Do you favor continuing:

(a) Military aid ($1.3 billion this year) to the armed forces of our allies?—40 percent.

(b) Defense support ($695 million this year) to bolster the economies of many of our allies?—27 percent.

(c) Special assistance ($245 million this year) to bolster the economies of so-called neutralist or undetermined countries?—15 percent.

(d) Technical cooperation ($181.2 million this year) supplying instruction and know-how to underdeveloped nations?—54 percent.

(e) Development loans in dollars ($550 million this year) to underdeveloped countries repayable mainly in the currencies of those countries?—40 percent.

(f) None of these; end the program?—24 percent.

SPACE

1. Do you feel it is important for us to be able to travel in space as soon as possible? Yes, 42 percent; no, 52 percent.

2. Do you feel that ability to travel in space will have military significance in the foreseeable future? Yes, 51 percent; no, 40 percent.

FARM PROGRAM

1. Do you favor an immediate end of all farm price supports?—36 percent.

2. Do you favor high rigid price supports to guarantee farmers return of their growing costs and return on their investment?—4 percent.

3. Do you favor reducing farm price supports over a period of several years until a free farm economy is restored?—60 percent.

FISCAL

1. Do you believe that the budget of the U.S. Government:

(a) Should always be balanced?—53 percent.

(b) May be unbalanced in years of decreased business activity to stimulate business?—43 percent.

2. Do you favor:

(a) Lowering Federal taxes immediately, without regard to a balanced budget?—9 percent.

(b) Increasing Federal taxes if necessary for additional public services?—6 percent.

(c) Lowering Federal taxes after reducing expenditures and reducing the national debt?—83 percent.

3. Do you favor:

(a) Systematically reducing the national debt each year?—88 percent.

(b) Increasing the national debt in order to provide additional Federal services without raising taxes?—3 percent.

(c) Keeping the national debt at its present level of about $290 billion?—5 percent.

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

1. Do you believe the Federal Government should assume a definite part of the responsibility for public school education in America, including payment of administration costs and teachers' salaries?—8 percent.

2. Do you favor Federal assistance for public school construction on a general basis?—10 percent.

3. Do you favor limiting Federal aid to the programs we now have, including assistance to federally impacted areas?—32 percent.

4. Should we have no Federal aid whatsoever?—44 percent.

MEDICAL BENEFITS TO THE ELDERLY

1. Do you favor free medical care for all people over 65 paid for by the Federal Government?—7 percent.

2. Should we include surgical and hospital care for persons over 65 as a part of social security?—26 percent.

3. Do you favor Federal incentives to private insurance companies to provide health insurance to the elderly?—18 percent.

4. Do you feel there should be no Federal program of any kind to provide medical assistance for elderly persons, leaving this to States and private resources?—50 percent.

VETERANS PENSIONS

1. Paying pensions to veterans without service-connected disabilities on a basis of need?—16 percent.

2. Giving all World War I veterans an honor pension of $100 per month without regard to need or disability?—8 percent.

3. Pensions to disabled veterans should go up automatically with the cost of living?—60 percent.

4. Other?—35 percent.

SENATE

MONDAY, MAY 23, 1960

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

Rev. C. Edward Gammon, D.D., minister, Fairlington Presbyterian Church, Alexandria, Va., offered the following prayer:

O God, who hast been the refuge and strength of good and wise men in many generations, we cry unto Thee for our world, tense with suspicion, haunted by the pain of yesterday's wars, our own countryside garrisoned with slender stalagmites of terrible, radioactive death. Thus we implore Thy mercy for all who this day must represent free peoples before the forums of world conscience.

We beseech Thee to grant physical stamina, intellectual vigor, and sensitivity of soul to all honored men of government—for men living with harsh, insistent pressures, struggling conscience, complex decisions, the vulgar demands of entrenched greed; the never-ending pleas of injured minorities and conflicting parochial interests; the outraged cries of the sluggard, men of borderline morals who went too far; the tragic victims of war, hunger, disaster, and disease; men living each day with the tensions of domestic politics.

O dear God, we Americans are hard on our public servants. Be merciful and gracious, a strong God of infinite love and grace to them.

Dear God, in these boisterous days when we Americans go about the business of selecting our leadership for the coming years, grant that, when all is said and done, and the campaigns of 1960 shall have become history, these walls, hallowed by the memories of radiant ideas, flaming words, and courageous men, shall once again be filled with men of honor whose abiding dedication shall be to sustain a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty for ourselves and our posterity.

These things we ask in the name of God, the Father of Jesus Christ. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, May 19, 1960, was dispensed with.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE SUBMITTED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Pursuant to the order of the Senate of January 18, 1960,

Mr. RUSSELL, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported favorably, with amendments, on May 20, 1960, the bill (H.R. 12117), making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes, and submitted a report (No. 1404) thereon.

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. 2130) to authorize a payment to the Government of Japan.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 9465) to authorize the extension of a loan of a naval vessel to the Government of the Republic of China.

The message further 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. 10809) to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for salaries and expenses, research and development, construction and equipment, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 11405. An act to provide for the treatment of income from discharge of indebtedness of a railroad corporation in a receivership proceeding or in a proceeding under section 77 of the Bankruptcy Act commenced before January 1, 1960, and for other purposes;

H.R. 11748. An act to continue until the close of June 30, 1961, the suspension of duties on metal scrap, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 12232. An act making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H.R. 4029. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to eliminate the proration of the occupational tax on persons dealing in machineguns and certain other firearms, to reduce occupational and transfer taxes on certain weapons, to make the transferor and transferee jointly liable for the transfer tax on firearms, and to make certain changes in the definition of a firearm;

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

H.R. 6482. An act relating to the credits against the unemployment tax in the case of certain successor employers; and

H.R. 9308. An act to extend until June 30, 1963, the suspension of duty on imports of crude chicory and the reduction in duty on ground chicory.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H.R. 11405. An act to provide for the treatment of income from discharge of indebtedness of a railroad corporation in a receivership proceeding or in a proceeding under section 77 of the Bankruptcy Act commenced before January 1, 1960, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 11748. An act to continue until the close of June 30, 1961, the suspension of duties on metal scrap, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

H.R. 12232. An act making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. MANSFIELD. 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 VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER DISPENSING WITH CALL OF THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the calendar, under the rule, be dispensed with.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Buildings and Grounds of the Committee on Public Works was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM—CONSIDERATION OF VETO MESSAGE ON DEPRESSED AREAS BILL

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to ask the acting majority leader about action on the President's veto of the depressed areas bill. It was my understanding that it would be called up tomorrow, and that the debate might run into Wednesday. But I had hoped we could set a definite day and hour when we could have the Senate vote on the vetoed bill, and probably divide the time equally, if there was to be debate.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I would say that, definitely, the President's veto of the depressed areas bill will be brought up tomorrow, Tuesday; and I hope the attachés of the Senate will notify all Senators accordingly.

As to the matter of the time, if the minority leader has a suggestion, I shall see, later this afternoon, whether something can be worked out, to the end that a time limitation can be set. It might be possible for us to vote tomorrow on the vetoed measure.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I shall be glad to confer further this afternoon, with the acting majority leader, in order to ascertain how much time may be taken by Senators on our side; and I presume he will ascertain the number of speeches to be made by Senators on his side. Perhaps we can contrive an agreement as to an hour certain, so all Senators may be on notice as to the time when the vote on the vetoed bill will come.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I shall be delighted to work on that; and later in the afternoon we shall see what we can arrange.

COMMISSION TO FORMULATE A MEMORIAL TO JAMES MADISON

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 417, 86th Congress, approved April 8, 1960, has appointed the following Senators as members, on the part of the Senate, of the Commission to Formulate a Memorial to James Madison: Mr. HOLLAND, of Florida; Mr. ROBERTSON, of Virginia; Mr. CARLSON, of Kansas; and Mr. BENNETT, of Utah.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

REPORT ON COOPERATION WITH MEXICO IN CONTROL AND ERADICATION OF FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, reporting, pursuant to law, that there have been no significant developments to report for the month of April 1960 relating to the cooperative program of the United States with Mexico for the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT OF OVEROBLIGATIONS OF APPROPRIATIONS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, 36 reports covering 49 violations of appropriations within that Department (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORT ON DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT CONTRACTS

A letter from the Director of Research and Development, Department of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on Department of the Army Research and Development contracts, for $50,000 or more, awarded during the period July 1, 1959, through December 31, 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

CHANGE OF METHOD OF PROMOTION OF CERTAIN RESERVE OFFICERS OF THE AIR FORCE

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to change the method of promotion of Reserve officers of the Air Force to Reserve general officer grades (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON EXPORT CONTROL

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on export control, covering the first quarter of 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT ON REVIEW OF AUTOMATIC DATA-PROCESSING INSTALLATION, NEW ORLEANS COMMODITY OFFICE, COMMODITY STABILIZATION SERVICE

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the review of automatic data-processing installation, New Orleans Commodity Office, Commodity Stabilization Service, Department of Agriculture, October 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON REVIEW OF DEVELOPMENT AND PROCUREMENT OF NEW COMBAT AND TACTICAL VEHICLES BY DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a confidential report on the review of development and procurement of new combat and tactical vehicles by the Department of the Army (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON REVIEW OF ADMINISTRATIVE MANAGEMENT OF BALLISTIC MISSILE PROGRAM

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, the initial report on review of administrative management of the ballistic missile program of the Department of the Air Force, dated May 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

ERECTION OF FREEDOM MONUMENT

A letter from the Under Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the erection of Freedom Monument, symbolizing the ideals of democracy, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON BACKLOG OF PENDING APPLICATIONS AND HEARING CASES IN FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on backlog of pending applications and hearing cases in that Commission, as of March 31, 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

FEDERAL WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1960

A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to strengthen the enforcement provisions of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act and extend the duration of the authorization of grants for State water pollution control programs, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Public Works.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Archivist of the United States on a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. CARLSON members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

RESOLUTION OF INDONESIAN PARLIAMENT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Assistant Secretary of State, transmitting, pursuant to the request of the Indonesian Government, a resolution of the Indonesian Parliament, concerning the Sahara atomic tests conducted by the French Government, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

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

"ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION 12

"Joint resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to oppose passage of H.R. 1884, which if enacted will prohibit the States from imposing a length-of-residence requirement as a condition to receiving welfare benefits under the Social Security Act

"Whereas H.R. 1884 has been introduced in the House of Representatives, and if enacted will prohibit the States from establishing a minimum length-of-residence requirement as a condition to receiving welfare benefits under the Social Security Act; and

"Whereas the right to require a minimum period of residence in the State is a right properly exercised by the States; and

"Whereas passage of the proposed bill will greatly increase the amount required to be expended by the State of Nevada to provide social security benefits; and

"Whereas depriving the States of the right to impose a length-of-residence requirement as a condition to receiving such benefits is an unjustified invasion of their sovereign powers: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of Nevada (jointly), That the Congress of the United States is hereby memorialized to oppose passage of H.R. 1884, thereby preserving the sovereign right of the States to require a minimum length of residency as a condition to receiving welfare benefits under the Social Security Act; and be it further

"Resolved, That certified copies of this resolution be prepared and transmitted forthwith by the legislative counsel to the President of the United States, Vice President of the United States, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and each member of Nevada's congressional delegation.

"Passed by the senate March 11, 1960.

"REX BELL,
"President of the Senate.
"LEOLA H. WOHLFEIL,
"Secretary of the Senate.

"Passed by the assmbly March 10, 1960.

"BERNARD POELE,
"Speaker of the Assembly.
"NATHAN T. HURST,
"Chief Clerk of the Assembly.
"GRANT SAWYER,
"Governor of the State of Nevada."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Nevada; to the Committee on Government Operations:

"ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION 7

"Joint resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to establish a system of payments by the Federal Government to the State of Nevada or its local governments, which payments will be made in lieu of property taxes on federally owned property in this State, which property is immune from State or local taxation

"Whereas the Federal Government owns approximately 60,500,000 acres of the total area of 70,745,600 acres of land in the State of Nevada, being approximately 86.2 percent of all land in the State of Nevada; and

"Whereas the Federal Government has indicated a desire of withdrawing additional lands from the public domain; and

"Whereas the constitution of the State of Nevada prohibits the taxation of such lands unless otherwise provided by the Congress of the United States; and

"Whereas the ad valorem property tax in effect in the State of Nevada is a primary source of revenue for the State of Nevada; and

"Whereas the several county assessors in the State of Nevada have estimated the value of all such lands held by the Federal Government in the State of Nevada to be $767,884,511; and

"Whereas the Commission on Intergovernmental Relation, in its 1955 report to the President of the United States, has evidenced its complete awareness that the immunity of federally owned property from State and local ad valorem taxation has greatly reduced the tax base of many communities which rely on property taxes as their chief source of revenue; and

"Whereas the impact of this immunity is unequal and particularly severe in areas where the value of Federal property is a large part of the total property values; and

"Whereas the Federal Government has realized this problem in the past and has developed a variety of financial arrangements between such Government and State and local governments; and

"Whereas the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations has recommended that the Federal Government inaugurate a broad system of payments by the Federal Government to State and local governments in lieu of property taxes on federally owned property; and

"Whereas such commission is of the opinion that such payments, or other financial arrangements whereby State and local governments can be reimbursed for tax losses arising by virtue of Federal real estate holdings, are necessary to help preserve financially healthy governments; and

"Whereas such immunity has weakened many local governments in the State of Nevada; and

"Whereas the Federal Government and State governments share the responsibility for avoiding the impairment of the financial ability of local governments; and

"Whereas equity as between the Federal Government and local taxpayers requires the Federal Government to make appropriate payments to the State of Nevada or its local governments, or both; and

"Whereas the Federal Government has given no indication of its intention to grant any part of its land to the State of Nevada; and

"Whereas in nearly 100 years of statehood, the State of Nevada has received less than 3 million acres as the result of Federal land grants; and

"Whereas the Federal Government has both the ability and power to compensate the State of Nevada and local governments for tax losses arising by virtue of the immunity of federally owned property from State and local taxation: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of Nevada (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of Nevada most respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to establish an effective system of payments by the Federal Government to the State of Nevada or its local governments, or both, as a means of reimbursing this State and its local governments for the tremendous tax losses which arise by virtue of the immunity from State and local taxation which federally owned property in the State of Nevada enjoys; and be it further

"Resolved, That certified copies of this resolution be prepared and transmitted by the legislative counsel to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the President pro tempore of the Senate, the Secretary of the Interior and to each member of the Nevada congressional delegation.

"Adopted by the senate March 8, 1960.

"REX BELL,
"President of the Senate.
"LEOLA H. WOHLFEIL,
"Secretary of the Senate.

"Adopted by the assembly March 1, 1960.

"BERNARD POELE,
"Speaker of the Assembly.
"NATHAN T. HURST,
"Chief Clerk of the Assembly."

A joint resolution of the legislature of the State of Nevada; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION 4

"Joint resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to prepare adequate State water rights legislation

"Whereas despite repeated congressional recognition in many statutes, such as the Federal Power Act, the Desert Land Act, and, more recently, the Water Supply Act of 1958, that the States have and should have the primary interest and responsibility for the control and coordination of water use, a series of judicial decisions in the last decade and a half has cast some doubt on the authority of the States to perform their appropriate tasks in this field, and has suggested the possibility of unlimited Federal prerogatives concerning water which casts doubt on the basis of vested water rights and weakens the ability of the States successfully to coordinate water redevelopment; and

"Whereas factors involved in water development are peculiarly dependent on local geography, climate and economic needs and are consequently best handled within our Federal system by the State level of Government; and

"Whereas the traditional role of the States in the administration, conservation, and utilization of their water resources has led in the direction of optimum harmonious development of these water resources; and

"Whereas Federal agencies which have compiled with State water laws in obedience to the expressed intent of Congress have not thereby jeopardized any of the legitimate interests of the Federal Government; and

"Whereas doubts raised by these judicial decisions as to theb asis of vester water rights, present and future, and doubts as to the relationships between the Federal and State Governments will, without corrective congressional action, tend to delay much-needed water development for an indefinite time and discourage the States in their efforts to make such needed improvements in their facilities for water resource planning and development: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of Nevada (jointly), That the Congress of the United States is hereby memori-

alized to enact legislation in unmistakable and effective terms to provide that the States shall have primary responsibility and authority for the administration and development of water resources within their boundaries; that such law be so clear and unambiguous as to be incapable of evasion by either executive order or judicial interpretations; and that such law require every agency, permittee, licensee and employee of the Federal Government, as a condition precedent to the taking or use of any water, to acquire a right to the use thereof in conformity with State laws and procedures relating to the control, appropriation, use or distribution of such water; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Congress of the United States is hereby memorialized to enact legislation defining the waters originating on federally owned or controlled lands which contribute to flowing or moving surface or ground waters, and thereby eliminate the doubts created by recent judicial revisions, and clarify the relations of the Federal and State governments in the water field, so as to minimize litigation and delays and allow water development by the Federal and State governments to proceed on a harmonious basis; and be it further

"Resolved, That certified copies of this resolution be prepared and transmitted forthwith by the Legislative Counsel to the President of the United States, Vice President of the United States, Secretary of the Interior, Secretary of Agriculture, Speaker of the House of Representatives and each member of Nevada's congressional delegation.

"Passed by the senate February 22, 1960.

"REX BELL,
"President of the Senate.
"LEOLA H. WOHLFEIL,
"Secretary of the Senate.

"Passed by the assembly February 15, 1960.

"BERNARD POELE,
"Speaker of the Assembly.
"NATHAN T. HURST,
"Chief Clerk of the Assembly.
"GRANT SAWYER,
"Governor of the State of Nevada."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Nevada; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 7

"Joint resolution memorializing Congress to propose constitutional amendment abolishing income, estate and gift taxes and prohibiting the Federal Government from engaging in any business, professional, commercial, financial or industrial enterprise except as provided in the Federal Constitution

"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of Nevada, jointly, That the 50th session of the Legislature of the State of Nevada respectfully requests the Congress of the United States to propose to the people an amendment to the U.S. Constitution or to call a convention for such purpose to add to the Constitution an article providing as follows:

" 'ARTICLE ——

" 'SECTION 1. The Government of the United States shall not engage in any business, professional, commercial, financial or industrial enterprise except as specified in the Constitution.

" 'SEC. 2. The Constitution or laws of any State, or the laws of the United States shall not be subject to the terms of any foreign or domestic agreement which would abrogate this amendment.

" 'SEC. 3. The activities of the U.S. Government which violate the intent and purposes of this amendment shall, within a period of 3 years from the date of ratification of this amendment, be liquidated and the properties and facilities affected shall be sold.

" 'SEC. 4. Three years after the ratification of this amendment the 16th article of amendments to the Constitution of the United States shall stand repealed and thereafter Congress shall not levy taxes on personal incomes, estates, and/or gifts'; and be it further

"Resolved, That the legislative counsel forthwith prepare and transmit certified copies of this resolution to the Vice President of the United States, the President pro tempore of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives and each Member of the Nevada congressional delegation.

"Passed by the senate March 1, 1960.

"REX BELL,
"President of the Senate.
"LEOLA H. WOHLFEIL,
"Secretary of the Senate.

"Passed by the assembly March 11, 1960.

"BERNARD POELE,
"Speaker of the Assembly.
"NATHAN T. HURST,
"Chief Clerk of the Assembly.
"GRANT SAWYER,
"Governor of the State of Nevada."

Resolutions of the City Council of the City of Lynn, Mass., favoring the enactment of legislation to grant pensions to veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the Milwaukee, Wis., Traffic Club, favoring the enactment of legislation to repeal the excise tax on transportation of persons; to the Committee on Finance.

ACQUISITION OF ADDITIONAL LAND AT FORT RILEY, KANS.—RESOLUTION

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, Fort Riley, Kans., is one of the Nation's oldest and most important military establishments. At the present time it is the home of the 1st Infantry Division of the U.S. Army and other important defense units.

The military affairs committee of the Junction City Chamber of Commerce at a meeting on May 10 adopted a resolution stressing the need for the acquisition of additional land at Fort Riley.

Modern weapons and modern warfare require large training areas in order that our military personnel may familiarize themselves with the new equipment.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution adopted by the military affairs committee of the Junction City Chamber of Commerce be printed in the RECORD, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

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

RESOLUTION OF CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF JUNCTION CITY, KANS.

Whereas Fort Riley, Kans., is one of the Nation's oldest and most important military establishments; and

Whereas Fort Riley, Kans., is the home of the 1st Infantry Division of the U.S. Army and other important defense units; and

Whereas the military affairs committee of the Junction City Chamber of Commerce has for several years adhered to a policy of supporting its adjacent military establishment, Fort Riley, to the end that its needs have been met, so that this historic post will continue to be utilized to maximum effectiveness; and

Whereas the military affairs committee has seen fit to recommend to the board of directors a program for the acquisition of land at Fort Riley, Kans.; and

Whereas, the board of directors of the Junction City Chamber of Commerce in legally authorized action did unanimously adopt as policy on March 20, 1959, a program for the acquisition of additional land at Fort Riley: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the military affairs committee of the Junction City Chamber of Commerce requests that members of the Kansas congressional delegation take all necessary action to acquire the additional required land at Fort Riley, Kans., to the end that this post continues to be utilized to maximum effectiveness.

This resolution adopted May 10, 1960.

ROBERT J. FEGAN,
Chairman.
LEE RICH.
R. A. SCHERMERHORN.
C. W. LAMER,
President.
FRED BRAMLAGE.
W. S. KENNEDY.
JOHN D. MONTGOMERY.
E. W. ROLFS.
G. C. WALPOLE, Jr.,
Secretary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. ENGLE, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, with an amendment:

S. 2998. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, in order to extend the life of certain vessels under the provisions of such act from 20 to 25 years (Rept. No. 1406).

By Mr. HARTKE, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, with amendments:

S. 1787. A bill to protect consumers and others against misbranding, false advertising, and false invoicing of decorative hardwood or imitation hardwood products (Rept. No. 1405).

By Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, without amendment:

S. 3179. A bill to increase the authorization for appropriations for construction of facilities for the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory (Rept. No. 1409); and

H.R. 8238. An act to authorize and direct the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service to make a study and report to Congress, from the standpoint of the public health, of the discharge of substances into the atmosphere from the exhausts of motor vehicles (Rept. No. 1410).

By Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, with an amendment:

S. 3025. A bill to amend title II of the Vocational Education Act of 1946, relating to practical nurse training, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1411).

By Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, with amendments:

S. 2830. A bill to amend the Library Services Act in order to extend for 5 years the authorization for appropriations, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1412); and

S.J. Res. 127. Joint resolution to help make available to those children in our country who are handicapped by deafness the specially trained teachers of the deaf needed to develop their abilities and to help make available to individuals suffering speech and hearing impairments those specially trained speech pathologists and audiologists needed to help them overcome their handicaps (Rept. No. 1414).

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, without amendment:

S. 3420. A bill to provide further for permissible writing and printing on third- and fourth-class matter, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1413).

ADMINISTRATION OF NATIONAL FORESTS FOR MULTIPLE USE AND SUSTAINED YIELD

Mr. HART. Mr. President, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, on behalf of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], I report favorably with amendments, the bill (S. 3044) to authorize and direct that the national forests be managed under principles of multiple use and to produce a sustained yield of products and services, and for other purposes, and I submit a report (No. 1407) thereon. I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed, together with supplemental views.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CARLSON in the chair). The report will be received, and the bill will be placed on the calendar; and, without objection, the report will be printed, as requested by the Senator from Michigan.

REPORT ENTITLED "A BUILDING FOR A MUSEUM OF HISTORY AND TECHNOLOGY" (S. REPT. NO. 1408)

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, pursuant to section 4 of Public Law 106, 84th Congress, 69 Stat. 189, from the Joint Congressional Committee on Construction of a Building for a Museum of History and Technology for the Smithsonian Institution, I submit a report entitled "A Building for a Museum of History and Technology." I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be received and printed, as requested by the Senator from New Mexico.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. YARBOROUGH (by request):

S. 3578. A bill to amend parts I and III of the Interstate Commerce Act in order to make unlawful certain discriminatory rates, charges, and practices; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

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

By Mr. MCCLELLAN (by request):

S. 3579. A bill to authorize agencies of the Government of the United States to pay in advance for required publications, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

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

By Mr. MURRAY (by request):

S. 3580. A bill to establish a revolving-type fund in the Treasury for the Bureau of Reclamation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

By Mr. ERVIN (for himself and Mr. JORDAN):

S. 3581. A bill to amend the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, to permit Federal savings and loan associations to invest in or lend to business development credit corporations; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

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

By Mr. CARROLL:

S. 3582. A bill for the relief of A1c. Percy J. Trudeau; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina (by request):

S. 3583. A bill to amend section 507 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, with respect to the preservation of basic compensation in downgrading actions; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. YARBOROUGH (by request):

S. 3584. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act so as to provide eligibility for annuities for certain employees who were serving on the date of the enactment of the act of May 22, 1920; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

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

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S.J. Res. 196. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of June 20, 1960, as "National Academy of Television Arts and Sciences Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RESOLUTION

CONTINUANCE OF STUDY OF RELATIVE WATER RESOURCE AND RELATED DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS OF THE UNITED STATES AND RUSSIA

Mr. MOSS (for himself, Mr. GRUENING, and Mr. MUSKIE) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 325); which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

Whereas the Senate, by committee action, public hearings, and floor vote on Senate Resolution 248 (85th Congress, 2d session), has been engaged in a continuing study of the relative water resources and related development programs of the United States and Soviet Russia since 1957; and

Whereas that endeavor, through the joint efforts of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and the Committee on Public Works, has now resulted in a factual, eyewitness report revealing the remarkable effort and accomplishment of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to overtake and then surpass the United States of America in this vital field: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this report be received, accepted, ordered printed, and referred to the Committee on Appropriations, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and the Committee on Public Works for appropriate consideration in relation to their other duties; and be it further

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and the Committee on Public Works continue the joint studies as previously requested, including, as appropriate, securing similar information concerning developments elsewhere in the world, and continue also, as previously requested, to submit their recommendation of ways and means to accelerate the development and utilization of the natural resources of the United States.

AMENDMENT OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT, RELATING TO STANDARDS FOR CERTAIN RAILROAD RATES

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act to apply to proposed railroad rates standards similar to those in the Robinson-Patman Act. The bill would require a common carrier petitioning the ICC for a lower rate in one geographic area to make available equal rate reductions over its whole system, when the requested rate is lower than necessary to meet competition from other forms of transportation.

The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has, since its formation wrestled with the complex problems of our transportation system. The problems of competitive ratemaking, long a controversial matter, are among the most complex of these issues—particularly when viewed in the perspective of the mandates of the national transportation policy enacted in 1940. This proposed legislation, which offers a possible solution to these problems by applying antitrust principles to competitive ratemaking, is a new approach worthy of consideration by the committee.

I introduce the bill today in order to provide the basis for meaningful discussion and thought on this aspect of competitive ratemaking.

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

The bill (S. 3578) to amend parts I and III of the Interstate Commerce Act in order to make unlawful certain discriminatory rates, charges, and practices, introduced by Mr. YARBOROUGH, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PAYMENT IN ADVANCE FOR REQUIRED PUBLICATIONS

Mr. MCCLELLAN. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize agencies of the Government of the United States to pay in advance for required publications, and for other purposes.

This proposed legislation was submitted to the Senate by the Secretary of the Interior and referred to the Committee on Government Operations on April 6, 1960.

Mr. President, in order that Members of the Senate may have full information relative to the objectives of the bill, I request that the letter transmitted to the President of the Senate by the Secretary of the Interior be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

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

The bill (S. 3579) to authorize agencies of the Government of the United States to pay in advance for required publications, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MCCLELLAN, by request,

was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

The letter presented by Mr. McCLELLAN is as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., April 1, 1960.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Enclosed is a draft of a proposed bill, "To provide agencies of the Government of the United States with authority to pay in advance for required publications."

We suggest that this bill be referred to the appropriate committee for consideration, and we recommend that it be enacted.

Section 3648 of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 529) prohibits advance payment for articles purchased by the Federal Government. The act of June 12, 1930 (46 Stat. 580), permits the advance payment of "subscription charges" for newspapers, magazines, and other periodicals. This language however, does not cover charges for publications that do not fall into the category of periodicals.

The proposed legislation would permit advance payment of subscription or other charges for newspapers, magazines, periodicals, and other publications.

Our acquisitions program has suffered as a result of our inability to make advance payment for publications. In some cases we have been unable to procure publications at all; in others we have had to pay a premium either to the publisher or to an agent.

