. He said in part:

We must meet the world challenge and at the same time permit no stagnation in America.

As one example consider our schools, operated under the authority of local communities and States. In their capacity and in their quality they conform to no recognizable standards. In some places facilities are ample, in others meager. Pay of teachers ranges between wide limits from the adequate to the shameful. As would be expected, quality of teaching varies just as widely. But to our teachers we commit the most valuable possession of the Nation and of the family—our children.

These are indeed significant statements by President Eisenhower; but now let us see what effective action, if any, he has taken for the advancement of education in our country.

A study of the record shows a strange paucity of such action.<sup>2</sup> Early in 1957 the President said that high priority should be given school construction legislation; but he failed to express any support when the bill approached a vote in the House, and—in the opinion of many people, largely as a result—on July 25, 1957, it failed to pass, by three votes. In 1954 he proposed a national conference on education, and in his budget message of 1959 he proposed a study of national goals for education. He has delivered to Congress special messages on education. But where is his present legislative program for the advancement of education, which he has declared to be so important to our national security?

About all I can find of such a program is the plan allegedly aimed at stimulating school and college construction which was announced last February by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Arthur S. Flemming. The proposal was presented in two complex bills, one advanced to help public primary and secondary schools and the other to aid colleges.

These bills were given a cool reception in Congress by many Democrats and Republicans alike, who recognized the deficiencies of the proposals.<sup>3</sup>

According to an article in the Washington Star the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] said right away that he would introduce the administration's bills but that he did not believe Mr. Eisenhower's proposals would meet the needs for elementary school construction. The honorable chairman of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], has said that he considers the administration's program a "legislative monstrosity, designed not to help education but to help bankers."

The Eisenhower administration's proposal has offered no considerable help toward the solution of the Nation's educational problems. It is a proposal for too little too late, and is unworkable.

Last year, with no persistent encouragement from the President, to put it mildly, the Congress passed the National Defense Education Act of 1958. This is similar to a bill that I introduced on March 31 of last year.<sup>4</sup>

#### SCHOOL SUPPORT ACT OF 1959

The Senate is now considering another measure which fortunately enjoys the support of a number of Republicans as well as Democrats, namely S. 2, the School Support Act of 1959. It was introduced on January 9 of this year by Senator MURRAY and 26 other Senators, of whom I am one. We need, and I call for, the support of the President in our attempt to place in the statutes this kind of legislation. It would provide important aid in the solution of the multiplicity of problems which the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Arthur S. Flemming, has said confront American education today.<sup>5</sup>

Enactment of the School Support Act of 1959 would help eradicate the creeping blight of congested classes, double shifts, and inadequate instruction, which, according to the latest annual report of the president of the Ford Foundation, and in the belief of innumerable other persons, have seriously weakened education in the United States.

Mr. President, as a reminder to all of us, I should like briefly to review the principal provisions of the School Support Act of 1959. It is a somewhat streamlined version of the Murray-Metcalf bill which was before the 85th Congress.

The purpose of the act is to provide Federal financial support to help meet both the immediate and the continuing problems of financing adequate school facilities and teachers' salaries and thereby to strengthen the Nation's public schools. The act declares that the Congress finds there is a serious national shortage of classrooms and teachers which requires immediate action on the part of the Federal Government.

The bill also points out the facts that, first, the financial resources available to many communities are inadequate to support construction programs sufficient to eliminate classroom shortages; and second, practically all communities face the problem of providing compensation to teachers commensurate with the salaries received by other persons with comparable education, experience, and responsibilities. These inadequacies are seriously restricting the quality of the educational programs of the Nation.

The School Support Act of 1959 would provide grants to the States for school construction and teachers' salaries or a combination of these two purposes, as each State sees fit. For these grants the bill would authorize appropriations for each fiscal year beginning July 1, 1959, as follows: \$25 for each child of school age—5 to 17 years inclusive—the first year; \$50 per child the second year; \$75 per child the third year; and \$100 per child the fourth and each year thereafter.

The bill directs the U.S. Commissioner of Education to allot to each State com-

<sup>2</sup> For details see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, February 26, 1959, p. 3079.

<sup>3</sup> Better Schools, March 1959, p. 1.

<sup>4</sup> H.R. 11776, 85th Cong.

<sup>5</sup> Better Schools, March 1959, p. 1.

<sup>1</sup> Centennial celebration of the NEA: April 4, 1957.

plying with the provisions of the act an amount based on the ratio between the school-age population of that State and the school-age population of all such States. The allotment to any State would be reduced proportionately if the State school effort index should fall below the national school effort index. The bill establishes the formulas for determining these indexes based upon the relationship between the expenditures per public-school child and the income per child of school age.

Thus, a State's allotment of funds would be reduced if its relative effort to support schools from State and local sources should become less than the average effort for all the States. However, the bill defers application of this maintenance-of-effort principle for the first 3 years that allotments are made.

A State education agency obtaining Federal funds for school construction would be required to certify to the Commissioner, first, that the funds would be used solely for the construction of school facilities in accordance with this bill, and, second, that priority would be given to school districts having greatest need for school facilities and least ability to finance them.

To obtain Federal funds for teachers' salaries a State education agency would be required to certify to the Commissioner that the funds would be distributed among the public-school districts and used solely for teachers' salaries.

The bill forbids any Federal interference over State and local school systems.

#### FEDERAL RESPONSIBILITY UNDER THE CONSTITUTION

In the School Support Act of 1959 the Congress declares that a major portion of the financial responsibility for the public schools resides in the States and local communities, but the Congress recognizes the Federal responsibility to share in the financial support of the schools. It seems to me that this is the key to the issue. It bears a share of the responsibility by law—the Constitution itself—and by tradition and practice antedating the Constitution and continuing to the present.

Some persons have claimed that because the Constitution omits specific provision for education and because the 10th amendment reserves to the States powers not delegated to the Federal Government, it has no duty, nor even the right to participate in education. Such a conclusion could be sincerely reached only on the basis of a blissful ignorance of provisions of the Constitution other than the 10th amendment. From the beginning, the general welfare clause and other clauses in the Constitution have served as warrants and guides for Federal aid to the States for education and other Federal educational programs.

Back in 1791 Alexander Hamilton said<sup>6</sup> that whatever concerned the general interests of learning was within the Federal jurisdiction "as far as regards an application of money." Even the strict constructionist Thomas Jefferson declared that Congress could appropriate

public lands for the support of education.

In 1931 President Hoover's Advisory Committee on Education reported finding in the Constitution 14 warrants for Federal activities in education.<sup>7</sup> The Congressional Digest in February 1944, pointed out a number of provisions of the Constitution which warrant the expenditure of Federal funds for aid to education.

The language of the general welfare clause is clear. It says that the Congress shall have power to raise funds to provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States. The purpose is unmistakable.

The Constitution expressly assigns the Federal Government responsibility for the national defense and places upon the Federal Government, by implication, a duty to promote the general welfare. The Constitution gives Congress authority to raise funds for these purposes. No informed person would deny that in this age education is basic to the national defense and to the continuing prosperity of the Nation. It follows, as the day follows night, that the Federal Government bears at least a share of the responsibility for the support of public education. Here we have the matter in a nutshell.

#### FEDERAL RESPONSIBILITY BY TRADITION AND PRACTICES

A tradition and practice of Federal sharing with the States the responsibility for financing education began with congressional grants of public lands for its support. Such grants antedate the Constitution.

In 1787 the Congress declared in an ordinance that: "Religion, morality, and knowledge being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged."

Early land grants by the Congress for the support of schools aggregated an area twice as large as England. During the first half of the 19th century the Congress also made certain monetary grants to the States which were frequently used to support education.

Early Federal policies respecting education were summed up in 1931 by the National Advisory Committee on Education as follows:

From the Revolution to the Civil War, the Federal Government encouraged and financially aided education in the States. It endowed higher and common schools with lands, and made grants of tax moneys: But it did not attempt to regulate the purposes, define the programs, supervise the teaching, or otherwise control public education in the States.<sup>8</sup>

I shall not at this time review the voluminous record of Federal activities in education to date. Even a cursory consideration of the role of the Federal Government in the establishment of the land grant colleges, Federal aid to the States for vocational education under the George-Barden Act, and so forth, shows a traditional Federal-State-local share of the responsibility for financing

education. The proposal embodied in the School Support Act of 1959 is entirely consistent with this tradition and practice.

#### FEDERAL SUPPORT AND THE GENERAL WELFARE

The Federal Government has a fundamental interest in the education of the national citizenry. The very preservation of our form of government depends upon the adequate education of the entire population.

For the successful functioning of our form of government it is necessary that all our citizens obtain the education necessary for informed participation in the life and work of the Nation. All our people must be educationally prepared to understand the basic principles of democratic government and apply these principles to current problems. In these years of worldwide conflict of ideologies we cannot hope to maintain government by the people unless they have education commensurate with the demands of the times. The Federal Government must see to it that all of the peoples have adequate educational opportunities. No other level of government and no private agency or organization can do this. The Federal Government alone can do the job. It must not fail in the discharge of this basic requirement for its and the Nation's continuing existence.

The better education of the national citizenry which would result from enactment of the School Support Act of 1959 would produce a number of economic, political, and social benefits contributing greatly to the national welfare and progress.

#### IMPROVEMENT OF CURRICULA

The Educator's Dispatch for April 12, 1959, has pointed out that:

The Nation is in hot pursuit of quality education. We want it fast—and we want it first.

There is indeed a grave need and desire throughout the country for improvement of the intellectual fare in our public schools. By enacting the School Support Act the Congress can effectively if not directly help to meet this need and desire of our people.

Numerous headlines have recently appeared in newspapers and magazines indicating the widespread interest in and need for improvement in certain kinds of school offerings. Here are a few typical headlines: "Schools Surveyed; U.S. Lag in Languages Spotlighted"; "More Science, Mathematics, Urged by School Principals"; "Educators Stress Need in Humanities"; "Make Diplomas Mean Something."

In hearings before the House Subcommittee on Special Education last year, Representative CARL ELLIOTT aptly summed up this matter in these words:

In the press, over the airways, on street corners and in homes, among businessmen and professional men, including educators themselves, we now hear a constant clamor for the refinement of curriculum and for the improvement of teaching at all levels, from the grammar to the graduate school.

By making available Federal support for school facilities and for the payment of teachers salaries, the School Support

<sup>6</sup> In his Report on Manufactures.

<sup>7</sup> Federal Relations to Education, pt. II, p. 4-9.

<sup>8</sup> Report of the committee, part I, p. 11.



Act would certainly help toward the improvement of curriculums and teaching at the two basic educational levels, elementary and secondary.

Early this year was published a first report to interested citizens on "The American High School Today," by James B. Conant, who for 20 years was president of Harvard University and afterwards U.S. High Commissioner of Germany and later U.S. Ambassador to the Federal Republic of Germany. Dr. Conant's opinions as an author and educator merit great respect. In this first report on his study of the American high school he has made 21 recommendations for improving public secondary education. I will quote from a few of his recommendations which enactment of the School Support Act of 1959 would help the States and local communities carry out:

1. In a satisfactory school system the counseling should start in the elementary school. \* \* \* There should be one full-time counselor (or guidance officer) for every 250 to 300 pupils in the high school.

2. It should be the policy of the school that every student has an individualized program.

7. In some communities, advanced programs of a technical nature should be developed.

8. Those in the ninth grade of the school who read at a level of the sixth grade or below \* \* \* should be instructed \* \* \* by special teachers.

10. For the highly gifted pupils some type of special arrangement should be made.

16. A school should have the equipment for a developmental reading program.

17. The school board should operate a tuition-free summer school.

18. The school board should be ready to offer a third and fourth year of a foreign language, no matter how few students enroll.

If carried out in all schools throughout the country these and other recommendations by Dr. Conant would help greatly to raise the educational opportunities of the Nation's children to a level approaching the demands of the time. But where is the money coming from? Undoubtedly many a school superintendent and school board member has read these recommendations with despair and a feeling of the hopelessness of it all. And this in a country which can well afford to put such recommendations into effect in all of its schools.

This is a national problem. It is a problem not of lack of money but of our persistent, foolhardy reliance upon State and local sources of revenue to support the public schools. We might as reasonably utilize the oxcart as our principal means of transportation. In the field of school finance we do not seem to realize that times have changed. To finance adequately all of the Nation's schools we must either undertake to reorganize our entire Federal-State-local tax system or else adopt the much simpler and more expeditious alternative of utilizing more funds from Federal revenue sources for the support of public education. Yes, it is as simple as that.

The U.S. Office of Education has urged foreign language study beginning in the third grade.\* General Alfred M. Gruenther, former head of the North Atlantic

Treaty Organization, has commented that Americans lack ability in foreign languages. As a nation with worldwide interests we are linguistically unprepared either to defend ourselves in the case of war or to exercise the full force of our leadership in building a peaceful world. Linguistically we are the most backward major nation in the world.

The National Association of Secondary School Principals has urged provision for more and better instruction in science and mathematics.<sup>10</sup> Prominent educators have stressed the need for broader study of the humanities in our schools.<sup>11</sup> Some Members of Congress have deplored the present neglect of some of the subjects they studied in public school.<sup>12</sup>

From these examples we see that the curricular demands upon the public schools today are coming from many sources and are indeed great. How can thousands of schools in many parts of the country meet these demands when they hardly have money enough to maintain a simple program? Where are the teachers with the necessary specialized training to be found when salaries are too low to induce enough people to take enough training even to meet the requirements for a license to teach?

#### NEED FOR ADEQUATE SCHOOL FACILITIES

For the second school year in a row, the numbers of school-age children and school enrollments in the United States have grown at twice the rate of total population. On the basis of its fifth annual survey, published in the spring of 1959, the U.S. Office of Education has reported that last fall the Nation's schools enrolled 33,936,000 pupils—23,315,000 in elementary schools and 10,621,000 in secondary schools. This is over a million more than the enrollment 1 year previous—a 3.5-percent increase in school enrollment as compared with a 1.7-percent increase in total population.

The Office has estimated that 1,843,000 of these pupils, or 5.4 percent of the total enrollment, were in excess of the normal capacity of publicly owned school plants in use.

The total classroom shortage reported by the State departments of education last fall was 140,500—65,300 to take care of the enrollment in excess of normal capacity, and 75,200 to replace unsatisfactory facilities.

These figures speak for themselves. They show that the States and localities are not doing the necessary school-construction job. I believe in many instances they are unable to do this job without further Federal help. But even if they were failing in performance for some other reason, the Federal Government must see to it that the job is done. The national interest demands it.

The shortage of classrooms and other facilities continues to plague boards of

<sup>10</sup> Washington Post and Times Herald, July 14, 1958, p. A16.

<sup>11</sup> Christian Science Monitor, Mar. 10, 1959, p. 11.

<sup>12</sup> American School Board Journal, July 1958, p. 33.

education and school administrators. Local school district indebtedness is still the principal source of revenue for school construction.

Dr. Clayton D. Hutchins, Chief of the Division of School Finance in the Office of Education, has pointed out that:

Some districts that have faced critical situations in past years have exhausted their bonding capacity. The heavy payments they must make to service their debts in the years ahead may take abnormally large proportions of their current tax revenues.

Debt service requirements have a prior claim on current revenues. Consequently the burden of debt liquidation in the future may threaten the diversion of funds from the program of financing current school operation.<sup>13</sup>

The only program of Federal aid to school construction now in operation is that provided for a very limited number of federally affected school districts. Studies have shown that there is a great need for a general program of Federal support for school construction. It is unfair and disastrous for the Congress to leave to the States and communities the entire responsibility for providing the needed educational facilities. Partial discharge of the Federal responsibility in education through a general program of Federal aid for school construction, as proposed in the School Support Act of 1959 would be feasible and effective.

In 1955 some 2,000 delegates—teachers, school administrators and other persons interested in education—assembled in Washington to come to grips with some of the Nation's school problems. The final report of that group contains the following statement:

It is an ironic truth that most Americans would not permit their children to live in a house as bad as the school building which many pupils are forced by law to attend.

Since that statement was issued, 4 more years of Federal do-little-or-nothing to aid school construction have passed. And in the richest nation in all history, thousands of children are still attending school in grimy, dilapidated, overcrowded buildings, many of which are potential firetraps.

#### NEED FOR GOOD TEACHERS

The National Education Association has just released—on April 27, 1959—a research report on "Teacher Supply and Demand in Public Schools, 1959." The 51-page report is replete with data to support its conclusions. The most important of these is that there is a tragic shortage of approximately 135,000 teachers in the United States today.

Although an increase in the number of science and mathematics teachers is foreseeable, the expected increase will meet only about half the demand for teachers in these fields, which are of major importance in relation to our national security. A critical shortage of elementary schoolteachers is expected to continue. While the need for elementary schoolteachers may not be so obviously related to the national defense as the need for science and mathematics

\* New York Times, July 27, 1958, p. E9.

<sup>13</sup> School Life, March 1959, p. 11.

teachers, this shortage of elementary schoolteachers could in the long run be the factor most responsible for national disaster.

If we could add to the mere shortage of teachers the shortage of good teachers we would indeed see a dark educational picture for the United States. While respecting the high standards and ideals of the teaching profession in general, we would be naive to think that the shamefully low salaries offered in thousands of localities can attract the most competent people into the profession. All of us know that many young people use teaching as a steppingstone to some other occupation, because they cannot maintain on teachers' salaries a standard of living commensurate with that available to them in other fields.

The pull of other occupations has been increased not only by the lack of competitive salaries in teaching but also by the resultant lack of social prestige of teachers, the lack of adequate equipment for teaching, and unsatisfactory working conditions, all of which, in the final analysis stem from insufficient funds being available to local school boards.

We undoubtedly have a distorted sense of values in this country, otherwise we, as a people, would not be paying some actors and baseball players many times the salaries of teachers. The Congress can do something to show improvement in our sense of values—enact the School Support Act of 1959.

With an increase of 10 million enrollment in the public schools within the last 10 years, and an increase of at least a million expected annually in the years ahead, the Congress must take some action to help the States and localities to reduce the teacher shortage and obtain and retain good teachers for the Nation's schools.

The National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards last year pointed out that efforts to raise the level of the Nation's school programs must place high priority on obtaining better trained, more knowledgeable teachers.<sup>14</sup>

The Congress can help give the teachers of the Nation the sense of personal security which they must have in order to do well the job of teaching. Teachers cannot be expected to do well their important work if they are beset by fears and anxieties that come from the half-empty pocketbook.

Teaching is the most important of all professions. It determines the shape of our Nation and the character of our people. We must elevate it to the position of high prestige it should hold in our society. To accomplish this we must start by increasing the financial rewards of teaching, for we are in fact a capitalistic Nation that places a dollar value upon the work of every individual. If we want the Nation's children to have the kind of education they must have in order to survive as a free people we must place a greater dollar value on teaching and Congress must take the necessary action to assure teaching the financial rewards this all-important work deserves.