For example, we were unable to obtain the proceedings of the Fourth World Petroleum Congress held in Rome in 1955, since we were prohibited from complying with the fiscal requirements of the Congress for advance payment of $70. Likewise, we were unable to procure the fifth decennial index of Chemical Abstracts published by the American Chemical Society at a prepublication price of $900. The postpublication price is likely to be $1,200 and in all probability more. The Comptroller General has ruled in 37 C.G. 720 that the index is not a periodical and consequently advance payment canot be made.

The Bonneville Power Administration has difficulty in purchasing the American Standards Association standards which are published as separates at 25 to 50 cents each. It is the association's practice to add 50 cents to each order not accompanied by a remittance. In order to facilitate advance payments of small amounts they sell coupon books, but the General Accounting Office has ruled that we cannot legally purchase them.

In recent years many State governments which formerly gave us their publications such as session laws have changed their policy and now require advance payment. These must now be ordered through a dealer who charges a premium for advancing the money.

These are but a few examples of the difficulties encountered in attempting to procure with facility, and at savings, much needed and required publications for the offices of this Department.

There is ample precedent for liberalizing the statute to permit this Department, as well as other agencies, to pay in advance for required publications. Set forth below are the statutory exceptions which have previously been made for the Department of Agriculture, the Quartermaster Corps, and the Veterans' Bureau (now Veterans' Administration) to pay in advance for subscriptions to publications without regard to section 3648 of the Revised Statutes.

1. The appropriation act for the Department of Agriculture for fiscal year 1910, approved March 4, 1909 (35 Stat. 1054), provided that "hereafter section 3648 of the Revised Statutes shall not apply to the subscriptions for publications for the Department of Agriculture, and the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to pay in advance for any publications for the use of this Department."

2. The act of April 27, 1914 (38 Stat. 362) provided that the Quartermaster Corps may pay in advance for "other publications" from funds authorized for the corps.

3. The appropriation act for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1925, provided that "Hereafter section 3648 of the Revised Statutes shall not apply to subscriptions for publications for the U.S. Veterans' Bureau and the Director is authorized to pay in advance for any publications for the use of the Bureau."

The same authority should be given to this and other departments in the furtherance of our library services.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised us that there is no objection to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress, but that the Comptroller General has recommended the inclusion of a section 2 that repeals the present special laws granting similar authority to specific agencies. We have no objection to the inclusion of a provision of this kind if the Congress believes it is advisable, and if the inclusion will not delay the consideration of our proposed legislation. The language suggested by the Comptroller General is as follows:

"SEC. 2. The following parts of acts and all amendments thereto are repealed:

"1. The proviso to the paragraph headed 'General Expenses, Library' under the caption 'Library, Department of Agriculture' in the Act of March 4, 1909 (35 Stat. 1054);

"2. The first proviso to the paragraph headed 'Regular Supplies, Quartermaster Corps' in the Act of April 27, 1914 (38 Stat. 362);

"3. The first parenthetical phrase under the caption 'Pay, Miscellaneous' in the Act of March 3, 1915 (38 Stat. 929);

"4. Section 5 of the Act of March 4, 1915 (38 Stat. 1049);

"5. The tenth paragraph under the caption 'United States Veterans' Bureau' in the Act of June 7, 1924 (43 Stat. 533)."

Sincerely yours,

D. OTIS BEASLEY,
Administrative Assistant, Secretary of the Interior.

REVOLVING-TYPE FUND IN TREASURY FOR BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, by request of the Secretary of the Interior to the President of the Senate, under date of May 16, 1960, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill "to establish a revolving fund in the Treasury for the Bureau of Reclamation and other purposes."

This proposed measure has far-reaching consequences with respect to reclamation appropriations. If referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, we will certainly consult the Appropriations Committee.

The text of the letter of February 16, 1960, from the Secretary of the Interior and the draft of the bill are attached. I ask unanimous consent that the copy of the letter with the draft of the proposed bill be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

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

The bill (S. 3580) to establish a revolving-type fund in the Treasury for the Bureau of Reclamation, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MURRAY, by request, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, 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 there is established in the Treasury of the United States an account to be known as the Bureau of Reclamation operating fund. To this fund there shall be credited:

(a) All receipts from the operation of projects and facilities under the jurisdiction of said Bureau;

(b) All funds advanced or contributed in accordance with law to said Bureau by water users, Federal agencies and others;

(c) All other receipts arising in connection with the operations of said Bureau;

(d) All appropriations made by the Congress for credit to the Bureau of Reclamation operating fund and unexpended balances of appropriations for the Bureau of Reclamation outstanding as of the effective date of this Act; and

(e) The unexpended balances as of the effective date of this Act in the emergency fund authorized by the Act of June 26, 1948 (62 Stat. 1052; 43 U.S.C., sec. 502); the Fort Peck continuing fund established by the provisions of section 10 of the Act of May 18, 1938 (52 Stat. 403, 406; 16 U.S.C., sec. 833i); the Upper Colorado River Basin fund created by section 5 of the Act of April 11, 1956 (70 Stat. 105, 107; 43 U.S.C., sec. 620d); the Colorado River dam fund established by the provisions of section 2 of the Act of December 21, 1928 (45 Stat. 1057; 43 U.S.C., sec. 617b); the Colorado River development fund established by the provisions of section 2 of the Act of July 19, 1940 (61 Stat. 56, 43 U.S.C., sec. 618a); the special deposit account for the Umatilla Project, Oregon, established by the provisions of section 4 of the Act of October 27, 1949 (63 Stat. 941); the special deposit account established for the North Platte project by the provisions of section 4 of the Act of July 17, 1952 (66 Stat. 754); the Boulder City municipal fund established by section 6 of the Boulder City Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 1729, 1731); the Disposal of Coulee Dam community fund maintained under the Coulee Dam Community Act of 1957 (71 Stat. 524); the special funds for "Payments to Farmers' Irrigation District (North Platte Project, Nebraska-Wyoming)" and for "Refunds and Returns"; and the Trust Fund account established for contributions, deposits and advances. Each of the foregoing funds and accounts is hereby abolished.

SEC. 2. The Bureau of Reclamation operating fund shall be available when so provided in appropriation acts and within such limitations as may be included in such acts, without fiscal year limitation, for the following purposes as provided in the Federal reclamation laws (Act of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388, and Acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto) and other Acts applicable to the Bureau of Reclamation: *Provided,* That moneys heretofore or hereafter appropriated shall be used only for the purposes for which they have been or are appropriated:

(a) Expenditures for engineering and economic investigations of proposed Federal reclamation projects; investigation of projects for the conservation, development and utilization of the water resources of Alaska,

but only to the extent that general funds for such expenditures are appropriated by the Congress for credit to the Bureau of Reclamation operating fund; studies of water conservation and development plans; formulating plans and preparing designs and specifications for authorized Federal reclamation projects or parts thereof prior to initial allocation of appropriations for construction of such projects or parts; and activities preliminary to the reconstruction, rehabilitation and betterment, financial adjustment, or extension of existing projects;

(b) Expenditures for construction and rehabilitation of authorized projects or parts thereof (including power transmission facilities) and for other related activities, as authorized by law, but only to the extent of funds appropriated by the Congress for credit to the Bureau of Reclamation operating fund for such purposes;

(c) Expenditures for operation, maintenance and replacement of reclamation projects or parts thereof and of other facilities, as authorized by law; for a soil and moisture conservation program on lands under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Reclamation; and for expenses required to be incurred because of unusual or emergency conditions, as defined by law (43 U.S.C., sec. 503), in order to assure continuous operation and maintenance of irrigation or power systems: *Provided,* That nonreimbursable expenditures for these purposes shall be made only to the extent that general funds are appropriated therefor by the Congress for credit to the Bureau of Reclamation operating fund.

(d) Expenditures for general administration and related functions in the office of the Commissioner of Reclamation and in the regional offices of the Bureau of Reclamation;

(e) Loans to irrigation districts and other public agencies for construction of distribution systems on authorized Federal reclamation projects, and for loans and grants to non-Federal agencies for construction of projects, as authorized by the Acts of July 4, 1955, as amended (69 Stat. 245, 70 Stat. 155; 43 U.S.C., sec. 421a–421d), and August 6, 1956, as amended (70 Stat. 1044, 71 Stat. 48; 43 U.S.C., sec. 422a–422k), including expenses necessary for carrying out the program, but only to the extent of funds appropriated by the Congress for credit to the Bureau of Reclamation Operating Fund for such purposes;

(f) Within the receipts of the Boulder Canyon Project available therefor under the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act, as amended, the payments provided for in subsection (c) and the expenditures provided for in subsection (d) of section 2 of said Act which but for the provisions of this Act would have been made from the Colorado River dam fund and the Colorado River development fund, respectively;

(g) Expenditures and transfers for the purposes specified in section 6 of the Boulder City Act of 1958 within the proceeds from the disposal under said Act of Federal property lying within the Boulder City municipal area, except that expenditures for the purposes specified in subsection (b)(2) of said section 6 may at the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior be made only to the extent that general funds for such expenditures are appropriated by the Congress for credit to the Bureau of Reclamation operating fund for such purposes: *Provided,* That the reference in subsection (c) of said section 6 to the Colorado River dam fund shall be taken to refer to the Bureau of Reclamation operating fund and the references in said section to the Boulder City municipal fund shall be taken to refer to the proceeds from the disposal under the Boulder City Act of 1958 of Federal property lying within the Boulder City municipal area: *Provided further,* That the reference in subsection (e) of said section 6 to appropriations available for municipal operations of the city shall be taken to refer to allotment of moneys in the Bureau of Reclamation operating fund for municipal operations of the city;

(h) Payments and expenditures for the purposes set forth in sections 7 and 9 of the Coulee Dam Community Act of 1957 within the proceeds from the sales made under sections 2 and 3 of said Act, and the transfer to the reclamation fund of any balance remaining from such sales as provided in subsection (a) of section 9 of said Act;

(i) Within the total amount authorized for such purpose by the Act of August 13, 1957 (71 Stat. 342), the payments to the Farmers' Irrigation District on behalf of the Northport Irrigation District provided for in said Act;

(j) Within the miscellaneous revenues accruing pursuant to subsections I and J of section 4 of the Act of December 5, 1924 (43 Stat. 685, 703; 43 U.S.C., secs. 501, 526), on behalf of those who have contracted with the United States pursuant to the Act of July 17, 1952 (66 Stat. 754), the expenditures provided for by section 4 of said Act;

(k) Within the payments therein referred to, the expenditures and transfers provided for in section 4 of the Act of October 27, 1949 (63 Stat. 941);

(l) Expenditure of funds advanced or contributed in accordance with law for the purposes for which advanced or contributed;

(m) Expenditures for the purpose of refunding overcollections and to return deposits in excess of amounts applied to the purposes for which the deposits were collected;

(n) Payment at least annually to the credit of the reclamation fund or miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury as the case may be, in accordance with law, from moneys in the Bureau of Reclamation operating fund in excess of the amounts required for the foregoing purposes: *Provided,* That for the purposes of the second paragraph under the heading "Increase in the Reclamation Fund" in the Act of May 9, 1938 (52 Stat. 291, 318; 43 U.S.C., sec. 392a), the net revenues derived from the sale of power in connection with a project shall be deemed to have repaid those construction costs of such project allocated to be repaid by power revenues when the total net power revenues heretofore realized in connection with such project together with those hereafter realized and credited to the Bureau of Reclamation operating fund in accordance with this Act shall have equaled such construction costs.

SEC. 3. (a) In the application of this Act to the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, the references in section 5 of the Act of April 11, 1956 (70 Stat. 105; 43 U.S.C., sec. 620d), to the revenues credited to and in the Upper Colorado River Basin fund shall be taken to refer to the revenues collected in connection with the operation of the Colorado River storage project and participating projects and credited to the Bureau of Reclamation operating fund.

(b) Hereafter, the computation of charges under the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act, as amended, for electric energy generated at Hoover Dam and in determining the obligation to repay advances and readvances for the construction of the project as defined in said Act (including the determination of nonprofit investments or expenditures), the references in said Adjustment Act to advances and readvances to the Colorado River dam fund shall be taken to refer to funds appropriated for credit to the Bureau of Reclamation operating fund for construction of the project and the references to receipts or revenues from the project shall be taken to refer to receipts or revenues from the project credited to the Bureau of Reclamation operating fund. For the purpose of computing interest on advances and readvances of funds for construction of the project, such funds shall be considered as advanced when they have been transferred to the credit of the account on the books of Treasury from which they are to be disbursed.

SEC. 4. The provisions of this Act shall take effect on July 1, following the date of its enactment.

The letter presented by Mr. MURRAY is as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., May 16, 1960.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Enclosed for your consideration is a draft of bill "To establish a revolving-type fund in the Treasury for the Bureau of Reclamation, and for other purposes."

I request that this draft bill be referred to the appropriate committee of the Senate and I recommend that it be enacted.

The proposal, if it is enacted, will authorize the establishment of a fund, to be known as the Bureau of Reclamation operating fund, into which all revenues and receipts of every nature arising from the operation of projects and facilities under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Reclamation would be deposited. Similarly, all appropriations made by the Congress for the Bureau and related unexpended balances thereof, as of the effective date of the act, and the unexpended balances in the special funds enumerated in section 1, paragraph (e) of the draft bill, would be deposited in the fund. The operating fund would, within such limitations as may be included in appropriation acts, be available without further appropriation and fiscal year limitation for meeting the costs and expenses of the program administered by the Bureau as stated in detail in items (a) through (m) of section 2 of the proposal. However, the draft bill does provide that moneys appropriated shall be used only for the purposes for which they are appropriated. The Bureau will continue to request annual appropriations for construction and rehabilitation, loans to irrigation districts and other public agencies, investigations of water resources projects in Alaska, the soil and moisture conservation program, and certain nonreimbursable operation and maintenance costs. The draft bill would not authorize, expressly or by implication, any new projects for construction or any new activities by the Bureau.

A basic objective of the legislation is to place on a revolving-fund type of operation four activities of the Bureau; namely, operation and maintenance—except insofar as this activity will depend upon appropriated funds to cover expenditures which are allocated to nonreimbursable purposes—general administration, general investigations, and emergency repairs. Current gross revenues from the projects operated by the Bureau exceed the funds required to defray the costs of these programs. Favorable action on the legislation would remove the activities from the normal annual appropriation procedures and thus reflect the results of these business-type operations in the budget on a net basis. Appropriations for these purposes in fiscal year 1960 aggregated $37.3 million with total appropriations for the Bureau in that year amounting to $255.5 million.

Enactment of the proposed legislation will result in our judgment, in bringing about a simplification and improvement in the overall financial operations of the Bureau of Reclamation. For one thing, it will reduce the number of cash accounts with Treasury and the resultant time-consuming reconciliations. In addition, the number of

funds in use would be reduced from 13 to 2, i.e., the reclamation fund and the Bureau of reclamation operating fund.

The Bureau, in accordance with prescribed law, is currently maintaining a series of special fund receipt accounts and revolving funds in addition to the reclamation fund. These include the Colorado River Dam fund; Colorado River development fund; proceeds from sales of property, Coulee Dam Community, and Boulder City municipal fund; and Fort Peck and Colorado River Basin funds. The draft legislation will authorize the discontinuance of the use of these special and revolving funds and the revenues and receipts pertaining thereto will henceforth be deposited directly to the operating fund. However, it is not the intent of this draft legislation to change in any way the use or disposition of funds as presently prescribed by law. The proper use and disposition of these funds will be assured through administrative accounting and fund control by the Bureau of Reclamation rather than by the use of the separate funds for each type of activity.

The reclamation fund established by the Reclamation Act of June 17, 1902 (32 Stat. 388), will be maintained to receive as heretofore proceeds from sales of public lands, royalties from oil and mineral leases and other accretions. With the establishment of the operating fund the balances in the reclamation fund will be available for construction purposes. Upon congressional appropriation the amount thereof would be transferred from the reclamation fund to the operating fund and construction expenditures would be made from this latter account.

The draft bill is not designed to effect nor would it result in a change in the principles on which the accounting system of the Bureau is based. This system is fully integrated to encompass budgeting, programing, and accounting, is patterned after the uniform system of accounts prescribed by the Federal Power Commission and has the approval of the Comptroller General.

A feature of the draft bill which should be noted is contained in subparagraph (n) of section. This provides for an annual transfer of funds to the reclamation fund or miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury, as the case may be, in accordance with law, of the balance in the operating fund in excess of the amounts required to finance the programs (see subparagraphs (a) through (m) of section 2) of the Bureau. With respect to the construction costs of a project allocated to be repaid by power revenues the draft bill provides that, when the aggregate of such net power revenues credited to the operating fund equals the construction costs, such costs shall be deemed to have been repaid for purposes of the reclamation fund (see the special provision in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1939, relating to increase in the reclamation fund).

In summary, if the attached draft bill is enacted, the Bureau of Reclamation would have two basic funds, (1) the reclamation fund and (2) the operating fund. The reclamation fund as indicated would receive all accretions and ultimately will be the main source of funds appropriated for the construction program of the Bureau. The operating fund would serve as a depositary for all funds available for expenditure and all disbursements by the Bureau of Reclamation. Control by the Congress over the activities of the Bureau would not be decreased since the various programs of the Bureau of Reclamation would continue to be included in the President's budget, either on a gross or net basis, and subject to whatever action the Congress may take, including the imposition of limitations on expenditures which may appear in appropriation acts.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that the enactment of this proposed legislation is in accord with the program of the President.

Sincerely yours,

FRED G. AANDAHL,
Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

AMENDMENT OF HOME OWNERS' LOAN ACT OF 1933, RELATING TO CERTAIN INVESTMENTS BY FEDERAL SAVINGS AND LOAN ASSOCIATIONS

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague, the junior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], and myself, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill which would amend the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933 so as to permit certain Federal savings and loan associations to invest in or to lend to business development credit corporations very small portions of their assets.

Business development credit corporations have been established in many States. Generally these make it possible for banks, insurance companies, and other financial institutions to contribute their backing to the development of their States through private financing of sound ventures, without any Federal or State money. The Banking and Currency Committee has issued a committee print on the subject of development corporations and authorities which contains much useful information.

I am proud to say that North Carolina, along with the New England States and New York, was one of the leaders in this movement. The Business Development Corp. of North Carolina has been operating effectively for 4 years. Its fourth annual report, for 1959, shows that the corporation had made disbursements on 49 loans totaling $3.8 million, and that it expected to disburse soon 16 additional loans totaling $2.7 million. According to the report the loans helped to maintain the employment of more than 5,000 people and created employment for an additional 8,000 people. The report shows that the North Carolina Business Development Corp. is financed by $1 million received from its 1,860 stockholders and by over $2 million advanced by its 145 members, including 92 commercial banks, 13 life insurance companies, and 40 State savings and loan associations. It has been paying interest on money borrowed from its members at the rate of 4¼ percent and 5¼ percent.

In North Carolina and a number of other States, including, I understand, Kentucky, New York, Oregon, Tennessee, and Pennsylvania, State savings and loan associations or State building and loan associations have been specifically authorized to participate in financing these State development credit corporations through buying stock, making loans or some similar device. These States have imposed restrictions on the amounts which these State savings and loan associations may make available to business development credit corporations, both in order to protect the savings and loans against the risks inherent in these commercial enterprises, and in order to prevent diversion of more than a nominal amount of the assets of the savings and loan associations away from their primary purpose of making loans on real estate.

The bill which I am introducing would impose stringent restrictions on the advances of Federal savings and loan associations to business development credit corporations. In the first place, it would only authorize a Federal savings and loan to participate in a business development corporation in a State if the State law specifically authorized a State savings and loan association to do so. In other words, if the State law establishing or permitting the establishment of a business development credit corporation does not contain sufficient safeguards so that the State will specifically authorize State savings and loan associations to invest in the development credit corporation, then a Federal savings and loan association in that State could not do so either.

In the second place, a Federal savings and loan association could only invest in a business development credit corporation if the association's general reserve, surplus, and undivided profits amounted to 5 percent of its withdrawable accounts. This formula, designed to limit this activity to well-financed savings and loan associations, is based upon the amendment to the Home Owners' Loan Act with reference to loans to develop real estate which Congress enacted last year.

In the third place, the amount which a Federal savings and loan association could invest in or lend to a business development credit corporation would be limited to the amount which a comparable State savings and loan association might invest or lend, or 2 percent of the Federal savings and loan association's general reserve, surplus, and undivided profits, or $50,000.

Subject to all of these limitations, it would seem that the bill would create no substantial risk to Federal savings and loan associations or those who have invested their savings in them, and no substantial diversion of the assets of Federal savings and loan associations from their basic purpose. And at the same time, the bill would permit Federal savings and loan associations to participate with State savings and loan associations in supporting these valuable business development credit corporations.

I am introducing this bill at this time, even though it is late in the session, so that there will be ample opportunity to consider the bill before the next Congress meets, and so that the views of all interested can be obtained.

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

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

The bill (S. 3581) to amend the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, to permit Federal savings and loan associations to invest in or lend to business development credit corporations, introduced by Mr. ERVIN (for himself and Mr. JORDAN),

was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 5(c) of the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933 (12 U.S.C. 1464) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"Without regard to any other provision of this subsection, any such association whose general reserves, surplus, and undivided profits aggregate a sum in excess of 5 per centum of its withdrawable accounts is authorized to invest in, to lend to, or to commit itself to lend to any business development credit corporation incorporated in the State in which the head office of such association is situated, in the same manner and to the same extent as the statutes of such State specifically authorize a savings and loan association organized under the laws of said State to invest in or to lend to such business development credit corporation, but the aggregate amount of the investments, loans, and commitments of any such association outstanding at any time shall not exceed 2 per centum of its general reserves, surplus, and undivided profits, or $50,000, whichever is lesser."

AMENDMENT OF CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT ACT TO PROVIDE ELIGIBILITY FOR ANNUITIES FOR CERTAIN EMPLOYEES

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act so as to provide eligibility for annuities for certain employees who were serving on the date of the enactment of the act of May 22, 1920. I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with an explanatory statement, prepared by me, be printed in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 3584) to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act so as to provide eligibility for annuities for certain employees who were serving on the date of the enactment of the act of May 22, 1920, introduced by Mr. YARBOROUGH, by request, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 8 of the Civil Service Retirement Act is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection to read as follows:

"(c) Any person who was serving as an employee on May 22, 1920, who was separated from the service after having performed not less than fifteen years of civilian service, and who is not otherwise eligible for annuity under this Act, shall be entitled to an annuity beginning at age 70, computed as provided in section 9."

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, benefits provided by the amendment made by this Act shall be paid from the civil service retirement and disability fund.

SEC. 3. This Act shall become effective the day following its enactment and no annuity provided herein shall be paid for any period prior thereto, except to those persons who had previously filed applications therefor and had been denied by the Civil Service Commission.

The statement presented by Mr. YARBOROUGH is as follows:

This bill will amend the Civil Service Retirement Act by clarifying the eligibility for retirement of certain former Government employees, to wit, those who had a minimum of 15 years classified civil service at the time of the passage of the original Civil Service Retirement Act of May 22, 1920.

The effective date of this act was August 20, 1920. It provided:

"That beginning at the expiration of ninety days next following the passage of this Act, all employees in the classified civil service of the United States who have on that date, or shall have on any date thereafter, reached the age of seventy years and rendered at least 15 years of service computed as prescribed in section 3 of this Act, shall be eligible for retirement on an annuity as provided in section 2 hereof."

This would give the impression that it was the intent of Congress to provide an annuity for all service employees then in the service who were 70 years of age, or who should later attain that age.

During the months and years that followed the effective date of that act, various employees who had been in the Government service at the time of its passage, left in order to accept positions in private employment, believing that when they had attained the age of 70, they would be entitled to receive an annuity for the years—15 or more—of their Government employment.

The Civil Service Commission ruled that they could not do so, unless they were still in the Government service on attaining the age of 70. This was probably a literally correct interpretation of the act, though probably not the intent of Congress, for in later acts, Public Law 411, 77th and others, Congress specifically provided that persons leaving the Government service before retirement age might still draw whatever annuity their years of service in the Government might entitle them to, when they had attained retirement age.

The Civil Service Commission, however, ruled that this privilege did not apply to those oldtime Government employees who worked 6 days a week (without benefit of coffee breaks) for piteously low salaries in the days before 1920.

This bill simply provides that these oldtime Government employees—there, are only a few, and these are 75 years and upwards of age—may have the privilege of drawing the annuities to which their years of former Government service will entitle them.

Since there are only a few, and since their annuities would be based on the piteously low salaries prevailing during their period of service, the cost to the Government would be negligible.

As indicated above the few beneficiaries of this bill are all of advanced age and early action upon it will be necessary if they are to receive in their few remaining years this long-delayed privilege.

AMENDMENT OF NAVY RATION STATUTE, RELATING TO SERVING OF OLEOMARGARINE—AMENDMENT

Mr. PROXMIRE (for himself and Mr. PROUTY) submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (S. 2168) to amend the Navy ration statute so as to provide for the serving of oleomargarine or margarine, which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

EXTENSION OF LIBRARY SERVICES ACT—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, at the next printing of the bill (S. 2830) to amend the Library Services Act in order to extend for 5 years the authorization for appropriations, and for other purposes, introduced by me, for myself and other Senators on January 14, 1960, I ask unanimous consent that the names of Senators ALLOTT and CASE of New Jersey may be added as cosponsors.

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

EXPANSION AND EXTENSION OF SALINE WATER CONVERSION PROGRAM—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of May 16, 1960, the names of Senators KUCHEL, MOSS, ALLOTT, SYMINGTON, JACKSON, KERR, SMATHERS, CASE of South Dakota, HUMPHREY, JAVITS, YARBOROUGH, MURRAY, GRUENING, CARROLL, CHURCH, CLARK, MANSFIELD, MCGEE, WILLIAMS of New Jersey, and MONRONEY, were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 3557) to expand and extend the saline water conversion program under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior to provide for accelerated research, development, demonstration, and application of practical means for the economical production, from sea or other saline waters, of water suitable for agricultural, industrial, municipal, and other beneficial consumptive uses, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. JOHNSON of Texas (for himself and Mr. ANDERSON) on May 16, 1960.

HUMANE TREATMENT FOR CERTAIN ANIMALS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of May 18, 1960, the names of Senators WILLIAMS of New Jersey, and CHURCH were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 3570) to provide for the humane treatment of animals used in experiment and tests by recipients of grants from the United States and by agencies and instrumentalities of the U.S. Government, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. COOPER (for himself and other Senators) on May 18, 1960.

ASSISTANCE TO CERTAIN DEAF INDIVIDUALS — ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF JOINT RESOLUTION

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, at the next printing of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 127) to help make available to those children in our country who are handicapped by deafness the specially trained teachers of the deaf needed to develop their abilities and to help make available to individuals suffering speech and hearing impairments those specially trained speech pathologists and audiologists needed to help them overcome their handicaps, introduced by me, for myself and other Senators, on August 6, 1959, I

ask unanimous consent that the names of Senators YARBOROUGH, GRUENING, and HUMPHREY may be added as cosponsors.

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

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF LOREN K. OLSON TO BE A MEMBER OF THE ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, in accordance with section 22 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, the President, on May 16, 1960, submitted to the Senate the nomination of Mr. Loren K. Olson to be a member of the Atomic Energy Commission for the remainder of the term expiring June 30, 1962, of Commissioner John F. Floberg, who has submitted his resignation to the President.

The Senate section of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy will hold a public hearing on Friday, May 27, 1960, beginning at 10 a.m. in room P-63, the Old Supreme Court room of the Capitol, for the purpose of considering this nomination.

For the information of the Members of the Congress and the public, I request unanimous consent to insert in the body of the RECORD biographical data on the nominee, Mr. Loren K. Olson, which has been furnished to the Joint Committee by the Atomic Energy Commission.

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

QUALIFICATION DATA OF LOREN KEITH OLSON

Personal: Born February 28, 1914, Wheeler, Wis., married—two children.

Education: B.S. Eau Claire Teachers College, Wisconsin, 1939; LL.B., University of Wisconsin, 1940.

Experience:

March 19, 1958, to present, USAEC, General Counsel.

January 1951 to March 18, 1958, partner, Shook & Olson, Washington, D.C.

November 1946 to December 1950, attorney adviser, Office of the Comptroller, Navy Department.

February 1946 to November 1946, personal services consultant contract, Office of General Counsel, Navy Department.

July 1943 to February 1946, officer, U.S. Navy.