#### RUSSIAN COMMITMENT TO EDUCATION

Last year a group of prominent American educators spent a month studying the schools in the Soviet Union. Upon their return, as spokesman for the group, U.S. Commissioner of Education Lawrence G. Derthick delivered an address to the National Press Club in Washington, in which he said:

What we have seen has amazed us in one outstanding particular. We were simply not prepared for the degree to which the U.S.S.R., as a nation, is committed to education as a means of national advancement. Everywhere we saw indication after indication of what we could only conclude amounted to a total commitment to education.

Our major reaction therefore is one of astonishment—and I choose the word carefully—at the extent to which this seems to have been accomplished. For what it is worth, 10 American educators came away sobered by what they saw.

The Commissioner went on to tell that the American educators found a number of evidences of this Soviet commitment to education, such as: First, classes of reasonable size; second, no shortage of teachers; third, widespread teaching of foreign languages; and fourth plenty of money available to do the educational job.

From this group of American educators who had a unique opportunity to study Soviet schools, and from other sources, we have information that the Russians are like a people at war, using education as the basic weapon of their determined efforts to excel over the United States. Education will inevitably be the cause and the reason for our defeat or victory, depending upon how much and how well we use it.

The Soviet Government years ago adopted education as a basic instrument for carrying out its policies. Using education as its tool, the Government of the U.S.S.R. has already built an immensely powerful and productive society. If our children are to survive in a world in which they will be greatly outnumbered by well-trained Communists, we must quit dilly-dallying with American education. We must take every measure possible for the improvement of our schools and be willing to make great sacrifices for the advancement of education in the United States and throughout the free world.

A recent article in *Look* magazine<sup>15</sup> is entitled "The Frightening Challenge of Russia's Schools." In it the authors point out that:

The Russians have decided that education is the best means of winning their place in the sun—and on the moon. Schools are a passion with them.

The Soviet Union is like one vast, sprawling college campus on the eve of a football game with its great rival. That rival is the United States. The game is economic and cultural conquest of the world.

This is indeed a game in which the stakes are high. It is a deadly game which we must play. We have no choice. If we lose we can expect the end of our way of life for ourselves or for our children.

For a number of years we have had warnings of the tremendous educational developments in Russia; but it took the first sputnik to waken us to the challenge and the danger. Thinking Americans realized that behind the sputnik was Soviet science and technology and behind that science and technology were the Russian schools.

Yet already we have fallen into complacency. As in the past, we stuff our national ego and avow to ourselves as well as to others that we are still the greatest Nation in the world. I believe we are, but we cannot hope to remain so unless we exert an unprecedented educational effort. We argue over whether we should provide a paltry amount of Federal money for the Nation's schools while the fate of the whole country is at stake. We might as well fiddle when our cities burn as to fiddle over Federal aid to education.

The U.S. Office of Education recently published a broad study of Soviet education. It gave a lot of facts that ought to stimulate us to action. I will mention only a few of them.

Within the last 30 years the Russians have increased their primary-secondary school enrollment almost threefold, from 11.5 million to over 30 million.

The Russians are operating their schools 6 days a week. They are concentrating in 10 years about the same number of scheduled hours that are spread over 12 years in the public schools of the United States.

June 1955 secondary-school graduates in the U.S.S.R. had taken courses in physics for 5 years, chemistry for 4 years, biology for 5 years, and mathematics for 10 years. In the United States, on the other hand, only about a fourth of the 1955 graduates had completed even a year of physics, less than a third of our graduates had taken a year of chemistry, and less than a seventh—mind you, a seventh—of our graduates had any courses in advanced mathematics.

During the 1955-56 school year, 40 percent of the Soviet secondary school pupils were studying German, another 40 percent were studying English, and 20 percent were studying French, Spanish or Latin.

In June of 1956 the Russian schools graduated 1.5 million boys and girls as compared with 1.3 million graduated in our country.

While many teachers in the United States, on shamefully low salaries, try to carry on their important work in obsolete, crowded and poorly equipped buildings, teachers in the Soviet Union enjoy high prestige and living standards far superior to those of the general population. Small wonder that most of our gifted high school graduates are reluctant to prepare themselves for the teaching careers that offer such meager economic and social returns. Small wonder that issuance of emergency licenses to persons having substandard qualifications for teaching has become a widespread practice in the United States.

The size of the educational task of the United States is staggering to the imagination. Far more than the Soviet dictatorship, our Government by the people calls for the education of all the

<sup>14</sup> New York Times, June 26, 1958, p. 27.

<sup>15</sup> Oct. 14, 1958.



people. Our national educational task grows harder each year because of the upsurge of school population in relation to total population and because in every subject field the content and significance for modern living are increasing.

#### CONCLUSION

About 2 weeks ago—(April 16)—the General Education Subcommittee of the House of Representatives voted to report an amended version of H.R. 22, the School Support Act of 1959 to the full Education and Labor Committee. Thus that subcommittee has responded to the grave need for legislation to provide a broad base of Federal financial support for education in the United States. I hope that the Senate will pass the original form of the School Support Act, S. 2, and the conferees can resolve the differences between the versions of the bill as passed in the two Houses.

We must rise to the attitude of our educational responsibility to the present and future generations of Americans. Only by doing this can we hope to guarantee that America will continue to be a happy land inhabited by a free and prosperous people.

Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

#### COAL

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on June 7 the New York Times published a handsome 28-page advertising section which I believe is one of the finest tributes to the American coal industry that I have seen.

The title of the Sunday supplement is "Coal Powers America's Progress." For page after page, it lists the multitudinous vital roles which coal plays in our national life today—in our economy, in our industry, and in thousands of items used in our daily living.

I am pleased to note that the name of my State appears in abundance throughout the section. There are advertisements from many West Virginia firms, including the Eastern Coal Co., of Bluefield; Island Creek Coal Co., of Huntington; Princess Coal Sales Co., of Huntington; Pittsburgh Chemical Coal Co., of Morgantown; Slab Fork Coal Co., of Slab Fork; Rish Equipment Co., of Bluefield; West Virginia Armature Co., of Bluefield; Maust Coal & Coke Corp., Eastern Gas & Fuel Associates, Consolidation Coal Co., and many other coal firms, railways, and equipment firms which are familiar names in a West Virginian's vocabulary.

There is even one advertisement from the State of West Virginia, itself, which reads as follows:

Coal, an inexhaustible supply in progressive West Virginia. West Virginia is the largest source of high-grade coal in the world. Beneath 55 percent of the State's total land area is enough bituminous coal to last more than 400 years at the current rate of production.

West Virginia's coal mining industry is keeping pace with the modern demand for coal with technological improvements designed to deliver better grades of coal at reduced cost. Industries planning to utilize coal as a production material will find that

West Virginia can furnish unlimited quantities at the lowest possible price.

For information about West Virginia's advantages in terms of your needs, write or phone: Don Crislip, executive director, West Virginia Industrial and Publicity Commission, State Capitol Building, Room NYT, Charleston, W. Va.

Mr. President, the entire supplement was prepared under the sponsorship of the National Coal Association, and I feel that that organization is to be commended for its excellent presentation of information concerning coal.

I believe that this special section is one which should be read by each of us in Congress, yet I realize that its great length precludes its inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that only the initial page of the section, titled "There's Coal in Your Future," be reprinted in the body of the RECORD.

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

#### THERE'S COAL IN YOUR FUTURE

You are a consumer of bituminous coal. So is every other American, from the moment his first diaper is fastened with a steel safety pin.

You, your friends and neighbors will use coal for the remainder of your lives—possibly for heat, probably in electricity, and undoubtedly in thousands of everyday products made by scores of industries which use bituminous coal and its myriad byproducts.

Surprised? Most of us are. Few of us realize how heavily coal is woven into the fabric of our lives—and how much it will remain a vital part of the Nation for centuries to come.

Take a typical family day. Dad gets up and turns on the light. Mother plugs in the toaster and percolator. They are probably using coal, which generates more electricity than all other fuels and water power combined. Dad shaves, using an electric shaver or a steel blade. About a pound of coal is required to make a pound of steel, whether the steel goes into razor blades or moon rockets.

The family dresses. Mother perhaps knows that coal is an ingredient of her nylons and other synthetic fabrics, but she may not realize that coal helped make other clothing and textiles in the house. The textile industry consumes millions of tons of coal for heat and process steam, and many of its dyes come from coal byproducts.

Dad drives to work in the family car (3,500 pounds of coal-made steel) over cement roads. (The cement industry is one of the Nation's largest coal consumers.) His office or factory may well be heated by coal, and coal probably powers the air conditioning. The kids troop off to a school which may be heated by modern, smoke-free coal-burning equipment.

Mother does the housework with the help of electric-powered gadgets made largely of steel and coal-derived plastics. She cooks in aluminum kitchenware (more and more coal is used to generate power for aluminum production, at the rate of 6.8 pounds of coal per pound of metal) and washes the dishes with a detergent made from a coal byproduct.

Byproducts of coal—200,000 at the latest count—touch the whole family's life a thousand times a day: Vitamins, insecticides, aspirin, drugs, phonograph records, dyes, paint, synthetic fibers, weed killers, cleaning fluids, fertilizer, films—the list is nearly endless.

At the day's end, the family has used countless products made by or from coal.

As average Americans, each of them has consumed about 12.8 pounds of coal in an average day.

And there's much more where that came from. At the current rate, it will be 1,000 years or so before America mines her last ton of recoverable coal.

Yes, there's coal in your future—and in the future of your children and grandchildren.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 59) requesting the President to issue a proclamation designating 1959 for the observance of the 350th anniversary of the historic voyages of Hudson and Champlain.

#### ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 1901) to amend section 101(c) of the Agricultural Act of 1949 and the act of July 28, 1945, to stabilize and protect the level of support for tobacco, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

#### AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL AIRPORT ACT—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1) to amend the Federal Airport Act in order to extend the time for making grants under the provisions of such act, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Moss in the chair). The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1) to amend the Federal Airport Act in order to extend the time for making grants under the provisions of such act, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have been unable to agree.

WARREN G. MAGNUSON,  
MIKE MONRONEY,  
GEORGE SMATHERS,  
ANDREW F. SCHOEFFEL,  
NORRIS COTTON,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

OREN HARRIS,  
JOHN BELL WILLIAMS,  
PETER F. MACK, JR.,  
KENNETH A. ROBERTS,  
WILLIAM L. SPRINGER,  
ALVIN R. BUSH,

Managers on the Part of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, as chairman of the conferees between the House and the Senate on the airport bill, I report to the Senate that it was impossible for us to reach an agreement between the widely differing views on the bill, S. 1, as passed by the Senate and the bill as finally passed by the House of Representatives.

Therefore I desire to take a new approach on the bill S. 1, since the conferees are unable to reach an accord thereon. I now move that the Senate recede and concur in the House amendment to S. 1, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute therefor.

That proposal I now send to the desk and ask that it be reported.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is first on agreeing to the conference.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. I understood that a substitute would be offered.

Mr. MONRONEY. Yes. I believe that from a parliamentary standpoint, however, we must first agree to the conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Is my understanding correct that the substitute will be open to amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It would be necessary first to agree to the conference report. That is the question before the Senate. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. MONRONEY. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MONRONEY. The conference report is that the conferees are in disagreement. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct. That is the question before the Senate. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate recede and concur in the House amendment with an amendment in lieu of the language of the House amendment. I now offer the substitute which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The substitute will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. Substitute for House amendment:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the amendment of the House insert the following: "That section 5 of the Federal Airport Act, as amended (49 U.S.C., sec. 1104), is amended as follows:

"(1) In subsection (a), strike out "and June 30, 1959" and insert in lieu thereof "June 30, 1959, June 30, 1960, and June 30, 1961."

"(2) In subsection (b), strike out "and June 30, 1959" and insert in lieu thereof "June 30, 1959, June 30, 1960, and June 30, 1961."

"Sec. 2. (a) Section 2 of such Act (49 U.S.C., sec. 1101) is amended as follows:

"(1) In paragraph (7), strike out "the Territory of" wherever appearing therein.

"(2) In paragraph (12), after "United States" insert "on May 13, 1946."

"(b) Section 3(a) of such Act (49 U.S.C., sec. 1102(a)) is amended by striking out "the Territory of" wherever appearing there-

in; and by striking out "the Territories, and" and inserting in lieu thereof "Alaska, Hawaii."

"(c) Section 5(b) of such Act (49 U.S.C., sec. 1104(b)) is further amended as follows:

"(1) In the first sentence, strike out "the Territories of."

"(2) In the third sentence, strike out "the Territory of" wherever appearing therein.

"(d) Section 7 of such Act (49 U.S.C., sec. 1106) is amended by striking out "the Territory of" wherever appearing therein.

"(e) Section 9(c) of such Act (49 U.S.C., sec. 1108(c)) is amended by striking out the phrase "the Territory of" wherever appearing therein.

"(f) Section 10(c) of such Act (49 U.S.C., sec. 1109(c)) is amended by striking out "the Territory of."

"Sec. 3. Section 13 of the Federal Airport Act (49 U.S.C. 1112), is amended by inserting '(a)' after 'Sec. 13.' and by adding a subsection to read as follows:

#### "COSTS NOT ALLOWED

"(b) With respect to amounts obligated after June 30, 1959, the cost of acquisition or construction of that part of a project intended for use as a passenger automobile parking facility, and the cost of construction of those parts of passenger or freight terminal buildings and other airport administrative buildings intended for use as bars, cocktail lounges, night clubs, theaters, private clubs, garages, hotel rooms, commercial offices, or gamerooms or such other use which, in the opinion of the Administrator, is not essential to the welfare and safety of those persons using airports for public aviation purposes, shall not be an allowable project cost under this Act."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Oklahoma to recede and concur in the House amendment with an amendment in the nature of a substitute for the House amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I ask for the yeas and nays on the motion.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, the amendment in the nature of a substitute, which I have offered to the House amendment, will simply do two things: first, it will continue the Airport Act at the same level of annual authorized funds of \$63 million for fiscal years 1960 and 1961, and second, it will recognize the statehood of Alaska but continue to provide that both Alaska and Hawaii will receive exactly the same amount of assistance under this extension as they have in the past.

Another provision would rule out as allowable project costs for matching with Federal funds any costs for the construction of passenger automobile parking facilities, and the cost of construction of those parts of passenger or freight terminal buildings and other airport administrative buildings intended for use as bars, cocktail lounges, night clubs, theaters, private clubs, garages, hotel rooms, commercial offices, or gamerooms or such other use which, in the opinion of the Administrator, is not essential to the welfare and safety of those persons using airports for public aviation purposes.

The amendment, therefore, simply extends the provisions of the present law without any substantial changes except a few technical amendments which are

necessary to recognize the statehood of Alaska but which do not change the amounts or formula for Alaska, or Hawaii, or Puerto Rico, or the Virgin Islands.

Each State, including Alaska, is treated exactly the same as it has been since this law was last amended in 1956.

The reason for offering this amendment is that the Senate conferees were unable to reach a satisfactory agreement on the differences between the bill as the Senate passed it on February 6 and as it was radically changed and modified by the House. Our bill provided a total of \$465 million over a period of 4 fiscal years which the House cut to a total of \$297 million for the same period of time. However, our differences were not confined to matters of dollars only. They covered several other items of importance not only to the States and local communities but also to the Federal Government itself.

I should like to offer for inclusion in the Record, at this point in my remarks, a memorandum prepared at my direction which summarizes the differences between the Senate and House versions of S. 1 and which shows the wide gap between the two Houses not only on dollar amounts but also on these other items of importance. I believe that the Senate will be interested in knowing how the Senate conferees sought to adjust these differences.

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

#### DIFFERENCES BETWEEN SENATE AND HOUSE ON S. 1, AIRPORT CONSTRUCTION AID BILL

##### DIFFERING PROVISIONS

##### 1. Terminal Aid

##### Summary

Senate: Continues Federal participation on a regular matching basis in the construction of terminal facilities—except for parking lots, and areas used by commercial enterprises unrelated to public aviation purposes. Requires Administrator to give priority to private financing of freight terminal construction.

House: Prohibits the use of Federal funds for construction of any airport building or parking lot, except for areas used by U.S. activities, which may be supported up to 100 percent.

##### Language Differences

Senate: Section 5 adds a new subsection 13(b) to the act as follows:

"(b) With respect to amounts obligated after June 30, 1959, the cost of acquisition or construction of that part of a project intended for use as a passenger automobile parking facility, and the cost of construction of those parts of passenger or freight terminal buildings and other airport administrative buildings intended for use as bars, cocktail lounges, night clubs, theaters, private clubs, garages, hotel rooms, commercial offices, or gamerooms, or such other use which, in the opinion of the Administrator, is not essential to the welfare and safety of those persons using airports for public aviation purposes, shall not be an allowable project cost under this Act. In the event of a showing to the Administrator that any part of a project for construction or acquisition of any building, other than a passenger terminal, intended primarily for use by private enterprise can be financed from private sources on reasonable terms, he shall take



such fact into consideration in allocating funds under this Act."

House: Section 5 adds a new subsection 10(d) to the act as follows:

"(d) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, to the extent that the project costs of an approved project represent the costs of constructing, altering, or repairing that portion of any airport building required to house air traffic control activities, whether reporting activities, communications activities related to air traffic control, or any other activity of the United States with respect to which the Administrator determines that it is in the best interests of the Government to provide facilities therefor, the U.S. share shall be not to exceed 100 per centum of the allowable costs of such facilities. The U.S. share shall not include any amount attributable to the cost of constructing, altering, or repairing any other portion of an airport building, or any amount attributable to that part of a project intended for use as a passenger automobile parking facility."

#### 2. Regular program funds

##### Summary

Senate: Provides for a 4-year extension of the Act at a level of \$100 million per year, \$95 million for the 48 States, plus \$5 million for special areas: Alaska (\$2,250,000), Hawaii (\$1,250,000), Puerto Rico (\$1 million), and the Virgin Islands (\$500,000).

House: Provides for a 4-year extension at \$63 million per year, \$62.1 million for the States, including Alaska and Hawaii, plus \$900,000 for Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands.

##### Language differences

Senate: Section 1 amends section 5(a) of the act to insert the sum of \$95 million in new obligatory authority for each of the fiscal years 1960 through 1963.

Section 2 amends section 5(b) of the act to insert \$5 million in new obligatory authority for the fiscal years 1960 through 1963.

House: Section 1 amends section 5(a) of the act to insert the sum of \$62.1 million for fiscal years 1960 through 1963.

Section 2 amends section 5(b) of the act by striking out Alaska and Hawaii, and by inserting the sum of \$900,000 in new obligatory authority for each of the fiscal years 1960 through 1963, \$600,000 for Puerto Rico and \$300,000 for the Virgin Islands.

#### 3. Special discretionary funds

##### Summary

Senate: Authorizes special discretionary funds of \$65 million to become available immediately on enactment and remain available until expended.

House: Authorizes \$45 million in special discretionary funds, \$20 million for fiscal 1961, \$15 million for fiscal 1962, and \$10 million for fiscal 1963.