November 1942 to June 1943, examiner, National Labor Relations Board, Minneapolis, Minn.

July 1936 to November 1942, examiner, Wisconsin Industrial Commission, Eau Claire, Wis.

Other affiliations: Member, District of Columbia Bar Association; admitted to Wisconsin bar.

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. WILEY:

Statement by him, entitled "WILEY Urges Greater Efforts To Go Over the Heads of Communist Leaders to People Behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains With Truth of World Affairs"; and excerpts from an address prepared by him, for broadcast over Radio Liberty, to the people of the Soviet Union.

By Mr. BEALL:

Statement, prepared by him, entitled "Washington, D.C., International Race, the Olympics of Racing."

By Mr. SCHOEPPEL:

Address entitled "The U.S. Merchant Marine and World Trade," delivered by Secretary of Commerce Mueller, before Port of Washington Propeller Club, in celebration of National Maritime Day, May 20, 1960.

BIRTHDAY GREETINGS TO SENATOR BUSH AND SENATOR DODD

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, last week I commented on the fact that the two distinguished Senators from New York [Mr. JAVITS and Mr. KEATING] had birthday anniversaries on the same day. I thought that was of particular significance, and quite unusual.

I now discover that the two distinguished Senators from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH and Mr. DODD] have birthday anniversaries which fall on the same day—May 15.

I suppose that if I were an astrologer, I might spell out some rather interesting implications—for instance, that a person should pick out the right day on which to be born, if he had future ambitions to be a Member of the Senate of the United States.

I congratulate the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] and also the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD].

PLATFORM ADOPTED BY MIDWEST FEDERATION OF COLLEGE YOUNG REPUBLICAN CLUBS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the Midwest Federation of College Young Republican Clubs at its meeting in Des Moines, Iowa, adopted a platform on April 9. I believe the platform is very timely, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

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

PLATFORM ADOPTED IN DES MOINES, IOWA, BY THE MIDWEST FEDERATION OF COLLEGE YOUNG REPUBLICAN CLUBS, APRIL 9, 1960

Preamble: We of the Midwest Federation of College Young Republicans are acutely aware that the effort of the U.S. Government resolutely to oppose the international Communist threat must be bolstered by sound and responsible public policies. In order to pursue this objective, we must strengthen the foundations of constitutional liberty by returning to the principles of true fundamental Republicanism. It is with this idea in mind that we submit the following platform:

I. AGRICULTURE

Whereas the Republican Party has sought to solve agricultural problems along lines consistent with our free enterprise economy; and

Whereas the Midwest Federation of College Young Republican Clubs is in agreement with this philosophy which endeavors to place farmers in a stable, independent, and self-supporting position; and

Whereas this policy must be carried out in such a way that individual farmers affected by the agriculture revolution are adequately protected against undue market fluctuations: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the following steps be taken to provide a responsible public policy toward agriculture:

1. Increase in the soil bank program by an addition of 60 million acres of land beyond the present level.

2. Further development of plans for oversea distribution of our farm surpluses, in lieu of foreign aid, with the requirement that these surpluses be paid for in hard currency.

3. Offering of surplus commodities, in lieu of cash payments, to farmers who participate in the soil bank and other conservation programs.

4. Further utilization of sliding scale parity payments based on a moving average of the last 10 years combined with a progressive elimination of all planting, acreage, and marketing controls as supply and demand are brought into equilibrium.

5. Increased rights for farmers to grow as much as they want as long as they do not grow the commodity for sale on the market.

6. Establishment of the right of all farmers, regardless of the number of acres of a crop which they may grow, to vote in polls to choose between different degrees of acreage control and different levels of parity prices.

II. ECONOMIC POLICY

Whereas our Nation must remain economically strong if our people are to remain free: Therefore be it

Resolved, That—

1. We favor lowering rates on present corporate and excise taxes.

2. We favor the increased taxation of cooperatives.

3. We favor the further examination of the taxation of insurance companies.

4. We favor lowering marginal tax rates in upper income brackets.

5. We oppose any efforts to increase the present debt limit of $295 billion.

6. We favor raising the interest ceiling on long-term Treasury bonds.

7. We favor economic and technical aid through private channels to foreign countries as a "good investment" for our own economy.

8. We favor careful scrutiny by Congress of all governmental foreign aid programs with an eye toward reducing the amount appropriated.

9. We favor participation by the United States in the General Agreement on Trade and Tariffs, with the reservation that Congress be given a stronger voice in the determination of our foreign trade policies.

10. We favor taking positive steps to improve the dollar's value abroad by fighting inflation at home.

III. EDUCATION

Whereas the Young Republican National Federation has in two consecutive conventions gone on record in opposition to Federal aid to education; and

Whereas we share their judgment in holding Federal aid to be both unnecessary and a potential avenue to Government influence on the curriculum; and

Whereas we believe that America's schools must be kept free of Government interference: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this convention expresses its unalterable opposition to Federal aid to American schools.

IV. FOREIGN POLICY

Whereas the Castro regime has abused the integrity of the United States by irresponsible attacks on our integrity; and

Whereas the Castro regime has made indiscreet and unfounded, accusations of sabotage against the United States; and

Whereas the rights of U.S. citizens have been repeatedly violated in Cuba: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Midwest Federation of College Young Republican Clubs urges the administration to take appropriate diplomatic measures and such economic sanctions as are necessary to remedy the situation,

Whereas the ruling class of South Africa has repeatedly violated the basic human rights of the Africans: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Midwest Federation of College Young Republican Clubs go on record as supporting peaceful efforts for the establishment of basic human rights in Africa; including gradual abolishment of apartheid; but be it further

Resolved, That we are not in favor of direct or indirect intervention by the United Nations in this matter because we feel such action is a violation of the U.N. Charter: be it

Resolved, That the Midwest Federation of College Young Republican Clubs urges the administration and the Congress of the United States to comprehensively review our foreign aid policy in view of the changing status in the world markets, our international deficit of payments, and the ability of recipient nations to handle their problems themselves; and be it further

Resolved, That foreign aid, when given, be on a loan basis wherever feasible.

Whereas the coming summit conference at Geneva may potentially influence peace in the world; and

Whereas diplomatic agreements made in the past with the U.S.S.R., such as at Yalta, were violated and in some instances completely disregarded when such action furthered the cause of world communism: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Midwest Federation of College Young Republican Clubs ask that the diplomatic leaders of the Western Nations keep the actions of the Communist leaders of the past in mind and take all precautions not to lead the free world into agreements or commitments that could be again violated by the U.S.S.R. in a manner that would better the causes of world communism.

Whereas it is in the best interests of the United States that West Germany remain a loyal partner in the NATO alliance; and

Whereas there has been expressed a doubt in European countries that the United States will maintain a strong stand on the Berlin issue: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Midwest Federation of College Young Republican Clubs urge that the United States reaffirm our belief in the strategic position of West Berlin in the NATO Alliance and our desire to protect the freedom of Berlin at all costs: Be it

Resolved, That, the Midwest Federation of College Young Republican Clubs approve the technical aid and assistance approach to the foreign aid problem as exemplified specifically by the U.S.S. *Hope*.

V. GOLDWATER, BARRY M.

Whereas he has rendered outstanding service in defining and clarifying the sharp difference between the Republican and Democrat parties, and

Whereas he has waged an unremitting battle to restore freedom and dignity to the American individual: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this convention urges that Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, of Arizona, be nominated for Vice President of the United States by the Republican National Convention in 1960.

VI. HEALTH AND WELFARE

Whereas the need for Federal medical assistance to our elder generation is temporary because the amount of private health insurance protecting this group has risen at a substantial rate; and

Whereas the voluntary effort at the community level is rapidly developing and expanding special facilities for the health, care of the aged; and

Whereas the cost of medical insurance provided by the Federal Government would be prohibitive; and

Whereas any health care offered to our aged by Government legislation would result in overcrowding of local hospitals and other facilities and a general deterioration of medical care: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Midwest Federation of College Young Republican Clubs go on record as opposing any attempt by the Federal Government, such as the Forand bill, to socialize medical care.

VII. LABOR POLICY

Whereas the Republican Party has fought for laws which would help labor unions become more responsible and representative institutions; and

Whereas we feel that the Landrum-Griffin Act was a step in the direction of establishing labor-management relations on a sounder basis; but

Whereas we are of the opinion that further action is needed to protect American workers in their rights: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Midwest Federation of College Young Republican Clubs go on record as favoring:

1. The right of any individual to choose his own bargaining agent without being compelled by public law or private agreement to belong to any association in order to earn a living.

2. The outlawing of all secondary boycotts and coercive blackmail picketing not covered by the Landrum-Griffin Act.

3. Adequate development of legislative safeguards to prevent any type of organization from operating in restraint of trade.

VIII. LOYALTY OATH AND DISCLAIMER AFFIDAVIT

Whereas the National Defense Education Act was created to provide for the national defense: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Midwest Federation of College Young Republican Clubs go on record as supporting Senator STYLES BRIDGES, chairman of the Republican senatorial policy committee, in his fight to preserve both the loyalty oath and disclaimer affidavit provisions of that act.

IX. NATIONAL DEFENSE AND SECURITY

Whereas we believe that this country's deterrent force is second to none, and we decry the politically unjustified attempts to generate hysteria over the alleged armed might inferiority of the United States defenses; and

Whereas it is noteworthy that the same Democrat politicians who in 1956 were frightening Americans with cries of an alleged "bomber gap"—a gap which never existed—are now claiming that the United States is behind the Soviet Union in missile and nuclear capabilities; and

Whereas the public record clearly shows that the men who sold America short then are trying to sell her short today: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we favor the continued elimination of wasteful interservice competition, with greater emphasis on a more centralized and unified mission command.

We encourage the continuing strengthening of our NATO, SEATO, and other collective security alliances, with more effective military protection of the Americas through OAS.

We urge additional public educational activities by the Office of Defense and Civilian Mobilization, particularly in the areas of nationwide alerts and the need for better civilian bomb shelters and emergency needs. And being aware that the real strength of Communist subversion rests upon public apathy and ignorance, we feel that a more active job must be done by the House Un-American Activities Committee and the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee; and be it further

Resolved, That it is the feeling of the Midwest Federation of College Young Republicans that sound judgment rather than dollars should be the main criterion when considering our national defense and security program.

X. NIXON, RICHARD M.

Whereas Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON has demonstrated his ability as a statesman and diplomat; and

Whereas he has been closely associated with the present administration and having this most favored position is the best qualified person to manage and deal with the present world situation; and

Whereas he has the integrity and experience necessary for national leadership: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Midwest Federation of College Young Republicans Clubs endorse the candidacy of RICHARD M. NIXON for President of the United States.

XI. PROGRAM AND PROGRESS COMMITTEE REPORT

Whereas our President Dwight D. Eisenhower has appointed a commission of outstanding Republicans to map a statement of long-range policy and objectives for the Republican Party; and

Whereas the report issued by that commission represents a published statement of farsighted constructive long-range goals; and

Whereas the report has been acclaimed and endorsed by President Eisenhower, Vice President NIXON, and by the national chairman of the Republican Party: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, the Midwest Federation of College Young Republicans, commend the Percy committee for its work in establishing the policy guides and ideas contained in this report.

ADLAI STEVENSON'S CRITICISM OF THE EISENHOWER ADMINISTRATION

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed, in the morning hour, for 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I wish to speak a little about crowbars and sledge hammers.

Last week, in his speech at Chicago, Governor Stevenson stated that Khrushchev wrecked the summit conference; and then Mr. Stevenson added:

> We handed Khrushchev the crowbar and sledge hammer to wreck the meeting.

The crowbar and the sledge hammer, according to Governor Stevenson, were the alleged blunders and mistakes.

Then followed his salute to unity, a reminder that his party also had a responsibility, an anticipation of what Republicans would say in the campaign, a recital of the Democrat duty to inform the people, and then the usual political "punch" that—

> This administration has helped make successful negotiations with the Russians—negotiations that are vital to our survival—impossible so long as they are in power.

In so doing, he projected crowbars and sledge hammers right into the middle of the campaign, notwithstanding the very

refreshing recitals of unity that came from the distinguished acting majority leader the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], who is a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and from the very distinguished majority leader, the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], and from a great many others.

Mr. President, whose crowbar did the wrecking? That is the question. According to Radio Liberty, Khrushchev knew of the reconnaissance flights in 1956. If true, why was he silent these many years? Why did he fail to raise the question at Camp David? Why did he fail to raise the question at the Press Club? Why did he fail to raise the question in the course of his tour? Why did he fail to raise the question at the closed meeting of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee?

I was in attendance at that meeting; and I asked Mr. Khrushchev quite a number of questions, and got a rather curt brushoff when we got around to the censoring of American dispatches, when Mr. Khrushchev said:

How do we know they are not all spies?

The U-2 incident was immaterial, and nothing more than a smokescreen. But I must get back to the crowbar.

On the day Khrushchev arrived in Paris, Governor Stevenson was quoted in an interview by the Paris press. It was first reported to us by William Stoneman, a competent, reliable reporter on the staff of the Chicago Daily News foreign service. Mr. Stoneman reported that in this interview Governor Stevenson made three suggestions. They were as follows, and they were headlined in the Paris papers on the day that Khrushchev arrived:

First, that he favored concessions on Berlin in return for an agreement with Russia on cessation of atomic tests.

Second, that he favored a reduction of American forces in West Berlin from 11,000 to 7,000.

I would gather from that suggestion that the distinguished former Governor of Illinois wants to close the last remaining hole in the Iron Curtain.

Third, that a disarmament accord might be sought on the basis of the Rapachi plan, under which forces would be reduced by both the East and the West in the area of central Europe.

Since then David Lawrence, in today's issue of the New York Herald Tribune, discusses the matter further under the caption, "Stevenson Is Seen Involved in Strange Circumstances." Mr. Lawrence comments at length on the matter, and then says:

The strangest episode of all, however, is the interview with Mr. Stevenson, which Soviet Premier Khrushchev read in Paris-Presse-l'Intransigeant just after his recent arrival in Paris. That interview was written by Robert Bulay, after a visit to Mr. Stevenson's home at Libertyville, Ill., where he said he spent an afternoon together with other guests.

The article with a streamer headline across the page said that Adlai Stevenson had proposed virtually a retreat from Berlin and American troop withdrawal from Europe. The published interview was a shock to Americans abroad coming as it did just a few days before the summit conference was to open.

That makes quite a picture. On the eve of the conference, the man who was twice the candidate of his party for the presidency, and in an election year, suggests publicly through the Paris press just how we should make the soft approach to Mr. Khrushchev.

When a reluctant prospect for the Democrat nomination—and I suppose he is a reluctant prospect, and who shall say what might happen—shows his hand in such fashion, Mr. Khrushchev would have been a fool not to consider postponement of the conference for 6 or 8 months—that is, until after election day—on the theory that he might be dealing later with a more gentle, a more tractable, a more flexible, and a less firm President. Or could it be with a more tractable Secretary of State?

In Mr. Khrushchev's comment to Mayor George Christopher at the San Francisco dinner, he rated Mr. Stevenson "the best among U.S. politicians."

Along with all this was the suggestion by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] in Oregon that, no matter who was nominated, Governor Stevenson would be a good candidate for Secretary of State.

Did Mr. KENNEDY read Governor Stevenson's interview in the Paris press? If he did not, how did he come on the statement that Khrushchev had made in East Berlin, that for the last 7 years Chancellor Adenauer has been the Secretary of State for the United States? Adlai, and only Adlai, used that phrase, and it appears in the Paris interview.

So we get back to the question, Whose crowbar brought about the wreckage of the summit? Perhaps it would be more appropriate to say it was a stick of dynamite with a delayed action fuse. Or, since Adlai is a Navy man, we might remain in character and say it was a well-placed, well-timed torpedo that found its mark.

To make sure that all this is documented, I submit and ask unanimous consent to have included in the RECORD as a part of my remarks the following:

No. 1: The address in full made by Governor Stevenson to the Cook County Democrat $100 Dinner, on Thursday, May 19.

No. 2: The dispatch by William W. Stoneman, under the caption, "Was Nikita Influenced By Adlai?"

No. 3: The press release of the American Committee for Liberation, which refers to the U-2 flights.

No. 4: The article by David Lawrence from the New York Herald Tribune, dated Monday, May 23, 1960.

No. 5: The article from the Portland Oregonian in which Senator JOHN KENNEDY stated, in response to a question at St. Helen's High School, that:

Khrushchev laid down two conditions to President Eisenhower for going on with the summit meeting. One was to apologize. I think that might have been possible to do.

That is Mr. KENNEDY suggesting that the President of the United States apologize to Mr. Khrushchev. I let this amazing statement speak for itself.

No. 6: The translation of the article by Special Correspondent Robert Boulay, based on his interview with Governor Stevenson at Libertyville, Ill., and bearing a Chicago dateline, in which appear all the questions and answers, including Governor Stevenson's statement that—

For 10 years there has not really been a Secretary of State for foreign policy. During this period, the real American Secretary of State has been German Chancellor Adenauer.

No. 7: A dispatch by Douglas Dales, under the caption "Farley Condemns Stevenson's Stand," in which Mr. Farley called upon the forthcoming Democratic National Convention to "condemn and repudiate Adlai E. Stevenson's criticism of the Eisenhower administration over the U-2 spy-plane incident."

No. 8: An article by Gould Lincoln, appearing in the Washington Star of May 21, 1960, under the caption "Would Adlai Have Banned the U-2?"

No. 9: The expression of viewpoint, much healthier and more refreshing, by the Honorable Averell Harriman, former Ambassador to the Soviet Union and former Governor of New York, which was written especially for United Press International. The article speaks for itself. I am glad to note that Mr. Harriman points out what President Eisenhower symbolizes to the Soviet people, and how enthusiastically he was received in 1945 when invited to Moscow by Premier Stalin. There was no crowbar in this.

No. 10: A declaration of confidence and support by the Western Governors Conference, adopted at Seattle, Wash., May 18, 1960, and subscribed by 12 western Governors.

Mr. President, I fancy we shall be hearing a lot more about crowbars and sledge hammers in the coming campaign if this is the line to be pursued by the opposition party.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all of these exhibits be printed as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Illinois?

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

TEXT OF ADDRESS BY ADLAI STEVENSON TO A COOK COUNTY DEMOCRATIC COMMITTEE DINNER

It appears that this year's campaign will be waged under the darkest shadows that ever hovered over the world—the mushroom clouds of a nuclear war that no one wants. This terrible danger—and how to avert it—will and should overshadow every other issue.

For the chances of a more stable world, which seemed to be brightening, have been rudely reversed by the breakdown of the summit conference in this historic week.

Premier Khrushchev wrecked this conference. Let there be no mistake about that. When he demanded that President Eisenhower apologize and punish those responsible for the spy-plane flight, he was in effect asking the President to punish himself. This was an impossible request, and he knew it.

SERIES OF BLUNDERS

But we handed Khrushchev the crowbar and the sledge hammer to wreck the meeting. Without our series of blunders, Mr.

Khrushchev would not have had a pretext for making his impossible demand and wild charges. Let there be no mistake about that either.

We sent an espionage plane deep into the Soviet Union just before the summit meeting. Then we denied it. Then we admitted it. And when Mr. Khrushchev gave the President an out by suggesting that he was not responsible for ordering the flight, the President proudly asserted that he was responsible. On top of that we intimated that such espionage flights over Russia would continue. At this point if Khrushchev did not protest he would be condoning our right to spy—and how long could he keep his job that way? Next we evidentially reconsidered and called off the espionage flights. But to compound the incredible, we postponed the announcement that the flights were terminated—just long enough to make it seem we were yielding to pressure, but too long to prevent Mr. Khrushchev from reaching the boiling point.

ALERT CARD NOTED

And, as if that wasn't enough, on Sunday night when there was still a chance that De Gaulle and Macmillan could save the situation, we ordered a worldwide alert of our combat forces. Is it unreasonable for suspicious Russians to think such a series of mistakes could only be a deliberate effort to break up a conference we never wanted anyway?

We Democrats know how clumsy this administration can be. We are not likely to forget the fumbles that preceded the Suez crisis on the eve of the 1956 election.

But nothing, of course, can justify Mr. Khrushchev's contemptuous conduct, especially after President Eisenhower had announced that our espionage flights had been called off. But his anger was predictable, if not his violence. How would we feel if Soviet spy planes based in Cuba were flying over Cape Canaveral and Oak Ridge? And also we could predict with certainty his efforts to use the situation to split the Western Alliance and intimidate the countries where our bases are situated.

Republican leaders are now saying that in this grave crisis we must all rally around the President in the name of national unity. Our respect for the Presidency will find us joined in salute to President Eisenhower upon his return. We resent deeply and bitterly the gross affront to the President and his Office.

NO QUESTION ABOUT UNITY

There is no question about national unity in a time of crisis. But errors must be corrected, and must not forget that the opposition party also has an obligation to our country and to our allies whose security is also involved. It is the duty of responsible opposition in a democracy to expose and criticize carelessness and mistakes, especially in a case of such national and world importance as this. We must see to it that we profit from such grave mistakes and misfortunes.

It is particularly regrettable that this happened in an election year. And we can already predict what the Republicans will tell the people in the months ahead.

They will stay that President Eisenhower's patience and dignity in Paris scored a diplomatic triumph by exposing Khrushchev's insincerity.

They will say that the Russians are hoping that a "softed" Democratic President will be elected in November. They will tell the people that a vote for the candidate the Russians distrust is a vote against appeasement.

It will be our duty, it will be the duty of all thoughtful, concerned citizens to help the situation and to face the hard, inescapable facts; that this administration played into Khrushchev's hands; that if Khrushchev wanted to wreck the conference our Government made it possible; that the administration has acutely embarrassed our allies and endangered our bases; that they have helped make successful negotiations with the Russians—negotiations that are vital to our survival—impossible so long as they are in power.

MUST SEEK UNDERSTANDING

We cannot sweep this whole sorry mess under the rug in the name of national unity. We cannot and must not. Too much is at stake. Rather, we must try to help the American people understand the nature of the crisis, to see how we got into this predicament, how we can get out of it, and how we get on with the business of improving relations and mutual confidence and building a safer, saner world in the nuclear age.

For in this age, unprecedented in human history, all of us, Americans and Russians alike, have one common enemy. The enemy is the danger of war. We must defeat the enemy together. Despite his hysterics last night, Mr. Khrushchev says he still believes in peaceful progress by negotiation. Let us hope he proves it, and let the United States come into the United Nations not content with the ordinary speeches, not content with the usual anti-Russian majority votes, but with constructive, positive, affirmative proposals to restore the hope of peace.

To those who will see nothing but Russian vice and American virtue, to those who will cry appeasement to any acknowledgment of our mistakes, I say that this is the toughest kind of common sense. For there is no future for any of us in a spiraling arms race propelled by mounting suspicion and distrust on both sides. The fact that Khrushchev seems to have lost his temper in Paris makes it all the more important that we not lose ours—or our heads.

[From the Daily News Foreign Service]

WAS NIKITA INFLUENCED BY ADLAI?

(By William H. Stoneman)

PARIS.—A startling statement by Soviet Premier Khrushchev expressing hope that he could do more business with one of Ike's successors than with Ike himself is being connected by imaginative Europeans with an interview recently given to a French newspaperman by Adlai Stevenson.

In an interview published by the Paris-Presse-l'Intransigeant on Saturday—the day of Khrushchev's arrival here—Stevenson was quoted as willing to make concessions to the Russians on a number of points.

One of Stevenson's alleged statements which startled and disturbed members of the American delegation to the summit indicated that he favored concessions on Berlin in return for an agreement with Russia on cessation of atomic tests.

One concession he was quoted as favoring was reduction of American forces in West Berlin from 11,000 to 7,000.

Of more importance was his suggestion that a disarmament accord might be sought on the basis of the Rapacki plan under which forces would be reduced by both the East and West in the area of central Europe.

This has been opposed by the Western Powers because it might involve retirement of American forces from Europe.

Stevenson was quoted as being willing to face this eventuality.

"I think Europeans—Germans, French and British—should be in a position to defend themselves in Europe," he was quoted as saying.

KHRUSHCHEV KEPT 4-YEAR SILENCE ON U.S. FLIGHTS; SOVIET PREMIER REJECTED PROTEST TO UNITED STATES IN 1956

(News release from American Committee for Liberation)

NEW YORK.—When did Nikita Khrushchev first learn of the U.S. U-2 flights over the Soviet Union? The question assumes importance in view of the Soviet Premier's temper tantrum in Paris on Monday.

According to Radio Liberty, Khrushchev himself has stated he first knew of the U.S. reconnaissance flights in 1956. Moreover, by his own admission, the Soviet Premier refused at the time to lodge a protest with the U.S. Government. Instead, he said he ordered improvements in Soviet rocket power.

It was a Soviet rocket which, according to Khrushchev, brought down the highflying Lockheed U-2 piloted by Francis Gary Powers near Sverdlovsk last May 1.

"The record thus indicates that Mr. Khrushchev first learned about the U.S. overflights almost 4 years before he raised the issue in an obvious effort to torpedo the Paris summit conference," said Radio Liberty. "The question naturally arises as to why the Soviet Premier waited 4 years to protest."

Radio Liberty also noted that it was during those 4 years—following the alleged 1956 plane episode—that Nikita Khrushchev roamed the world as a salesman of "peaceful coexistence." Later, after he succeeded in being invited to the United States, he began expounding the so-called spirit of Camp David.

"There is nothing on the record to suggest that Mr. Khrushchev ever brought the subject of these flights to President Eisenhower's attention during his U.S. visit last fall," said Radio Liberty. "Why—if they pained him so deeply—he waited 4 years to finally broach the subject in Paris on Monday should be of considerable interest to the peoples of the Soviet Union, to whom peace is as important as it is to the peoples of the free world. Is it possible Mr. Khrushchev had other considerations in mind when he decided to torpedo the summit conference?"

Radio Liberty, which is the voice of former Soviet citizens, is providing thorough coverage of the Paris summit developments in its around-the-clock broadcasts to all parts of the Soviet Union in Russian and 17 other languages from powerful transmitters in Western Europe and the Far East.

According to Gene King, U.S. programing chief of the network, Radio Liberty is placing special emphasis on news developments which official Soviet communications media appear to be ignoring. For example, President Eisenhower's announcement that the United States was not going to resume survey flights over the U.S.S.R. was not immediately reported by Soviet press and radio.

"We are also transmitting balanced accounts of world reactions to the latest developments in Paris," Mr. King declared. "We are fully aware of the Soviet citizens' desire to be fully informed on matters which concern them as much as they do us."

According to Radio Liberty, a study of Khrushchev's recent speeches indicates that he referred to three specific U.S. flights over Soviet territory. The first one apparently occurred on July 2, 1956; the second on April 9, 1960; and the third, Francis Powers' ill-fated flight on May 1, 1960.

The July 2, 1956, flight was disclosed by Khrushchev at a reception in the Czechoslovak Embassy in Moscow last May 9. According to the text provided by TASS, the official press agency, this is what the Soviet Premier said:

"I shall say further, when Twining, the then Chief of Staff of the U.S. Air Force, arrived here we welcomed him as a guest and

entertained him. He left our country by air and the next day he sent a plane flying at great altitude into our country. This plane flew as far as Kiev.

"The question arose: Should we protest? I proposed that no protest should be lodged. Only an animal might act like Twining, which, eating at one place, might do its unpleasant business there. From such behavior, we drew the conclusion: To improve rockets, to improve fighters. Our fighters can fly as high as 28,000 meters. But the difficulties of a fighter are that though it can rise high, it is not so easy and simple to find the target in the air: a plane in the air is like a needle in the ocean.

"But the rocket finds its targets itself. This is the advantage of the rocket and we made use of it."

The record shows that Gen. Nathan F. Twining arrived in Moscow on June 23, 1956, for what the then Air Force Chief of Staff later termed an 8-day "controlled" inspection of some Soviet air and military installations. The day after his arrival, he later reported, he attended a Moscow party tendered by the Defense Ministry on Soviet Air Force Day. At the party, Khrushchev drunkenly insulted the United States, British, French, and West German air officials present while Nikolai Bulganin, then the Soviet Premier, vainly shouted, "Shut up."

General Twining left the Soviet Union on July 1, 1956. According to Khrushchev, the following day an American plane "flying at great altitude * * * flew as far as Kiev," the capital of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, about 500 miles southwest of Moscow and about 600 miles north of Turkey. Khurshchev gave no further details.

Last May 5, in his speech before the Supreme Soviet, Khrushchev dramatically announced that a U.S. plane, which had violated Soviet airspace on May 1—May Day—had been shot down by a Soviet rocket. But he also disclosed this:

"Previously, an aggressive act was committed by the United States of America on the 9th of April 1960. A U.S. aircraft invaded the airspace of our country from the direction of Afghanistan. Naturally, no person of common sense could think or suspect that this violation was carried out by Afghanistan, a country which is friendly toward us. We are convinced that this aircraft belonged to the United States and was evidently based somewhere on the territory of Turkey, Iran, or Pakistan.

"When this invasion occurred, some of our comrades raised the question as to whether the United States should be warned. We exchanged views within the Government and decided not to take any special measures, not to write notes or memorandums because from previous experience we knew that this leads to virtually nothing. We then gave a stern warning to our military, especially those who are directly responsible for the aerial defense of the country, that they must act resolutely and not permit the invasion of our airspace by foreign planes to go unpunished.

"The American military evidently liked the impunity which they experienced on April 9, and they decided to repeat their aggressive act. For this purpose they selected May Day, the most solemn occasion for our people and for the working people of all countries."

In his May 9 remarks at the Czechoslovak Embassy, Khrushchev returned to the April 9 episode. "Even now," he said, "this flight is denied in the United States. In this case the thing is: If the thief is not caught, he is no thief. But this time we caught the thief and now the whole world knows about it.

"The reconnaissance plane should have been brought down on April 9, too. But our military, to put it mildly, let a chance slip by. And we, as one says, took them to task for it. On May 1 the reconnaissance plane was shot down. The military splendidly coped with the task when the opponent grew bold."

[From the New York Herald Tribune, May 23, 1960]

STEVENSON IS SEEN INVOLVED IN "STRANGE CIRCUMSTANCES"

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON, May 22.—Does Nikita Khrushchev want to see Adlai Stevenson elected President of the United States in November so that he can negotiate a deal at the next summit conference?

Does Mr. Khrushchev hope that Mr. Stevenson, if not nominated, will be considered for the post of Secretary of State in a Democratic administration, as Senator KENNEDY hinted the other day?

Why was Mr. Stevenson, in an interview published in Paris a week ago Sunday quoted as favoring an Allied retreat on the Berlin problem?

Why did Mr. Stevenson last Thursday night tell a political dinner meeting in Chicago that the administration has "helped make successful negotiations with the Russians—negotiations that are vital to our survival—impossible so long as they are in power?"

A STRANGE SEQUENCE

These questions are prompted by a strange sequence of circumstances. Thus on March 9 last the New York Times printed a United Press International dispatch from Moscow which read:

"Soviet Premier Khrushchev has his own opinions about the U.S. Democratic Party's presidential possibilities, he revealed tonight. He put Adlai Stevenson at the top of his list in comments to Mayor George Christopher of San Francisco at a dinner. Mr. Khrushchev's rating of the Democrats:

"Mr. Stevenson: the best among U.S. politicians.

"Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY, of Massachusetts: able, but some reservations about his youthfulness.

"Senator STUART SYMINGTON, of Missouri: he's a good man."

No other Presidential aspirants were mentioned, not even Senator HUMPHREY, who had once participated in a marthon conference of several hours with the Soviet Premier. Mr. Stevenson also conferred at length with Mr. Khrushchev in Moscow and wrote articles about him, but they did not contain any of the sting that the Minnesota Senator included in his published remarks.

DIPLOMACY RULE IGNORED

Mr. Stevenson, therefore, apparently is the favorite of Mr. Khrushchev, who has brushed aside the old rule of diplomacy that a foreign government must not interfere in the political campaigns of another country. The Soviet Premier evidently thinks Mr. Stevenson, as the titular head of the Democratic Party, speaks for it.

But James A. Farley, former Postmaster General in the cabinet of the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt and a former chairman of the Democratic National Committee, has just issued a statement urging the Democratic Party to repudiate Mr. Stevenson's speech of last Thursday night. Mr. Farley said in part:

"The unwarranted attack of Mr. Adlai E. Stevenson on the President's conduct of the summit negotiations, in my opinion, in no way represents the thinking of the Democratic Party. * * * In his few remaining weeks as titular spokesman of the Democratic Party has indicated every reason why the Democratic Party in convention should select a spokesman who speaks for it in fact. I can think of no more effective way of doing so than by a unanimous resolution of condemnation and repudiation of his absurd speech in Chicago as representing the views of the Democratic Party."

HIS TALK OF RETREAT

The strangest episode of all, however, is the interview with Mr. Stevenson which Soviet Premier Khrushchev read in "Paris-Press L'Intransigeant" just after his recent arrival in Paris. That interview was written by Robert Boulay after a visit to Mr. Stevenson's home at Libertyville, Ill., where he said he spent an afternoon, together with other guests. The article, with a streamer headline across the page, said that Adlai Stevenson had proposed virtually a retreat from Berlin and American troop withdrawal from Europe. The published interview was a shock to Americans abroad, coming as it did just a few days before the summit conference was to open. Evidently Mr. Khrushchev read it carefully, because in his own speech at East Berlin last Friday he paraphrased one of the points in the interview to charge that Chancellor Adenauer had succeeded "in worming his way to the post of Secretary of State of the United States."

Mr. Boulay, in his interview, quotes Mr. Stevenson as having said:

"For 10 years there has not really been a Secretary of State for American foreign policy. During that period the real American Secretary of State has been German Chancellor Adenauer."

ON REDUCING TROOPS

In other parts of the same interview, Mr. Stevenson is quoted as favoring American concessions, such as a substantial decrease in allied troops in West Berlin. He is reported to have declared also that he could foresee in the future the pulling of American forces out of Europe. When asked whether there would be a change in American foreign policy after the November elections, Mr. Stevenson is quoted as having said: "There will be important changes in American foreign policy."

Mr. Stevenson last Tuesday denied ever having given any interview at all to any Paris newspaper. But he issued a statement to the Chicago Daily News the next day admitting that he had talked with Robert Boulay but calling the published interview incorrect. He said it did not represent his views and that "the most charitable explanation of such irresponsibility, presumption, and discourtesy is that his English was poor and my French no better."

In Paris, however, Americans who know Mr. Boulay say he writes and talks English very well and is a reliable reporter. Just what did Mr. Stevenson really say to Mr. Boulay? Maybe all this is something for Democrats in Congress to include in their investigation of recent events. For there is no doubt that an appeasement faction exists today inside the Democratic party, and certainly Mr. Stevenson's speech—just 4 days before the all important debate at the United Nations Security Council—helped to wreck bipartisan unity in this country.

[From the Portland Oregonian]

KENNEDY SAYS SOFTER U-2 STANCE MIGHT HAVE SAVED SUMMIT TALKS

(By Mervin Shoemaker)

If Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY, of Massachusetts, were President he might apologize to Soviet Premier Khrushchev for the U-2 spy incident, but the Pope would keep his hands out of U.S. governmental affairs.

The Democratic presidential primary candidate made these points Wednesday, a day of appearances spanning St. Helens and Oregon City which ended with a campaign-climaxing rally at Benson Tech High School in Portland.

In Friday's election he is matched against Oregon Senator WAYNE L. MORSE, who is campaigning actively, and Senators STUART SYMINGTON, of Missouri, and LYNDON B. JOHNSON, who are not appearing in the State. Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, will have his name on the ballot, but he has withdrawn from the contest.

It was at St. Helens High School, following a breakfast meeting for which he arrived too late, that KENNEDY spoke for a degree of mollification of Khrushchev in answering a question on how he would have reacted to the Soviet Premier's attack in Paris.

POSSIBILITY SEEN

"Khrushchev laid down two conditions to President Eisenhower for going on with the summit meeting," said KENNEDY. "One was to apologize. I think that might have been possible to do. The other was to put on trial and punish those responsible for the U-2 flight. That couldn't be done. The men involved were acting under orders."

Later KENNEDY modified the word "apologize," and said the President might "express regret."

KENNEDY told several audiences during the day that he particularly criticizes the timing of the U-2 flight such a short while before the scheduled summit meeting, "letting the risk of war hang on the possibility of an engine failure."

Throughout Wednesday—at high school, supermarket, and industrial plant—KENNEDY used a defense against attacks on his Catholic faith that apparently was developed after his mid-April visit to Oregon.

He is telling audiences that he "swore an oath to God" to uphold the Constitution when he entered Congress, and that the President takes the same oath. The Constitution, he points out, provides for separation of church and state.

When KENNEDY says he would not let the Pope interfere with his duties as President, there is more behind the statement than an Irish Catholic's independence. The Pope, it follows naturally, would be asking him to violate an "oath to God."

KENNEDY says he doesn't think the Pope would interfere with him as president. any more than he does with Charles de Gaulle in France and Konrad Adenauer in West Germany.

MILL VISITED

The candidate toured the Crown Zellerbach paper mill at West Linn, and a sampling of Democratic workmen opinion here brought nothing of comfort to MORSE, SYMINGTON, and JOHNSON.

Of 15 men in a lunchroom which KENNEDY had visited, 10 were Democrats, and 7 of them held up a hand to signify he favors KENNEDY for the nomination. None responded to a call for a show of hands by MORSE supporters.

Random Democrats at the papermill, separated by a sprinkling of Republicans—Leroy Saulsbury, 41, Milwaukee, a millworker, and Art Goldade, 33, West Linn, a pipefitter—were mostly for KENNEDY.

One man asked: "What's wrong with MORSE?" He got no answer.

There is a small chill for Republicans in one reaction to these questions, which came from Richard Buse, 33, a millwright.

His wife likes KENNEDY. She is a Democrat and a Catholic. But Buse likes KENNEDY, too. He's going to vote for him if he gets the nomination. Buse is a Lutheran and a Republican.

There was another party line-crossing incident at Gateway Shopping Center, where a long queue of persons followed KENNEDY from shop to shop in the rain.

A girl in a barber shop was a Democrat. She's for KENNEDY.

"Most of us in here are Republicans," said one of several men present, "but we're going to vote for KENNEDY in the fall."

KENNEDY got unusual support from a fellow Democrat in another Wednesday incident, one which dramatized the widening Democratic Party breach occasioned by the election campaign.

At a meeting of the East Multnomah County Democratic Women's Forum, MORSE, the speaker, vigorously criticized KENNEDY, and KENNEDY was defended by State Senator Monroe Sweetland, Milwaukee, a member of KENNEDY's committee. The unusual part is that Sweetland is a candidate for Democratic nomination for secretary of state, and a candidate for major office does not often expose himself to the enemies of any other candidate.

NO TAX CUT SEEN

In the question period at Sandy Union High School KENNEDY was asked if he would favor increasing the income tax personal exemption from $600 to $800.

"In a dangerous time, and we stand on the razor's edge," he answered, "I don't think we can have any tax reduction."

In his Benson Tech speech KENNEDY criticized the Republican administration for its "record of failure" in natural resource development.

Nearly 1,800 persons filled the Benson auditorium nearly to capacity to hear KENNEDY, who bore down hard on significance of the Oregon primary, again contending that Democrats should not "waste their vote" on a candidate not seriously in the running for President—meaning MORSE.

KENNEDY was introduced by Representative EDITH GREEN, Portland.

TRANSLATION OF ARTICLE BY SPECIAL CORRESPONDENT ROBERT BOULAY

I passed an afternoon with Adlai Stevenson at his farm at Libertyville, 80 kilometers from Chicago. This is the man who could be the next President of the United States. Despite the fact that he has already failed twice against Eisenhower, he still has a chance. Until now, Stevenson has repeated that he was not a candidate. But when interrogated on what he would do if drafted, he replied that he was not a deserter. And having spent 4 hours with Stevenson and several of his friends I have the definite impression that the lawyer-farmer of Libertyville has not abandoned hope of succeeding Eisenhower. In any case he is certainly aiming at becoming Secretary of State if a Democratic candidate other than himself were elected next year.

It was the Saturday of Easter. Stevenson had just returned from a study trip of South America. Tanned, a little overweight, smiling, he nevertheless appeared to me rather nervous. He had just finished lunch in the company of his two sons and daughter-in-law, his grandchildren and the British economist, Barbara Ward. Stevenson moved from one to the other, offering candies, moving the same book around three times, and straightening out the coffee table.

Everyone then left for a tour of the property. Stevenson lent boots to his visitors and himself ensuring that everything was properly taken care of. For an hour and a half he showed us his fields, his sheep, his horses, and the river which was slowly draining off his flooded fields. In his corduroy suit, bareheaded, a scarf around his neck, he was the typical American gentleman farmer.

We returned to the house at 5 o'clock. Adlai Stevenson helped his grandchildren look for Easter eggs and gifts which he had hidden himself. He was more relaxed. Tea was served. Stevenson then invited me to follow him into his office and I never would have believed that he was about to speak to me as he did.

Question. What, according to you, Mr. Stevenson, is the most important question in the political world today?

Answer. The suspension of atomic tests—this is a prime question.

Question. Can it be achieved?

Answer. It must be possible to reach agreement through mutual concessions.

Question. I take it that you refer to agreement with precise control—inspection?

Up till now the Russians have not accepted the minimum inspection formula proposed to them by the Western Powers.

Answer. Naturally, an agreement with inspection * * * but I repeat to you that an agreement must be possible. This problem of atomic tests must be considered as absolute priority. With mutual concessions * * *.

Question. Does this problem appear to you of such importance as to justify concessions on other matters?

Answer. Yes certainly.

Question. Does this mean that the Western Powers should make concessions on the German problem?

Answer. Yes certainly.

Question. On Berlin?

Answer. Yes.

I was surprised and persisted—

Question. Do you establish a connection between atomic agreement and Germany and more particularly Berlin?

Answer. There is no connection. But an atomic agreement is basic and justifies concessions on other matters. Since you mention Berlin incidentally, the present situation cannot be maintained.

WHY 11,000

Question. But the Western Powers are not the petitioners in Berlin. It is the Russians who seem to wish to force the Western Powers to leave Berlin?

Answer. Mr. Boulay, the present situation in Berlin cannot be maintained. Strategically, the presence of 11,000 American soldiers is meaningless * * *.

Question. Must I understand that you are prepared to accept a reduction of American forces in Berlin?

Answer. Yes. * * * One could have for instance 7,000.

Question. Why 7,000 rather than 11,500? Would you accept 5,000, or 3,000, or none at all?

Answer. Yes, but not now, later.

(I once again expressed surprise, and asked Mr. Stevenson to explain himself more fully.)

Question. Do you believe it is possible to take the political and moral risk of such a decision?

Answer. Mr. Boulay, do not be surprised. All I am telling you, I have already said and written several times.

(This explanation surprised me for to the best of my knowledge Mr. Stevenson has never gone so far or been so precise in the direction of seeking an East-West agreement.)

I WAS AT BERLIN

Question. Do you appreciate what would be the reaction of the Berliners and of the Europeans, of the Germans, of the French, and perhaps even the English and others, and even the Americans? Do you think that——

(My host interrupted.)

Answer. Mr. Boulay, I have been in Berlin several times; I know the situation.

(I permitted myself the following answer):

"Mr. Stevenson, I have also been in Berlin. Less often than you perhaps, but perhaps for a longer period. I remained for 5 weeks. I saw Berlin, even both Berlins; I have seen and listened to the Berliners. I have seen and listened to the refugees * * * the refugees whose number I believe has not diminished, on the contrary during recent weeks. Do you really think one can leave 2 million West Berliners 'alone' "?

Answer. I believe that one must first arrive at an agreement which will guarantee free access between West Berlin and the Federal Republic.

RUSSIAN GUARANTEES

Question. But how?

Answer. An agreement must be reached with Russian guarantees.

Question. The experience of the last 10 years does not encourage any optimism on what you refer to as "Russian guarantees."

Answer. That is true, but a change is possible in the future. The agreement must be sought and a solution may be found.

(Mr. Stevenson then spoke to me of the necessity and of the possibility of reducing Soviet pressure on Eastern Europe, particularly by a withdrawal, more or less substantial, of Moscow's military forces. He cited particularly as a happy precedent the Austrian Peace Treaty. I pointed out that if it is true that the Russians withdrew militarily from Austria, as did the Western Powers, they did so from a country where the political power was not held by the Communists. The problem for the Soviets is not only to withdraw such-and-such military force from such-and-such country, but to envisage the strategic consequences, and above all the political consequences of even a localized withdrawal. The Russians must fear the consequences for the political power of the Communists in any Iron Curtain country as well as the example which would be furnished to other Iron Curtain countries.

(Mr. Stevenson admitted the great difficulties, but maintained a relative optimism. He insisted in telling me that he believed a sort of political decompression might be possible in the countries behind the Iron Curtain.)

GI, GO HOME

Question. Do you believe, therefore, that an agreement can be reached on European disarmament?

Answer. I believe that the Rapacki[1] plan could serve as a basis for discussion.

Question. Your answer surprises me. Up to the present the Western Powers, and especially the Americans, have always opposed the Rapacki plan which is considered by the Atlantic Powers as the beginning of the neutralization of Europe. This policy could be summarized by the formula "G.I. Go Home." Do you really envisage the withdrawal of American forces from Europe?

Answer. Yes, in the future.

Question. You have just made, Mr. Stevenson, a very important answer. Does this mean that Europe would have to provide for its own defenses alone?

Answer. I believe that the Europeans—Germans, French, English, etc.—must be in a position to defend themselves in Europe.

Question. Do you believe, then, that the Americans should put atomic weapons at the disposal of European forces?

Answer. This could be discussed.

(During the rest of the conversation Mr. Stevenson gave me no further definition on this point. He nevertheless reminded me that in the past, he had said and repeated, especially to General de Gaulle, that in his opinion, European forces should concern themselves only with conventional weapons, the Americans being alone to have at their disposal atomic weapons.)

ADENAUER—U.S. SECRETARY OF STATE

Question. Will there be a change in American foreign policy after the election?

Answer. There will be important changes in American foreign policy.

(I persisted.)

Question. Mr. Stevenson, you told me there will be important changes after the elections. Would you repeat this? Do you think there will be changes regardless of the results of the elections?

(Mr. Stevenson slams the table with the palm of his hand to confirm.)

Answer. Definitely yes; there will be major changes whatever the results of the election.

(Mr. Stevenson goes on, while severely criticizing the decisions of Foster Dulles and those decisions which followed, and this is his categorical conclusion.)

For 10 years there has not really been a Secretary of State for American foreign policy. During this period the real American Secretary of State has been German Chancellor Adenauer.

DANGEROUS WORDS

(I prepared to leave.)

Goodby, Mr. Stevenson. Thank you for your hospitality. I may see you at the summit conference. Not the next but perhaps the following.

Mr. Stevenson, while appearing very satisfied with my polite reference, answered me "Oh no." But I sensed in his voice that he had not lost hope of some participating in the discussions between the Big Four as President of the United States, or at least as successor to Mr. Herter, or, more exactly, Chancellor Adenauer.

But on the basis of what he said to me, how could he find enough votes to be elected to the Democratic Convention if he holds to these statements? If a Democrat other than he were elected, could he really choose Stevenson as Secretary of State if Stevenson holds himself strictly to his statements of this Saturday of Easter?

FARLEY CONDEMNS STEVENSON STAND—ASSAILS SPEECH ON SUMMIT—SAYS HIS NOMINATION WOULD BE DISASTROUS

(By Douglas Dales)

James A. Farley assailed Adlai E. Stevenson yesterday for his criticism of the Eisenhower administration over the collapse of the summit conference.

He warned the Democratic Party that the nomination of Mr. Stevenson for the Presidency would be disastrous.

The former Democratic National Chairman, in a caustic statement, charged that the party's standard bearer in 1952 and 1956 was using the failure of the summit meeting as a vehicle to promote a third nomination for himself.

The basis of his attack was Mr. Stevenson's speech Thursday at a party gathering in Chicago in which he declared that it was the obligation of the Democrats, as the opposition party, to expose and criticize any carelessness and mistakes of the Eisenhower administration.

As Mr. Farley directed his fire at the party's titular head, the Stevenson-for-President Committee of New York increased its activities with an advertising campaign to obtain support for Mr. Stevenson. Scores of volunteers were out in the city and suburbs, gathering signatures to petitions urging Mr. Stevenson's nomination.

Mr. Farley said he was impelled, as a matter of honesty and in furtherance of national unity, to reject Mr. Stevenson's thesis that the administration had furnished Premier Khrushchev with the "sledge hammer and crowbar" to wreck the summit conference.

"On the contrary," he said, "it occurs to me that Mr. Stevenson is attempting to use the incident to 'sledge hammer and crowbar' another disastrous nomination for himself as the Apostle of Appeasement out of the Democratic Party."

Meanwhile, the Republican National Committee criticized the Chicago speech as "reckless" and declared that Mr. Stevenson was falling "like a ton of bricks for the Khrushchev line."

The statement by Mr. Farley, who often voices the views of the conservative wing of the Democratic Party in the State, foreshadowed the possibility of a major division in the party on the question of foreign policy as a campaign issue.

Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt endorsed Mr. Stevenson's speech at a news conference here Friday. And a substantial group of Democrats in the House of Representatives have framed a series of questions for the Republicans on the U-2 plane incident and other developments on the eve of the Paris summit meeting.

UNWARRANTED ATTACK

Mr. Farley, terming Mr. Stevenson's speech an "unwarranted attack" on the President's conduct of the summit negotiations, said Mr. Stevenson did not represent the thinking of the Democratic Party.

Mr. Farley said that for Mr. Stevenson to say that the President had provided the tools to wreck the conference "indicates to me that Mr. Stevenson continues to be as misinformed on the facts as he is infatuated with his own writing style."

"It is my experience," the former party leader said, "that adroit phrasemaking does not necessarily indicate sound policymaking, a view which I find fortified by the rejection of Mr. Stevenson on two occasions by the American electorate."

Mr. Stevenson was particularly out of his field, Mr. Farley said, in criticizing the President's calling of a military alert on the eve of the Paris meeting. Recalling that the attack on Pearl Harbor had occurred immediately after negotiations with the Japanese mission had broken off in Washington, he said:

"I feel that the most felicitous use of the language, even Mr. Stevenson's, would be totally inadequate to explain away the enormity of a magnified Pearl Harbor, in the event of a surprise Soviet attack. If Mr. Stevenson is suggesting that the Commander in Chief should refer all measures of defense to Mr. Stevenson before issuing orders to adequately protect the country, the idea is both impractical and unconstitutional."

CHINA SUGGESTION NOTED

Mr. Farley's reference to Mr. Stevenson as an "apostle of appeasement" was based in part on the suggestion last September by Mr. Stevenson that the United States should cease leading the "anti-admission" lobby against Communist China at the United Nations.

"It is part of Mr. Stevenson's appealing, if adolescent, naivete in international affairs," the statement continued, "that it appears not to occur to him that the admission of Red China by the United Nations would establish another Red spy nest in New York City under full diplomatic protection."

Mr. Farley said that during his recent travels in the Far East, heads of government had insisted to him that the slightest wavering in the country's policy of nonrecognition of Communist China "would result in a worldwide diplomatic disaster for the cause of freedom, not second to an ignominious surrender of Berlin."

Mr. Stevenson has given the National Convention every reason to select a spokesman "who speaks for it in fact," Mr. Farley said, continuing:

"I can think of no more effective way of doing so than by a unanimous resolution of condemnation and repudiation of his absurd speech in Chicago as representing the views of the Democratic Party. As a former National Chairman and as one who has been proud to be a Democrat for over 50 years. I shall call upon all Democrats to keep the symbol of our party the Democratic mule and not Mr. Stevenson's umbrella."

Mr. Stevenson, who left Chicago for New York late yesterday afternoon could not be reached for comment.

---

[1] The Polish plan referred to as "Rapacki" from the name of its author provides principally for a partial European disarmament dealing with the production and stockpiling of nuclear weapons.

[From the Washington Star, May 21, 1960]

WOULD ADLAI HAVE BANNED THE U-2?

(By Gould Lincoln)

Adlai Stevenson's blast at President Eisenhower and the administration's handling of the U-2 intelligence flights over Russia raises some interesting questions—while at the same time thrusting an issue into the political campaign, with Mr. Stevenson as its first and perhaps principal spokesman.

Among the questions raised by the titular leader of the Democratic Party, who has been called a willing candidate for a third presidential nomination—if he can be drafted—is the following: Would Mr. Stevenson, had he been President during the last 4 years, have banned U-2 intelligence flights over Russian territory? These flights have been called by men intimately connected with the security of the United States and the free world not only essential but of great value.

Second: Is Mr. Stevenson in any way denying that we should seek information regarding the intentions and the strength of a potential enemy—particularly during a period of constant sabre rattling and threats of destruction of the United States by Soviet Premier Khrushchev and other leading Russian Communists?

This is a subject which Mr. Stevenson has not thoroughly discussed in his comments so far. But it is one that, should he be nominated by the Democratic Party, he will be asked many times, and will have to answer. It is obvious he cannot have it both ways. Mr. Khrushchev in his recent widely publicized press conference in Paris, when he torpedoed the summit conference, said in answer to a question that he had known for some time of the U-2 flights over Russia; that he knew all about them at the time he visited the United States and President Eisenhower at Camp David. If he did, his restraint—he did not mention these flights to President Eisenhower in their intimate conversations—was in remarkable contrast to his outbursts in Moscow on May Day and in Paris.

RESPONSIBILITY OF PRESIDENT

Had Mr. Stevenson been President he would have been told by the country's defenders in all probability that it was of vital importance to rise above the Iron Curtain and obtain as much information as possible regarding Russia's military strength and her intentions, so that this country could be alerted before a surprise attack. Presumably Mr. Stevenson would have agreed to this form of espionage. He would have known, as did President Eisenhower, the need for our security in the face of the constant threat of Soviet attack. He would have known, too, of the wideflung espionage carried on—and with much success—by the Soviet, both in this country and in the rest of the world.

Nevertheless, Mr. Stevenson has undertaken to thrust this whole subject of intelligence work for national security into the political campaign. Another question rises: Have Mr. Stevenson's charges against the President and his handling of the use of these intelligence flights tended to create a picture in Russian minds and in the minds of our allies of a divided America? The titular leader of the Democratic Party was careful in his Chicago speech to denounce the demands of Mr. Khrushchev for an apology from President Eisenhower because of the U-2 flights and for the punishment of those responsible for launching them. He was careful to say that this is no time for America to be divided. But what he said, taken as a whole, may well be interpreted as showing a serious division among the people of America. It may be interpreted as a backhanded apology.

Certainly, Mr. Stevenson seems to have indicated that the country must get rid of the Republicans and Mr. Eisenhower and all his works if the United States is to be able in the future to negotiate with Soviet Russia and the Communist world. This, in a measure, is exactly what Mr. Khrushchev declared in Paris. If Mr. Stevenson intended to exhibit himself as a better negotiator for a peaceful world, he has not given an impression that he would be a stronger one.

SPEECH POLITICAL

Mr. Stevenson in Chicago was addressing a Democratic political rally, a Cook County fund raising dinner. His speech was a political speech and so intended. The issue of the U-2 flights, their handling, and all other implications, so far as Mr. Stevenson is concerned, are firmly in the campaign. It may be that other Democratic leaders will follow a similar course. The question naturally arises: Will this issue gain votes for the Democratic nominee for President— whether Mr. Stevenson, Senator KENNEDY or another? Will Mr. Stevenson picture the President as a wrecker of the Paris Summit Conference—or won't he? It would be a difficult task to put that across in the minds of Americans, in view of Mr. Khrushchev's exhibition at Paris. In his Chicago speech, Mr. Stevenson called Mr. Khrushchev the wrecker of the conference. But he said Mr. Eisenhower had placed the crowbar in Mr. Khrushchev's hands by ineptness, by contradictory statements emanating from this Government. This raises the question: Would Mr. Stevenson, as President, have denied the whole business of the U-2 flights, have disclaimed any responsibility for them?

The American people have learned over the years that President Eisenhower is devoted to peace and the preservation of a peaceful world. He, however, has never been an advocate of peace at any price. He has insisted that the country be prepared and strong and informed in order to forestall or prevent Communist attack. Now he is charged by Mr. Khrushchev with seeking war, with a desire to prevent a successful summit conference. Mr. Stevenson would not have the American people believe any such thing. His contention is that the President has been stupid—more stupid than a Democratic President would have been. That, however, is still to be proved.

RUSSIANS WANT TO HEAR PEACE MESSAGE FROM IKE

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Probably no living American has known Russia and the Russians over as many years as Averell Harriman, former New York Governor and Ambassador to the Soviet Union from 1943 to 1946. He returned several months ago from a 6-week tour of the country during which he had a long series of conversations with Nikita Khrushchev and leading government officials.)