##### Language Differences

Senate: Section 3 adds a new subsection 5(e) to the act as follows:

"(e) In addition to the sums authorized in subsections (a) and (b), the Administrator is authorized to obligate in his discretion the sum of \$65,000,000 which shall be available to pay the United States share of costs of any approved project, and shall be administered as a separate fund without regard to the provisions of section 6 of this Act. This sum shall become available for obligation upon the enactment of this subsection and shall continue to be available until so obligated."

Section 4 amends section 5(c) of the act to authorize appropriations to cover funds obligated under the special discretionary authority.

House: Section 3 adds a new subsection 5(e) to the act as follows:

"(e) In addition to the sums authorized in subsections (a) and (b) of this sec-

tion, the Administrator is authorized to obligate in his discretion the sum of \$20,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and the sum of \$15,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and the sum of \$10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, which sums shall be available to pay the United States share of costs of any approved project, and shall be administered as a separate fund without regard to the provisions of section 6 of this Act. Each of the sums authorized to be obligated under this subsection shall become available for obligation beginning July 1 of the fiscal year for which it is so authorized, and shall continue to be so available until so obligated."

#### SCHEDULE OF PROPOSED MONEY

##### AUTHORIZATIONS

##### 1. Regular program

[In millions]

	Fiscal year—				Total
	1960	1961	1962	1963	
Senate.....	\$95.0	\$95.0	\$95.0	\$95.0	\$380.0
House.....	62.1	62.1	62.1	62.1	248.4

##### 2. Special areas fund

[In millions]

	Fiscal year—				Total
	1960	1961	1962	1963	
Senate.....	\$5.0	\$5.0	\$5.0	\$5.0	\$20.0
House.....	.9	.9	.9	.9	3.6

##### 3. Discretionary fund

[In millions]

	Fiscal year—				Total
	1960	1961	1962	1963	
Senate.....	\$65.0				\$65.0
House.....		\$20.0	\$15.0	\$10.0	45.0

##### 4. Total amounts authorized

[In millions]

	Fiscal year—				Total
	1960	1961	1962	1963	
Senate:					
Regular.....	\$95.0	\$95.0	\$95.0	\$95.0	\$380.0
Special areas.....	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	20.0
Discretionary.....	65.0				65.0
Total.....	165.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	465.0
House:					
Regular.....	62.1	62.1	62.1	62.1	248.4
Special areas.....	.9	.9	.9	.9	3.6
Discretionary.....		20.0	15.0	10.0	45.0
Total.....	63.0	83.0	78.0	73.0	297.0

##### 4. Treatment of Alaska and Hawaii

##### Summary

Senate: Continues the policy of providing aid to Alaska and Hawaii from the separate special areas fund. Continues the 75 percent to 25 percent matching formula for Alaska.

House: Treats Alaska and Hawaii as "States," including them in the regular fund with apportionment based on area and population, and calculating the matching ratio formula on a public lands basis. Alaska would thus be entitled to a 62½ percent to 37½ percent matching ratio.

NOTE.—Differences in amounts allocated to Alaska and Hawaii under the various formulas are as follows:

	Alaska	Hawaii
Present law.....	\$1,350,000	\$750,000
Senate formula (\$100,000,000 program).....	2,250,000	1,250,000
House formula (\$63,000,000 program).....	3,721,000	118,000

##### Language Differences

Senate: Section 10 amends section 2(a) (12) of the act redefining "State" to include only the former 48 States plus the District of Columbia.

Section 11 amends section 7 and section 10(c) of the act to substitute "Alaska" for "Territory of Alaska."

House: Section 3 amends section 5(b) to exclude Alaska and Hawaii from the special areas fund.

Section 7 amends section 2(a) of the act to delete references to the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii, and to include Hawaii within the definition of "State."

Amends section 3 of the act deleting references to the "Territory of Alaska" and the "Territories" with respect to formulation of the national airport plan.

Amends sections 7 and 9(c) of the act, deleting references to Alaska and Hawaii as areas where funds are to be made specially available and where the United States may act as a sponsor.

Amends section 10(c) of the act deleting Alaska as an area entitled to a 75 percent to 25 percent matching ratio.

##### 5. Redistribution of apportioned funds summary

Both versions provide in substance that funds apportioned to the States which have not been obligated during two fiscal years shall be added to the Administrator's discretionary fund. Under present law, 75 percent of such unexpended funds are reapportioned to the States.

##### Language Differences

Senate: Section 8 amends section 6(c) of the act to read as follows:

"(c) Any amount apportioned for projects in a State pursuant to subsection (a) of this section which has not been obligated by grant agreement at the expiration of the fiscal year immediately following the fiscal year for which it was first authorized to be obligated shall be added to the discretionary fund established by subsection (b) of this section."

House: Section 4 amends the second sentence of section 6(a) of the act to read as follows:

"Each amount so apportioned for a State shall, during the fiscal year for which it was first authorized to be obligated and the fiscal year immediately following, be available only for grants for approved projects located in that State, or sponsored by that State or some public agency thereof but located in an adjoining State, and thereafter any portion of such amount which remains unobligated shall be transferred to and become part of the discretionary fund provided for by subsection (b)."

Strikes section 6(c) of the act.

Provides that funds reapportioned prior to the date of this enactment shall remain available as reapportioned until the end of the then current fiscal year.

##### ADDITIONAL PROVISIONS

##### 6. Effect of act on current projects

Section 8 of House amendment provides as follows:

"SEC. 8. The amendments made by this Act shall not apply with respect to projects for which amounts have been obligated by the execution of grant agreements before July 1, 1959, or the date of the enactment of this Act, whichever is the later date, and,

with respect to such projects, the Federal Airport Act shall continue to apply as if this Act had not been enacted."

There is no corresponding provision in Senate version.

#### 7. Seal coating

Section 6 of Senate bill amends the definition of "airport development" contained in section 2(a)(3) of the act to allow Federal aid for "the periodic seal coating of flexible airport pavements, and the filling of joints in rigid airport pavements at airports at which air traffic is not sufficient to meet the criteria of the Administrator for the location of an airport traffic control tower operated by the Federal Aviation Agency."

This was stricken by the House.

#### 8. Interstate compacts

Section 9 of the Senate bill adds a new section 21 to the act as follows:

"SEC. 21. The consent of Congress is hereby given to each of the several States to enter into any agreement or compact, not in conflict with any law of the United States, with any other State or States for the purpose of developing or operating airport facilities. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this section is expressly reserved."

This was stricken by the House.

#### IDENTICAL PROVISION

#### 9. Announcement of plans

Both Senate (sec. 7) and House (sec. 6) versions add a new subsection 4(b) to the act as follows:

"(b) It shall be the duty of the Administrator to make public by January 1 of each year the proposed program of airport development intended to be undertaken during the fiscal year next ensuing."

Mr. MONRONEY. I should like briefly to sum up our efforts in this regard.

First, on the matter of total amounts of Federal matching funds: As I have noted the House reduced S. 1 from \$465 million for fiscal years 1960 through 1963 to a total of \$297 million for the same period of time. Under the House version the total authorized amount for fiscal year 1960 was \$63 million—\$2 million less than the amount recommended by the President in his budget message. We were prepared to accept the House figures for fiscal year 1960 with one minor adjustment and to provide for escalated increases in the following years. Thus we were prepared to recommend that the Senate agree to a total of \$341,320,000—a reduction of \$124 million—which would mean that the House would have to come up \$44 million for this 4-year period.

We were prepared to accept all of the House figures for discretionary funds, which were a great deal less than Senate figures, and to take their figures for fiscal year 1960, except to add \$632,000 in discretionary funds so as to permit Hawaii to receive the same level of Federal assistance as it had in the past; namely, \$750,000 annually. I might state at this point that we found that the House amendments had changed the treatment for Hawaii and Alaska so as to make this additional amount in 1960 necessary.

We proposed that the amount be escalated upward in the following fiscal years for regular apportionment among the States, including Hawaii, as follows: \$70 million for fiscal 1961, \$75 million for fiscal 1962, and \$85 million for fiscal 1963.

The House had eliminated the provision for seal-coating assistance to small airports and I gather was not willing to reinstate it. This is an item of extreme importance to small communities throughout the Nation and is one on which we had a recent communication from the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] urging us to get it back in and on which the New England Council for Economic Development on June 3 urged us to incorporate in the final measure because of its importance to the proper preservation of an adequate system of airports. However, we were prepared to concede on this point in order to get a bill.

The House also changed the treatment for Alaska and Hawaii so as to deal with them as States which would receive Federal matching funds on an apportionment basis rather than on the specific dollar basis in the present law. This meant that Alaska's share of eligible funds was raised to a point where they could never hope to match them—\$1.3 million to \$3.7 million—whereas Hawaii was reduced from \$750,000 to \$118,000. However, we were prepared to compromise on that by writing in additional funds for fiscal 1960, which would take care of Hawaii, at least for the first year. This meant, of course, that under the House bill that each of the other States would receive somewhat less than what they are now receiving under present law.

On terminal buildings, the Senate conferees, under the pressure of having to accept this proposal or no bill at all, were prepared to adopt the House language which would have eliminated airport buildings from future Federal assistance, except in the case of areas which the Federal Government would occupy, itself, such as control towers, and the like, for which the House had provided up to 100 percent of the cost to be borne by the Federal Government.

We proposed to make that very clear and to fix it at a full 100 percent and suggested that possibly in the future the Government should start paying rent in all those airports where they are now occupying such space rent free; because under present law the airport operator has to give them any space they want, rent free, if the Federal Government has put \$1 into the runways, the runway lighting, or the terminal building, or any other item on the airport. We also pointed out that under the provisions of the House bill, unless the airport building was under a grant agreement, which is really a written contract between the local and Federal Government, it would not be eligible for any future Federal assistance even though the local authorities had raised the money or had obligated themselves to raise the money pursuant to an airport development plan, approved by the Federal Administrator himself, which included those buildings. In other words, where moral obligations existed or where local authorities had been induced, pursuant to the continuing offer to assistance contained in the present law, to go out and start the machinery to raise the matching funds.

We submitted specific language to amend the House provisions so as to take

care of such hardship cases which were really all confined to two categories of airport buildings: First, those for which Federal funds had been programed or allocated prior to June 30, 1959; and second, those which had been approved as a part of a master plan for airport development prior to January 1, 1959, and for which the local sponsors had obligated themselves to raise the local matching funds, but for which Federal funds had not been specifically programed or allocated.

We submitted figures from the FAA showing that there was about \$11 million in Federal funds which had been allocated for airport buildings as of June 9, 1959, and which would not be taken care of unless the Senate savings clause was adopted. However, we were unable to submit any figures as to the probable cost of taking care of projects for which Federal funds had not been allocated, but where the local authorities had incurred obligation through special legislation or bond issues.

Many such airports, such as the one at Denver, were called to my attention by the distinguished junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL]. There were many other States which had situations of this type. The committee was informed of them, and we felt they should be taken care of in conference if it were possible. But we met with much resistance on this item.

Accordingly, we were ready to yield on this last point, and we were also ready to yield on the Senate proposal for Federal payment of rent.

However, the stumbling block appeared to be the amount of money which the Federal Government might have to pay to take care of these hardship cases, and the House conferees expressed the view that since there was great difficulty in securing the enactment of the \$297 million authorization they would have similar difficulty if the total figures were adjusted upward—even the \$44 million which we were asking them to agree to. Moreover, it was pointed out that there was no indication that the President might not veto the \$297 million House bill which was \$97 million in excess of what he had recommended for the same period of time. Therefore, it was evident that unless we were ready to completely accept the House bill in all its parts, particularly the dollar items, and abandon the provisions of the Senate version, which was passed by the Senate by a vote of 66 to 22, we were headed for a stalemate. And even then, there was no assurance that the President might not veto the bill anyway.

Under the circumstances, therefore, I believe that the amendment which I now offer is the only sound approach to preserve and maintain the Federal Airport Act which expires at midnight June 30.

I remind Senators that this act will expire in 2 weeks, June 30, 1959. If Congress does not act before that time, there will be no continuation of the Federal Airport Act.

The program will be continued on exactly the same level and basis for the next 2 years as it has been administered for the past 4 years. It does not affect the President's budget for 1960—as a



matter of fact, it will be \$2 million under the President's budget for 1960—and, while it would exceed his recommendation for fiscal year 1961 by a few million dollars, it is well to bear in mind that the Congress cannot be expected to legislate for 1961 in advance of his budget message for that year, by which time I trust he may have had a change of heart anyway. I think it is important to observe that this amendment is substantially the same approach which the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] offered as the first amendment offered on the Republican side when we considered S. 1 on February 6. The Senator from Kansas offered that amendment in behalf of himself, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. CORTON] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON]. I refer Senators to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 6, page 2028. At that time the Senator from Kansas, the ranking minority member of the committee, proposed to extend the present provisions of the Federal Airport Act at the same level of \$63 million for the next 4 years and stated "the best commonsense approach is to offer a program that has already proven itself by working well. The present Federal Airport Act, in my judgment, is such a program." This amendment is the same approach cut down to 2 years.

The amendment includes language specifically, definitely, and positively prohibiting the expenditure of money for cocktail bars, cocktail lounges, game rooms, and the fancy Dan arrangements which may have been included in or charged against airport terminal financing in the past.

I think this is the best we can do under the circumstances. It certainly is all we should do under the circumstances. It will permit us to take another look at this problem prior to fiscal year 1962, at which time we will be in a much better position to appraise the needs for meeting the impact of the jet age and would permit us to legislate much more wisely, and with a better understanding on the part of the occupant of the White House, than if we tried to write a 4-year program now in order to meet the administration's views on what is good for those years ahead for which it has no responsibility whatever. Today we cannot do it. We are forced, by the approaching expiration of the law in 2 weeks, to follow the old adage: "Half a loaf is better than no bread." That is the way I approach the matter. It is better to have something on the books, to continue a vitally needed airport program, than to have no legislation at all.

I am convinced, after the long weeks the bill has been in conference, and the negotiations which we have had, of the adamant position of the House conferees and of the troublesome difficulties of extracurricular communications from 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, which took place almost day by day. I do not know what else to do.

I feel that we dare not leave the Nation without some hope of an airport program to meet the needs of the jet age. The amount of money will be inadequate. Many wise provisions, such as the pro-

vision for advance consent to interstate airport development compacts, which was written into the bill by the Senate at the instance of the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. CORTON], cannot be included if we hope to get legislation. The bill must simply be reduced to the bare bones of a simple extension. But we must make it certain, so that no one can misunderstand to any degree, we must write, in flashing red neon lights, that no Federal money can be invested for saloons, cocktail lounges, bars, automobile parking lots, or hotels. We want to have that fully understood. I stress that point. It has been in the administrative regulations of the Federal Aviation Agency for many years. There is no money provided for those types of operations.

Such a prohibition has been in the law by virtue of administrative regulation all along; nevertheless, some officials at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue either cannot read or do not take the trouble to read the regulatory provisions of their own Administrator. So I again propose to write it in the statute.

I think what I have proposed is the best we can hope to do; and I believe it will work less injustice on the people of the country, including those of the cities who have voted bond issues and are waiting, under the assumed pledge of the Federal Government, for some measure of help in the construction of airport buildings. At least the amendment will give the Administrator the right, if he so chooses, to carry out that pledge.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield to me?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. I wish to commend the distinguished junior Senator from Oklahoma for his untiring efforts in behalf of Federal air safety regulations and also for his interest in the construction of airports.

I can say to him that the people of Denver, in reliance on the law and on what they thought was in the law, only a month ago voted a \$21 million bond issue for airport expansion. They were led to believe that perhaps Denver could participate in the airport terminal facilities development program. I voted for the Senate bill that would have provided Federal aid to development of terminal facilities.

I believe the conferees on the part of the Senate have done a magnificent job. However, if we must agree to this compromise, I should like to ask several questions in this connection, if I may.

Mr. MONRONEY. I shall be glad to have the Senator from Colorado do so.

Mr. CARROLL. I understand that it is now proposed that the existing law be extended for 2 years.

Mr. MONRONEY. That is correct.

Mr. CARROLL. And I understand the compromise proposal is for \$63 million for fiscal 1960.

Mr. MONRONEY. And for next year, fiscal 1961, as well.

Mr. CARROLL. That is less than the amount in the President's budget estimate for 1960.

Mr. MONRONEY. Yes. It is \$2 million less than the President's budget

estimate for 1960. No one can read the President's mind and tell what his budget item for this purpose for 1961 will be.

Mr. CARROLL. My point is that today Denver is confronted with the necessity to enlarge its airport in order to meet the needs of the jet age. Furthermore, Denver wishes to develop a terminal facility which will cost—so the mayor of Denver informs me—\$3,700,000.

We do not know whether Denver can qualify under the act, but certainly Denver has a right to file an application, to see whether it can meet the requirements of the regulations.

If this law is extended, will it be possible for Denver to participate in the expansion program for jet runways?

Mr. MONRONEY. The law, as we now propose to extend it, will be the same, for all intents and purposes, as the one with which we have had experience for the past 4 years. Whether the matching funds required for the terminal building at Denver will be granted by the Federal Aviation Agency I cannot say.

Under the compromise proposal, if the President's appointee, General Quesada, does not believe it to be wise or proper to grant the matching funds, or any portion thereof, for this or any airport building, he still will have the discretion to deny them. But I say the Congress should not be expected to pass a law—as one of the administrative personnel said—merely to take the heat off the Government Administrator. If the President does not wish to match that money, his appointee can turn down the request when it involves terminal or airport building construction.

The funds for all the other facilities—runways, ramps, and taxi strips—would continue to be, as already provided by the law, eligible for matching funds.

Of course, under this proposal we shall have to take half a loaf, instead of a full loaf, in terms of meeting the requirements of the jet age.

Mr. CARROLL. But at least under this proposal there will be an opportunity to ask for Federal matching funds for such construction, will there not?

Mr. MONRONEY. That is correct; such construction would not be prohibited, as it would be under the House provision.

Mr. CARROLL. Otherwise—using Denver as an example—Federal matching funds for the construction of the terminal facility at Denver would be precluded, would it not?

Mr. MONRONEY. Indeed so. In fact, if the law is not extended, possibly no money will be available for runways or anything else in connection with such airport.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, as I understand the Senator's statement, it is that the Congress permits the Administrator to allocate matching funds for terminal buildings; but the Administrator, the President's appointee, can prohibit the use of any funds for that purpose, if in his judgment they should be prohibited.

Mr. MONRONEY. That is entirely correct.