(By Averell Harriman)

The success or failure of the summit conference hangs largely on the decisions of one man—Nikita Khrushchev. But even Khrushchev, powerful as he is, cannot prevent President Eisenhower's visit to the Soviet Union from being a tremendous success, and of lasting benefit to our country.

To the Russian people, Dwight D. Eisenhower is not just a President of the United States. He is the supreme commander of the allied forces who with the Soviet armies fought to victory over the ruthless Nazi invaders. During the war his reputation was built up by the Soviet Government, through the press and other ways, as a great ally and friend of the Soviet Union. In July 1945, Stalin invited him to visit Moscow, and he was given a hero's welcome.

He stayed with me at the Embassy, and I vividly recall his reception by the people, particularly at the Dynamo football game. The 80,000 spectators who jammed the stands raised the sky with their applause when he and Marshal Zhukov stood up to take a bow, with their arms around each other's shoulders.

Then we were invited to review the youth parade in Red Square. The participants, 100,000 strong, from all over the Soviet Union, saw him standing with Stalin and Zhukov on top of Lenin's tomb.

Last year, when I visited the Soviet Union, wherever I went—Moscow, or central Asia, or the wilds of Siberia—people talked to me about peace, expressed their fear of war, and asked why we planned to attack them.

It is hard for us Americans to believe that the Russian people think the threat of war comes from us. But the propaganda has been constantly dinned into them that our Government is controlled by a small industrial clique, and this clique wants war for profit.

When President Eisenhower gives his message of peace and friendship, it will reach the hearts of tens of millions of Russians.

Peace with the United States is the message the Russian people want to hear, and President Eisenhower is the one living man who can give it convincingly.

DECLARATION OF CONFIDENCE AND SUPPORT BY WESTERN GOVERNORS' CONFERENCE, SEATTLE, WASH., MAY 18, 1960

Resolved, That the Governors of the Western Conference declare their strong and wholehearted support of the President of the United States in his dignified and unyielding response to the ignoble and outrageous demands of Chairman Khrushchev. We express our hope that the obstacles placed by Mr. Khrushchev in the path of discussion of grave international issues at the summit can be overcome by the leaders of the free world in furtherance of our deep desire to build a world where all peoples can live in freedom and justice, peace and dignity; unmolested and unafraid.

Gov. Grant Sawyer, of Nevada; Gov. William F. Quinn, of Hawaii; Gov. Albert D. Rosellini, of Washington; Gov. Mark O. Hatfield, of Oregon; Gov. Edmund G. Brown, of California; Gov. George Dewey Clyde, of Utah; Gov. John Burroughs, of New Mexico; Gov. J. J. Hickey, of Wyoming; Gov. William A. Egan, of Alaska; Gov. J. Hugo Aronson, of Montana; Gov. Robert E. Smylie, of Idaho; Gov. Stephen L. R. McNichols, of Colorado.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I listened with interest to what the distinguished minority leader had to say about a speech by the two-time candidate of the Democratic Party, Mr. Adlai Stevenson, which speech was given in Cook County, I believe, last Thursday. Evidently the minority leader thinks that a man high in party councils should remain quiet when, in all good conscience, he perhaps feels a deepening disquiet.

It appears to me that so far as the Democratic leadership is concerned there will be an inquiry, which I understand, from reading the press reports today, has the tacit support of the minority leader.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. One of our distinguished correspondents grabbed me this morning as I was coming into the Capitol and began to ask about a possible investigation. I think I qualified my remark by saying, "If there is going

to be an investigation," that probably the Foreign Relations Committee might undertake it.

I begin to have some doubts about the merit of an investigation, when we are dealing with such a sensitive matter as the whole intelligence system of this country. Once that door is opened, I doubt whether it will be closed again. Then who shall say what will be the repercussions?

So my statement was a qualified statement.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I accept the Senator's statement, and of course I believe it. I was simply referring to a ticker tape report which indicated that if an inquiry were to be held the Foreign Relations Committee was the place to hold it.

It happens that after every international conference of any significance the Secretary of State and other interested individuals almost always appear before the Committee on Foreign Relations and gives the committee a report. Although my knowledge comes from press reports, I understand from that source that there may be a suggestion tomorrow, when the Committee on Foreign Relations meets, that it conduct not an investigation but instead an inquiry, to furnish an opportunity for many interested Senators to raise questions which have been bothering them.

Speaking about questions, I dare say there is not a Member of this body on either side of the aisle who does not have at least one question which he would like to have answered.

If the inquiry is forthcoming, I wish to express the hope, as I have previously expressed it, that it will be an inquiry based upon the facts, that it will not become a political football and will not become such a campaign issue that the welfare and the unity of the country may well be lost in the shuffle.

I think Mr. Stevenson had the right to make the kind of speech he made. I do not think that speech is going to disrupt national unity. I would invite the attention of my colleagues to the fact that we still live in a free country and that we still have the right to express our opinions as we see fit. As a responsible official of the Democratic Party I can find no fault with Mr. Stevenson for making his honest views known in a speech in Cook County.

The minority leader has mentioned the fact that a story, so called, came out during the course of the summit conference, or prior thereto, in which Mr. Stevenson said something about the fact that he hoped the nuclear test ban negotiations would continue. Well, I hope they will continue, also, because I think what happens at Geneva in regard to the ban on nuclear testing is going to have a great effect not only upon this country, but also upon mankind as a whole.

The minority leader said that Mr. Stevenson advocated a reduction in U.S. forces in Berlin from 11,000 to 7,000. I do not desire to be picayunish, I assure the Senator, but it is my understanding that the forces of the three Western Allied Powers in Berlin are comprised roughly of 11,000 men, and the American forces comprise something on the order of 4,000 to 5,000 of the total.

The third thing with which the story seems to find fault, on the part of Mr. Stevenson, is the fact that he advocated consideration of the Rapacki plan, by means of which there might be created a neutralized zone in middle Europe. Others of us have advocated that, also. I have advocated consideration of the Rapacki plan, the Eden plan, and the Gaitskill plan, with the proviso that there be a quid pro quo in return before anything definite is done along these line. I see nothing wrong with that.

I can understand the opposition of the Republican Party to what Mr. Stevenson has said, because, frankly speaking, I think the Republicans look upon him as a possible presidential candidate. He may be. He may not be. This is one way of anticipating something in advance.

However, I find it extremely difficult to understand why Democrats should go out of their way to find fault with Mr. Stevenson for expressing his honest opinions. Some of them, in effect, want to "read him out" of the party. He will not be "read out" of the party, because he has made many contributions to our country in the past, and I anticipate he will make many more in the future.

Some people say, "Well, Mr. Stevenson is going to be our next Secretary of State." He may well be. I have heard the names of Mr. CHESTER BOWLES and of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] mentioned in that respect, also. That is a matter which will be determined by the next President, if he is a Democrat. If he is not a Democrat, we may rest assured that none of these three will be appointed. If the next President is a Republican, of course he will have to make his own decisions.

The reference to the 6 to 8 months, laid down by Mr. Khrushchev in the hope that a new administration will come into power, carried the implication by the distinguished minority leader that if the new President happened to be a Democrat, and most specifically if he happened to be Mr. Stevenson, things were going to be easier, that we were going to be "softer." Well, I do not think we are the ones who have been "soft" on communism, to revive an old Republican phrase. We did not invite Mr. Khrushchev to America. Mr. Khrushchev never invited a Democratic Presidential candidate to visit him in the Kremlin.

I do not know what Senators mean when they say that, because of the statement made by Mr. Khrushchev that 6 or 8 months would be time enough to hold another conference, if a Democrat is to go to such a conference it would indicate a sign of softness. It is hard for me to follow that reasoning.

I would advise my Republican colleagues, if I may, not to look too far ahead and not to arrive at too many assumptions too early.

I think we ought to find out something about the crowbar and something about the sledge hammer, and the place to find out about these articles and the place to raise these questions is in the Committee on Foreign Relations.

We have the Foreign Relations Committee to look into matters affecting the foreign policy of the United States; and what has been affected is the foreign policy of the United States. Mr. President, I have never heard of a statement attributed to another outstanding presidential candidate, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] to the effect that he advocated apologizing to Mr. Khrushchev. I do not know of any Democrat who has ever at any time advocated apologizing, publicly or otherwise, to Mr. Khrushchev. The Senator from Massachusetts will return to the Senate shortly, and I am sure he will take care of himself in that respect.

In respect to the interview, it is my understanding that Mr. Stevenson stated, as soon as the news of this interview broke, that he had had nothing to do with it, and that he did not give an interview of that nature, but I cannot vouch for that, because I am calling on memory, and going back to the public print.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. I wish that the Republicans would let us take care of our business and that they would take care of their own business, but let us together take care of the Nation's business.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President——

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President——

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I try always to be careful about documentation. Everything I have said this morning has a documentary article to support the statement. The interview in Paris was pretty lengthy. It was a translation of an article by special correspondent Robert Boulay. The heading is "I Passed the Afternoon With the Possible Successor to Mr. Eisenhower—Adlai Stevenson Told Me, 'The Americans Must Quit Berlin and Europe if They Wish To Achieve Atomic Peace.'" That is the headline. It has a Chicago dateline, and after the introductory portion the interview was on a question and answer basis. It is all here. It was done at Adlai Stevenson's home at Libertyville, Ill. It must have appeared in the Paris newspapers because there is no more reputable foreign correspondent than Bill Stoneman on the Chicago Daily News foreign staff. He commented on it. David Lawrence also commented on it. I shall leave the entire question and answer statement to speak for itself as to precisely what Governor Stevenson said.

Then, of course, there is the factor of timing. The article hit the papers on the day Khrushchev got to Paris, and he had to read it, because he gave himself away in East Berlin when he mentioned that Adenauer had been our Secretary of State for 7 years, and that is precisely what Adlai Stevenson said to Robert Boulay at Libertyville, Ill. It would be amazing indeed to have words flowing out of two different mouths

3,500 miles apart, each individual being insensible of what the other said.

I have only one further comment to make, because I do not want to preempt the floor. My distinguished friend from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] said we had invited Mr. Khrushchev here. That is correct. We had invited Mr. Koslov. We had invited Mr. Mikoyan. We got them on the "home diamond." But I can remember another period in the history of this country when the President of the United States went to Yalta and when he went to Teheran, to their orbit, rather than have them here, and so it was much better to have them on the "home diamond." But all the articles are there and all the quotes are there; they must speak for themselves, including the estimate of the whole matter uttered by a very distinguished Democrat, James A. Farley, of New York.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President——

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, as I understand, what the distinguished minority leader has just said is that Mr. William Stoneman, a very reputable journalist, did write a story on this matter, but is my understanding correct that he got the story from a story carried in a Paris newspaper?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Exactly so. He saw it in the Paris newspaper, and sent a dispatch to the Chicago Daily News. That was the only reference I saw to it until these other developments arose.

Mr. MANSFIELD. May I ask one question: Did Adlai Stevenson deny the interview?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have not heard him deny it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Did the Senator read it? I read a report that he denied it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It would be amazing indeed if a correspondent for a French newspaper could journey all the way to Libertyville, Ill., in the northern section of the State, and say he was there with other correspondents, and then to reduce to question-and-answer form, with interpolated comments, this kind of statement.

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

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President——

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President——

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, while I was in the Middle West, I read a report in the press that Mr. Stevenson denied having given the interview in the way it was presented by the French journalist. He said that the French journalist's English was wrong, that he again wanted to deny the assertions made in the story by the French writer. I do not have that denial here at this time, but I ask for unanimous consent that Mr. Stevenson's statement in the press as I read it be inserted at this point in my remarks.

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

STATEMENT BY ADLAI E. STEVENSON ISSUED TO PRESS MAY 18

My recollection is that the young man was brought to my home by friends. I never give exclusive interviews without request. And he would not have received one had he asked in such circumstances.

As I recall, he wanted to discuss all of the problems of Europe; and evidently confused discussion with opinion.

What he reports me as saying have, of course, never been my views and are not my views today.

The most charitable explanation of such irresponsibility, presumption, and discourtesy is that his English was poor and my French no better.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Connecticut. Before I do so, I wish to say I am very happy to see so many Republicans in the Chamber at this very early hour, and also so many Democrats. But I was caught cold, and I believe we were all caught cold, by what the distinguished minority leader said this morning, so if I can find some documentation, I shall try to get it later and put it in the RECORD, because I know the Senator from Illinois would be delighted to have it there.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Indeed I would.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I was glad to hear the Senator speak on the subject of an inquiry by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. What concerns me very much about such an inquiry is the question whether it would be held in executive session by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

Mr. MANSFIELD. May I say to the Senator from Connecticut that I did not make a request for an inquiry, though I have stated on this floor that at the proper time the questions should be asked, and in the course of that earlier statement I stated as my belief that any queries of this kind ought to be held in private, that they should not become the subject of political controversy. I am very happy to read in this morning's paper that a Member of the Senate on the other side of the aisle, the distinguished Senator from the State of New York [Mr. JAVITS], indicated that he thought it would be worth while to have an inquiry at this time, one conducted by the Foreign Relations Committee.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, let me observe, in conclusion, that I am very glad to hear the acting majority leader speak of this matter in this way. I assume that such an inquiry would have his support, and that any inquiry into the entire business of the U–2 incident and subsequent developments would be in executive session and of a private nature. I express the very urgent hope that that will be the case, because, as the acting majority leader himself said a few moments ago, we are dealing with a very sensitive subject, a very sensitive situation, in which not only our own security, but the security of the whole free world and that of our allies, is involved. Whatever the temptation may be, I do not believe that this subject should become a political football. I believe that if Senators or other political leaders have something to say on their own responsibility, they have, as the acting majority leader pointed out, the right to say it if they wish to take the consequences. But because of the overall seriousness of the whole situation and the sensitiveness of it, I believe that Members of the Senate, who are all responsible men, should not engage in a public inquiry into this subject which might imperil our position, because we are not in a position to afford that kind of a wild goose chase, so to speak. I compliment the acting majority leader for the position he has taken upon that issue.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I do not wish to have any misunderstanding about my position. I express the hope that we will act responsibly. I have expressed the hope, and I again express it, that this matter may be kept as far out of politics as possible, because if we do not know by now the precarious and delicate situation we are in, we will never know it. I hope no one has the idea that the "summit that never was" turned out to be a victory for us. If so, let him disabuse his mind completely. It was anything but a victory. We had better recognize that fact and remember that in this day and age in which we live, if things go too far, there is going to be no differentiation between a Democrat and a Republican. So I hope that we will act together in the interest of our country, not in the interest of a particular political party. I now yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for yielding to me. I have a brief statement to make in connection with the proposed investigation.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me first?

Mr. BUTLER. The Senator from Montana has yielded to me. I have the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that the Senator from Montana has the floor.

Mr. BUTLER. I thought the Senator had yielded to me to make a brief statement.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I have yielded to the Senator for that purpose.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, it has been most revealing to observe the increasing number of politicians who have been eager to cry "Me too" about the U–2. In their eagerness to gain a few headlines and perhaps votes, they have muddled and muddied the events of the last few weeks so that the U–2, the summit, the events prior, during, and after have all been thrown together into an incredibly tangled mass. Now the cry has gone up for investigation by a committee of the Senate.

Mr. President, no matter how sincere and impartial the gentlemen of any such committee might be, their actions and their words will be turned into political ammunition for the coming election. It might even be that some of these gentlemen are well aware of this at the present time and that their interest in an investigation is not so impartial. Indeed, the Democratic advisory council has cleared summitry as an issue in a statement made public today.

That statement is filled with the most intemperate and ill-considered remarks. For example, "The foreign policy of the Eisenhower-Nixon administration is a shambles." Or "It has become obvious

that the operations of the Government of the United States in its most important areas are chaotic." Or "During the first 2 weeks of May 1960 the foreign policy of the Eisenhower-Nixon administration collapsed." Perhaps it is not necessary to point out the obvious, but it is a fact that the party of the majority of the proposed investigating committee and of the advisory council I have just been quoting are one and the same. Can one operate without being influenced by the other? I think not.

As the cry for investigation of the U–2, of the summit, of the CIA, of every person and agency connected with our foreign policy goes up, I would like to raise this question: Does the legislative branch have the authority to investigate the Executive? I think not. Foreign policy is the responsibility of the executive branch. The State Department, the CIA, and all the other agencies of our foreign policy division are responsible to the President and to the President alone.

If the Democratic advisory council and the majority of this Senate are dissatisfied with what has happened in the last few weeks and want to do something about them other than engage in a debate, I believe they have two paths open to them.

One, they may impeach the President for giving a sledge hammer and a crowbar to Mr. Khrushchev with which that most sincere and peace-loving individual wrecked the summit conference. If they believe that the President has been derelict in his duties as the Chief Executive and as the Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces, let them start impeachment proceedings against him, or let them stop their ridiculous talk about investigating the President.

There is a second path open to the experts in hindsightmanship, those who are now howling and wringing their hands about what happened in Paris. They may work to convince the American people to vote against the present administration. Those are the two alternatives and the only alternatives.

Mr. President, I am not suggesting that we should not have debate on this issue. I believe that there should be long, serious, and dignified discussion of the U–2 and the summit. But a full and open committee investigation of these issues with television, radio, and newspapers blowing it up to the best of their considerable ability and skill would provide nothing but the most grotesque and meaningless Roman circus.

Criticism does not weaken a country, Mr. President, but selfish vindictive exploitation always does.

Mr. President, I would be the very last Member of this body to argue that we did not make some errors in the handling of the U–2 incident. But it would be well in the present atmosphere to remember that there are positive sides to this issue.

One, the U–2 proved that the United States is able to engage in the most difficult and demanding espionage for as long a period of time as 4 years without being publicly discovered. Two, the U–2 penetration to a distance of 1,300 miles into the heartland of Russia proves the ineptness and inability of Soviet air defenses. No wonder Mr. Khrushchev lost his temper and his control in Paris—he was revealed as the leader of a nation unable to defend itself against unarmed reconnaissance nonjet airplanes.

Mr. President, let me make myself absolutely clear. I am not against discussion and debate of the U–2. But, I am against investigation because I believe it to be unconstitutional and because its proceedings and consequences would end in a severe schism of the American people when we must all stand united.

If there are those who believe the events of the past few weeks to have been wrong, let them use the constitutional and electoral means at hand to set right such wrongs. But let them not raise a political banner and ask Americans sincerely concerned about the future of this country and the free world to follow them.

These are not easy times, Mr. President. Times of crisis never are. It is my sincere hope that the critics of the administration will not attempt to follow the easy way and blacken every issue and every action of the last several weeks with mud. Cries of blunder will not lead us to victory in the fight against communism, Mr. President, but into confusion and mistrust of each other. Let us fight together—not against each other.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, before I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania, I should like to say that I am delighted that the Senator from Maryland recognizes that criticism has a valid part under our system of government. Speaking only for myself, I would say that, so far as I am concerned, I do not wish to see a propaganda field day made of such a delicate situation. I now yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, in order to throw a little light on whether or not Mr. Stevenson did or did not give the interview, it should be noted that an article appeared in the Paris Press-L'Intransigeant of Sunday-Monday May 15–16, 1960. Mr. David Lawrence, in his article published in the New York Herald Tribune of May 23, states:

> Mr. Stevenson last Tuesday denied ever having given any interview at all to any Paris newspaper. But he issued a statement to the Chicago Daily News the next day admitting that he had talked with Robert Boulay but calling the published interview incorrect.
>
> He said it did not represent his views and that the most charitable explanation of such irresponsibility, presumption, and discourtesy is that his English was poor and my French was no better.

Others, however, have noted, as appears in Mr. Stoneman's article, that:

> In Paris, however, Americans who know Mr. Boulay say he writes and talks English very well and is a reliable reporter.

This interview has, in my mind, the Stevensonian touch, to which has been added, I should say, and as Mr. James Farley has referred to it, the Stevensonian umbrella instead of the Democratic mule.

Mr. Stevenson joined Senator KENNEDY in the role of hindsight heroes; and if there is any question as to whether Mr. Stevenson gave this interview to Mr. Robert Boulay, I suggest that the appropriate committee of the Senate, either in executive session or in open session, request Mr. Boulay to appear in this country and request Governor Stevenson to appear, and let us have noted whether or not Governor Stevenson advocated the withdrawal of American forces from Europe, as he puts it, at some time in the future; an immediate reduction of forces in Germany; and concessions to Khrushchev all along the line; together with the statement that there would be important changes in American foreign policy next year; and the statement that "the real American Secretary of State has been German Chancellor Adenauer."

I might also add, in connection with the statement of the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], as reported in the Portland Oregonian, that the Senator himself said:

> Khrushchev laid down two conditions to President Eisenhower for going on with the summit meeting. One was to apologize. I think that might have been possible to do.

Then the quotation goes on to other matters. The report in the Oregonian is that:

> Later KENNEDY modified the word "apologize," and said the President might "express regret."

It is my hope that neither the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts nor that other candidate for the Presidency, Governor Stevenson, will—either one of them—brand himself as a "turnquote." It is my hope that they will relieve themselves of the curse of suspicion of appeasement, and it is my hope that the unity, which started out so well in support of the President and in support of the administration, may somehow be found again.

But as Mr. Farley has so well said, he has no part in the appeasement process as exemplified by the unfortunate statement of Governor Stevenson.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I may say, in reply to the Senator from Pennsylvania, that I think he is doing a disservice to the country when he puts words in the mouths of Stevenson and KENNEDY which were never uttered. The idea of calling those men appeasers. What does he mean, "appeasers"? Both of them served their country in times of emergency. Stevenson was an apprentice seaman in the First World War; JACK KENNEDY was a PT-boat commander in the Second World War. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania call those men appeasers? What kind of tactic is this? I thought we were trying to keep this matter out of the field of politics. Why does the Senator from Pennsylvania pick on those men? Why put those titles and those names upon them? They are not appeasers, and the Senator from Pennsylvania knows it. They are good, decent, honest, upright Americans, and should be so considered by everyone.

Mr. SCOTT. If the Senator from Montana will yield, I did not ascribe to them the word "appeasers." I said they had an opportunity to divest themselves

of reference to appeasement, as exemplified by the statement of Mr. Farley.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The implication is clear, and the term "curse of suspicion" was used.

Mr. SCOTT. If they are appeasers, let the record speak for itself. If they are not appeasers, let that record speak for itself. But above everything else, let us find out whether Governor Stevenson made the statement he is reported to have made; and let us find out whether Senator KENNEDY made the statement reported and attributed to him.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I think the remarks which have been made by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] with respect to the character and the patriotism of Governor Stevenson and Senator KENNEDY are most unfortunate. I am consoled by the source from which they came.

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

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I rise to a point of personal privilege.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana has the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, it seems to me that if we shoot off any more fireworks around here, we will not have any left for the Fourth of July. Our job now is to make certain that we will have the Fourth of July from now on, and that we have the right to celebrate it. It may be all right to shoot off fireworks, but I think we are shooting them off too close to the gas works to be helpful.

Like others, I have no doubt that Mr. Stevenson might have spoken rather indiscreetly in his speeches. He appears to be one of the ever-hopeful variety, so perhaps we should accept his remarks in that sort of hopeful atmosphere.

I, myself, do not regard Mr. Stevenson as being representative of more than one section of the Democratic Party. I think Mr. Farley represents another viewpoint within that party. Perhaps the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] may represent an element greater than the others put together. At least, that is what has been said. Whatever position they have to take, they probably have the right to take it.

However, in view of all the verbal fireworks which have taken place, both on the Senate floor and around the Nation, during the last few days, it appears to me that we have gone too far not to have a discreet, judicious, and careful inquiry into the events of the last 2 or 3 weeks, in the hope that we may fill in two or three gaps in our information. I do not see how this type of inquiry can hurt anyone. I should think it might prove helpful in the long run. I intend to be present, if that inquiry is made by the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, which is the place where it should be made, to see that there is no unfairness during the proceedings.

If we undertake to suppress an inquiry now, it will look to the world as if we really had something to cover up. I do not think anyone wants to do that. I do not think we have anything to cover up.

I think Mr. Khrushchev got himself on one wonderfully hot spot, and he had to have time—6 or 8 months, or, heaven knows, probably more than that—before he could get off the hot spot, and get out from under the various pressures which have been bearing down on him, and which made him scuttle the conference. I do not say he did not want to scuttle it anyway, but certainly he came to the conference intending to scuttle it, one way or another.

It has been said by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], though I do not think it was said exactly in that way, that an ICBM certainly cannot tell the difference between a Democrat and a Republican. Even the IBM has not gotten to the point where it can do that yet, simply by having a person walk past a machine. Certainly an ICBM—an intercontinental ballistic missile—could not tell any difference between us, should the point be reached where any enemy might see fit to use it against us.

We have a common job now. It is to assure the security of the United States, and to make every endeavor we can to lessen international tensions, and to lessen the risk of international conflict, which would be so terrible to contemplate that we should not be thinking of getting even with each other. We ought to be getting together, to make certain that the United States will not face any cataclysm in the future. I do not think we will have to face one, but I think it is important that we work together; that we find some other issues for November; and not concentrate on something which may prove injurious to all of us on the international scene.

I simply want to make certain that we have the right to shoot off fireworks on Fourth of July, and that we will celebrate the Fourth of July for a long, long time to come.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in response to what the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] has just now stated, I wish to say that, as always, in a few words he reaches the heart of the matter. I think his statement is one to which all of us—Democrats and Republicans alike—can subscribe.

I wish to assure the Senator from Vermont and the Senate that, so far as I am concerned, there are no political implications and there is nothing picayunish in my attitude. But there is a desire to find the answers to some questions. In seeking those answers, I hope we try to avoid personalities and not raise charges or strawmen against persons such as the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], who is not now in the Chamber, to defend himself, or against Adlai Stevenson, who—like every other American—has a right to state his views. After we find the answers, if there then are criticisms, they can be answered.

I only hope that the next time something of this sort occurs, we shall have a little prior notice.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President——

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I had no prior notice of the Stevenson speech.

Mr. MANSFIELD. It was made last Thursday.

Mr. DIRKSEN. And generally I have no prior notice of the statements which from day to day are made on the floor of the Senate. Therefore, I usually find myself in the same dilemma in which the acting majority leader now finds himself.

The other point is that today, with the acceleration of events, it becomes difficult to document one's speech. I try to document the statements I make; I endeavor to state for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as a part of my remarks, the sources and every document and every report. That was the reason for what I said.

I make this final comment: I am unhappy when this matter gets into the political field or in the newspaper headlines. The headlines in the newspapers, particularly those in the Midwest, were printed in very large letters, "Adlai Charges Use of Crowbar"—or something to that effect. Obviously, we cannot "blink" it, because public opinion begins to be manufactured in exactly that way, and that is not conducive to unity.

Last week, when the majority leader made such an excellent statement, here on the floor, he mentioned the fact that the distinguished junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee; Governor Stevenson, the titular head of the Democrat Party, and twice its candidate for the Presidency; the Speaker of the House of Representatives; and the majority leader had signed a cablegram which was sent to the President, in Paris; and I said it was a refreshing note, and I was delighted to see it.

But one has to take judicial notice when a former candidate for the Presidency—who, first of all, is watched with interest and, second, travels about South America, Europe, Asia, and elsewhere, and confers with the foreign leaders—makes such a statement. How can one "blink" it? One has to take account of it. I was only taking judicial notice of what I have seen; and what I was able to put in the RECORD today was by way of documentation. Obviously, I am always contented to let that speak for itself.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I was not being serious when I said I hoped we would receive a little prior notice the next time an incident of this sort occurs, because I recall that I have asked very serious and delicate questions of the minority leader, without giving him prior notice. I appreciate what the Senator from Illinois has said.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President——

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I rise to a question of personal privilege.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I shall not long detain the Senate.

I regret that I was not in the Chamber at the beginning of this debate. I had no idea that attacks of this kind would be made at this hour on Monday.

Last week, in response to an inquiry in regard to the Foreign Relations Com-

mittee, I stated that it is customary for the committee to hold briefings and hearings on matters of importance. I think that, without exception, following every international conference which has been held since I have been here, always upon their return the Secretary of State and others have come before our committee, to inform it and, through it, the Senate and the Nation. I see nothing irregular about that. I think it entirely in order.

I am a little surprised that Members of this body on the other side of the aisle would be so aggressive about this particular matter. It seems to me something must be hurting their conscience, and they seem to be counterattacking before any attack is made. No one has attacked anyone, so far as I know—that is to say, no one in this body. People outside, who have their impressions, can say what they like, for ours is a free country.