We also wrote in a provision that if in a moment of weakness the Administrator were tempted to allow funds for a cocktail lounge, bar, or game room, he would be prohibited by law from doing so. That specific provision was a part of Senate bill 1 as it was passed by the Senate. So we tell him that he cannot allow these funds to be spent except for facilities which will be usable for the health and safety of passengers in the terminal buildings. But under the compromise, the Administrator would not be precluded from allocating some Federal funds, to be used as matching amounts, for the construction of terminal buildings, if he so desires. However, under the House provision, all funds which have been allocated to the local communities as matching funds for airport buildings would be ruled out unless the final grant agreement had not been signed.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield further to me?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. I think it is of very great importance to point out that at the time when the original Monroney bill was under consideration, I called the Federal Aviation Authority representative in Colorado on the telephone, because not only was I interested in learning what would happen in Denver, but also I was interested in learning what would happen in the case of some of the small airports—for instance, those at Pueblo and in Jefferson County, and four or five airports under construction in other Colorado cities. If the law is not extended, what will happen to the funds for those airports?

Mr. MONRONEY. In that event, possibly no funds for them would be available unless a final allocation had previously been made.

Mr. CARROLL. Can the Senator from Oklahoma state the total amount of the Nation's airport needs at the present time?

Mr. MONRONEY. I do not have that precise figure readily at hand, although it was spelled out in the hearings. In fact, I recall that the hearing showed that approximately \$1,300 million worth of necessary work needs to be done now on the national airport system; that much need was found by General Quezada's agency, and he is the Administrator of the Airport Act.

We now propose—it is the best we believe it is possible to obtain at the present time—\$126 million for the next 2 years, with approximately \$1,300 million worth of work waiting.

Mr. CARROLL. I wonder whether the Senator from Oklahoma realizes what will be the effect upon the communities in many areas if this law is not extended for another 2 years. That is why I have raised these points, which I believe are important for consideration by each Member of the Senate when he is considering the effect on the airports in small communities if the law is allowed to expire.

Mr. MONRONEY. I refer my distinguished colleague—who has always been so vitally interested in aviation, to page 208 of the Senate committee hearings,

where it is shown that in Colorado alone, total needs over the next 4 years in the amount of \$30,308,000 were found by the Federal Aviation Agency itself. If that total need were met in the next year, that would consume a large percentage of the Federal participating funds available for the entire Nation. So we can see what a small part of the need will be met by the compromise which now is before us, and to which I believe the Senate will agree—almost with a loaded gun held at its head, I may say.

Mr. CARROLL. That is one of the reasons why I commended the able junior Senator from Oklahoma at the time when this measure first came before the Senate.

I think it most unfortunate that the Senate has to recede from its position. But I agree with the Senator from Oklahoma that sometimes we have to do things a step at a time, and wait until later to develop a real program.

The figures for Colorado clearly demonstrate that the entire amount in the Senate bill was justified. But if the House refuses to go along to that extent, we have to do the next best thing.

I sincerely hope that the conferees on the part of the House will, after the law is extended—as I am confident it will be—take steps to meet the needs of both the small and the large cities, as our Nation moves into the jet age.

Mr. MONRONEY. For instance, Mr. President, I see on the floor the Senator from Pennsylvania. Pennsylvania alone needs \$80,764,000 of airport construction for the next 4 years, as found by the Federal Aviation Agency.

In the case of Texas, its total needs, as found by the Federal Aviation Agency, are for \$42,500,000 for the next 4 years. Those figures give some idea of the magnitude of airport construction needs.

I am merely saying that some action is better than none; half a loaf is better than nothing at all. Furthermore, it is important to point out that only 15 days remain before "execution time."

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield to me?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I understand that Senate bill 1, of which the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma was the author, and which the Senate passed earlier in the year, provided authorizations of in excess of \$400 million.

Mr. MONRONEY. Four hundred and sixty-five million dollars.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Over a 4-year period?

Mr. MONRONEY. Yes. That amount would come fairly close to matching the fair airport needs, as found by the Federal Aviation Agency itself.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. And that amount is \$465 million?

Mr. MONRONEY. Four hundred and sixty-five million dollars, over a period of 4 years.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The amount provided by the House bill was how much?

Mr. MONRONEY. Two hundred and ninety-seven million dollars.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Also over a period of 4 years?

Mr. MONRONEY. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Now the Senator from Oklahoma is recommending—in view of the fact that the administration will not agree to \$465 million over 4 years, or \$297 million over 4 years—

Mr. MONRONEY. We do not know; but we presume, from the conversations we have had with the House Members, that there was objection by the administration even to the cut-down amount voted by the House of Representatives.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Has the Senator from Oklahoma received any indication that the administration was willing to accept the House figure?

Mr. MONRONEY. No; in fact, the House conferees said, day after day, "We do not know whether the administration will accept the House version of the bill."

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Does the Senator from Oklahoma know what the administration's position is?

Mr. MONRONEY. I do not know; it seems to change from day to day.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. What does the Senator from Oklahoma propose in connection with this legislation?

Mr. MONRONEY. Sixty-three million dollars for the net year, and \$63 million for the following year.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. In other words, \$126 million for the next 2 years?

Mr. MONRONEY. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. That will simply be an extension of the present Act, which the President signed 4 years ago; is that correct?

Mr. MONRONEY. That is correct, except we will tighten it up by making technical amendments required by the change of status of Alaska from a Territory to a State and the transitional status of Hawaii; and we also include a provision—lest someone in the agency downtown has not been able to understand our previously stated position—that none of the funds under this measure can be used for the construction of cocktail rooms, bars, and so forth.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Basically, this is a request for extension for 2 years of the act which President Eisenhower signed 4 years ago. Is that a correct statement?

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CLARK and Mr. GRUENING addressed the Chair.

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield first to the distinguished senior Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, anything I may say in the next few minutes is intended to be no criticism whatever of my good friend the Senator from Oklahoma, who has made such a valiant effort with the conferees of the other body to assure a decent airport bill. I know my friend has tried to the utmost of his ability. Apparently he ran into a stone wall.

The Senator explains that from his point of view, half a loaf is better than no bread. That is a principle which on



many an occasion I felt had to govern one's experiences not only as a legislator but also sometimes as an executive. Nevertheless, I cannot fail to feel this is a very sad day indeed for American civil aviation.

I recall with what high hopes early in January I joined with the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma in sponsoring a sensible civil aviation bill, a bill which would have made it possible for our airports to flourish and to grow, for their runways to meet the requirements of the jet age, and for the Federal Government to move in, as it must move in, and provide the necessary funds if we are to have a first-class civil aviation system.

Mr. President, in all candor that has gone out the window today. I remember issuing a press release—which I hold in my hand—on January 6, 1959, expressing great satisfaction at being able to join with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] in sponsoring a bill to increase from \$1,902,130 to \$3,011,706 a year the share the Federal Government would pay for our hard-pressed civil aviation system in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. Now that has all gone down the drain. The increase will be nonexistent. The small airports in the depressed areas of Pennsylvania will have to struggle along as best they can without the help of the Federal Government, over and above what they have already.

Mr. President, I say that surely half a loaf may be better than no bread, but what we ought to be able to insist on—if, as, and when we get a Democratic President in the White House—is the full amount of \$100 million a year for the next 4 years for the airport system of the United States, because that is what is needed for a first class America in this air age. Our localities are hard pressed, as well as our States, and they should be assisted by the Federal Government.

Mr. President, I am grateful to the Senator from Oklahoma for what he has been able to do. However, I do not think this represents half a loaf, Mr. President. I think it is more like a quarter of a loaf. But thank goodness, the Senator has been able to get something.

I regret very much that the Members of the other body do not seem to recognize the need and the necessity for assistance by the Federal Government on a far more massive scale than will be possible under this little bill, in order that we may enter the jet age of aircraft at least with as good a system as our friends in the Kremlin are setting up for their country.

I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank my distinguished colleague, who is always such a tower of strength.

I wish to point out that while it may seem we are cutting away down below the total amount in either bill, the fact that we do not accept the totally inadequate amounts for 1962 and 1963 provided by the House bill will mean we can take the matter up for further consideration 2 years earlier, and we can enact an adequate bill for those years. We are not marrying ourselves to an inadequate,

impossible allocation or commitment of funds for such a future period.

By making this an extension for only the next 2 years, at the end of that time we properly anticipate that President Eisenhower will have retired and will be able to use his hand on a mashie or a niblick instead of a veto pen. We know we can come back later, when we have a President who realizes civil aviation is here to stay, and can enact an adequate bill to meet the tremendous impact on airports forced upon us by the jet air age.

Mr. CLARK. I have no quarrel with my friend as to cutting the program from 4 years to 2 years. I think that was a wise thing indeed.

I object strenuously to the fact that our good friends in the other body were not willing to go along with the Senator from Oklahoma on insisting that \$100 million a year for each of the next 2 years should be provided, because the money is needed all over the country.

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

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to my distinguished colleague from Colorado.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, I wish to say I share the views of the distinguished senior Senator from Pennsylvania. I feel exactly the way the Senator from Pennsylvania feels about this matter.

I also joined as a co-sponsor of the proposed legislation. In the early weeks of this session I thought we were moving in the right direction and that the proposed legislation would accomplish something—that we were going to have a “do something” Congress.

This issue serves as a classic illustration. When we are criticized as a “won’t do” Congress, this illustrates that they “won’t permit us to do”.

Again I wish to commend the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma for his efforts in this field.

I see present on the floor the distinguished Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPPEL] who in February offered an amendment substantially similar to the amendment we are going to vote on today. The Senator offered his amendment in February and we voted it down, because we wanted a really progressive program.

Now we come back for further consideration, and we are asking, indeed, begging, that the law be extended for 2 years. If we do not extend the law we will do great damage to the airport construction programs presently under way.

This is a sad day, a tragic day; but we must support the Senator from Oklahoma.

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

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield. I shall be glad to yield the floor if the Senator desires.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. The distinguished Senator from Oklahoma, who has submitted to the Senate a conference report this afternoon setting forth the position of the respective conferees, that the Senator has covered the salient points mentioned in the conferences.

There has been some reference to the compromise amendment which the Sen-

ator from Kansas offered on the floor at the time the bill was before the Senate. I did offer the amendment to continue the present act for a period of 4 years. I thought it was the part of wisdom and good judgment to do that, because there were some very definite objections in the offing with regard to the enlarged amounts in the bill which was before the Senate.

I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma if he recalls, at the time of the last meeting of the conferees of the House and the Senate, that it was the Senator from Kansas, myself, who asked the House conferees the question, “Would you be willing to consider a 2-year extension of this act under the terms of the present act?” We were informed in that conference by the conferees of the House and by the chairman of the conference, the distinguished Representative from Arkansas, that they would not consider and could not consider it by reason of the action taken by the House. This left the conferees in a position where we could not agree to and could not get approval of even a compromise proposition on the basis of 2 years with reference to the extension of the act.

Is that the recollection and understanding of the Senator from Oklahoma, as to the situation which finally confronted us?

Mr. MONRONEY. That is correct. Under the rules of the conference we were bound by the subject matter as to which the House and Senate agreed. Therefore, since both bills had provisions for 4-year terms, we could not modify the 4-year term to a 2-year term. Finally, even with all the other disagreements, all we could do was to say, “Let us report the bill in disagreement.” The Senate can concur in the House amendment with an amendment for a simple 2-year extension. That is what I, as chairman of the Aviation Subcommittee, am trying to have done.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. The objection with which we were confronted was even related to a continuation of the present law, if it involved the terminal facilities and any related matters with reference to the terminal buildings. That was what we were confronted with in the conference with the House Members.

Mr. MONRONEY. We had great difficulties, but it was my understanding—this was not binding, but merely what I learned in the course of conversion—that a straight 2-year extension would be satisfactory to the House although not finally agreed to, at least for the purpose of proposing acceptance of the Senate’s position.

The House does not like any more than we do coming down from \$465 million or in its case, from \$297 million, to \$126 million, but it is a fate we have to accept.

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

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to my distinguished colleague.

Mr. GRUENING. I wish to join in commending the junior Senator from Oklahoma, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Aviation, of the Senate

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce for the magnificent work he has done in trying to get progressive, modern, up to date, and needed airport legislation.

Such a measure was passed when S. 1 was adopted by the Senate. It is a great pity that circumstances have compelled him to take the lead in saying something which while far less desirable than the original bill passed by the Senate office some prospect for the future.

I agree fully that half a loaf or even, as the senior Senator from Pennsylvania has called it, a quarter loaf, is better than none, because it holds out the hope that when the situation changes and when we get an occupant of the White House who is alive to the needs of the jet age and the fact that our Nation must move forward rather than backward, we will have a chance to reenact a bill as good as S. 1 was when it was passed by the Senate.

The junior Senator from Alaska wants also to express appreciation to the Senator from Oklahoma and to the other Senate conferees for their solicitude about Alaska's needs in this field and for their understanding that since Alaska has virtually no road system and only one small railroad, aviation is of supreme importance and is about the only method of getting around that vast new 49th State.

On behalf of my colleague and myself, I want the Senator to know how deeply we appreciate his interest in our aviation and airport problems.

Mr. MONRONEY. The committee was kept fully advised of Alaska's needs by the distinguished junior Senator from Alaska and also by the distinguished senior Senator from Alaska. We were constantly aware of the fact that without a modern airport system there could be no internal transportation to link the widespread areas of the great State of Alaska.

Mr. GRUENING. To say nothing of the great impairment to national security from inadequate airport facilities, since Alaska plays so large a part and will continue to play an increasing part in national defense.

Mr. MONRONEY. That is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND rose.

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

Mr. MONRONEY. If the distinguished Senator from Colorado will permit, I was going to yield to the distinguished Senator from Florida, who has had a great deal of experience with the airport construction program, because for many years the appropriations for these matters were handled in the subcommittee of which he was the chairman.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator from Oklahoma. Not only is it true that for some years the subcommittee which I have the honor to head has handled this appropriation, under a program identical to the one which the Senator now offers, providing for a 2-year extension, but it is also a fact that customarily the funds expended have been well below the funds authorized by the act,

because the communities of the Nation did not see fit to match the \$63 million which was the total authorization for each year.

Now, at a time when we are just about reaching that amount, it seems to me that we are practicing good, conservative economy, and at the same time profiting by the experience of a good many years, in holding on to this type of legislation so far as the amount is concerned.

There is some of the legislation with which I would not completely agree if we were starting afresh, as the distinguished Senator knows. I have always emphasized that we must put our Federal money, as nearly as possible, into safety measures, and into measures which afford greater security to those who travel and those who operate the planes.

At the same time, the amount which would be available to go into terminal buildings is relatively small. What is the complete answer to any objection on that score? We have the assurance that the administration of the act will be in the hands of those who are as eager as we are to emphasize and accentuate the safety features, meaning that they will not approve programs which are out of sympathy with that approach.

My feeling is that the Senator from Oklahoma and his associates have done a good job in coming forward with the proposed extension. I am happy to support it. I realize that it falls short of the ambitions of the Senator from Oklahoma, who has always been an enthusiast for aviation. I appreciate his enthusiasm, and I share it. Yet I have felt heretofore that my distinguished friend had been approaching the problem a little too enthusiastically. But I find myself on common ground with him now, and I am delighted to commend him and assure him of my support.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the distinguished Senator for his support.

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

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. In view of certain questions which have heretofore been asked, I should like to insert certain statistics into the Record.

How many airports would be involved? This information comes from the National Airport Plan of 1959, prepared by the Federal Aviation Agency. When I examine this report I am convinced that the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma has not been overzealous in his efforts on behalf of U.S. aviation. This report I have in my hand is the program of the Federal Aviation Agency, the head of which is appointed by the President. The FAA program contemplates 3,325 airports. The Agency has said, in effect, "We need to move in this field."

Although the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma was the original thinker in this field, the figure representing a summary of the estimated required airport development costs is the figure furnished by the Agency, not by the junior Senator from Oklahoma. The Agency figure is \$1,285,394,000 for a 4-year period—1959 to 1963 inclusive.

How does the Congress propose to meet this situation? We have been fighting for a good, constructive program. It is proposed that the Congress meet the problem with an appropriation of \$63 million a year for the next 2 years, when we should have had, as a minimum, the amount proposed in the bill presented by the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma.

So I say this is a constructive program. Under the circumstances we shall be fortunate to be able to hold the line for 2 years. Then perhaps we can move forward with the junior Senator from Oklahoma, as indicated by the plan presented by the Federal Aviation Agency.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank my distinguished colleague for his contribution, and I appreciate his support.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed to strike out section 3 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

Section 10 of the Federal Airport Act, as amended (49 U.S.C. 1109), is amended by inserting immediately after subsection (c) the following new subsection:

"FACILITIES USED FOR UNITED STATES ACTIVITIES

"(d) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, to the extent that the project costs of an approved project represent the costs of constructing, altering, or repairing that portion of any airport building required to house air traffic control activities, weather reporting activities, communications activities related to air traffic control, or any other activity of the United States with respect to which the Administrator determines that it is in the best interests of the Government to provide facilities therefor, the United States share shall be not to exceed 100 per centum of the allowable costs of such facilities. The United States share shall not include any amount attributable to the cost of constructing, altering, for repairing any other portion of an airport building, or any amount attributable to that part of a project intended for use as a passenger automobile parking facility."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, this bill has been in conference for nearly 6 weeks. It passed the House nearly 10 weeks ago, and as yet there is no bill. There is a proposal before us to accept the report of the conferees, and adopt substitute language in the nature of a stopgap measure to run for 2 years.

I do not quarrel over the time period. I do not quarrel over the money involved, \$63 million for a period of 2 years. But I think I should reassert the basic premise of the administration and of the Federal Aviation Agency with respect to the use of Federal money for the construction and modification of airport facilities.

When the testimony was taken before the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I thought the administration had made it abundantly clear that it was following a safety concept which began when the doors of the airplane closed about the passenger and continued until the doors opened after the passengers had reached his destination.



But the administration went on the theory, after 4 years of experience, that Federal funds should not be used for the construction of terminal facilities. The distinguished Senator from Oklahoma has gone a part of the way, as he says, to eliminate the fancy Dan items. No Federal money may be used to build cocktail bars at airports, as a part of the facilities. No Federal funds may be used for fine cocktail lounges furnished with period furniture. No Federal money may be used for parking facilities.

That goes a part of the way. But the proposal which is before us now as a stopgap still provides that Federal money may be used for airport facility construction, with the exception of the fancy geegaws and gadgets which have been so freely discussed on the floor of the Senate and the floor of the House.

If my sense of tradition and history is correct, 30 percent of the money appropriated under the Federal Airport Act has gone for the construction of facilities. If I know anything about arithmetic, two times \$63 million is a little more than \$125 million; and if I know anything about percentage, 30 percent of that would be \$37 million or \$38 million. That is the amount which would be used to construct facilities for cities which can provide such facilities for themselves.

I listened to the appeal of my distinguished friend from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL]. I can understand his interest in Denver. I can understand the interest in free Federal money. There are a few airports in Chicago, and there are others in other areas of the State. I suppose the operators of some of them would not like it particularly well if I were to say that facilities should be eliminated, for facilities have become moneymakers.

The other day I talked with the manager of an airport in a certain State—not my own. I know him by his first name. I said, "John, how you getting along?" He replied, "Quite well. We are making money, and plenty of it." That airport has fine restaurant facilities, newspapers, magazines, candy, snack bars, and everything else. Yet this proposal would allow Federal money to be expended for such facilities, excluding the "fancy Dan" gadgets. That is the only exception the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma makes.

That is a departure from the administration's concept. That is a departure from the safety concept. I do not believe there is an obligation on the Federal Government to match money for such purposes, when the municipalities can provide such facilities for themselves.

There is a request before Congress to increase the temporary debt ceiling to \$295 billion. There is a request to raise the permanent debt ceiling to \$288 billion. What an astronomical sum. A person almost has to be a space astronaut to comprehend such sums. I do not believe there is a finite mind that can comprehend that kind of money.

I took the trouble to look at some of the debts of municipalities and States. The most recent figure I have seen shows that Chicago has a debt of \$398 million; San Francisco has a debt of \$106 million.

That is peanuts compared with the national public debt. And when local communities can provide such facilities for themselves, it is a ghastly departure from sound financing to ask the Federal Government to provide them, whether it be in Chicago, Denver, Omaha, or any other community.

It has been said, "That is in the law. This proposal calls for an extension of existing law, and the administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency can turn down such requests." That he can. But, oh, the pressures he is under. I understand that only recently he had to agree to \$800,000 for an airport because he was pressured into it. He was told, "Look, we have complied with all the matching requirements in existing law. You have no right to turn us down."

I have been around the Capitol for a quarter of a century, and I know what some of the pressures are in Government. The only thing we can do is to write it out and nail it down in the law, so that one man does not have to undertake that onus and that responsibility. The fact of the matter is that that is what the House has said in the bill. The amendment I have at the desk I tore out of the Harris bill in the House. It has not been changed. It has been adopted by the House by a vote of 272 to 134.

Members talk about half a loaf. They talk about a quarter of a loaf. They had better talk about satisfying the other end of this legislative branch. It has voted on it. What I have offered is an amendment to put an end to spending the money of the Federal Government on terminal facilities in airports. It will have to go back to conference. The conference broke up once. It did not succeed. This will have to go back to conference. We already know the position of the House. By 272 to 134 it has said, "No money for these terminal facilities." Do Senators think they will get by that? I doubt it very much. I have served in the House, and I know that they do not back down and take it that easy in conference. If we want a bill at all, notwithstanding the June 30 deadline, we had better "get right" with the House, and also with the concept of the administration.

I do not know what the President will do. But I do know that he laid down a hard concept and said, "We are responsible for the safety of the individual from portal to portal; from the time he walks into the plane until when he leaves it. That is where we stop."

I do not quarrel with the refinements in the bill, relating to Alaska and Hawaii. However, if Senators want to pass a bill, they had better adopt the amendment, which is taken from the House bill, and which the House has already approved. The House Members are sticklers as to that matter, because they think it is sound law, and so do I. I do not know whether I will get enough hands to show, but I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FREAR in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DIRKSEN. 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. DIRKSEN. I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I have made my statement. There is nothing more I need to say. I am ready to vote.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I have listened with great interest to the remarks of the distinguished minority leader. I am as conscious as he is of the very great expenditures we are under. I also know that in the budget there are many, many expenditures for which the President has asked, but which fail to meet my test of economy.

Mr. President, we have built airports by the dozen, even by the hundreds, not with 50-50 matching money, but with 100 percent Federal funds under our Federal aid program overseas. I have helped support those appropriations. I feel, however, that when we have practically hard surfaced the ground of France, and have built airports and airport buildings in Bangkok and Tokyo and Laos and Cambodia, and elsewhere in foreign lands, it comes with ill grace for the administration to say that we shall be denied necessary funds with which to build an essential national airport system of our own.

I object to being told that we are going to legislate with a loaded veto pen at our head. If the distinguished minority leader thinks that that is in keeping with the dignity of the Senate, then he is entitled to his opinion. I for one, do not intend to accept it.

Neither do I feel that an administration which is willing to buy itself nearly \$18 million worth of jet transports for the President and perhaps for the Secretary of State, and even one for standby, also a jet transport, at more than \$6 million, stands in very good stead to talk about economy for the rest of the 185 million people who must depend on public transport.

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

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. How about the helicopters?

Mr. MONRONEY. And there are helicopters too. We have cruise boats and we have just about everything. On top of that there is a very carefully compiled budget coming down to us with a \$70 million figure in it for swing-tailed jets. Those are the VIP planes. They are the VIP jets, for high Government officials. The way these planes are designed, they cannot have any other use but as VIP planes, because of the way they load. If they were to be used as cargo planes, it would be necessary, first, to take out all the seats in order to get the cargo to the rear of the plane. There is no loading door in the front.

I should like to respectfully call attention to the rapid progress which is being made, under the President and his Federal Aviation Administrator, in connection with the building of the \$90 mil-

lion airport for Washington, D.C., at Chantilly. I am in favor of it. I have supported that airport in Virginia in opposition to my friend from Maryland, because I felt that Washington needed another airport. We are going to be called upon for \$90 million in connection with that airport. And the buildings at that airport, I may say to the distinguished minority leader, will not have merely a hamburger stand. The terminal building alone will be a palace of magnificent proportions. I have seen some of the preliminary designs. There will be nothing there of which Washington, as the Nation's Capital, will need to be ashamed.

I say that if we can afford these facilities for Representatives and Senators and officials of the Government, to use as they come into Washington, we should not deny them as a matter of statute for a few cities and towns that are having hard going in connection with their airports, if the Administrator believes they are warranted.

The distinguished minority leader, in his amendment, goes farther than the House would ever dream of going, because of some of the language he has picked up, which provides that the Federal money cannot be spent, no matter how great the commitment, no matter how essential the allocation unless the check has been issued by June 30 to the airport undergoing construction.

Talk about luxury terminal facilities. Here are some of the airport building needs we are talking about. They include buildings other than terminals—workshops, or storage shops, for example. They are what we talked about for 2 weeks in conference, trying to make them eligible under a savings clause. These are the airport buildings for which Federal funds have been programmed by the Federal Aviation Administrator. These are on the list, but they would not qualify under the House amendment or under the language of the amendment now offered by the Senator from Illinois. The proposed amendment goes farther, and would wipe out these airport buildings, for which tentative allocations have been made but for which the check has not been passed or a grant agreement executed:

Alabama: Birmingham, \$700,000; Muscle Shoals, \$71,000.

Arizona: Phoenix, \$346,350.

Arkansas: Fort Smith, \$173,000; Hot Springs, \$41,000; Stuttgart, \$11,000; Texarkana, \$69,000.

California: Fresno, \$662,900; La Verne—at Pomona—\$42,746; Oakland, \$1,555,284; Stockton, \$271,612.

Colorado: Akron—I do not know where that is—\$7,992 and \$42,624; Denver—Jefferson County—\$12,231.

Connecticut: Bridgeport, \$325,000.

Florida: Tallahassee, \$267,500.

Georgia: Americus, \$2,500.

Illinois: Chicago—Meigs Field—\$95,700; West Chicago, \$182,500.

Iowa: Cedar Rapids, \$19,000; Sioux City, \$10,000.

Kansas: Coffeetown, \$7,000; El Dorado, \$2,750; Garden City, \$48,610.

Kentucky: Louisville, \$450,000.

Louisiana: Baton Rouge, \$5,000; Lake Charles, \$175,000.

Michigan: Ironwood, \$25,000; Jackson, \$75,000; Kalamazoo, \$100,000; Pontiac, \$100,000.

Montana: Livingston, \$21,308.

These figures include funds needed for control towers or Government space. And so on down the list. Nine-tenths of these places are small cities, most of which are getting below \$100,000 from the onerous terminal aid fund about which so much is being said—terminal aid for fancy cocktail bars and monumental lounges.

I see little justification, since the Senate overwhelmingly rejected this proposal before, for changing its position now. I think the Senate will overwhelmingly reject the proposal again. We have bent down our head to take a figure lower than that in either the House or the Senate bill, complying with the President's determination to squeeze down on this particular type of Federal aid. We have agreed to that lesser amount of money.

The responsibility of the Senate is to legislate. The Senate has already on two occasions passed bills overwhelmingly supporting the continued eligibility of airport buildings. The President, 4 years ago, signed such a bill. Now we are asked to refuse to continue to give the right to the Federal Aviation Administrator to approve assistance for airport buildings, if he feels it is necessary. Does not the President have faith in his own appointee? We feel airport buildings—including terminals—should be eligible. He can rule them out if he thinks there is not a high priority of need for them. But I do not think the Senate is ready to agree that we should strike them out, as a matter of basic law.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Is any money provided for airports in South Carolina?

Mr. MONRONEY. Apparently, some funds are provided for South Carolina on this list; but there is another list, which is even longer than this one, of cities which had programs, which had filed their airport and terminal building plans, but which had not received allocations temporarily because they had not voted bonds, and other cities were allowed to take their places. So we are breaking faith with such cities and towns by abruptly cutting off any prospect of possible aid. The Administrator will be permitted to take care of hardship cases under my proposal where we are bound in honor to carry out our commitments. He will have the discretion to do that.

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

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. I have some information which I believe may be helpful. If my figures are correct, Columbia, S.C., has an outstanding tentative allocation for airport buildings in the amount of \$265,000. Greenville has \$10,000.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY]. On this question the yeas

and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] is absent because of illness.

On this vote the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE] is paired with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. CORTON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nevada would vote "nay" and the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "yea."

I further announce that if present and voting, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. CORTON], and the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN] is absent on account of illness.

If present and voting, the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. CORTON] is paired with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "yea" and the Senator from Nevada would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 27, nays 54, as follows:

#### YEAS—27

Alken	Dirksen	Prouty
Bennett	Dworshak	Saltonstall
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Schoeppel
Bush	Hruska	Scott
Capehart	Keating	Smith
Carlson	Kuchel	Thurmond
Case, N.J.	Langer	Wiley
Case, S. Dak.	Morton	Williams, Del.
Cooper	Mundt	Young, N. Dak.

#### NAYS—54

Allott	Ervin	Johnston, S.C.
Anderson	Frear	Jordan
Butler	Fulbright	Kefauver
Byrd, Va.	Gore	Kennedy
Byrd, W. Va.	Green	Kerr
Carroll	Gruening	Lausche
Chavez	Hart	Magnuson
Church	Hartke	Mansfield
Clark	Hayden	McCarthy
Dodd	Hennings	McGee
Eastland	Holland	McNamara
Ellender	Jackson	Monroney
Engle	Johnson, Tex.	Morse



Moss  
Murray  
Muskie  
Neuberger  
O'Mahoney

Pastore  
Proxmire  
Randolph  
Smathers  
Stennis

Symington  
Talmadge  
Williams, N.J.  
Yarborough  
Young, Ohio

The result was announced—yeas 71,  
nays 11, as follows:

## YEAS—71

**NOT VOTING—17**  
Bartlett  
Beall  
Bible  
Cannon  
Cotton  
Curtis

Douglas  
Goldwater  
Hill  
Humphrey  
Javits  
Long

Martin  
McClellan  
Robertson  
Russell  
Sparkman

Aiken  
Allott  
Anderson  
Bennett  
Butler  
Byrd, Va.  
Byrd, W. Va.  
Capehart  
Carlson  
Carroll  
Case, S. Dak.  
Chavez  
Church  
Clark  
Cooper  
Dodd  
Dworshak  
Eastland  
Ellender  
Engle  
Ervin  
Frear  
Fulbright  
Gore

Green  
Gruening  
Hart  
Hartke  
Hayden  
Hennings  
Holland  
Hruska  
Jackson  
Johnson, Tex.  
Johnston, S.C.  
Jordan  
Kefauver  
Kennedy  
Kerr  
Kuchel  
Langer  
Lausche  
Magnuson  
Mansfield  
McCarthy  
McGee  
McNamara  
Monroney

Morse  
Moss  
Mundt  
Murray  
Muskie  
Neuberger  
O'Mahoney  
Pastore  
Prouty  
Proxmire  
Randolph  
Russell  
Schoeppel  
Smathers  
Stennis  
Symington  
Talmadge  
Thurmond  
Wiley  
Williams, N.J.  
Yarborough  
Young, N. Dak.  
Young, Ohio

## NAYS—11

Bridges  
Bush  
Case, N.J.  
Dirksen

Hickenlooper  
Keating  
Morton  
Saitonstall

Scott  
Smith  
Williams, Del.

## NOT VOTING—16

Bartlett  
Beall  
Bible  
Cannon  
Cotton  
Curtis

Douglas  
Goldwater  
Hill  
Humphrey  
Javits  
Long

Martin  
McClellan  
Robertson  
Sparkman

So Mr. DIRKSEN's amendment to Mr. MONRONEY's amendment was rejected. Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the amendment to the amendment was rejected be reconsidered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FREAR in the chair). 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.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question recurs on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY]. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered; and the Clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] is absent because of illness.

On this vote the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE] is paired with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nevada would vote "yea" and the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "nay."

I further announce that if present and voting, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], and the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN] is absent on account of illness.

If present and voting, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] and the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] would each vote "yea."

So Mr. MONRONEY's motion was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the motion of the Senator from Oklahoma was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I understand the papers with regard to the conference report on the Department of Interior appropriation bill are en route to the Chamber. I should like for all Senators to know that as soon as the papers arrive from the Appropriations Committee the chairman of the Appropriations Committee plans to present to the Senate the conference report on the Interior Department appropriation bill. I am informed that the report is signed by all the members on the part of both Houses. So far as the minority leader is aware and so far as I am aware there are no matters in controversy. I do not expect a yea and nay vote, although I should like for all Senators to know that the conference report will be considered very shortly.

Mr. President, I wish to commend the Senate for the action it has just taken. In a Government where the executive branch of the Government is headed by a member of one party and the legislative branch of the Government is controlled by a majority of another party it is always very difficult to enact legislation. We must seek the best at all times, and attempt to do the possible.

This body originally expressed itself by a vote of almost 3 to 1, when it passed an airport bill which would authorize, over the next 4 years, the expenditure

of \$465 million. The House of Representatives, in the bill which we were considering a short time ago, and with respect to which several Members just now voted against an amendment, would authorize, over a 4-year period, \$297 million.

There were some Senators who felt that \$465 million was the minimum amount. Some Members of the House felt that \$297 million was the minimum amount. There were some, I am sure, who did not want any kind of bill passed, but after months of discussion an agreement was finally reached which appealed to a great many Senators, and that was to extend the present act for 2 years.

The present act was signed and supported by the President of the United States 4 years ago. It was good enough then. Under the present act allocations have been made for the improvement of our airways and airports, including the construction of terminal facilities, over a period of 4 years.

We felt that in a Government which is divided, we can either do something or do nothing; and if we could not have what most of us thought was desirable, namely, \$465 million, and if we could not do what a good many of us thought was next desirable, namely, appropriate \$297 million, the least we could do would be to extend for another 2 years the Act which the Congress had enacted and the President now in the White House had signed, and allow the people an opportunity to decide how they want their Government operated.

The Senate felt so strongly about the original \$465 bill that it was approved by a vote of 63 to 22. Fifty-one Members on this side of the aisle and 12 Members on the other side of the aisle joined in that vote.

It is now apparent that we cannot do what we thought should be done. But the Senate has demonstrated by a vote of 71 to 11 that it is ready to do what can be done.

That seemed to most of us to be a reasonable thing to do. Personally I preferred the Senate bill. If I could not get the Senate bill I would take the House bill. If I could get neither the Senate nor the House bill, I would take the act under which the President is now operating.

I think the Senate has acted wisely. I think it has demonstrated that it is reasonable and fair, that it is not hard-headed, that it is not adopting a "me too" attitude. It believes that if we cannot do all we desire to do, we should at least do what can be done.

I repeat that in these days of division in Government we can either do something or do nothing. As for myself, speaking for the party which I attempt to represent, I prefer to do something.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, long ago I learned, in hanging around a blacksmith shop, that the truth is beaten out on the anvil of discussion. I believe that is what must be done here. It would be strange indeed if the President of the United States, after 4 years' experience under existing law, could not think up some improvements in the law.

One of the improvements the need for which he saw, and which he undertook to bring about, was to enunciate the principle that the Federal Government has a responsibility for the air passenger from the moment when the door closes at the air terminal until it is opened again at the destination.

In pursuance of that principle he felt that it was not our responsibility, as a Federal Government, to build air terminal facilities for communities, even on a matching basis, when the communities could do it for themselves, and were making money, and plenty of it, from such facilities.

They are making money at Idlewild. They are making money in Chicago. They are making money at Knoxville, Tenn. All we have to do is to recite the list. It is singular, indeed, to place a burden on the Federal Government when the municipalities and counties can provide such facilities for themselves.

There is pending in the Senate Finance Committee a proposal to lift the temporary debt ceiling to \$295 billion, and the permanent debt ceiling to \$288 billion. There is more involved here than a 2-year stopgap bill providing \$63 million a year. This airport program will bloom and boom, and it will articulate itself in terms of billions of dollars.

The question is: Are the pattern and format right? I did not believe they are. That is the reason why I offered an amendment.

The amendment which I offered would have made it possible for the Federal Government to get out of financing airport facilities. It has already been adopted in the Harris bill in the House of Representatives, by a vote of 272 to 134. There it is. My amendment was merely a simple exercise to determine whether the Federal Government should continue down this road, which will ultimately cost billions before we are through. I only sought to state the administration case. This may be a stopgap, but the formula and the pattern are still with us. I rest with the judgment of the House of Representatives, and with the executive branch.

During the course of the discussion a little while ago it was mentioned that someone had suggested the threat of a veto. I never said anything about a veto. I never use the word when I can help it. It does not even appear in the Constitution of the United States. That great document merely mentions disapproval, not a veto.

I do not know what the President may do. I neither speak for him nor do I undertake to prophesy what he will do, but I do know what his concept was in the first instance, when the message on the airport bill came to this body and the other body. I sought to be consistent, no matter what the size of the vote.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I have not spent much time around blacksmith shops, but I am glad that Members of the Senate who voted for the Monroney amendment today voted for an amendment which would at least do something. Only 11 Senators opposed it.

# DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1960—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 5915) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report. (For conference report, see House proceedings of June 12, 1959, p. 10717, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, as this bill passed the House of Representatives it included \$468,106,800 for the programs of the Department of the Interior, exclusive of the Bureau of Reclamation, the Southeastern Power Administration, the Bonneville Power Administration, the Southwestern Power Administration, and the various related agencies, including the Forest Service of the Department of Agriculture. The Senate bill provided \$478,785,025 for the programs and activities of these agencies and the conference bill provides \$472,717,100.

Mr. President, I will be glad to answer the questions of any Senator with respect to the action of the conference committee.

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

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. First, I wish to pay my respects to the able chairman of the Senate Committee on Appropriations for guiding the Senate conferees into a unanimity of opinion with respect to the conference report which is now before the Senate.