I do not know enough about all the background and the reasons and the explanations of the various statements made preliminary to the final breakup of the conference, to be able to reach any final conclusion. That is why I think a study and an inquiry by the Foreign Relations Committee is in order.

I propose, tomorrow morning, at the regular meeting of our committee, to submit this question; and I hope that after thorough discussion, the procedure the committee will follow will be agreed upon. I expect the procedure of the inquiry to be agreed upon by the members of the committee of both parties, because it is entirely in order, and follows the usual precedent, which I believe always has been followed in the past, when anything of importance in the international field has occurred.

I do not think it promotes the effort to keep this matter on a nonpartisan plane, to indulge in such acrimonious attacks here on the floor of the Senate on leading Members of either party—and, in this case, on Members of my party. I think it is most unfortunate; and certainly it is premature, because I do not believe any one of us is now able to arrive at firm and final conclusions in regard to the very tragic event which occurred last week, in Paris.

The only advice I gave to some of my friends of the Republican Party was that I hoped they would not try to pretend that what happened at Paris was a great triumph. I said that if that were done, necessarily it would call for rebuttal. I said I hoped we would soberly approach this matter, in a serious endeavor to determine, first, what happened; and, second, the practices and procedures which have grown up in our Government. I do not mean only the practices and procedures in the executive branch; I think the Congress itself has much to learn in this field, and I believe there are ways and means by which our procedures can be improved. Last year, the Foreign Relations Committee suggested ways which I think would have been a great improvement; and from time to time other Senators make similar suggestions. Certainly I do not believe that either the Congress or the Executive has perfected its methods of dealing with these very complex matters.

So I believe that the purpose of the proposed inquiry is, in the first place, to understand just what has happened; and, in the second place, if the circumstances call for it, to make some changes, in order to tighten up the administration.

But I believe the worst thing, from the national point of view and from the point of view of the welfare of the Nation, would be to pretend that we have experienced a great triumph, and that nothing need be said about what happened. Everyone knows what happened is a great tragedy for the entire world. Who is to blame, and so forth, is a subject of legitimate inquiry.

But at the moment I do not wish to indulge in a debate attacking Members of my party or Members of the other party. At this point, I believe that would be quite premature.

However, if, following inquiry, there are found to be reasons for criticizing the conduct of our policies, then, of course, it will be our duty to do so; and I do not believe that any plea for unity should foreclose any justified criticism based upon an inquiry which is held in a sober and responsible manner.

I am confident that the members of the administration, including the Secretary of State, have no objection at all to coming before the Foreign Relations Committee and giving their explanation of what happened. That is appropriate. That is what Secretary Dulles did. That is what Secretary Acheson always did after international meetings. He came before our committee and explained what happened, his reasons why, and his point of view. Then it was up to us to draw our own conclusions therefrom. That is the way I expect to proceed now. I think it will be beneficial at the proper time to make a report or observations or, if conditions warrant it, a criticism of the way things have been handled.

In the meantime, I think we ought to be careful in what we say, and ought not to inflame anyone's thoughts, and make sure we do not lose a sense of objectivity in forming our judgment on what the facts are after we develop them in a proper inquiry.

I do not propose at this time to pursue this debate on the substance of the speeches or what happened in Paris.

Mr. SCOTT and Mr. YOUNG of Ohio addressed the Chair.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield first to the Senator from Ohio. Then I shall yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, may I say at the outset, I completely agree with the statement made today by the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the acting majority leader, and I admire very much the statement made by the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee. I agree with him. Certainly, the distinguished Senator from Vermont made a very moderate and very wise statement with which all of us can agree.

Mr. President, unfortunately for President Eisenhower, and also unfortunately for the American people, the law of averages caught up with our President. His good luck over the years seemed to have deserted him, and at a time when he needed it most.

Without a doubt, President Eisenhower hoped to end his administration in an aura of peace and good will. He had been the supreme commander of the greatest army ever gathered under the bending sky of God. He had hoped that the high point and final public service in his life would be that, as Chief Executive of the United States, he would be regarded by future historians as a peacemaker. He even envisioned himself as the father of permanent peace. Instead of that, he returned from Paris to Washington at a time when the increased tension in the cold war between this Nation and the Soviet Union has become more violent. In fact, he returns at a time when that relationship between our two nations could not become much worse, except by the temporary ending of diplomatic relations on the part of one or both nations.

He himself did not cause this situation. Inept officials in his administration created an appearance of saber rattling and jingoism that President Eisenhower had wished to avoid.

President Eisenhower, from the time of his 1952 campaign for election—that "clean as a hound's tooth" campaign—has placed an accent on teamwork on the part of all his associates. Morality has been glorified, as is entirely proper, yet, in an emergency that occurred due to the downing of an American reconnaissance plane far within the territory of the Soviet Union, American people—and in fact, peoples the world over—were given conflicting and utterly false statements by administration officials in authority in the United States.

Leaders of friendly nations were startled over the muddleheaded, mentally inert, and inept handling of the controversy by administration officials over the downing of this plane.

American prestige throughout the world dropped, and no one is to blame more than officials of the Eisenhower administration.

Doubtless, President Eisenhower himself must share in the responsibility. It appears he failed to know personally details of the work of our Central Intelligence Agency. It may be that had he been an alert, active, strong President, he would have been in constant touch with the actions and activities of all administrative agencies and in position to hold in check any which directly or indirectly acted in violation of the law and customs of nations.

Apparently the President had no knowledge that our U-2 plane penetrated behind the Iron Curtain in an aerial reconnaissance and was approximately 1,300 miles within the borders of the Soviet Union a few days before the last Big Four summit conference meeting to be held during his administration.

What should have been feared, occurred. This resulted in a propaganda

victory for Premier Khrushchev, who instantly, violently, and unmercifully pushed his advantage to the uttermost. Leaders of friendly nations were shocked and our Chief Executive was humiliated by the tongue lashing from Premier Khrushchev brought on by the failure of his trusted subordinates.

It is true President Eisenhower endured with dignity and restraint a vituperative face-to-face tongue lashing from the Communist Dictator Khrushchev. Personally, I would prefer a President who would have lashed back instantly and forcefully with some blunt, uncensored Texas, Missouri, or Massachusetts language and plain spoken epithets.

Mr. President, I assert that what seems to be the Eisenhower concept of the Presidency of the United States, frequently by remote control from Augusta and Gettysburg, and frequently altogether at the discretion of subordinates, is not sufficient for 1960 and this grim period of international anarchy.

Operating the Presidency on a part-time basis and not in the personalized manner of Abraham Lincoln, Theodore Roosevelt, Woodrow Wilson, Franklin D. Roosevelt, and Harry Truman, removed President Eisenhower from key decisions and left our allies and our own citizens, even President Eisenhower himself, in a state of uncertainty about what was going on.

In addition, Secretary of Defense Gates calling the alert of the Armed Forces for Sunday, May 15, was an extraordinarily reckless act. Bear in mind, Sunday, May 15, was a bitter day for us. A mischance had occurred. Blunder was compounded upon blunder. The tension of the cold war between the Soviet Union and this Nation was increased.

The slogan of peace and prosperity was not being uttered in even the softest whisper. This was the hour and day picked by Secretary of Defense Gates for an exercise to parade the armed might of this Nation before the world. This, added to false statements and deceit and the confusion of a right-about-face statement, plus a bristling declaration that invading the air over the Soviet Union was necessary, plus an inference that this practice would be continued—all of this was just a little too much.

Then, a little too late, came the statement backing down on the previous statement that aerial spying would be continued. This despite the fact that the Vice President had publicly reaffirmed the policy of continuing aerial reconnaissance.

Mr. President, we can truly say that these have not been our proudest hours.

I thank the Senator from Montana for yielding to me.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, would the Senator from Montana at this time consider yielding the floor?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Does the Senator have in mind raising a question of personal privilege?

Mr. SCOTT. No, I do not.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Because, if the Senator did, I wanted to read rule XIX.

Mr. SCOTT. If the Senator does that, he may force me into raising a point of personal privilege. I hope not to be pressed into doing so.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I had understood the Senator was going to rise to a point of personal privilege, but I understand now he is not, and therefore I am delighted to yield to him.

Mr. SCOTT. I thank the Senator from Montana.

Mr. President, am I recognized in my own right?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized.

Mr. SCOTT. I thank the Chair. I had originally planned to raise the point of personal privilege, because I wished to make it crystal clear that I did not at any time, nor have I ever at any time, impugned the patriotism of any other Member or of any candidate for the Presidency, and I do not now impugn the patriotism of any Senator, or of Governor Stevenson, whose recent unfortunate remarks have infuriated a good part of our Nation.

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

Mr. SCOTT. If I may do so briefly, I am glad to yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. My remarks will be very brief. I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania.

The statement issued by Gov. Adlai Stevenson was issued to the press May 18, and I shall quote it.

> My recollection is that the young man was brought to my home by friends. I never give exclusive interviews without request. And he would not have received one had he asked in such circumstances.
>
> As I recall, he wanted to discuss all of the problems of Europe; and evidently confused discussion with opinion.
>
> What he reports me as saying have, of course, never been my views and are not my views today.
>
> The most charitable explanation of such irresponsibility, presumption and discourtesy is that his English was poor and my French no better.

I thank the Senator.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, if the Senator from Missouri had been on the floor—or, if he was on the floor and had been paying attention—he would have heard me read several times part of that statement myself. I added that Mr. Boulay, among those who know him, is known to speak English very well, and therefore is presumed to be able to understand English when it is addressed to him.

I further suggested that the way to clarify this matter is to have the testimony of Mr. Boulay and to have the testimony of Governor Stevenson to see what was really said.

However, I rose for the purpose of saying that I do not impugn the patriotism of anyone. I regret that the Senator from Missouri, who is my very good friend, used the phrase with reference to myself of "considering the source." I am not a candidate for the Presidency. I hope that "considering the source" has no reference to presidential candidacy.

I will leave the remark where it has been made, since I rose in good faith and I am proceeding in good faith to make a certain point, which is that when I spoke on the floor about a week ago I praised the distinguished majority leader [Mr. JOHNSON of Texas] and the distinguished majority whip, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] for their patriotism and for their true show of a bipartisan approach to these critical circumstances.

However, after that speech a certain speech was made by the former Governor of Illinois, and a certain speech was made by the distinguished, patriotic, and able Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY]. Those speeches did appear in the press. An issue was raised by those speeches which had not been raised on the floor, and which all of us had expressed the hope would not be raised. That issue was whether President Eisenhower should apologize to Khrushchev or whether President Eisenhower should seek to reopen the negotiations with Khrushchev by retreating from a previous position.

A further issue raised again, I will say, by my friend the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] a moment ago, was the issue of the action of the Secretary of Defense in calling an air alert.

Therefore, these matters become legitimate subjects of discussion on the floor of the Senate.

My answer as to whether the President should have apologized is that, in my opinion, he should not have. My answer as to whether the President should have appeased Mr. Khrushchev, or reopened the negotiations at the expense of an expression of apology or regret on our part, is that he should not have.

My answer as to the calling of an air alert ought to be familiar to all of the American people.

The tragedy at Pearl Harbor occurred immediately after the break up of a conference with the Japanese leaders. Lest another tragedy occur in America, the Secretary of Defense, undoubtedly with the approval of the President, certainly as a matter of policy, upon the breakup of this conference, or observing that it was about to terminate, in any event, put this country on an air alert.

Some have suggested that President Eisenhower should have met Khrushchev with his own kind of attack, that he should have lashed back, that he should have assaulted Khrushchev with similar tactics.

Mr. President, Theodore Roosevelt a long time ago advised us to speak softly and to carry a big stick. I do not believe that President Eisenhower should have demeaned himself by adopting the method, the manner, the tactics or the language of Khrushchev. I believe he was correct in speaking with dignity at that time, and I believe he was right in showing that America had a big stick, by reason of the calling of the air alert.

I hope, if there is to be an investigation—if the Committee on Foreign Relations believes such an investigation should be had—that an investigation

will be made of American foreign policy as a whole, if the committee wishes to do so, and that such an investigation will also look into the charges which I regard as being unfounded, as being politically inspired, as being motivated by desires to be either President or Secretary of State.

All of these charges—some of which would appear to be reckless, unfounded, and certainly unduly deferential to the leader of the Soviet Government at this time—ought also to be included in such an investigation.

Finally, Mr. President, the Russians have asked for a hearing at the United Nations, charging the United States as an aggressor. Surely, the Russian Government should not be given ammunition by any responsible American and should not have the benefit of being able to argue that responsible Americans agree with Khrushchev that he ought to have an apology. The Russians should not have the benefit of this attitude of some people that the Russians were right and we were wrong.

It would be well, if this is to become an issue in a political campaign, that we have a moratorium on it until after the issue raised by the Russians has been fully heard in the United Nations, so that we do not furnish them with ammunition.

Mr. President, I am very glad that President Eisenhower, no matter what any other person may think, did not crawl on his belly to a bully.

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

Mr. SCOTT. I am glad to yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator recommends that there should be a moratorium on this discussion. What puzzles me, and what I still do not understand, is why the Senator and his colleagues chose this particular time to precipitate this violent attack upon certain leaders of the Democrats. We did not open up this matter. What is the logic of the Republicans choosing Monday morning, immediately before the United Nations meeting is to consider these charges, to open up this violent partisan attack?

Mr. SCOTT. I am glad to point out to the Senator from Arkansas that these remarks should not be considered violent attacks. They should be considered as rebuttal and reply to the very unfortunate statements attributed to at least two responsible leaders of the Democratic Party, including the titular head of the Democratic Party.

I seek to express, as I think surely we should express, our regret that these particular statements have been made, if in fact they were made during the past week.

I appreciate the blandness of the comment of the Senator from Arkansas, but it does not conceal who made the statements.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The statement attributed to Mr. Stevenson he has very clearly denied he made. I think a great deal was made of that.

Mr. SCOTT. If the Senator will permit, Mr. Stevenson has not withdrawn the statements which he made on other occasions last week within the United States in public bodies, which were publicly reported. He has merely refused to accept the quotations attributed to him in the article appearing in a French newspaper.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not wish to argue the merit of that point. It seems to me rather ill advised to begin an open and very strong attack upon the Democrats before any Member of this body, at least of whom I am aware, has tried to be critical at all.

I have not been critical. I consciously refrained from making critical comments on this subject, both when I arrived at the airport and later this morning in order that there might be a proper inquiry. I did not wish to inspire the very kind of political attack which has taken place today. I was taken aback by it. I do not think it makes it easier for us to conduct a reasonable, objective, and quiet inquiry into what has taken place.

Mr. SCOTT. I say to the Senator from Arkansas, for whom I have the highest respect, that the Senator is evidently not aware of the statement issued by the Democratic Advisory Council and approved by the membership, including a number of Senators, or the action taken by at least 12 Members of the other body, all of which contributed to initiating an unfortunate controversy.

Does the Senator from Missouri wish me to yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I understood the Senator was yielding the floor.

Mr. ANDERSON rose.

Mr. SCOTT. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and then I shall yield the floor.

Mr. ANDERSON. May I express to the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] the hope that he will take a good look at his language, because I know he did not mean it when he said:

> It is my hope that neither the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, Mr. KENNEDY, nor that other candidate for the Presidency, Governor Stevenson will—either of them—brand themselves as turncoats.

Mr. SCOTT. "Turnquotes," is the phrase. I shall be glad to examine the language.

Mr. ANDERSON. I wish the Senator would, because it comes close to violating the rule. The transcript reads:

> So it is my hope that they will relieve themselves of the curse of suspicion of appeasement.

I wondered if the Senator intended that language.

Mr. SCOTT. I appreciate the suggestion of the Senator from New Mexico, and if my language appears at any point to be intemperate, I shall be glad to revise it in accordance with my own better judgment, if it seems necessary.

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

Mr. SCOTT. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. If the Senator will withdraw his remarks with respect to Adlai Stevenson and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], I will be glad to withdraw mine.

Mr. SCOTT. I must decline the offer of my friend from Missouri. The remarks of Adlai Stevenson and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] appeared in the public press and unfortunately cannot now be withdrawn.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I then ask unanimous consent that the reporter read into the RECORD the statement made by the Senator from Pennsylvania.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield the floor?

Mr. SCOTT. I wish to address the same question to the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] which was addressed to me by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], and that is: Is the Senator rising on a question of personal privilege?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I am not rising on a question of personal privilege.

Mr. SCOTT. Then I will yield the floor.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the stenographic record be read at this point to the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the reporter will bring in the transcript.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to make a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. What particular part of the transcript is to be read?

Mr. SYMINGTON. The part which the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and I requested to be brought to the floor of the Senate with respect to the remarks about the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] and former Gov. Adlai Stevenson.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the clerk reading the transcript as described? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will read it.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

> I might also add, in connection with the statement of the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, Mr. KENNEDY, as reported in the Portland Oregonian, that the Senator himself said:
>
> "Khrushchev laid down two conditions to President Eisenhower for going on with the summit meeting. One was to apologize. I think that might have been possible to do."
>
> Then the quotation goes on to other matters.
>
> The report in the Oregonian is that:
>
> "Later KENNEDY modified the word 'apologize,' and said the President might 'express regret.' "
>
> It is my hope that neither the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts nor that other candidate for the Presidency, Governor Stevenson, will—either one of them—brand himself as a turncoat. So it is my hope that they will relieve themselves of the curse of suspicion of appeasement, and it is my hope that the unity, which started out so well in support of the President and in support of the administration, may somehow be found again.
>
> But as Mr. Farley has so well said, he has no part in the appeasement process as exemplified by the unfortunate statement of Governor Stevenson.
>
> He said it did not represent his views and that "the most charitable explanation of

such irresponsibility, presumption, and discourtesy is that his English was poor and my French no better."

Mr. SCOTT. I believe the clerk is still reading from my statement, but I call attention to the fact that the word is "turnquote."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri has the floor.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, the RECORD has been read to my satisfaction at this point, and unless the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] would like to have the reading continued, I wish no further part of the RECORD read.

Mr. SCOTT. I request that no further portion of the RECORD be read.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I rise to a point of parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MORSE. I have not heard the debate except in the last few minutes. I shall make some comment on my own time shortly. My parliamentary inquiry is this: Is it proposed that the RECORD be changed in any way from what was stated on the floor of the Senate today?

Mr. SYMINGTON. No. In answer to the inquiry of my friend from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], I state that the reverse is now true.

Mr. ANDERSON. I wished to suggest to the Senator from Pennsylvania that the term "turncoat" is an unfortunate term, and also the expression "suspicion of appeasement" is an unfortunate term, and I expressed the hope that those terms might be modified.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to make a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MORSE. May terms spoken on the floor of the Senate, no matter how unfortunate they may be, but nevertheless spoken in debate, be changed by the spokesman or withdrawn by the spokesman in the absence of unanimous consent?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CARLSON in the chair). I am advised by the Parliamentarian that a Senator may correct an error which may have been made, but he may not substantially change the context.

Mr. MORSE. Will the Chair advise the Senator from Oregon the definition of the word "error" under the ruling?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state that such an error would be a misstatement, possibly a misquotation, as to the form of the statement, but not as to content.

Mr. MORSE. Not as to content.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, does the Senator wish me to yield further?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to have the parliamentary situation cleared up. So that the RECORD may be perfectly clear, speaking hypothetically, if a Senator makes a statement which is critical of some Government policy or some Government official and then has a second thought minutes later which causes him to wish he had not said what he had said and asks to have the matter stricken from the RECORD, does such request require unanimous consent?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair holds that such a request would require unanimous consent.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Chair for the ruling, and I wish to serve notice now that I shall object to any change in today's RECORD.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President——

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield.

Mr. SCOTT. I would like to make clear, so there will be no misunderstanding concerning the remarks of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], who was not present when the statement was made, that I have no intention of changing the sense or meaning of anything I have said. If I have made grammatical errors or errors of syntax, I reserve the same right which is available to other Senators to make such corrections; and I will, of course, be my own judge. I say to the Senator from Oregon, as to what changes or revisions I make, exercising the same privilege as is available to the Senator from Oregon. But I wish now to make it perfectly clear that I reject any inference that I desire to withdraw the meaning of anything that I have said.

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

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I assure the Senator from Pennsylvania that I made no implication that the Senator had any intention to change any of his remarks. There was a request or suggestion made that an opportunity be offered to change remarks. To that, I object. I merely wish to say that the Senator from Pennsylvania, under the rule, is free to comply with the rule, but when he says he will be his own judge as to what he will change, I say the Senate will be the final judge in case he makes a change outside the rule.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, for the past hour and a half we have heard a series of nonpolitical, nonpartisan statements from both sides of the aisle. All of these remarks contained suggestions about what should or should not have been done at the summit, as well as attempted to assess the blame for what was or was not done.

In making these remarks, many Members of the Senate, as well as most of the presidential candidates, have been quoted. However, in listening to these remarks, I note that one very important presidential candidate has been ignored. To my knowledge, he has not been quoted in the Senate today. Yet it is my opinion that this presidential candidate, in his speech on the floor of the Senate last week, made one of the most statesmanlike speeches which have been made in connection with the summit conference, and again, in Indianapolis, Ind., last week made another very appropriate comment, one which I believe every Member of the Senate would do well to ponder before we get too partisan.

I refer to a statement made by our majority leader, the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], in which, when he was asked to assess blame for the Paris fiasco, he observed:

> Any jackass can kick down a barn, but it takes a good carpenter to build one.

[Laughter.]

ONE LESSON FROM THE SUMMIT

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, an unseen but potent consideration at the summit tragedy was the administration's fiscal policy of placing expenditure ceilings above military strength.

If this administration had approached the summit conference from a position of relative strength over the Communists, the rude but shrewd Kremlin chief would have been less belligerent.

The Soviet leader, on the other hand, approached the summit with certain knowledge about:

Our small and relatively immobile ground forces with their antiquated equipment.

Their rocket and missile superiority.

Our failure to provide an airborne alert capability and the consequent vulnerability of our retaliatory strength.

Their great numerical superiority in submarines, with and without missiles.

Moreover, the Soviet leader knew that the United States would have been stronger in all of these respects if our military experts, rather than our budget bookkeepers, had been listened to.

Instead major attention has been given in this country toward feeding the American people a diet of complacency, backed up by appealing slogans.

We cannot afford to waste any time in abandoning these policies of weakness. In fact, if we do not act promptly, it may soon be too late, because, at our present pace, and under existing policies, we may find ourselves shortly in a very critical position.

Therefore, I recommend the following program now:

That the Secretary of Defense be authorized and directed, at once, to raise overall expenditure ceilings in his Department so as to carry out this program.

That the Secretary of Defense direct the removal of all overtime limitations on high priority projects and order a sharp acceleration in those projects.

That the Air Force be authorized and directed to take the procurement and crew-training actions for the SAC air alert capability which General Power recommended, and that the Congress appropriate $415 million above the budget request for that purpose.

That the Congress appropriate $360 million above the budget request for going ahead as fast as possible with the B–70 weapons system project.

That the Congress appropriate $1.3 billion over and above the budget request for acceleration of the Atlas-Titan, Minuteman, Polaris, Hound Dog, and Sky-Bolt programs.

That the Congress authorize an increase of Army personnel strength from 870,000 to 925,000, and appropriate $120 million for that purpose. In addition, that $800 million be appropriated over

and above the budget request for procurement of new equipment for the Army.

That the Congress authorize an increase of Marine personnel strength from 175,000 to 200,000 and appropriate an additional $40 million for that purpose.

That the Congress appropriate $465 million over and above the budget request for antisubmarine warfare.

The above recommendations for air alert, B–70, missiles, Army personnel, Army procurement, Marine personnel, and antisubmarine warfare would amount to $3½ billion over and above the budget request for those progams.

This total of $3½ billion is the equivalent of less than 3 days of our gross national product, and would seem to be a small contribution to greater national security in view of the threat facing the free world.

It is hoped that the recent failure of high level negotiations will awaken us to action and, to that extent, make a similar but more permanent contribution to reality than did Sputnik I when it broke the space barrier.

ILLEGAL ACTIVITIES ON THE PART OF LABOR RACKETEERS AND MANAGEMENT

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, during the course of the hearings of the Senate Select Committee on Improper Activities in the Labor or Management Field, we have on numerous occasions communicated with local law enforcement authorities when our investigations have disclosed illegal activities on the part of labor racketeers or management.

I should like to place in the RECORD an editorial of the Long Island Daily Press, dated May 17, 1960, entitled "Victory and Warning," an editorial of Newsday of the same date, entitled "A Big Victory," as well as a letter dated May 18, 1960, from the district attorney of Nassau County, N.Y., Mr. Manuel W. Levine, enclosing these editorial comments on the successful prosecution of labor racketeers who operated juke box Local 266 of the Teamsters Union.

Both the officials of this union and the owners of a juke box company were convicted of conspiracy. The officials of this local were also convicted on charges of coercion and extortion. These convictions were hailed by the newspapers as a great victory on the side of law enforcement.

I may say that much of the information upon which these prosecutions were based was developed by the Senate select committee.

I wish to commend and congratulate Mr. Manuel W. Levine, the district attorney of Nassau County, N.Y., for the monumental accomplishment of securing convictions of these racketeers after a trial which lasted for 3½ months.

The district attorney in his letter pointed out that it was unfortunate that some of the defendants were freed from prosecution due to inability of the prosecutor to introduce into evidence certain wiretaps which would have proved them guilty of a crime.

I understand that had they been permitted to use wiretap evidence which was available to them, in all probability all these defendants would have been convicted. Those who escaped, escaped upon that one technicality.

These were taps made pursuant to New York State laws and pursuant to a New York State court order. Some States, such as New York State, have enacted laws to enable their enforcement agencies to intercept communications under proper safeguards and to eliminate the dangers of promiscuous and improper use. In New York, for example, the enforcement agencies must apply to the court of highest original jurisdiction for a warrant to permit the interceptions. This warrant is only granted when the court is satisfied that reasonable grounds exist that evidence of crimes will be obtained as a result of the wiretap.

The inability to introduce these wiretaps stems from the decisions in the U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit in the case of People against O'Rourke, which follows the decisions in the *United States* v. *Benanti* (355 U.S. 96).

In its decision, the Supreme Court ruled wiretap evidence obtained by State officers under authority of a State law was inadmissible in the Federal courts. The language of the decision left a cloud on the right of States to legally authorize law-enforcement agencies to obtain court warrants to intercept communications under proper safeguards.

The lower courts—People against O'Rourke—have followed the line laid down by the Supreme Court and have indicated that, while not enjoining the State courts, the introduction of wiretap evidence by State officials in State courts would be in violation of section 605, Federal Communications Act of 1934, and thus would constitute a crime.

The district attorney pointed out that the inability to use wiretaps in local law-enforcement cases is a severe blow to the side of law and order. He expressed the hope that Congress would be able to do something in this session so that one of our most effective tools against bigtime racketeers and hoods would not have been removed.

On January 16, 1958, shortly after the decision of the U.S. Supreme Court in the Benanti case, I introduced a bill, S. 3013—85th Congress, 2d session—amending section 605 of the Communications Act, to clarify the right of State law enforcement agencies to use wiretaps to uncover evidence of the commission of serious crimes.

The Supreme Court in the Benanti case did not rule on constitutional questions. The decision was based solely on the interpretation of the intention of Congress when it passed section 605 of the Federal Communications Act of 1934, which declares:

> No person not being authorized by the sender shall intercept any communication and divulge or publish the existence, contents, substance, purport, effect, or meaning of such intercepted communication to any person.

It is my belief that Congress, in the enactment of section 605, never intended to cripple and hamper law enforcement agencies in their efforts to stamp out crime and punish criminals.

When I introduced S. 3013, I predicted that the detection, investigation, and prosecution of crime, particularly organized crime, would be seriously handicapped and weakened by the Supreme Court decision that is proving to be true. In many cases, prosecution and investigation of crimes would be completely thwarted and would collapse were wiretapping to be denied to the law enforcement agencies.

Recent developments show that the court decisions have created an intolerable situation and that there are many cases pending in the courts which the district attorneys' offices cannot prosecute because of the strictures against the introduction of wiretap evidence.

It is my contention that Congress has never intended that it permit the criminal to use the modern means of communication with impunity, or that it intended to enjoin law enforcement agencies from intercepting these communications.

To accept a contrary interpretation would mean that Congress would permit criminals a free license to use telephone communications in the commission of crimes without fear of detection, and thus provide them with a "privileged sanctuary." I say again, this is an interpretation that I cannot accept, and that it is one Congress should correct by appropriate legislation.