Am I correct in saying that there is no money provided in the proposed legislation for basin studies of fish and wildlife by the Corps of Engineers and/or the Bureau of Reclamation, with respect to the construction of public works facilities or reclamation projects?

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator is correct. I read from page 7 of the report:

The conferees are in agreement that funds for river basin studies should continue to be transferred from appropriations of the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation. However, the conferees recommend that the appropriations involved hereafter contain specific language indicating the amount to be transferred to the Fish and Wildlife Service. It is recognized that these agencies will require additional funds to finance these studies.

This means that in the public works appropriation bill, which includes funds for the Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Engineers, we will have to provide adequate funds for these studies, which are required by law.

Mr. KUCHEL. So far as the Senator from Arizona is concerned, he believes wholeheartedly in the continuation of such river basin studies; but in accordance with the language he has just read from the conference report, consideration of the type of appropriation to be made should be in connection with the public works appropriation bill.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct. As I stated the conference committee suggests specific language.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 5915, which was read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U.S.,  
June 15, 1959.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 34 to the bill (H.R. 5915) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for other purposes," and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

## "ALASKA PUBLIC WORKS

"Not to exceed \$350,000 of appropriations heretofore granted under this head shall remain available until June 30, 1960, for administrative expenses necessary for liquidation of the public works program carried out under the act of August 24, 1949, as amended (48 U.S.C. 486-486j)."

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House to Senate amendment No. 34.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It was my understanding, when the majority leader was called from the Chamber, that he desired to ask a question on this subject.

Mr. HAYDEN. He does.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Does the Senator wish to take action now, before he returns to the Chamber?

Mr. HAYDEN. No.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I should like to ask the Senator to yield to me in order that I may introduce a bill out of order and make a few remarks concerning it.

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

(At this point, out of order, Mr. O'MAHONEY introduced a bill and made a statement in connection therewith, which appears under a separate heading elsewhere in today's RECORD.)

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Arizona a question on the conference report. As I understand, the bill as passed originally by the Senate recommended certain additional facilities in amendment No. 26, and appropriated \$3,410,000 for construction. The House appropriated



\$2,775,000. On what figure did the conference agree? Did it agree on the Senate figure or on the House figure?

Mr. HAYDEN. It agreed on the Senate figure.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. In that Senate figure, according to the report, on page 19 of the Senate bill, there is contained an item for the Inks Dam, Tex., Hatchery of \$100,000.

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Included in the appropriation are the following items:

1. Construction of fish-holding house, water supply and drainage lines, including battery of 12 concrete tanks, fish-food preparation room, storage room, refrigeration room..... \$35,000
2. Repairs to quarters existing..... 1,500
3. Construction of another residence for permanent personnel..... 17,500
4. Installation of concrete curbs and asphalt paving road repairs..... 7,500
5. Construction of new earthen ponds..... 33,000
6. Extension of water supply lines to service new ponds..... 6,000

As I understand, the \$100,000 provided by the Senate was to cover these items, and that that amount was accepted by the House.

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Therefore, the conference report now before us includes \$100,000 for the Inks Dam, Tex., Hatchery, as provided on page 19, for the purposes which I have enumerated.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct.

Mr. MUNDT. I might say that this fish hatchery in Texas is on exactly the same basis as the one at Gavins Point, S. Dak., which was included in the same type of consideration and which is in very good shape indeed.

Mr. HAYDEN. The same amount of money is involved, too.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. As I understand, the South Dakota hatchery expenditures are in connection with a continuation of construction, whereas the one in Texas involves rehabilitation.

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes. They are both in the same amount.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The exact amount put in has been retained.

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thank the distinguished Senator.

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

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I was very much interested, as the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee so well knows, in procuring funds for additional campsites in the Great Smoky Mountain National Park, where they are woefully inadequate. With that in mind I have filed an amendment for \$250,000 in additional funds for campsites at that park. The distinguished chairman suggested, or it was suggested, that there was included \$1,550,000 for additional campsites in the several national parks.

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes. The committee did not specify where the increase of \$1,-

550,000 should go. There is a great demand for additional facilities of this type in several parks. Of course, the demand for camp areas in the Great Smoky park far exceeds the number available.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The lump sum of \$1,550,000 was allowed.

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. KEFAUVER. From that sum, allocations will be made to the Great Smoky National Park.

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes. As a matter of fact, there are more visitors to the Great Smoky Mountains than to any other park in the East because they are so close to the centers of population, and those visitors require attention. I am sure the Park Service will give them that required attention.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I appreciate the interest of the Senator. I am glad that that is the case.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Arizona that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House to Senate amendment No. 34.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have included in the Record a tabulation giving the appropriation for the current year, the budget estimate, the House allowance, the Senate allowance, and the conference allowance for each appropriation in the bill.

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

TABLE 1 (Revised June 4, 1959).—Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriation Act, 1960 (H.R. 5915)

Agency and appropriation	Appropriations, 1959 (includes funds in 1st and 2d supplemental appropriation acts)	Budget estimates, 1960	House allowance	Senate allowance	Conference allowance
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
<b>TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR</b>					
<b>DEPARTMENTAL OFFICES</b>					
Office of Saline Water:					
Salaries and expenses.....	\$1,182,960	\$1,355,000	\$1,355,000	\$1,355,000	\$1,355,000
Construction.....		300,000	300,000	300,000	300,000
Subtotal, Office of Saline Water.....	1,182,960	1,655,000	1,655,000	1,655,000	1,655,000
Office of Oil and Gas.....	577,700	390,000	360,000	390,000	390,000
Office of the Solicitor.....	3,041,300	3,091,000	3,080,000	3,091,000	3,091,000
Office of Minerals Exploration.....	2,659,300	1,500,000	1,100,000	1,100,000	1,100,000
Office of Minerals Mobilization.....	274,300	( <sup>1</sup> )			
Acquisition of strategic minerals.....	3,200,000				
Total departmental offices.....	10,935,860	6,636,000	6,195,000	6,236,000	6,236,000
<b>BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT</b>					
Management of lands and resources.....	26,910,100	24,377,000	24,323,000	24,377,000	24,627,000
Construction.....	5,685,000	5,200,000	5,200,000	200,000	200,000
Construction (indefinite appropriation).....				(5,000,000)	(5,000,000)
Range improvements (indefinite appropriation of receipts).....	(688,715)	(776,000)	(776,000)		(776,000)
Total, Bureau of Land Management.....	32,595,100	29,577,000	29,523,000	25,077,000	24,827,000
<b>BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS</b>					
Education and welfare services.....	57,759,000	58,958,000	57,700,000	59,433,000	58,700,000
Resources management.....	18,978,700	22,425,000	21,873,000	22,402,000	22,202,000
Construction.....	26,000,000	17,000,000	13,000,000	14,575,000	13,575,000
Road construction and maintenance (liquidation of contract authorization).....	12,000,000	14,600,000	12,000,000	14,600,000	14,600,000
General administrative expenses.....	3,701,800	3,715,000	3,700,000	3,715,000	3,715,000
Payment to Menominee Tribe of Indians.....	200,000				
Payment to Klamath Tribe of Indians.....	250,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
Liquidation of Klamath and Menominee Agencies.....		250,000	250,000	250,000	250,000
Payment to Standing Rock Sioux Tribe.....	6,960,000				
Total, Bureau of Indian Affairs, exclusive of tribal funds.....	125,849,500	117,048,000	108,623,000	115,075,000	113,142,000
Tribal funds (not included in totals of this tabulation).....	(3,000,000)	(3,000,000)	(3,000,000)	(3,000,000)	(3,000,000)

<sup>1</sup> In addition \$62,746 of prior year funds made available.

<sup>2</sup> In addition, \$37,000 transferred from the Office of Minerals Exploration.

<sup>3</sup> To be financed from funds appropriated to Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization.

TABLE 1 (Revised June 4, 1959).—Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriation Act, 1960 (H.R. 5915)—Continued

Agency and appropriation	Appropriations, 1959 (Includes funds in 1st and 2d supplemental appropriation acts)	Budget estimates, 1960	House allowance	Senate allowance	Conference allowance
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
<b>GEOLOGICAL SURVEY</b>					
Surveys, investigations, and research.....	\$41,488,200	\$42,517,600	\$42,000,000	\$42,500,000	\$42,350,000
<b>BUREAU OF MINES</b>					
Conservation and development of mineral resources.....	21,162,200	21,277,000	21,177,000	21,277,000	21,277,000
Health and safety.....	6,362,700	6,387,000	6,387,000	6,387,000	6,387,000
Construction.....	12,624,000				
General administrative expenses.....	1,191,900	1,197,000	1,187,000	1,197,000	1,197,000
Total, Bureau of Mines.....	41,340,800	28,861,000	28,751,000	28,861,000	28,861,000
<b>NATIONAL PARK SERVICE</b>					
Management and protection.....	416,011,200	17,000,000	16,297,000	16,647,000	16,647,000
Maintenance and rehabilitation of physical facilities.....	12,477,100	14,000,000	13,093,000	14,000,000	14,000,000
Construction.....	20,000,000	13,600,000	12,400,000	15,250,000	13,600,000
Construction (liquidation of contract authorization).....	30,000,000	34,000,000	30,000,000	32,350,000	30,000,000
General administrative expenses.....	1,429,300	1,475,000	1,464,000	1,475,000	1,475,000
Total, National Park Service.....	79,917,600	80,075,000	73,254,000	79,722,000	75,722,000
<b>FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE</b>					
Office of the Commissioner of Fish and Wildlife:					
Salaries and expenses.....	332,100	343,000	340,000	340,000	340,000
Bureau of Sports Fisheries and Wildlife:					
Management and investigation of resources.....	12,491,500	14,894,000	13,308,000	14,693,625	13,520,000
Administration of Alaska game law (from receipts).....	(454,621)		(268,000)		(268,000)
Construction.....	3,929,350	2,105,000	2,775,000	3,410,000	3,410,000
General administrative expenses.....	771,600	631,200	625,000	631,200	631,200
Subtotal, Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife.....	17,192,450	17,630,200	16,708,000	18,734,825	17,561,200
Bureau of Commercial Fisheries:					
Management and investigations of resources.....	6,270,500	7,601,000	5,928,000	6,906,300	6,345,000
Administration of Alaska fisheries (from receipts).....	(454,621)		(398,000)		(398,000)
Construction.....	500,000	245,000	245,000	345,000	345,000
Fisheries loan fund.....		3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
Limitation on administrative expenses, Fisheries loan fund.....	(313,000)	(313,000)	(313,000)	(313,000)	(313,000)
General administrative expenses.....	188,500	325,200	325,000	325,000	325,000
Administration of Pribilof Islands (appropriation of receipts).....	(1,340,451)	(1,940,000)	(1,940,000)	(1,940,000)	(1,940,000)
Subtotal, Bureau of Commercial Fisheries.....	6,959,000	11,171,200	9,498,000	10,756,300	10,015,000
Total, Fish and Wildlife Service.....	24,483,550	29,144,400	26,546,000	29,651,125	27,916,200
<b>OFFICE OF TERRITORIES</b>					
Administration of Territories.....	2,100,000	2,606,000	2,606,000	2,606,000	2,606,000
Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.....	4,862,100	5,225,000	5,200,000	5,225,000	5,225,000
Alaska public works.....	5,300,000			(700,000)	(350,000)
Total, Office of Territories.....	12,262,100	7,831,000	7,815,000	7,831,000	7,831,000
<b>OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY</b>					
Salaries and expenses.....	2,700,940	2,706,600	2,686,000	2,706,600	2,706,600
Total, Department of the Interior.....	371,573,650	344,396,600	325,393,000	337,659,725	329,691,800
<b>TITLE II—RELATED AGENCIES</b>					
Commission of Fine Arts.....	37,700	37,800	37,800	37,800	37,800
Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review.....	70,000	70,000	70,000	70,000	70,000
Forest Service, Department of Agriculture:					
Forest protection and utilization:					
Forest land management.....	87,661,400	77,815,800	77,543,000	77,815,800	77,815,800
Forest research.....	16,681,400	14,026,400	13,923,000	14,026,400	14,026,400
State and private forestry cooperation.....	12,822,800	12,307,800	12,297,000	12,327,800	12,327,800
Subtotal.....	117,165,600	104,150,000	103,763,000	104,170,000	104,170,000
Forest roads and trails.....	26,000,000	24,000,000	26,000,000	24,000,000	26,000,000
Acquisition of lands for national forests:					
Cache National Forest.....	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Special acts (appropriation of receipts).....	(10,000)	(10,000)	(10,000)	(10,000)	(10,000)
Cooperative range improvements (appropriation of receipts).....	(700,000)	(700,000)	(700,000)	(700,000)	(700,000)
Total, Forest Service.....	143,215,600	128,200,000	129,513,000	128,220,000	130,220,000
Indian Claims Commission.....	177,700	180,000	180,000	180,000	180,000
National Capital Planning Commission:					
Salaries and expenses.....	243,000	475,000	400,000	400,000	400,000
Land acquisition.....		4,389,000	2,286,000	2,286,000	2,286,000
Total, National Capital Planning Commission.....	243,000	4,864,000	2,686,000	2,686,000	2,686,000
Smithsonian Institution:					
Salaries and expenses, Smithsonian Institution.....	7,587,800	7,718,000	7,718,000	7,718,000	7,718,000
Salaries and expenses, National Gallery of Art.....	1,790,100	1,834,000	1,834,000	1,834,000	1,834,000
Total, Smithsonian Institution.....	9,377,900	9,552,000	9,552,000	9,552,000	9,552,000

\* In addition \$45,000 of prior year funds continued available.



TABLE 1 (Revised June 4, 1959).—Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriation Act, 1960 (H.R. 5915)—Continued

Agency and appropriation	Appropriations, 1959 (includes funds in 1st and 2d supplemental appropria- tion acts)	Budget estimates, 1960	House allowance	Senate allowance	Conference allowance
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Civil War Centennial Commission.....	\$36,492	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000
Lincoln Sesquicentennial Commission.....	350,000	145,000	145,000	145,000	145,000
U.S. Territorial Memorial Commission.....				4,500	4,500
Alaska International Rail and Highway Commission.....	240,000				
Boston National Historic Sites Commission.....	20,000				
Hudson-Champlain Celebration Commission.....	50,000				
Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission.....	150,000				
Total, related agencies.....	154,018,392	143,148,800	142,583,800	140,995,300	142,995,300
TITLE III—VIRGIN ISLANDS CORPORATION					
Contributions.....	130,000	130,000	130,000	130,000	130,000
Loans to operating fund.....	125,000				
Limitation of administrative expenses.....	(170,800)	(172,000)	(160,000)	(172,000)	(172,000)
Total, Virgin Islands Corporation.....	255,000	130,000	130,000	130,000	130,000
Total, direct appropriations above.....	525,847,042	487,675,400	408,106,800	478,784,225	472,717,100

# ANNOUNCEMENT WITH RESPECT TO CONSIDERATION OF OTHER AP- PROPRIATION BILLS AND PRO- POSED UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT ON THE STRAUSS NOMINATION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations if he expects to have before the Senate this week any additional appropriation bills.

Mr. HAYDEN. We hope to mark up one appropriation bill tomorrow. The chairman of the subcommittee considering that appropriation bill is the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND].

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. That is the Commerce Department appropriation bill.

Mr. HOLLAND. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I should like to have Members of the Senate on notice that if that bill is marked up tomorrow and the report is filed and the hearings are available, we will take it up at the earliest possible date this week. If there is controversy connected with it, it may have to go over under the rule. If there is no substantial controversy, we may proceed to its consideration at an earlier date than the rule would normally allow.

Mr. HOLLAND. I should like to say that the record is printed and available. The markup of the bill by the subcommittee was completed this morning. The chairman of the full committee has been gracious enough to set the bill up for markup by the full committee. I see no reason why the bill cannot be reported sometime during business hours of the Senate tomorrow, in which case the majority leader may certainly call it up, either in accordance with the rule or under a suspension of the rule.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thank the Senator. I should like also to give notice that after the Senate convenes tomorrow, I shall seek to obtain a unanimous-consent agreement allotting sev-

eral hours to each side in connection with the nomination of Mr. Strauss, and providing for a vote on that nomination on Thursday or Friday or Saturday of this week.

I hope we may be able to do that. I expect the Senate will run late in the evening, certainly on Tuesday until 7 or 7:30, and then on Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday we may have late sessions.

I believe all Senators realize that a good deal of business must be transacted by the Senate. We have had very few Saturday sessions and very few evening sessions. But it is going to be necessary, if we are to conclude our business within the next few months, for us to pass on a good many bills and on some nominations.

Today we have had an excellent day. We agreed to the conference report on the Interior Department appropriation bill, and we passed the Atomic Energy Authorization Act. We also passed the airport bill. It may be necessary to sit late in the evening and to sit on Saturdays, and I will ask the Senate to do that, because I believe this Congress should be a "do something" Congress. I believe it will be. The only persons who are going to be hurt by contrary predictions are those who accept that kind of propaganda. They will wake up late in September and find that "it ain't so."

Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

## EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate, as in executive session, proceed to the consideration of the executive calendar, beginning with new reports.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will state the nominations under new reports.

## PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Public Health Service.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the Public Health Service be considered and agreed to en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are agreed to en bloc.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be notified of the nominations confirmed today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified.

## EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session.

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Charles L. Powell, of Washington, to be U.S. district judge for the eastern district of Washington; and

Herbert S. Boreman, of West Virginia, to be U.S. circuit judge for the fourth circuit.

By Mr. ANDERSON, from the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy:

John S. Graham, of North Carolina, to be a member of the Atomic Energy Commission.

## ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL TOMORROW

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today, it stand adjourned until noon tomorrow.

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

## NOTICE OF PROBABLE CONSIDERATION OF APPROPRIATION BILLS THIS WEEK

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, we expect to take up at least one

and perhaps two or three additional appropriation bills this week. As soon as they are filed and the reports and hearings are available, I shall ask consent of the Senate to proceed to their consideration.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 2094) to authorize appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes.

#### THE ECONOMIC PICTURE

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, on Thursday, June 11, the distinguished junior Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] rose on the floor of the Senate and trumpeted, like a triumphant elephant, the good news that the recession was over, and that massive unemployment was a thing of the past.

I am happy to see the distinguished Senator from New York in the Chamber as I commence my remarks.

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

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield.

Mr. KEATING. I think perhaps the characterization which the Senator has made of my address on that day is somewhat overdrawn. There was no intention, as was stated, to do any crowing; I was simply pointing out the lessons to be learned from the improvement in the economic picture.

Mr. CLARK. In view of the Senator's well-known political affiliation, I hope he did not take with any lack of good humor my comparison of him with that fine animal which is the symbol of the party to which he gives allegiance.

Mr. KEATING. I am very happy to be identified with that particular animal in the menagerie.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator from New York chided unidentified members of my party for comments made a year ago expressing concern at the then state of economy. He charged them with being false prophets of gloom and doom. He indicated his own strong view that the sound policies of the present administration had brought about recovery without the need for massive governmental expense or substantial tax cuts.

On the same day, the distinguished senior Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] delivered a scholarly address on the subject of economic growth. I notified the Senator from Utah that I intended to deliver this speech this afternoon. He thanked me for the courtesy and said that if he had not had another important committee engagement, he would have been here; but he urged me to proceed in his absence.

The Senator from Utah concluded that our economy was proceeding at a satisfactory rate and that we had overestimated the potential Soviet competition in the economic area.

There is a germ of truth in what these two staunch Republican Senators say.

We are out of the recession on a national scale, although serious pockets of depression remain in my own State and elsewhere; pockets of depression which, in my judgment, call for legislation in relief during this session of the 86th Congress.

We are in a phase of expanding economic activity. Unemployment is down substantially, and employment is up. An argument can be made that this result vindicates the laissez-faire policies of Adam Smith and David Ricardo, which appear to constitute the economic bible of the present administration, an administration which, in the economic field, appears to have usurped a somewhat outmoded cliché of an early Democrat, Thomas Jefferson, to the effect that "that government is best which governs least."

Nevertheless, there is another side to this coin. That other side was described in considerable detail and with great ability the other day by the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]. The Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] took note of the comments of the Senator from Minnesota and undertook to criticize them. I do not intend this afternoon to go over that field again or to repeat either argument. What I should like to do is to discuss, for a few minutes, the proper role of Government in determining the course of our economy in the immediate future, and to bring this subject better to the attention of Senators. Then I should like to ask a few questions and, in some instances, indicate my own answers thereto.

First, is there any assurance that the current boom will not follow the course of recent history and collapse into another recession similar to those of 1953 and 1954 and 1957 and 1958? Have we learned any lessons from recent economic history, except that the measures taken during the days of the New Deal and the Fair Deal to shore up our economy have been successful in preventing the recurrence of so disastrous a depression as hit the Nation during the last days of the Hoover administration?

Second, is it not reasonably clear that the present restrictive monetary and fiscal policies of the administration will, if continued, inhibit sound national growth in the future, as they have in the past? I refer specifically to the obsession that the budget must be balanced at the figure of \$77 billion, and to the high interest policy brought on by the Treasury and encouraged by the Federal Reserve Board.

Third, I wonder if all Senators appreciate the fact that during the Eisenhower administration our economy, measured in realistic terms, has hardly grown at all. The Senator from Utah was candid enough to admit that figures which merely state the gross national product are likely to be not only inconclusive but actually misleading. He pointed out the desirability of considering national economic growth in terms of per capita growth in constant dollars.

Using the figures which the Senator from Utah himself utilized, I note that in 1953 the per capita share, in constant dollars, of every American—man, woman, and child—in our gross national product was \$2,516. By 1958, after the

administration had been in power for 5 years, the per capita share of our gross national production had fallen to \$2,455. So during that period there was no growth at all; in fact, there was a decline.

Even if we take the first quarter of 1959 as our standard—and I am now using figures which I obtained through the good offices of the Federal Reserve Board, rather than the figures used for the whole year 1959 by the Senator from Utah—we find that the per capita share of each American in the gross national product has increased only to \$2,616, or a total increase of \$100 during a period of 5½ years. This is an increase of substantially less than 1 percent per annum.

Fourth, is it not deceptive and misleading to state growth in terms of gross national product, in obsolete terms, without adjusting for our growing population? The Senator from Utah was candid enough enough to admit it. I call the attention of Senators to the fact that twice as many babies were born in the United States in 1956 as were born in 1936. More babies means more mouths to feed, more bodies to clothe, more people to house, more children to send to school, more pure water to bring through the pipelines for human and industrial consumption, and a large number of other programs and projects which make up the public sector of our economy.

Our real rate of growth between 1953 and the first quarter of 1959, under the Eisenhower administration, has not been 2 percent or 3 percent or 4 percent per annum, as is so often stated, but 0.71 percent, or less than three-quarters of 1 percent per annum on a per capita basis. Surely this is hardly a rate of growth of which we can be proud.

There are varying figures as to the rate of growth in Communist Russia. The Senator from Utah suggested that 6¼ percent per annum increase in the Soviet gross national product was the best he could make out of it. Mr. Allen Dulles, the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, in a public speech the other day, said the Russian rate of industrial growth was 9½ percent. The Senator from Utah has tried to convert this annual increase in the gross national product to a per capita basis. He himself states candidly the difficulties he finds in reaching a meaningful figure; but he arrives, nevertheless, at his best guess of 4½ percent per annum on a per capita basis, which is roughly six or seven times our own rate of growth.

I next inquire: Do our measures of gross national product really reveal a true picture? Is it not necessary to be far more selective in determining the kind of growth we need and want? Let me suggest a few examples. Do we really need more Cadillacs, more Coca-Cola, more cigarettes, more cosmetics, more liquor? Do we really need, as a part of our gross national product, the servicing and advertising of these products on billboards and in slick magazines? Is not this portion of our gross national product as represented by these goods and services either useless or downright harmful?

What is the total of our gross national product which goes into goods and services which assist the American people



in their physical well-being and in their mental and spiritual development? That is the only kind of gross national product which really counts.

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

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. As I understand the Senator from Pennsylvania—and I hope he will correct me if I am wrong—he has said that his calculations are that in recent years the growth of the American national economy, corrected for constant dollars and for an increasing population—in other words, putting it on the basis of constant dollar growth—has been less than 1 percent per year.

Mr. CLARK. Three-fourths of 1 percent per annum.

Mr. PROXMIRE. What years are covered?

Mr. CLARK. The years of the Eisenhower administration since 1953.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I think this figure is extremely important and very significant, because we find the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board and also the administration frequently talking about growth and recognizing its importance, but talking about it either in terms of dollars without allowance for the fact that there has been inflation, or more usually without reference to the increase in population.

Mr. CLARK. My figures come from the Federal Reserve Board and from the monthly pamphlet "Economic Indicators," with which the Senator from Wisconsin is familiar. Unfortunately, it is necessary to pick out the figures from tables in the back of Economic Indicators and the back of the report of the Federal Reserve Board. The Board itself never uses those figures when it speaks of increases in gross national product.

Mr. PROXMIRE. So the increase is three-fourths of 1 percent for the past 5½ years?

Mr. CLARK. Three-quarters of 1 percent per annum, adjusted per capita and in constant dollars. In gross terms, the share of each American man, woman, and child has increased from \$2,516 to \$2,616 as of the first quarter of 1959; whereas if we stop with the figures for 1958—the last period for which we have any definitive and final figures—we find that the per capita share of the real gross national product had decreased by approximately \$55 a person.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I think it extremely important to stress the per capita measurement, although it is not the one which is usually used in the testimony given by economists for the administration and other witnesses who have appeared before our committees. They usually have ignored the per capita aspect. The Senator from Pennsylvania has, however, very properly pointed out that the per capita increase should be considered.

Do not the figures also show a larger working force? Has not the working force expanded very substantially over the past 6 years?

Mr. CLARK. It has; and of course that is most important.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Is not the increase in the working force extremely perti-

nent? Obviously, if there is an increasing work force, and if it is increasing very rapidly, it is possible to show an increase in the gross national product, even with constant dollars and even if there is diminishing productivity.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator from Wisconsin is correct.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I do not wish to interfere unduly with the Senator's presentation of his remarks. However, I should like to refer to a point which, it seems to me, bears on his difference with the Senator from New York about the kind of prosperity we are enjoying.

Did the Senator notice on the back page of the Wall Street Journal of today the very surprising information—at least, it was surprising to me—that housing starts actually declined in May? We now find that they declined—and did so contra-seasonally. It seems to me that that drop in housing starts is most significant, in view of the expectation that housing starts would increase in May. The drop, instead, in housing starts reflects very directly the increase in interest rates, and points out how foolish Congress would be to go along with the administration's request for an increase in the statutory interest rate.

Mr. CLARK. That is true. Although the amount of housing being constructed is still substantial, the tight-money situation is responsible for the decrease in housing starts.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Yes.

So let me say that when we find that the construction of the needed homes is decreasing—not increasing, as we expected—that would not seem to be the sensible time to put a brake on the economy and prevent progress in this very vital area of the economy, to wit, the construction of the homes which Americans need so badly.

Mr. CLARK. That is correct.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, at this point will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McCARTHY in the chair). Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. CLARK. I am very happy to yield.

Mr. KEATING. Of course, the game of statistics is one which everyone can play; and statistics can seemingly be made to indicate something which they do not in fact indicate.

The gross national product per capita includes all defense spending or Government spending, as the Senator from Pennsylvania knows.

Does he have any figures which show the increase in consumption expenditures per capita during these years, eliminating Government spending?

Mr. CLARK. No, I do not; other than the fact—with which I know my friend is familiar—that there seems to be no substantial letup in the increase in consumer credit.

Mr. KEATING. Of course, a case could be made to the effect that it would be in the overall interest—if world conditions were such that it were possible—to eliminate, tomorrow, all of our defense spending.

Mr. CLARK. There can be no doubt about that.

Mr. KEATING. The arrival of the millennium of world peace, and the consequent elimination of all defense spending, is a wonderful idealistic objective, but of course it would result in a terrific drop in the gross national product per capita.

Mr. CLARK. Of course. And, of course, at the end of the war in 1945 the fear of all of us was that there would be a depression, accompanied by vast unemployment. That was predicted by many economists of considerable ability and reputation. But that did not occur.

Mr. KEATING. The Senator from Pennsylvania has referred to an increase of three-fourths of 1 percent a year in the gross national product per capita.

I do not have at hand the figures in regard to the increase in consumption per capita—meaning the increase in the consumption of goods and services, other than Government spending, for the years 1953 to 1958. But I shall supply those figures for the RECORD, probably tomorrow. They indicate a very substantial increase over those years. However, I cannot state, tonight, the exact figures.

Mr. CLARK. I do not wish to quarrel with the Senator from New York as to how relevant they will be. We shall see that when he submits them.

But again I should like to buttress my point that large parts of the gross national product, as it is presently computed statistically, to my way of thinking are either useless or are outright harmful in terms of our needs. In my own view, none of those expenditures is in the public sector of our economy; all of them are in the private sector of the economy.

Of course it might be said that, from an idealistic point of view, defense expenditures are harmful—although hardly anyone would say they are useless. Certainly in the present state of the world we have to continue to make defense expenditures, until there is disarmament.

But I think that in considering the gross national product, in addition to the fact that, as a rule, we consider it in a vacuum, without reference to its per capita implications, we also tend to group Cadillac and Coca-Cola production in the same category of usefulness as the construction of schools for use by our children. That seems to be a fallacy in connection with all our thinking about the gross national product.

I should like to see prepared some figures which would show us—and I think they could be prepared by the Government statisticians, although I have not seen such figures prepared—which would show what part of the gross national product is really contributing to the physical, mental, and spiritual development of the American people.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, at this point will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield again to me?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I think that would be an extremely useful study, and a good guide to Government policy, particularly monetary policy, because an increase

in interest rates falls most heavily on products which are paid for over long periods of time, and which thus must be paid for with borrowed funds. Of course, I am referring to schools, homes, hospitals—all the things people buy to make a better life in the best sense.

The monetary—the interest rate—policies presently being followed by this administration, are defended on the grounds that they permit a steady growth over a period of time. But they discourage growth in exactly the sector of the economy where growth is most urgently and desperately needed.

Mr. CLARK. I agree; and that is especially true in the field of housing—as indicated by our experience on the Banking and Currency Committee.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield again to me?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. I agree entirely that that would be a very fine study to make; and I should like to see such a study made.

But in general there is no particular merit to increasing our gross national product by means of Government spending. Certainly it adds less to the overall good than does private spending. I am sure the Senator from Pennsylvania will concede that.

Mr. CLARK. No, I do not; I disagree very drastically with that conclusion.

Mr. KEATING. Well, at least some of us who are trying to cut down on excessive Government spending.

Mr. CLARK. The argument I am making is against that point of view.

Mr. KEATING. The Senator from Pennsylvania is making the point that there has not been enough increase per annum per capita in the gross national product. Of course, one way to increase that figure would be by bringing about a tremendously large increase in Government spending, which would have the effect of increasing the per capita spending. But I believe that what has happened to consumption spending per capita, other than Government spending, is a truer measure of what is best for human welfare.

It is true that it would be necessary to select certain elements from Government spending and certain elements from private spending, in order to obtain an entirely perfect record—although no doubt we would never have a perfect record which all of us would agree was the proper gage of human welfare. But, by and large, the proper measure would seem to me to be the increase in the consumption expenditures—the increase in expenditures for goods and services per capita over these years. I am certain that those figures show a very substantial increase.

Mr. CLARK. I shall be happy to look at those figures when my friend produces them. For the moment I shall register my dissent with their materiality.

Although I find myself in accord with much of the latest statement by the Senator from New York, I wish to suggest that what we really have to do is examine the entire spectrum of the private and public sectors of the economy, and decide which parts of the private sector

and which parts of the public sector are most in the national interest and need to be encouraged, and then determine the ways and means to encourage them.

That brings me to my sixth question, namely, is it not very clear, indeed, that we need a stronger national defense? I am sure my friend from New York would not be in favor of cutting down the appropriations for national defense.

Is it not clear that we need more schools, and more and better paid teachers? I am sure my friend from New York would agree we need them, although he and I might differ as to the level of government which should pay for them.

Is it not clear that we need a decent home for every American family? That is the policy declaration of the Wagner-Ellender-Taft Act of 1949. I am sure my friend in that respect would follow former Senator Taft, as I am happy to do.

Is it not clear we need protection and preservation of our water supply? My friend and I are busily engaged at the moment in trying to accomplish that with regard to the Delaware River, in which both our States have a keen interest.

Is it not clear that we need economic aid for our own depressed areas? This, perhaps, I feel more strongly about than my friend from New York, but I am sure he would agree we have to do something about the people who are chronically and persistently unemployed for so long a time.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on that point briefly?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. That was brought out in my remarks. We do have a spotty problem of unemployment, and we should approach it as a spotty proposition and not with a shotgun, overall approach.

Mr. CLARK. Selectively.

Mr. KEATING. Selectively.

Mr. CLARK. I agree with my friend. His comments in that regard were to me very interesting.

I return now to the listing of the things we need.

We need the elimination of slums in our cities. Whether it be Buffalo, New York City, Rochester, Altoona, or Pittsburgh; surely the Senator and I agree that slum elimination is a necessity and can best be brought about with the aid of Government, although he and I might quarrel with regard to the rate at which we should attack the problem.

We need to complete and to maintain adequate transportation facilities by road, rail, water, and air. In all of these fields, although it seems unfortunate, the Government has to move in to give some assistance.

We need better hospital facilities and medical care for everyone, but especially for the aged. Again, we have massive Government programs which are intended to achieve those ends.

We need community facilities of all sorts. They are particularly badly needed in my own Commonwealth, where so many local units of government, because of bad economic conditions, cannot raise the taxes which are necessary

even for the installation of a sewage system, or a decent system for providing pure water, or a respectable courthouse in which to administer justice. Many times the local governments cannot provide a city hall which does not leak and which has an adequate and substantial floor.

There is need for a host of other community facilities, which appear to be beyond the financial capabilities of many local governments to provide.

All of these things will vastly increase our security, our well-being, and the value of our civilization in mental, moral, and spiritual terms.

My seventh question is, Who is going to supply these things we need, about which I have been talking? My answer is that in large part government at all levels—local, State, and National—has to supply them.

Why, one might ask, cannot private enterprise supply these goods and services? The answer is very clear. It is because these things cannot be supplied at a profit. It is exactly as simple as that. What I have been talking about are the areas in the public sector of the economy, where the needs are great, but where we cannot expect the private enterprise system to provide these needs because private enterprise is built upon the profit system. Unless a profit can be made out of a project, one cannot expect the private enterprise system to provide it. If I were the director of or an executive officer of a private corporation which operated for profit, and if I were asked to do these things on a pro bono publico basis, I would certainly decline. They must be done by Government, for only Government can do them.

Where will the Government get the money to supply these things which are so greatly needed? That is also clear, though perhaps it is somewhat unpopular. The Government will get the money from the taxes which are paid by Americans and by the corporations Americans have organized.

My next question is: Can the Federal Government provide its share of these things we need in order to establish and maintain a first-class America over the next decade on a \$77 billion budget? My answer to that question is clearly "No," and that it is folly to think so. The sooner we in Government acknowledge this fact, both to ourselves and to our constituents, the sooner we will be prepared to meet the real challenge of our time. The fact is that the public sector of our economy is starved, and the unneeded and luxury elements of the private sector of the economy are glutted.

The next question which arises is: Is it not necessary, then, to increase Federal taxes? My answer to that question is, "Not necessarily."

By closing tax loopholes and by a more rigorous enforcement of the existing tax laws, I am confident we can balance the Federal budget for the fiscal year 1960 and still provide adequate appropriations in the short run for the programs I have outlined. I believe the 1960 fiscal year budget can be balanced at around \$81 billion or \$82 billion, if these steps are taken, and that we will



still have enough revenues for a substantial payment on the national debt.

If we will take off the fiscal and monetary brakes which have been imposed on the growth of our economy by the Treasury and by the Federal Reserve Board, tax receipts in subsequent years may—and I underscore the word "may"—enable us not only to continue to remedy the obsolescence in the public sector of our economy, but also to give tax relief to those who most need it.

The brakes which, in my judgment, are unnecessarily holding back our growth are the high interest rates, the unreasoning fear of inflation, and the obsession that the budget must be balanced but only at the sacred figure of \$77 billion for fiscal year 1960, instead of at the higher figure which I suggest.

So I should like to say to my good friend from New York, it is true, as he says, that the 85th Congress failed to pass a community facilities bill, an area redevelopment bill, a housing bill, or an adequate education bill. But in my judgment our failure to act is no cause for satisfaction. It is instead a cause for shame—shame that the President and a majority of both Houses of Congress did not see the need for these measures and insist that they become law.

I express the fervent hope that this Congress, the 86th Congress, will be wiser than its predecessor, even though the President clearly is not.

When my friend from New York asks, "What will it take to restore confidence?" I would say to him, somewhat in lighter vein but nevertheless using his own pungent phrases, "A little less talk of gloom and doom and panic-driven measures from your colleagues and your constituents about the threat of inflation. A little less hollering from the Wall Street all-is-lost group about a perfectly normal withdrawal of gold holdings by our friends and allies abroad; a little less support from the Senator from New York and his colleagues for the extraordinarily ill-timed request of the Treasury for an increase in the statutory ceiling on interest rates on long-term Government bonds; and a little more support for the proposals of those of us who want Government to help our country's sound economic growth instead of holding it back."

I would say to my good friend from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], "I respect you for your carefully thought out and clearly expressed views about our economy and for the temperate way in which you state the conservative case. We seek the same goals, but we travel by different paths."