In the field of criminal detection and prosecution, the law enforcement agencies are constantly waging a war against criminals who attack society. To do so effectively, it is necessary and essential to intercept their communications.

The Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] and Representative CELLER introduced, respectively, S. 3340, and H.R. 11589, on April 6, 1960, and with certain minor changes, these are bills which follow almost the exact language of S. 3013, except that they amend title 18 of the United States Code rather than the Federal Communications Act of 1934.

I feel that these are all good bills and I strongly urge that action be taken to pass one of them and give law enforcement agencies a tool to prevent crime instead of affording the criminal element a haven and refuge from detection and prosecution. I have read with appreciation the statements made by the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] on April 20, 1960. I am impressed with the almost unanimous support granted in editorial comments of the New York Mirror of April 16, 1960; the New York Herald Tribune of April 15, 1960; the New York Times of April 16, 1960; the New York Journal-American of April 16, 1960; the New York Daily News of April 16, 1960; and the Rochester Times-Union of March 22, 1960, all of which are set

forth in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 20, 1960, pages 8306 and 8307.

Mr. President, I hope the Senate will give attention to and take action on these measures before adjournment.

Mr. President, may I have a ruling on my unanimous-consent request to have certain material which I have heretofore offered printed in the RECORD?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the letter and articles will be printed in the RECORD.

The letter and articles are as follows:

OFFICE OF THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY
OF NASSAU COUNTY,
Mineola, N.Y., May 18, 1960.

Senator JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
Select Committee on Improper Activities in the Labor or Management Field, New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: On Friday, May 13, 1960, a Nassau County jury convicted three union officials of Teamster Local 266, "a jukebox local," of conspiracy, coercion, and extortion. The three officers convicted were Joseph De Grandis, president, Frank de Forte, vice president, and Ernest Zundel, secretary-treasurer. In addition thereto, two jukebox operators, Eugene Jacob and Herbert Jacob, coowners of the Nu-Way Vending Machine Co., were convicted of conspiracy.

The result was hailed by the press as a victory for the decent people of this county and two newspapers circulated in Nassau County, Newsday and the Long Island Daily Press, had editorials.

I feel, Senator, that both you and your committee are deserving a great deal of the credit, since the minutes of your hearings were a great part of the base which we used as a jumping-off place for our investigation. In fact, I consider this to be an example of the proper cooperation between the agencies of the Federal Government such as yours and the law-enforcement officials who have the burden of the prosecution on the local level. I might say, a most effective combination when employed.

It is unfortunate that some of the defendants were let out, but it is my considered opinion and that of my staff, that the primary reason for this was our inability to introduce wire taps, the result of a ruling of our county judge after the decision of the U.S. circuit court of appeals in *People* v. *O'Rourke, et al.*

I might add, the inability to use wire taps in local law enforcement is a severe blow and I sincerely hope that Congress will be able to do something in this session so that one of our most effective tools against big-time racketeers and hoods will not have been removed.

I want to thank you for the very gracious and generous statements you made to me and to the press and once again I am sure I speak for the people of Nassau County when I say we are deeply grateful to you and to your congressional committee for the help and cooperation we received.

Your very truly,
MANUEL W. LEVINE,
District Attorney.

[From Newsday]

A BIG VICTORY

"This shows the underworld goons that they can't set up paper unions out here."

The words are those of Nassau County District Attorney Manny Levine, but the sentiments are those of every decent citizen after yesterday's happy ending to the marathon jukebox rackets trial.

The conviction—and stiff sentences that can follow—of three top Teamster officials in local 266 should prove that "paper" unionism is no basis for coercion and extortion by the goons who run such phony unions. Yesterday's verdict, after 23 hours of deliberation by the jury can result in 17-year sentences for Joseph de Grandis, Frank de Forte, and Ernest Zundel, the three officials of the local.

This knockout blow against paper unions could not come at a better time. Following the directed acquittal of Teamster boss John J. O'Rourke last month, there were those who doubted the goons could be convicted. Yesterday's verdict erased those doubts as emphatically as it should erase the jukebox racket in Nassau County, a racket first exposed by Newsday.

Levine, prosecutor William Cahn and the staff of assistants who worked hard for 18 months deserve the cheers they are getting today.

[From Long Island Daily Press, May 17, 1960]

VICTORY AND WARNING

The convictions of three officers of the so-called jukebox local on charges of extortion, coercion, and conspiracy should be a warning to all who would misuse organized labor's good name to prey on others.

These three Teamster Union Local 266 officials—Joseph DeGrandis, Frank DeForte, and Ernest Zundel—face prison terms of 17 years each. Two jukebox operators, convicted on a conspiracy count wtih them, face a year in jail.

The now famous trial, which ran 3½ months, stemmed from the shakedown of a tavern jukebox owner by the use of illegal picketing to extract dues.

Senator JOHN MCCLELLAN, Democrat, of Arkansas, chairman of the Senate Rackets Committee, has hailed the convictions as a monumental accomplishment. Honest working people everywhere agree. Our congratulations to Nassau District Attorney Manuel W. Levine, Assistant District Attorney William Cahn, who presented the State's case, and the able staff.

DISTINGUISHED SERVICE AWARD OF NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF BROADCASTERS TO CLAIR R. MCCOLLOUGH

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, recently my attention was called to an address delivered by Mr. Clair R. McCollough early last month at the convention of the National Association of Broadcasters, held in Chicago.

It was at this gathering that Mr. McCollough received the 1960 Distinguished Service Award.

For the information of the Senate, Mr. McCollough is the president and general manager of the Steinman stations, and resides in Lancaster, Pa.

The Distinguished Service Award was conferred on Mr. McCollough for a 30-year "record of industry citizenship unique in the annals of broadcasting." The award citation noted that he had served with distinction as a board and committee member of the association and had never failed to respond when called on for organizational tasks requiring the utmost skill. Additionally, the citation saluted him for being a broadcaster who "has directed the stations and under his management in a manner consistent with the highest ideals of the broadcasting profession."

Believing that Mr. McCollough's address will be of much interest to the Senate, I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

THREE KEYS TO STABILITY IN BROADCASTING: PERFORMANCE, GOOD PRACTICES, UNITY OF PURPOSE

(Address by Clair R. McCollough, president and general manager, the Steinman Stations at the 38th Annual Convention of the National Association of Broadcasters, Chicago, Ill., April 4, 1960)

I am pleased and gratified to receive the Distinguished Service Award which is being conferred by my fellow broadcasters of the National Association of Broadcasters.

The award itself traditionally notes the contributions which it is said the recipient has made to the industry and the association.

Such contributions as I have made over the past 30 years would not have been possible without the loyalty and endeavor of my associates in the Steinman Stations as well as my longtime friends and fellow broadcasters throughout the industry. I see many of these faces in the audience today.

Upon this occasion I also recall many other broadcasters whose names were synonymous with industry leadership at the time I started in broadcasting—fine men who are not here because they did not live long enough or retired too soon to see their industry emerge from the age of the pioneer into the age of the plaque.

I think of them often, as do many of you: Chuck Myer, Al McCosker, Johnny Gillin, Arthur Church, Harold Ryan, Harry Shaw, Deac Aylesworth, Ed Klauber, Don Lee, Joe Maland, Edgar Bill, Gene O'Fallon, and Paul Kesten.

There are others—too numerous to mention, too worthy to forget.

Looking through our family album, the names and faces of these people can be related to classic experiences in broadcasting—industry adventures that contributed to the tedious process of carving an important social and economic institution out of the raw stone of invention.

This has been done before, but never quite so quickly nor under such pressure as has attended the growth of broadcasting. It has been done in transportation, in the printed media, in education and in government—but never at such intense speed.

In truth, the evolution has been so swift that yesterday's problems—and yes, yesterday's passions—sometimes are forgotten in the welter of current events.

Most of the vexing problems we have today, we have had before—in one degree or another.

The problem of freedom of speech.

The problem of industry standards.

The problem of legislative investigations.

The problem of regulatory ills.

The problem of advertising surveillance.

The problem of music licensing fees.

The problem of trade practices such as rate juggling, trade deals, competitive policies.

The problem of rigging, payola and perhaps others that have been overlooked by the overseers—phenomena not peculiar to us.

We have had them and—to the extent that law and custom allow—we have made prodigious efforts as an industry to solve them ourselves; to resist the assistance of Government which so frequently, as now, has been offered.

The most effective effort we have put forward in every direction has been through this association, the NAB.

A moment ago I mentioned the names of some of those who were responsible for starting this association, some of those who carried on its work through the difficult days

of the 1920's and early 1930's. Many broadcasters of this same period are still active today.

But with increasing frequency, the baton is being passed to younger men who have more recently entered the field of broadcasting and are taking up the burdens of the NAB.

These young executives represent, in conservative estimate, a clear majority of the Nation's licensees.

By way of confession, I should like to say that I have participated, on occasion, in informal discussions with some of my fellow broadcasters about this influx of young executive talent—this vast homesteading rush onto the reservation which for so long a time has been a more or less private preserve.

There have been remarks, about "Johnny-come-latelies," the "new order of confusion" and similar expressions. It is a truism that elders in their wisdom frequently look upon the young with annoyance tempered by compassion.

BROADCASTING'S NEW GENERATION

But there they came after the late great conflict—this new generation—casting aside their wartime uniforms and acquiring broadcast licenses in all manner of communities around the Nation.

Their enthusiasm and their well-intended zeal have led, at times, to a certain amount of fretful grumbling among their fellow broadcasters.

More recently I have noticed, however, and perhaps you have, too, the emergence from this group of numerous highly intelligent, public spirited, successful broadcasters upon whom must rest the responsibility for the profession's future.

Thus today, presuming upon the prerogatives of tenure, if not of talent, I should like to address a few remarks to three general subjects, in this order: (1) Our trade practices, (2) our performance before the public, and (3) our national association.

It may be that the most important activities in American broadcasting, other than legislative and regulatory, fall within these three general categories.

A PERIOD OF ADJUSTMENT

As we know, any human pursuit, whether in industry, or in art and letters, in government or in education, must undergo a period of adjustment through experience before it stabilizes.

This "experience cycle" in broadcasting has not reflected a steady, predictable curve.

Just prior to World War II, we had reached a comfortable plateau. There was limited competition within radio itself and a consequent prosperity that assured good programing and acceptable advertising.

This placid situation was disrupted, of course, by the postwar radio stampede and the astonishing growth of television; by the consequent changing patterns in broadcast programing; by the dislocation of radio network economy and by the unrestrained performance of some of the newcomers in their anxiety to capture audience and revenue by whatever means at their disposal.

Thus, during the last 15 years, we have found ourselves engaged in a frantic and occasionally untidy search for economic and regulatory equilibrium.

Changing fortunes in radio and allocation problems in television have attended this struggle.

In the subsequent scramble for position—and even, in some cases, for survival—there have been harmful doings.

CONSTRUCTIVE COMPETITION INSTEAD OF GUERRILLA WARFARE

In far too many instances within our own industry, the pursuit of stability and reasonable prosperity has taken on the character of guerrilla warfare, rather than hard-hitting constructive competition.

We have moved from the enervating period of rate cutting to the far more dangerous situation where some radio stations do not have established rates.

Indeed, manifestations of the same practice are now appearing in television.

Are we, in truth, such poor businessmen that we do not know how to price our product and stay with the decision?

Are we not, through such practices, depicting ourselves before our fellow businessmen and advertisers as immature, if not worse?

Quiz rigging and payola per se are not the major shortcomings with which we must contend.

These are symptoms of something deeper—symptoms of certain business malpractices whose only cure is self-treatment.

Among the fundamental, underlying ills of broadcasting are rate manipulations, trade deals, downgrading the competition in our own media and kindred activities.

Until we cure them—and we can only cure them individually, not in concert—we run the continuing risk of loss of advertiser confidence.

More disturbing than that, however, is the greater peril of attracting to our industry the charlatans, the dealmakers, the unprincipled who, by erosion through the years, can destroy the confidence of the public itself.

What I would suggest as a corrective measure is not easy to accomplish. It requires courage, determination, a high sense of business values, and a certain amount of moral rearmament.

AN INVENTORY FOR THE AUDIENCE

All of us should take inventory of our business practices.

Do we have a profit and loss statement for the listeners and viewers we serve as well as for our auditors?

Are we selling a valuable service—or are we bartering it?

Are we selling a valuable service—or are we auctioning it?

Please count me among the first to resist to the wall any effort by Government, or any other outside agency, to dictate our policies, our programs, or our profits.

But nonetheless I think it is time for something more than causal circumspection. It is time for intensive self-inspection.

If such self-inspection, accompanied by thoughtful and determined action, is undertaken by individual broadcasters, then we may attain more surely the stability of business practice that underlies the whole process of sound free enterprise.

STRENGTH AT THE FOUNDATION

In the absence of such strength at the foundation of the broadcasting economy, we may expect further depredations of one sort or another—and consequent injury to our defenses against our detractors.

We must remember always, it seems to me, that individual action is not alone sufficient to the purpose.

In those areas where custom dictates and the law permits us to act in concert, we must allow no abridgement. The broadcasting industry must place great stress upon this "oneness" factor in the days that lie ahead.

Thus, in related context, I would like to speak briefly about the National Association of Broadcasters.

What is a trade association? It is an organization of institutions or individuals, or both, gathered together to pursue common objectives and defend the principles for which its membership stands.

The National Association of Broadcasters was organized right here in Chicago. At that time, the organization included 16 members and the common objective was to do something about music copyright fees. This was a reasonably uncomplicated objective, but not so uncomplicated that it has gone away. It was the first objective but not, by any means, the last.

Since that time, the industry has increased in broadcasting units in the nature of 842 percent and the Association membership in the order of 850 percent. The number of objectives has increased in no less startling manner.

Over the years, the association has encountered and contended with such problems as freedom of speech, tax legislation, industry standards, copyright quarrels, regulatory ills, political broadcasting, editorializing, labor problems, engineering complications, research ventures, and others far too numerous to relate.

NAB FOLLOWS DEMOCRACY'S PATTERN

An association, such as ours, follows the pattern of democracy itself. At times, its members may find it cumbersome and unwieldy. The frustrations that grow out of organized action in a system dedicated to freedom are caused by the very virtue which spawns the system itself—action by consent.

Broadcasting is a large and complicated business, multifaceted in its problems, populated by an extraordinary potpourri of humanity; performers, administrators, salesmen, newsmen, engineers, inventors, legislators, regulators, financiers, and many others. To obtain consent on any given problem in such a complex is a tedious, time-consuming task.

Therefore, it sometimes may seem that the NAB mills are grinding slowly—when indeed they really are, through the orderly chaos of membership soundings, committee recommendations, board actions, and staff implementation.

In any lag that exists between incubation of a problem and unified effort to obtain a solution, some may become impatient and place upon the executors of policy unusual and unfair burdens—when they themselves, the members, are frequently responsible for the lag through inaction or disinterest.

HUMAN RESERVES OUTWEIGH CASH RESERVES

Cash reserves are not as important as human reserves in the success of an association. If the new order of broadcasters will remember this and act upon it, the NAB will grow ever more effective.

There is a trace of dissension among some of you about the multiplicity of organizations in present-day broadcasting.

Besides the NAB, there are the Radio Advertising Bureau, the Television Bureau of Advertising, the Television Information Office, the Clear Channel Broadcasters Association, the Association of Maximum Service Telecasters, the Regional Broadcasters Committee, the Community Broadcasters Association, the National Association of FM Broadcasters, the Daytime Broadcasters Association, 48 State associations and perhaps others.

We need not be perplexed by this situation. It is a known fact that there are more associations in the newspaper business, than there are in ours, and yet the newspaper industry is much less fractionated.

Each of our associations, many of which were generated by the NAB itself, has a specialized job to perform and each is doing it well. The NAB remains the single organization of unquestioned mutual interest to all of us. In the sensitive task of dealing with Government as well as public and economic relations and a myriad of other day-to-day problems, it excels.

If you are among those who, in an occasional moment of doubt, question the vitality of the NAB, listen:

In July of 1937, the NAB Standards of Good Practice for Radio Broadcasters were promulgated.

On March 4, 1941, ASCAP signed the consent decree.

On March 7, 1946, the blue book was issued and fought to extinction by the NAB.

On April 16, 1946, the Lea amendment to the Communications Act outlawing featherbedding in the music field was adopted by the Congress.

On July 1, 1949, the Mayflower decision was rescinded.

On March 1, 1952, the television code was promulgated.

I could continue this list for the next hour.

You name it; the NAB was there.

You could pay your dues to the NAB from now on for the rest of your natural life and still owe money on the obligation.

The NAB performs the most essential function of any organization in broadcasting. Yet, at times, the impossible is expected of it. There are those who would have the NAB negotiate their union contracts; try their cases before the FCC; rebuke their competition and explain their audience ratings.

Times have changed. The NAB cannot be all things to all people. It has a prescribed course and must be what it set out to be—an organization devoted to the advancement of its members' objectives and a protection for their interests. These objectives and these interests must exist in a climate untainted by program interference or any other kind of artificial intrusion.

If we cannot be together on these essentials, in one single forum, regardless of our individual broadcasting problems, we might as well surrender now.

And, if you will forgive a personal allusion to old friends, in this time of your generous tribute to me as their courier, we might as well dismiss the principles for which they fought so valiantly through the years, not alone in their own interest, but in the interest of the public as well.

Broadcasting is a vital industry that demands the capacities of vigorous men with originality, courage, and a dauntless determination to unite in purpose and in action.

STRENGTH OF PURPOSE AND INTEGRITY

We must value self-respect highly, not alone in our conduct before the public, but also in our conduct among ourselves; we must lend to our associated activity the same strength of purpose and integrity of character that we should and must espouse in our own communities.

I, for one, am satisfied that those who hold such beliefs will firmly fix the conditions of broadcasting in the future, and, as our industry marches along the road to destiny, good broadcasters will far outnumber those who do not care.

THE ROLL OF HONOR

The Distinguished Service Award of the National Association of Broadcasters was instituted in 1953 as the Keynote Award. The award was given its present name in late 1959.

Previous recipients were:

In 1959: Robert W. Sarnoff, chairman of the board of the National Broadcasting Co.

In 1958: Dr. Frank Stanton, president of the Columbia Broadcasting System, Inc.

In 1957: The Honorable Herbert C. Hoover, former President of the United States.

In 1956: Robert E. Kintner, then president of the American Broadcasting Co.

In 1955: Mark Ethridge, publisher of the Courier-Journal and Louisville Times and a former NAB president.

In 1954: William S. Paley, chairman of the board of the Columbia Broadcasting System, Inc.

In 1953: Brig. Gen. David Sarnoff, then chairman of the board of the National Broadcasting Co.

CONDEMNATION BY THE NEW HAMPSHIRE STATE COUNCIL OF CARPENTERS, AFL-CIO, OF THE SALE AND DISTRIBUTION OF OBSCENE AND OBJECTIONABLE MATERIAL

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, because of my cosponsorship of Senate Joint Resolution 160 in regard to obscene literature, and my deep concern in this matter, I have been greatly heartened by the public response which indicates a general concern, without which legislative action is almost impossible. Indicative of public reaction is Resolution 11, passed by the New Hampshire State Council of Carpenters at their eighth annual convention on April 16, 1960.

I certainly wish to commend the New Hampshire State Council of Carpenters for their forthright expression on this matter, and, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution may, at this point, be inserted in the RECORD.

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

RESOLUTION 11

Whereas being publicly mindful of the general increase in the sale and distribution of obscene matter on the newsstands and through the mails, and the showing of indecent pictures and programs on the cinema and television screens; and

Whereas the continuous dissemination of this objectionable material has contributed more than anything else in an alarming increase of adult and juvenile delinquency; and

Whereas a condition of this nature being allowed to continue without repression will bring about a general demoralization of our people, thereby making our country vulnerable to attack by an enemy that has sworn to destroy and eradicate from this earth, the Judeo-Christian concept of society; and

Whereas mindful of the many unsuccessful attempts in the past to stop this flow of obscenity in our midst: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the delegates of the New Hampshire Council of Carpenters in its eighth annual convention assembled, do and hereby go on record favoring and supporting the establishment of a statewide committee which will seek to devise ways and means to:

1. Seek the cooperation of all store owners, theater operators and television program directors to sell, distribute and show only decent and wholesome literature, pictures and programs.

2. Refuse to patronize or encourage any establishment that will continue to sell, distribute and show obscene material; and furthermore, be it

Resolved, That we commend and support all those individuals, organized groups, newspaper editors, and public officials who have undertaken a mission to combat obscenity; and be it also

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to General Postmaster Summerfield, to U.S. Senator H. Styles Bridges, to Mr. William Loeb, publisher of the Union-Leader, and to Hon. J. T. Benoit, editor of L'Action.

CONQUERING THE PAST

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, British Army bulletins of 1918 tell of a certain Colonel Elkington, who in the early part of the war was cashiered from the army for conduct unbecoming an officer. The public dispatches do not state the nature of this misconduct, but the inference is that it was cowardice in the face of the enemy.

The disgraced man, with his name dropped from the rolls of the British Army, went back to Paris, assumed another name, and enlisted in the Foreign Legion. Wherever the men of the legion went into action, this man was conspicuous for his daring and gallantry. After one of his feats of heroism he was decorated by the Government of France. In some way his real identity was disclosed, and the facts were brought to the attention of the British Government. His commission was given back to him; and, resuming his name and title, he again joined his old regiment at the front. By wounds and daring and fidelity he won back the honors and the rank that cowardice had forfeited him.

Start where you stand and never mind the past;
The past won't help you in beginning new.
If you are done with it at last,
Why, that's enough. You're done with it, you're through;
This is another chapter in the book,
This is another race that you have planned.
Don't give the vanished days a backward look—
Start where you stand.

The world won't care about your old defeats.
If you can start anew and win success,
The future is your time, and time is fleet,
And there is much of work and strain and stress;
Forget the buried woes and dead despairs.
Here is a brand-new trial right at hand;
The future is for him who does and dares—
Start where you stand.

Old failures will not halt, old triumphs aid;
Today's the thing, tomorrow soon will be;
Get in the fight and face it, unafraid,
And leave the past to ancient history.
What has been, has been; yesterday is dead,
And by it you are neither blessed nor banned;
Take courage, man, be brave and drive ahead—
Start where you stand!

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 44. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct the San Luis unit of the Central Valley project, California, to enter into an agreement with the State of California with respect to the construction and operation of such unit, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 6779. An act to amend section 170 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to the unlimited deduction for charitable contributions for certain individuals).

A FOREIGN POLICY FOR THE 1960's—ADDRESS BY SENATOR AIKEN BEFORE WORLD AFFAIRS COUNCIL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on May 20 the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] delivered an address entitled "A Foreign Policy for the 1960's," before the

World Affairs Council in Boston. It is an excellent statement of the problems which confront us in the years ahead and sets forth a sound philosophy for dealing with them effectively. In this statement, the distinguished Senator, who is a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, reveals once again the deep human wisdom and the sound grasp of world affairs which mark him as an exceptional leader of this body, beyond party, in matters pertaining to our relations with other nations.

I should like to direct the attention of the Senate to the very fine address previously referred to, and therefore ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

A FOREIGN POLICY FOR THE 1960'S

(Address by Senator GEORGE D. AIKEN, at the World Affairs Council annual meeting, Boston, Mass., May 20, 1960.)

It is my good fortune to be able to spend this time between planes with you this afternoon. I was very glad indeed to accept the invitation of my friend, Chris Herter, Jr.

I approach my assignment, however, with some diffidence and trepidation, not only because of the formidable requirements of the subject but also because of the formidable qualifications of the audience.

Massachusetts has traditionally been at the center of American involvement in world affairs. It has supplied—and is today supplying, perhaps more than ever before—some of our most notable practitioners of diplomacy. I need cite only three or four examples among the many which come to mind, beginning, of course, with the Secretary of State himself, who is bringing grace and distinction to one of the most difficult offices in our Government.

Mention should also be made of Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., at the United Nations, and Ambassador John Moors Cabot, in Brazil, who are ably representing us under circumstances that are rarely easy, often trying, and sometimes impossible. Also we are very fortunate to have Dick Wigglesworth representing us in Ottawa.

I understand your own group here is getting a Peabody Award this year for your excellent television series entitled "Decisions 1960." You indeed deserve the greatest commendation for this effort, because the basic decisions which will determine our foreign policy for the 1960's cannot be made solely by the State Department or even by the State Department and the Congress.

They must be made by the American people, and they will be sound only to the degree that the people have the intelligent insight which is necessary.

In my discussion this afternoon I do not intend to let the events of the last 3 weeks—crucial as they are—divert me from the announced subject of my talk—"A Foreign Policy for the 1960's."

There is no doubt but what incidents influence the course of history, and the incidents of the last few days may be no exception to that premise.

However, until we know more about the circumstances surrounding the capture of the U-2 and its pilot by the Russians, and until we know more about the reasoning back of Mr. Khrushchev's determination to scuttle the summit conference, we must regard these incidents for what they are and not at this time undertake to use them as the basis for a totally new foreign policy.

Although the climate in which our foreign relations are conducted is obviously different this month from what it was last month, the framework for those relations is not, I think, essentially or fundamentally changed. We make a great mistake if we change our basic policy every time Mr. Khrushchev changes from a smile to a scowl or vice versa. We ought not to be diverted from our essential purpose by the ups and downs of this remarkable character's blood pressure.

Personally, I do not believe that the events of recent weeks will have a cataclysmic effect upon the Western World. While the collapse of the summit conference is indeed regrettable it may serve to put the relationship of the Communists and the Western World in a clearer and less illusory perspective.

The ease with which unarmed American planes have been able to penetrate the vaunted impregnable air defenses of Russia is more likely to produce a radically profound effect upon the Government of Russia.

Therefore, I feel that our long-range purpose will best be served by sticking to my original subject, "A Foreign Policy for the 1960's."

However, I shall not be so presumptuous this afternoon as the title of these remarks indicates. I shall not leave you, at the end of this talk, with a neat blueprint of our foreign policy over the next decade.

I shall, however, attempt to set up some broad guidelines and especially to deal with the factors which our foreign policy will have to take into account. It seems to me that an understanding of these factors is the first prerequisite.

There are limits to foreign policy. It is not omnipotent. We cannot order the world to our liking. A realistic foreign policy must, therefore, have limited objectives.

In making foreign policy, we are not given clear choices between black and white, but among various shades of gray; and the problem is to produce the lightest possible shade of gray from a mix into which somebody else is assiduously pouring all the black pitch he can lay hands on.

Robert Browning wrote that "The common problem—yours, mine, every one's—is not to fancy what were fair in life provided it could be, but finding first what may be, then find out to make it fair up to our means."

This is the problem we face—not how to bring about the millenium by 1970, but how to make the 1960's "fair up to our means." It is a problem, really, of how to turn history to our advantage. We cannot repeal history, nor can we reverse the forces which are dominant in the world today. But if we have the wisdom and patience, it may be that we can shape and influence those forces so that they work more to our advantage and less to our disadvantage.

We have to take the world as we find it and then do the best we can to strengthen what is in our interests and to minimize what is opposed to our interests. The dominant forces at work in the world in this decade of the 1960's set forth in no particular order of importance, are these:

First, the growth of nationalism in Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

Second, and closely related in the same areas, the demand for economic development.

Third, the economic strength of Western Europe and the trend there toward economic integration, possibly to be followed by political federation.

Fourth, the industrial growth of the Soviet Union and Communist China.

Fifth, the pace of technological and scientific change throughout the world, but especially in North America, Western Europe, and the Soviet Union.

These add up, I suggest, to a fundamental shift in the position of the United States in the world compared with so short a period as 20 years ago.

I do not want to become involved here in the argument over whether the United States is in danger of becoming a second-rate power. This argument misses the essential point, which is that the world is going through a period of revolutionary change, the like of which has not been seen in at least 200 years. It is stating no more than what should be the obvious to say that in such a period changes inevitably occur and revisions are consequently called for in our attitude and approach.

Americans, of all people, have no cause to be alarmed by revolution. Indeed, of the five forces which I mentioned as being involved in the current world revolution, the United States bears a substantial responsibility for four.

The only one to which we have not made a significant contribution is the industrial growth of the Soviet Union and Communist China, and even here we have unavoidably contributed something in the form of accumulated technological know-how which is freely available in any library or university of the West.