Accordingly, I must most respectfully state for the RECORD my profound disagreement with the basic conclusions of the Senator from Utah about the role Government should play in promoting full employment, maximum growth, and reasonable price stability.

First, I believe we must and can control our economy. We cannot sit idly by and permit our economy to control us, for left to itself our economy is amoral and without a sense of social direction.

Second, I concur wholeheartedly with my colleague from Minnesota in his

advocacy of more and better economic and social planning at the National Government level. Such planning does not and should not ignore the realities of life and of human nature. It does and should represent the soundest of economic thinking. It calls for the outpouring of the best of man's nature. This planning is a recognition that man does not live by bread alone. It advances Christian compassion, instead of greed, as the basic force in American life. It calls us onward toward our manifest destiny—peace on earth, good will to all men everywhere, in an atmosphere of freedom and in an economic and social climate in which man can fulfill the best which is in him and rise above the jungle law of the unregulated marketplace.

The 86th Congress, Mr. President, has a rendezvous with destiny in following this course. I hope that rendezvous will be kept.

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

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I should like to warmly commend the Senator for what I think has been an excellent speech. It is very timely. I am delighted it has been delivered.

I think it is certainly desirable that the fine, conservative Republican speeches which were made by my good friend the junior Senator from New York and by the senior Senator from Utah should be answered.

I think one of the most dramatic points which has been made by the Senator from Pennsylvania—and I think this is the first time I have heard it made in the emphatic and documented way the Senator has made it on the floor of the Senate—is the point regarding the sharp discrepancy between the growth of our economy, which is three-quarters of 1 percent—

Mr. CLARK. Per capita.

Mr. PROXMIRE. And the growth of the U.S.S.R. economy, which the Senator says is about 4½ percent per capita. The growth of the Russian economy is six, seven, or eight times as large as ours.

Mr. CLARK. Those are the figures used by the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT].

Mr. PROXMIRE. I think the Senator from Pennsylvania gave us another refinement which was very useful, since it is rarely heard in discussions among economists, to say nothing of discussions among Senators. I refer to the discrimination between kinds of growth.

I am sure every Member of the Senate will agree that we would not give up any of the political or economic freedoms of the American system. We insist on preserving our system. We recognize the system of tyranny of Russia, and we want none of it.

At the same time, if we are to preserve our lead—and we have a substantial economic lead, and perhaps military lead—it seems essential that our political leaders challenge the American people and tell them the truth—tell them that a system of tyranny is concentrating a tremendous amount of resources in education, in capital equipment and capital investment, and that as a result of such

concentration it is forging ahead at an alarmingly rapid rate.

Mr. CLARK. I agree with my friend entirely. I thank him for his helpful comments.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I think we should also recognize that this is something which can be done in a system of freedom. We have grown with great rapidity in America, with a free economy and free political institutions. Today in Western Europe—France, Italy, Great Britain, and West Germany—there are free political institutions, and virtually free economies are growing very rapidly. From what I have read and heard, their growth compares very favorably with that of Russia and greatly surpasses the United States. Is that correct?

Mr. CLARK. I believe the Senator is correct, although I have not the figures at my fingertips.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I conclude by commending the Senator. I hope we shall have more speeches of this kind. It is extremely important not only that the political leadership of the country, represented in the Congress and the administration, be challenged, but that the people be challenged, too, so that they will realize what is at stake.

Mr. CLARK. I thank my friend for his comments.

I wish to thank also my good friend from New York [Mr. KEATING] for participating in this discussion and remaining to hear me. I suspect that to some extent he is a captive audience, because he is the acting minority leader. At any event, it is helpful to have his interjections.

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

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. Let me say to the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania that I enjoyed his discourse. I share emphatically with him the sentiments expressed in the statements toward the end of his address, in which he said he hoped that the 86th Congress would do more than the 85th Congress.

I invite attention to the fact that he and the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] both have a very much greater responsibility in that connection, and very much greater influence with the majority leader, in shaping the policies of their party, than has a very junior Senator on the minority side.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is unduly flattering. I only wish that he were correct.

Mr. KEATING. I assure the Senator that I shall be glad to join in advocating such legislation as I consider constructive. There is much in what the Senator from Pennsylvania and the Senator from Wisconsin desire in this area with which I would agree.

I am happy that the Senator from Pennsylvania did not take issue with the fundamental thesis of my remarks the other day, to the effect that we now have brighter economic skies. I know that he, as well as I, the Senator from Wisconsin, and all other Senators, have a desire to continue the upward trend.

Mr. President, in the Washington Star of Thursday, June 11, there was published a very illuminating editorial on this subject, entitled "Brighter Economic Sky."

I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

#### BRIGHTER ECONOMIC SKY

The impressive statistics on mid-May employment released by the Commerce and Labor Departments lead to two gratifying conclusions. One is that the upward business trend which began slightly more than a year ago has passed the stage of recovery from recession and reflects now a fully confirmed prosperity cycle of considerable vigor. The second is that the administration and the congressional leadership of both parties were on sound ground last year in refusing to be panicked into programs of massive emergency pump-priming expenditures of Federal funds.

In brief, the statistics show this: In the latest 30-day period covered, civilian employment increased by 1 million to a record May level of 66 million gainfully at work. This total was 2 million higher than the corresponding 1958 level and virtually every major industry group showed better than a normal seasonal increase. Favorable significance also was attributed to the fact that the average workweek in manufacturing had advanced to 40.5 hours, longest for that month since 1955, with average factory wages reaching an all-time high above \$90 weekly. In the same period, unemployment dropped by another 240,000 to a total of 3.4 million. At the depth of the 1957-58 recession, the jobless numbered 5.3 million.

There are no infallible rules, of course, by which the duration of a prosperity cycle may be measured in advance. Experience suggests, however, that one which has been developing steadily for as much as a year has the momentum to continue for at least another 6 months and perhaps considerably longer. Until recently, neither capital spending for plant expansion nor automobiles, two major segments of the economy, had contributed much to the upswing. Both are showing current signs of considerable improvement. A third component, an export trade which has lagged badly because of several factors, likewise has somewhat brighter prospects for the remainder of the year. All in all, the economic outlook, for the medium-term future, at least, is good.

#### ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, June 15, 1959, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 1901) to amend section 101(c) of the Agricultural Act of 1949 and the act of July 28, 1945, to stabilize and protect the level of support for tobacco.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, as in legislative session, pursuant to the order heretofore entered, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 29 minutes p.m.) under the order previously entered, the Senate adjourned, as in legislative session, until tomorrow, Tuesday, June 16, 1959, at 12 o'clock meridian.

#### CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 15, 1959:

##### PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

Eugenie Mary Davie, of New York, to be a member of the Board of Regents of the National Library of Medicine, Public Health Service, for a term expiring August 3, 1962.

The following candidates for personnel action in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law and regulations:

##### I. FOR APPOINTMENT

O. David Garvin to be senior surgeon.  
Norman J. Petersen to be assistant sanitary engineer.

##### II. FOR PERMANENT PROMOTION

Thomas E. McClellan to be senior assistant dental surgeon.

Philbrook H. Knight to be pharmacist.

The following candidates for personnel action in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law and regulations:

##### FOR APPOINTMENT

Clarence A. Imboden, Jr., to be surgeon.  
Joe R. Held to be senior assistant veterinary officer.

##### To be nurse officers

Rena E. Boyle  
Kathryn M. Fritz  
Dorine J. Loso

##### To be health services officer

Marion Andrews

The following candidates for personnel action in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law and regulations:

##### I. FOR APPOINTMENT

##### To be senior assistant surgeons

James C. Allen	Arthur Karmen
Burton Allyn	James H. Kauth
David L. Aronson	Kurt W. Kohn
Joseph A. Bauer	Irwin J. Kopin
Thomas C. Bithell	Leavie E. Lee, Jr.
Kurt J. Bloch	Leonard M. Linde
Jacob A. Brody	Philip R. B. McMaster
Howard M. Cann	Arthur D. Merritt
Theodore R. Carski	Edward L. Michals
Thomas M. Cassidy	Richard S. Moraites
George E. Cobb	Charles F. Nadler
Robert B. Couch	Robert J. Olson
Robert L. Dernlan	Robert J. B. Osnos
H. Bruce Dull	Malcolm I. Page
Frederick L. Dunn	Bertram W. Pepper
Leland L. Fairbanks	Douglas K. Powers
George H. Franck	John C. Pruitt
Herschel C. Gore	Carroll B. Quinlan
Charles L. Greenblatt	Robert R. Schenck
John H. Hammann	Donald P. Schilder
Avery R. Harrington	Sam Silbergeld
Hugh R. Hayward	George P. Sperry
Alan F. Hofmann	William H. Strange
Alfonso H. Holguin	Gerald G. Van Aren-
John P. Hughes	donk

##### To be assistant surgeons

Paul G. Belau	James L. Johnson
Norris D. Buchmeyer	Donald E. McMillan
Joseph O. Dean, Jr.	Charles A. Peterson
John W. Dickson	James S. Sullivan
S. Paul Ehrlich, Jr.	Paul N. Vann

##### To be senior assistant dental surgeon

Richard L. Smith

##### To be assistant dental surgeon

Oscar H. Tatum, Jr.

##### To be assistant sanitary engineers

Robert G. Bostrom	Gerald G. Vurek
Gerald M. Hansler	Carl M. Walter
Parker C. Reist	

##### To be junior assistant sanitary engineer

Paul H. King

##### To be senior assistant pharmacists

Frank W. Hollister  
M. Thomas Wagner, Jr.

##### To be assistant pharmacists

James R. Grigdesby	Walter J. Ludwig
George R. Hall	Bernard Shleien
John H. Herath	Lawrence D. Smith

##### To be senior assistant scientists

Herber F. Hasenclever Roslyn Q. Robinson  
Leonard A. Herzenberg Kenneth K. Takemoto

##### To be assistant scientist

Alan Burkhalter

##### To be senior assistant veterinary officer

Richard L. Parker

##### To be assistant veterinary officers

John E. Holman, Jr.  
Charles W. McPherson  
Gerald L. Van Hoosier, Jr.

##### To be senior assistant nurse officer

Ellen I. McDonald

The following candidates for personnel action in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law and regulations:

##### FOR APPOINTMENT

##### To be surgeon

George Moore

##### To be senior assistant surgeon

Donald C. Reifel

##### To be senior sanitary engineer

Harry P. Kramer

##### To be senior assistant therapist

Norma J. Ewan

The following candidates for personnel action in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law and regulations:

##### FOR PERMANENT PROMOTIONS

##### To be medical directors

George Massengill	Luther Terry
Robert F. Martin	Joseph H. Bragdon
Paul A. Lindquist	Donald S. Martin
R. Lincoln Smith	John M. Whitney
George E. Parkhurst	Will H. Aufranc
Randolph P. Grimm	Burnet M. Davis
Elmer L. Hill	Leon A. Heppel
James F. Maddux	Fred W. Thyng
Eugene J. Gillespie	Mary Walton
Edward T. Blomquist	Elton S. Osborne, Jr.
James L. Elliott	Robert W. Rasor
Andrew P. Sackett	William W. Richards
Frederick C. Bartter	Lewis C. Robbins
Herbert Tabor	Carl R. Kunstling
Robert J. Huebner	

##### To be senior surgeons

Charles S. McCammon	James H. Baxter
Richard A. Malmgren	Milton Zises
Roger K. McDonald	G. Donald Whedon
Andrew G. Morrow	Robert C. Lam
Robert O. Scow	

##### To be surgeons

Louis A. Gaul	Cameron L. Self
Donald S. Fredrickson	Bernard G. Keizer
Howard W. Kopping	James L. Goddard
William B. Kannel	Craig S. Lichtenwalner
Eugene W. Veverka	Gilbert R. Christenson
Wallace P. Rowe	T. Phillip Waalkes
Charles M. Bowyer	Donald R. Chadwick
Aubrey F. Haynes	Frederick Stohman,
Fred J. Payne	Jr.
Joseph A. Falzone, Jr.	Leonard J. Duhl
Melvin R. Davis	David Horwitz
Robert J. Trautman	Edward V. Evarts
David C. Miller	John L. Stephenson
Margaret S. Wheeler	

##### To be senior assistant surgeons

Conrad E. Herr	S. Ross Fox, Jr.
Ellsworth Y. Ching	Stanley R. Mohler
George H. Christ	Richard I. Myers
Joseph M. Torruella	Jack P. Clark



Vernon O. Larson  
Donald C. Loos  
Norbert L. Dugan, Jr.  
Paul P. Carbone  
Dean F. Tirador  
Richard L. Pentecost  
Ray L. Zeigler

*To be dental directors*

Mark E. Bowers  
Fred D. Lewis, Jr.  
Dennis E. Singleton, Maurice S. Rodgers Jr.

*To be senior dental surgeon*

Charles P. White

*To be dental surgeons*

Richard L. Hayes  
Viron L. Diefenbach  
Norman W. Littleton  
Stanley Lotzkar

*To be senior assistant dental surgeons*

John F. Dyar  
William R. Wallace  
James E. Hardwick III  
Kenneth C. Lynn  
Ralph S. Johnson  
Herald D. Green, Jr.  
Samuel Kakehashi  
Raymond Berlin

*To be sanitary engineer directors*

James H. Le Van  
Ralph Porges  
John S. Wiley  
Kaarlo W. Nasi  
Richard L. Woodward  
Gerald W. Ferguson  
Conrad P. Straub

*To be senior sanitary engineers*

Andrew D. Hosey  
Henry J. L. Rechen  
Frederick S. Kent  
Charles R. Bowman

*To be sanitary engineers*

William E. Bell  
Lester M. Klashman

*To be senior assistant sanitary engineers*

Paul A. Kenline  
Walter M. Sanders III

*To be assistant sanitary engineers*

Paul W. Kolp  
Lloyd A. Reed  
Marvin D. High

*To be senior pharmacists*

Henry L. Verhulst  
Reede M. Ames

*To be senior assistant pharmacist*

Mark H. Barnett

*To be scientist directors*

Roy F. Fritz  
Ralph C. Barnes  
Harold B. Robinson  
Dohrman H. Byers  
David B. Lackman  
Howard W. Bond

*To be senior scientists*

William B. Cherry  
Harvey I. Scudder  
Walter L. Newton  
Geoffrey M. Jeffery

*To be scientists*

Martha K. Ward  
Sidney S. Chernick

*To be sanitarian directors*

Glenn M. Kohls  
Maurice E. Odoroff

*To be senior sanitarians*

Louis J. Ogden  
Kent S. Littig

*To be sanitarians*

Morgan S. Seal  
Joseph A. Staton

*To be veterinary officers*

Robert W. Menges  
Donald D. Stamm

*To be senior assistant veterinary officers*

Daniel Cohen  
Roy F. Kinard, Jr.

*To be nurse directors*

Ellwynne M. Vreeland  
Esther A. Garrison  
Vera P. Hansel

*To be senior nurse officers*

Esther Kaufman  
Apollonia O. Adams  
G. Alice Boore  
Ann F. Mathews  
Jeannette E. Potter

*To be nurse officers*

Mildred Jones  
Anne J. Lello  
Mary B. Krause  
Mary L. Casey

*To be senior dietitian*

Clara B. Tavis

*To be senior assistant therapists*

Michael J. Oliva  
John L. Echternach  
Donald E. Shipley

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JUNE 15, 1959

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. William Wood Glass, D.D., minister, First Presbyterian Church, South Boston, Va., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Spirit whom our fathers have called God, in whom we live and move and have our beings, from whom we derive life and breath and all things, we thank Thee for Thy most holy, wise, and powerful preserving and governing all Thy creatures and all their actions.

We are prone to come before Thee with sundry petitions all of which express the hope that we may be blessed, that we may enjoy that which we vaguely identify as good fortune.

Help us to see that Thou art with us in shadow as in sunshine, in suffering as in health, in sorrow as in joy, to see that the blessing we covet may well come to us in darkness rather than in light—as it did of old time to Jacob who wrestled with the angel.

To see that for us the blessing may be no material thing but rather that we may learn to trust Thee more confidently, more truly, more surely.

Bless us then, great God, that we may with confidence place our trust in Thee, and become ourselves a blessing to others.

For we ask all this in Jesus' name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, June 12, 1959, was read and approved.

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed

without amendment bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 318. An act to authorize a revision of the boundaries of the Edison Laboratory National Monument, N.J., and for other purposes;

H.R. 1306. An act to provide for the sale of Columbia Basin project lands to the State of Washington, and for other purposes;

H.R. 1471. An act for the relief of Jim B. Hill;

H.R. 1711. An act for the relief of the Galveston, Houston & Henderson Railroad Co.;

H.R. 1758. An act for the relief of Gerald M. Cooley;

H.R. 2011. An act for the relief of Lenora Holmes Mola;

H.R. 2044. An act for the relief of the estate of Richard Anthony Nunes, Jr.;

H.R. 2100. An act for the relief of John F. Carmody;

H.R. 2154. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire certain additional property to be included within the Independence National Historical Park;

H.R. 2286. An act for the relief of Joseph E. Gallant;

H.R. 2289. An act for the relief of Mrs. Gertrude E. Shetler;

H.R. 2586. An act for the relief of Miss Mame E. Howell;

H.R. 3292. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to furnish supplies and services to foreign vessels and aircraft, and for other purposes;

H.R. 3366. An act to authorize the extension of loans of naval vessels to the Governments of Italy, Turkey, and the Republic of China.

H.R. 3454. An act to disclaim any interest on the part of the United States in certain lands in the State of Colorado, and for other purposes;

H.R. 3495. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to administer certain acquired lands as revested Oregon and California railroad grant lands;

H.R. 3496. An act to revise the boundaries of the Kings Mountain National Military Park, S.C., and to authorize the procurement and exchange of lands, and for other purposes;

H.R. 3522. An act for the relief of Aaron Green, Jr.;

H.R. 3825. An act for the relief of Dr. Gordon D. Hoople, Dr. David W. Brewer, and the estate of the late Dr. Irl H. Blaisdell;

H.R. 3960. An act for the relief of Patrick W. Gowan, David Dooling, Harlie L. Mize, James H. Blaes, and William L. Perkins;

H.R. 4345. An act to repeal clause (9) of subdivision a of section 39 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 67a(9)), respecting the transmission of papers by the referee to the clerk of the court;

H.R. 4692. An act to amend sections 1, 18, 22, 331, and 631 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 1, 41, 45, 731, 1031) to provide for automatic adjudication and reference in certain cases;

H.R. 4748. An act to extend the leasing provisions of the act of June 14, 1926, as amended by the act of June 4, 1954 (68 Stat. 173; 43 U.S.C. 869-869-3), to certain lands in Oregon, and for other purposes;

H.R. 5212. An act to revise the minimum charge on pieces of mail of odd sizes and shapes;

H.R. 5262. An act to revise the boundaries of the Montezuma Castle National Monument, Ariz., and for other purposes;

H.R. 5488. An act to revise the boundaries of Wright Brothers National Memorial, N.C., and for other purposes;