The 20th-century drive of nationalism in Asia, Africa, and Latin America is largely fueled on French and American philosophical writings of the 18th century and frequently seeks to build parliamentary institutions modeled on those developed in 19th century Britain.

The demand for economic development was triggered at least in part of the comforts of home which American GI's scattered over the world in 1941–45. It draws at least part of its force from the technology of modern communications which provide an irresistible demonstration of how the favored one-fifth of the human race lives.

The economic strength of Western Europe is largely a tribute to the Europeans' own work and ingenuity, but a significant part of it is the result of the Marshall plan. It should also be remembered that from the beginning of the Marshall plan the United States pointedly and repeatedly has encouraged greater European integration.

Finally, the research and development which is the basis of the technological revolution has been largely carried out, at least until recent years, in the United States and Western Europe.

It is one of the curiosities of our time that, now that we have started all this, some Americans have a tendency to recoil aghast from what we have done as though we have unleashed a Frankenstein on the world and on ourselves.

This is hardly a proper frame of mind from which to approach our problems. Like Disraeli, "I have ever been of the opinion that revolutions are not to be evaded." We cannot evade this one, nor could we have prevented it even if we had tried.

I am reminded of a member of the ruling oligarchy with whom I talked in a rather turbulent foreign country some months ago. "Our trouble here," this gentleman explained to me, "comes from the fact that we have taught too many people to read."

Of course, when people read, they get ideas, and my informant made it very plain that he found many of these ideas distasteful. The United States has nothing to be afraid of, so far as ideas are concerned.

In the field of economics, you will recall, Gresham's law holds that bad money drives good out of circulation. Well, in the field of ideology, I hold that the opposite applies and that good ideas drive bad out of circulation.

And I have enough faith in American ideas not to be afraid of competition. I also have enough realism to know that, if we are going to survive competition, we have to compete. We can't win wars, hot or cold by waiting for the other fellow to fall on his face.

So, it is quite clear that as far as Asia, Africa, and Latin America are concerned, the primary task of our foreign policy in the

1960's is to protect the nationalist revolution, with its subsidiary social and economic aspects, from the scavengers, whether of the Communist left or the totalitarian right.

This is not an easy task, because the nature of nationalism is such that it resists any kind of external influence, even a beneficent, protective one. On the whole, however, we have not done badly; and as we grow in experience, we can reasonably expect to do better.

I turn now to the problems posed for us by the wholly new situation in Western Europe resulting from the Common Market and the still unresolved relationships between the Common Market, the Outer Seven, and ourselves.

The Common Market is, in part, as I have said, an American creation. It may, but it need not, turn out to be an instrument of discrimination against American commerce and a means of luring American industry from the United States to Europe.

If it is not so to turn out, we had better undertake a hard reexamination of our basic trade relationships with Europe and prepare ourselves for some adjustments.

Experience indicates that the richer a country is, the better trading partner it makes for us, to our mutual benefit. It follows, therefore, that if the Common Market makes Europe richer, we should benefit on balance, but the balance will be the algebraic sum of a number of pluses and minuses.

Our job is to keep the minuses down and build the pluses up, and we should certainly not so concentrate our attention on either the plus or the minus side of the ledger that we ignore the other side and accordingly, but falsely, conclude that the Common Market is either undiluted good or unmitigated evil.

Nor can it be judged purely in economic terms. To the degree that the Common Market makes Europe a stronger and more cohesive entity, it will strengthen the whole Western World.

Equally important, it will, to the same degree, tend to reduce the bipolarity in world power relationships which we have seen growing since the beginning of the cold war between the United States and the Soviet Union.

This bipolarity, in which there are two and only two superpowers in the world, is at the root of many of the world's political tensions and contributes to the danger of inadvertent war.

Our relationship to the Soviet Union, is, of course, at the heart of our foreign policy problem for the coming decade. Here, too, we see great changes in process, the consequences of which no man can foresee.

Of this much, however, we can be certain: the Soviet Union of Khrushchev is a vastly different character from the Soviet Union of Stalin.

Now, what are the characteristics of this new creature? It has an advanced technology supported by a solid and growing base of heavy industry. It is in a position, not only to shoot rockets to the moon and Heaven knows where else, but also to export sizable amounts of capital and substantial numbers of technicians to underdeveloped countries.

Because of the emphasis which its leaders have put on heavy industry, its economy is distorted with consumer goods, housing and agriculture lagging well behind. But it has ruthlessly carried out the priorities it has assigned in its scale of values, and it has got just about what it wanted.

In the process, the Soviet economy has inexorably matured and become more sophisticated. Its inter-relationships have grown more complex. As its capacity to trade has increased, so will its dependence on trade increase.

These economic changes have been accompanied by social changes. A new elite has established itself in the form of a managerial class and the new scientists and engineers.

Education has been made universal, for all practical purposes, and though it is heavily oriented toward science and political indoctrination, the Communist oligarchy—like the oligarchy of my foreign friend whom I quoted earlier—may yet find that it has made a mistake in teaching too many people to read.

But this, if it comes, is far in the future. All we can say now is that the Soviet Union is undergoing a social evolution which has already had some political repercussions and which is bound to have more.

The net result seems to be a trend in the direction of greater conservatism. This is hopeful and should be encouraged by whatever means are at hand. These means are few and, at best, of marginal effectiveness. They include such things as reasonable trade in nonstrategic goods and greater travel by westerners to the Soviet Union and by Russians to the West.

From this point of view—as well as from others, of course—it would be greatly to our interests to be able to conclude a satisfactory disarmament agreement, even one on so modest and limited a point as the suspension of nuclear testing.

It must be admitted in the light of recent events that the prospects of reaching constructive agreements in this field have become dimmed. However, by every means at our command we must strive to convey to the Russian people the fact that we are fully desirous of continuing our efforts to promote a franker and more peaceful understanding between us.

There is some reason to believe that Mr. Khrushchev's behavior in Paris this week is a reflection of the pressures of those forces in the Soviet bloc—found principally in the army and among the Chinese Communists—which are resisting the evolutionary changes taking place in Soviet society.

To the degree that this is true, then the process of social change has been slowed, if not halted. But the dynamics of the situation are such that this slowdown is most probably temporary.

Beyond the Soviet Union, lurking ominously behind the eastern horizon, nine-tenths hidden—like an iceberg—lies Communist China, a restless, growing giant. At some point during the 1960's, we shall have to adjust our foreign policy to take account of this fact.

We shall have to put behind us the passions of 10 years ago and discuss it calmly and objectively—not in terms of appeasement or no appeasement, of a hard policy or a soft policy, but of a realistic policy.

I am not suggesting that we recognize Communist China day after tomorrow, or that we withdraw our opposition to seating Communist China in the United Nations. In fact, it would not be the part of wisdom to do either. Neither Communist China nor any other country should be permitted to blackmail its way into a respectable society of nations.

I am simply recommending that we consider, dispassionately, Communist China's place in the world and our relationship to it. This place is already important, and it is bound to become more so. There are more than 600 million Communist Chinese. Soon, there will be a billion. They are industrious, hard-working people, with their energies harnessed and driven by a ruthless regime which is out to do us no good.

It is not a wholly sufficient reaction for us to stand fast around the periphery of this mass, that is China, though certainly an important part of our policy should be to strengthen the peripheral states, especially India and Japan.

The Chinese Communist regime is not going to collapse. I doubt very much that it is going significantly to change its direction in the next decade. Its power is most likely going to continue to increase. It will have to be reckoned with sooner or later, and we will be better off for doing it sooner rather than later.

One of the interesting possibilities involved in a possible disarmament agreement with the Soviet Union is that any inspection system would have to include Communist China. This might provide an opening wedge to change the basis of United States-Chinese relations.

Although the United States and Soviet Union are agreed that Communist China would have to be included in such an agreement, it is by no means certain that the Chinese would welcome the opportunity.

On the contrary, they might very well brush it off or even resist it. That is a bridge which can be crossed only when we come to it. In the meantime, it is worthy of note that the Soviets see this particular problem the same way we do.

Although it is easy—and dangerous—to jump from a wishful thought to a premature conclusion about Soviet-Chinese relations, I cannot believe that the Soviets view the growth of Communist China with entire equanimity.

Just as it is in the interests of the Soviets to attempt to drive a wedge between the Western allies, so it would be in our interests to attempt to drive a wedge between the Communist allies. It may not be possible, and one should not expect spectacular results soon, but it is at least worth some imaginative thought and subtle effort.

I come now to the last of the five forces which I mentioned as being at work in today's world—the quickening pace of scientific and technological change.

This deserves a great deal more public discussion than it has yet received, because it is fraught with the most incalculable social implications.

It is a the bottom of the social evolution in the Soviet Union to which I alluded.

It is intimately involved in the nationalism and the demands for economic growth which we find in Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

It is one of the things which makes the growth of Communist China so awesome.

It is changing the face of the world and of our own country. I am not at all sure that we have learned how to cope with it.

When technology, even rudimentary technology, comes to a primitive society, it introduces cultural changes and these can be destructive of the fabric of a traditional society, even though in the long run they result in better standards of living.

Increased agricultural production so that a farmer has a surplus to sell means the introduction of money into a subsistence economy, and this sometimes means a rather drastic rearrangement in the social hierarchy of a village.

Industrialization means at least some kind of work discipline—if nothing more than starting and quitting on time—and this frequently disrupts established cycles of work and leisure.

The more primitive the society, the less flexible it is likely to be in adjusting to changes of this sort. All of this, of course, has the most significant political implications.

By reducing the death rate through such things as DDT and antibiotics, technology is responsible for the population explosion which is one of the most dramatic factors of the decade.

Through hybridization of plants and animals, through fertilizers, and cultivation methods, it is responsible for our domestic farm surpluses and it may yet be responsible for a world food sufficiency, even taking into account the population explosion.

Through nuclear fission and thermonuclear fusion, it is responsible for the delicate balance of terror in which the human race lives, and it may yet be responsible for extinction of the human race.

Or it may—if we guide it and control it properly—be responsible for the final elimination, for all practical purposes, of human want.

Technology, in other words, is bringing us closer, at an accelerating pace, to the day when we, as human beings, will indeed have a choice between black and white.

Well, as Ralph Waldo Emerson put it in his essay, "The Scholar," "I have exhausted your patience, and I have only begun. * * * but it is so much easier to say many things than to explain one."

At the risk of exhausting your patience further, however, let me take a couple minutes to try to pull together the many things I have said, or at least talked about.

The essential point, is that in making our foreign policy for the 1960's, we have got to accommodate it to the facts of life in the world—to the nationalism of Asia, Africa, and Latin America, to the industrial power of the Soviet Union, and to the growing power of Communist China.

We cannot undo any of these things, but we can, perhaps, capitalize on the advantages of some and minimize the disadvantages of others.

We cannot do anything to make Communist China weak, but we can do something to make India and Japan strong.

We cannot do anything to keep the Soviet Union from having more scientists and engineers, but we can do a great deal to see that we have more ourselves.

We cannot do anything to quench the desire for land reform in Latin America, but we can do something to help our friends there carry it out in a responsible and democratic manner.

We might as well resign ourselves to the fact that all of this is going to require a considerable national effort and is going to cost substantial sums of money. Our taxes may go up.

The question to be decided here is not, "Can we afford it?" but "Do we want to do it badly enough?"

To sum up, my prescription for our foreign policy in the 1960's is to concentrate on doing what is feasible and to stop worrying about doing what is impossible.

And in this connection, the advice which comes to us over the ages from that wise old Greek—Demosthenes—is still sound:

"As a general marches at the head of his troops, so ought with politicians, if I dare use the expression, to march at the head of affairs; insomuch that they ought not to wait the event, to know what measure to take; but the measures which they have taken ought to produce the event."

INDUSTRIAL SLOWDOWN IN FACE OF COMMUNIST ECONOMIC CHALLENGE REQUIRES CONGRESSIONAL ACTION

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, as the Senate considers, in these closing days, depressed-areas legislation, housing bills, and other crucial economic legislation, I suggest we take a long, careful, and thoughtful look at our economy.

The bellwether of the American economy is steel. The longest steel strike in history is only a few months behind us; but this morning's newspapers report the alarming news that in regard to the steel industry, which now is down to a shocking less than 75 percent of capacity, market experts are now expecting that the percentage rate of operations will sag to the lower 60's in June, and will probably go lower in July. This means that actual steel production may sink below that of Russia, this year.

At the same time, the National Industrial Conference Board forecast at its annual meeting was announced in this morning's newspapers as an expectation that U.S. economic growth would slow down during the next 10 years. In view of the rising pace of Communist economic expansion in Russia and China, this is deeply alarming. Mr. President, I think this economic situation indicates how urgently congressional action all along the economic front is needed.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article entitled "Orders for Steel Below Forecasts," which was published today in the New York Times; and an article entitled "U.S. Economic Growth To Slow Down in 1960's, Industry Leaders Say," which was published today in the Wall Street Journal.

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

[From the New York Times, May 23, 1960]

ORDERS FOR STEEL BELOW FORECASTS—MOST OFFICIALS NOW FORESEE NO BUYING SPURT AND DROP FOR MILL OPERATIONS—USERS CUT INVENTORIES—MAKERS OF APPLIANCES, CARS TRIMMING STOCKS MOST—BUILDING METAL GAINS

PITTSBURGH, May 22.—The expected slight pickup in steel order volume has not materialized and steelmakers look for a series of declines in operations. This trend may be affected temporarily by summer seasonal factors.

Most sales officials are convinced that customers do not intend to step up their buying at this time. The consensus is that many steel users will cut inventories and will continue to buy on a hand-to-mouth basis.

As expected by some of the older steel officials, the market has all the earmarks of the so-called normal markets of years past. That many steel users were able to weather the 116-day steel strike has brought a new and sobering factor into the steel market picture. There seems now to be a strong trend toward much smaller inventories than before.

USERS CUT INVENTORIES

In the last few weeks there have been warnings from steelmakers that customers might do well to take a second look at their inventories and perhaps slow the cutting. The users apparently took the second look and decided to keep going on the inventory cut. That is probably why Iron Age magazine has interpreted the low demand as presaging seasonal cuts of less than moderate proportions in the steel operating rate. Some market experts believe that the percentage rate of operations will sag to the lower 60's in June and will probably go lower in July. Most top steel officials, however, are keeping mum.

The largest cutters of steel orders have been auto and appliance manufacturers. But other steel users are quietly cutting orders and using more of their inventories.

Shipments of construction steels have improved slightly. But in many cases structural units made from steel ordered some time ago were assembled during the bad weather a few months ago. They are now being shipped. However, new structural awards have been trending slightly upward in the last few months. Part of this was said to be because of the improvement in spending for new plant and equipment.

In recent weeks tinplate users have been a little slow in releasing tinplate made and stored for shipping releases. This could mean that tinplate users—especially makers of cans—are well supplied and may be in no hurry to take in large tonnages after midyear.

GALVANIZED SHEET IN DEMAND

Galvanized sheet demand was still strong, but with the unusual capacity that has been built, there has been no tightness in the last month. That was in sharp contrast to market conditions of 3 months ago when deliveries were unusually extended and when all mills had large backlogs.

Few, if any, steel experts see increases in steel prices in the foreseeable future. The softness in prices of concrete reinforcing bars in the Southeast, the East, and the Southwest reflect strong competition with lower price foreign steels. The price change or reduction in special vacuum processed steels reported by some makers was attributable to the combination of domestic and foreign competition and decreased production costs being passed on to the customers in a highly competitive market. There was no evidence that the mill prices of regular steel products had been or were about to be affected by the "special cases" in other steels.

[From the Wall Street Journal, May 23, 1960]

U.S. ECONOMIC GROWTH TO SLOW DOWN IN 1960'S, INDUSTRY LEADERS SAY—INDUSTRIAL CONFERENCE BOARD TOLD BANK LOANS, STOCK PRICES WILL RISE LESS SHARPLY IN DECADE

NEW YORK.—Slower growth faces the Nation in the 1960's in several spheres of economic activity, the National Industrial Conference Board's 44th annual meeting was told.

Forecasts were presented, for example, that bank credit demand and stock market prices may rise less sharply in the present decade than in the 1950's.

John D. Wilson, vice president of the Chase Manhattan Bank, gave several reasons why he expects bank loan demand to be "somewhat less pressing in the 1960's." Among these factors he cited less inflation, higher bank lending charges and heavier corporate debt. Mr. Wilson expects banks to continue to be quite heavily "loaned up" in the 1960's, so that they are not likely to go after lending business as aggressively as in the past decade.

According to Regnar D. Naess, senior partner of Naess & Thomas, a securities firm, the stock market in the 1960's as a whole will show only a modest advance compared with the sharp runup in stock price averages in the 1950's. His reasons: The market in the past decade was pushed up by several special postwar factors, notably the rebuilding of Western Europe, the supply to consumers of goods cut off during the war, and the establishment of a "huge U.S. defense industry."

A number of industry-by-industry forecasts were made to the conference. One of the most optimistic was presented by a spokesman for the electronics industry, Donald C. Power, chairman of General Telephone & Electronics Corp., who predicted electronics sales and revenue would jump from $14 billion to $27.25 billion by 1970. As recently as 1950, he noted, the industry posted total receipts of only $5 billion.

E. B. Germany, president of Lone Star Steel Co., said he expects "the 10 years ahead will be difficult for U.S. steelmakers," due largely to the prospect that steel exports will decrease and imports will increase as a result of lower cost operations of foreign

competitors. He called for a stiffer industry stand on labor to promote greater efficiency and so make U.S. prices for steel more competitive in world markets.

The conference board itself predicted that the annual gross national product—total output of goods and services—would rise to nearly $800 billion by 1970, an increase of 60 percent from the present level of slightly over $500 billion. That would compare with a rise of about 65 percent to $479.5 billion during the 1950's.

The board also predicted in its survey, titled "Economic Growth in the 1960's," that the country's output per man-hour will continue to rise at a postwar rate of 3.2 percent. The board anticipates additionally, among other things, that capital spending by business for new plant and equipment will run about $58 billion annually in the 1960's, a rise from the $38 billion businessmen say they expect to spend on expansion this year.

AMENDMENT OF MOTOR VEHICLE SAFETY RESPONSIBILITY ACT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FREAR in the chair). The hour of 2 o'clock has arrived; and the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2131) to amend the Motor Vehicle Safety Responsibility Act of the District of Columbia, approved May 25, 1954, as amended.

LIFE MAGAZINE AND NEW YORK TIMES GREAT DEBATE ON THE NATIONAL PURPOSE

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, America's greatest need today, in the wake of the disaster at the summit and the revelation of Premier Khrushchev as an unstable bully, shouting insults at the United States of America, remains as before. Of course we need the material strength of military and economic power and the educational strength to give it meaning. But, even more, we need a sense of national purpose. Somehow we need to bring to every schoolchild and farmer, every housewife and salesman, a far clearer comprehension of American freedom, its heavy responsibilities, as well as its immense opportunities.

Life magazine, with its vast 6 million-plus circulation, and its tens of millions of readers, together with the New York Times, with its broad national readership, have set out to do this in a series of four articles.

Judging by the quality of the men selected to discuss the national purpose, and by the excellent "kickoff" article written by John Jessup, the chief editorial writer of Life magazine, this promises to be an immense contribution to the national will.

Because the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD represents an appropriate repository of this historic contribution, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the first article of this series be printed at this point in the RECORD, preceded by a letter I have written at the invitation of publisher C. D. Jackson, of Life magazine, in commenting on the series.

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

Mr. C. D. JACKSON,
Publisher, Life Magazine,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR MR. JACKSON: Congratulations on your decision to plunge directly into what so many of us have been vaguely calling for: a great debate on our national purpose by eight leading American thinkers.

An America that has some idea of where it is going and why is even more necessary than closing the missile gap, stepping up the pace of our economic growth, or even pouring more of our resources into education. Quite essential as are these means of achieving our ends, understanding of what our ends are and why and inspiration to spark the desire and fuel the drive must come first.

Since 1945 victorious power throughout the world has come not from planes or tanks or factories or even nuclear power. It has come from people who know what they want and are willing to work and sacrifice and die for it. This has resulted in successful revolutions in Ghana, Nigeria, Guinea, the Sudan, Egypt, Jordan, Morocco, Iraq, Syria, Cuba, Tunisia, Pakistan, Ceylon, Burma, Indochina, India, Israel, Indonesia, and China. In every revolution except Czechoslovakia since the end of World War II, military and industrial power has been on the side of the government in power. But in each case people who understand their purpose well enough to fight and die for it have succeeded.

The initial article by Life's chief editorial writer, John Jessup, surmounts the tough job of framing this cosmological subject in a workable perspective. He provides two vital ingredients of any beginning in arriving at a national purpose: a historical comprehension and a moral framework. This Democratic Senator is reminded of how difficult, but how useful, this is in the painful present—after our grave national difficulty over the U-2 reconnaissance plane and the Khrushchev explosion at the summit. How strengthening now are the words quoted by Jessup from Wisconsin's Carl Schurz in replying to Stephen Decatur's "our country, right or wrong," with "our country * * * when right, to be kept right; when wrong, to be put right." How very pertinent in the decade of this greatest American weakness of privatism to be reminded of Teddy Roosevelt's shout that "the rights of men have to be earned afresh each day."

How central to this inquiry the historical fact that since the Mayflower Compact, whose ultimate purpose, as Jessup says, "was the quest of God's truth"—and how inevitably it follows today in Jessup's words that "it is the highest of man's political purposes to contrive his human institutions in conformity with this order, while realizing that all human institutions are subject to constant change."

I hope that subsequent articles will grapple with the big problem to which Jessup has ably brought this series, i.e., how do we contrive to adjust these institutions to the fantastic change of the past few years of the nuclear age, the space age, and the relentless and brutal march of communism.

The big task is to challenge the American people to the immensity of their power and resources and to the enormity of the task that confronts us armed with these resources. Innovation has been the genius of America's mighty economic system and our Nation's unparalleled material progress. No nation on earth is so richly armed. More important, thanks to our Jeffersonian birth, we Americans enjoy a political tradition founded on the open, searching, reaching mind pursuing justice as well as happiness. Our task is to convince our countrymen that the mountain in all its bristling enormity is not only there to climb but that no men have ever been better equipped to climb it than this generation of still reluctant Americans.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM PROXMIRE.

THE NATIONAL PURPOSE

(The words above, The National Purpose, have begun to sound increasingly throughout the country, stirring up uneasy questions, forcing Americans to reexamine themselves and their aspirations, engaging men of high position in what can be the most crucial debate of our generation.

(But the discussions sometimes produce only earnest confusion or empty declamation. To explore what the phrase has meant to America and what it means—or should mean—today, Life here begins a five-part series on "The National Purpose": what we as citizens and as a nation wish and hope to achieve.

(It is a question important in an election year when the great issues must be brought out by the men who wish to lead the Nation, but it transcends partisan politics. Life has asked eight eminent Americans to explore the question. This week the background of the debate is set down on the following pages. In four succeeding issues "The National Purpose" will be discussed by Adlai Stevenson, twice a presidential candidate; Archibald MacLeish, Pulitzer Prize poet and playwright; Billy Graham, the evangelist; David Sarnoff, chairman, RCA; John Gardner, president, Carnegie Corp. of New York; Albert Wohlstetter, national defense specialist for the Rand Corp.; Clinton Rossiter, author and professor of government, Cornell University; Walter Lippmann, political commentator.

(The debate, of course, cannot be left to the country's leaders. Life invites all Americans to join in. For upon the Nation's purpose depend the lives of all—not in some comfortably remote future but right now and in the years just ahead.)

A NOBLE FRAMEWORK FOR A GREAT DEBATE

(By John K. Jessup)

(The words and deeds that expressed our past purpose are the starting point for discourse on aims today.)

"The critical weakness of our society is that for the time being our people do not have great purposes which they are united in wanting to achieve. The public mood of the country is defensive, to hold on and to conserve, not to push forward and to create. We talk about ourselves these days as if we were a completed society, one which has achieved its purposes, and has no further great business to transact."

So wrote Columnist Walter Lippmann a few months ago. It is a disturbing charge for three reasons. First, Lippmann is not alone in making it. The same complaint is heard, with varying emphasis, from many other critics and leaders of opinion, and also, according to a recent survey of Life's correspondents, from many an average anonymous American as well. Some of them speak like Lippmann of our lost or mislaid national purpose or purposes; others use an older phrase, "the American dream." Thus William Faulkner: "What happened to the American dream? We dozed, and it abandoned us. And in that vacuum now there sound no longer the strong voices * * * speaking in mutual unification of one hope and will." As though he also felt something missing, the President himself has appointed a Commission on National Goals "to develop a broad outline of national objectives and programs for the next decade and longer." So much palpable concern, in quarters high and low, suggests that the vacuum of purpose may be a real one.

Second, the charge is disturbing because if it is true it is new. The United States has hitherto been a country associated with great purpose. If that purpose is now absent, we are not what we were. Is there not a connection between the rise of nations and great purposes, between the loss of purpose and their decline. A United States without a purpose, or no greater purpose than "Don't rock the boat," may well be a United States in decline.

Third, the world needs a purposeful America. Even if the United States could ever be a "completed society," to use Lippmann's phrase, the world is not. Mankind has much further great business to transact—if not with the active leadership of the United States then without it, and probably with the leadership of communism.

It may be argued that Lippmann's charge, even if true, is irrelevant. Does the United States really need a self-conscious purpose in the world? Is not a democracy its own raison d'être, and survival the whole of its duty? Many feel that only individuals, not nations, are capable of high purposes; and that the proper role of the American Nation is simply to provide the political framework in which each American citizen defines and conducts his own private pursuit of happiness, nobly or ignobly, to suit himself. Yet this theory of a passive role for the Nation has not satisfied the growing uneasiness. "Why are many Americans fearful that we have lost our sense of national purpose?" asks Adlai Stevenson. "Why is there a slackness about public problems and a wholesale retreat to the joys of private life?"

Our onetime confidence

If America is in fact an elderly, status quo nation, it has had one of the briefest runs for its money in the history of great nations, and its early senescence will have belied more prophecies and grander promises than any nation ever made. During most of its brief history America has been bursting with confidence in its own unlimited destiny. A French visitor in the 1840's asked one of these confident spokesmen, Senator Lewis Cass of Michigan, "If such is the youth of the Republic, what will be its old age?" Replied the Senator, "Sir, it will have no old age." Cass' bold prophecy is already proved doubtful by the fact that so few Americans feel like repeating it today.

Thus there appears to be a real vacuum in the national will, or at least the widespread fear that such a vacuum exists. To explore this disturbing condition, Life here begins a series of articles which we hope may stimulate a fruitful national debate. Does the United States lack a national purpose? Does it need a national purpose in the world? If so, what should that purpose be?

The present article is a résumé of what earlier generations have felt about the American national purpose, together with a few remarks on the new historical conditions that may have affected these beliefs. How far are the older beliefs relevant to the problems that face our country now, in this strange era of communism, megaton weaponry, fractured empires, mushrooming sovereignties, and continuing moral, social, and technical revolution? The answers hinted at in this introductory article are not offered as definitive. Fuller answers will be presented in the subsequent articles by leaders of opinion.

The motivating beliefs of a nation are to be sought in its deeds and illuminated by the words of its leaders, its spokesmen and its key documents. Deeds and words do not always match, but in America they have matched often enough to show a pattern to those who look for one. Thus when Roger Williams expounded the principles of religious liberty and democracy, his authority did not run beyond colonial Rhode Island; but the practical experience of mutual accommodation among the sects in other colonies eventually established religious liberty as part of the American political creed. Thus, too, township self-government and the common law, which helped to make the Constitution workable, were the slow deposit of English and colonial experience rather than the decree of towering prophets or statesmen. But on occasion sudden flashes of great documentary lightning have also illuminated our beliefs. The greatest of these was, of course, the Declaration of Independence on July 4, 1776.

The Declaration turned what had just a few months before been an Anglo-American family quarrel into a defiance of all tyranny everywhere. Colonial loyalty to the English crown, the dominant American sentiment of 1775, was transformed into national loyalty to the cause of political freedom for the human race.

Thomas Jefferson achieved his masterpiece not by taking an opinion poll, nor yet by sucking the words from his thumb. In writing the Declaration he borrowed some current political ideas from England, from Virginia, from Massachusetts, from Tom Paine and from other sources. He carefully listed the colonists' grievances against George III. But above all he related the cause of American independence to certain timeless beliefs about the nature of man, society and government.

Men are created with equal and inalienable rights—all men everywhere. The chief purpose of any government is to secure these rights, and its just power comes only from the consent of the governed. Although this news took decades to spread and has yet to penetrate everywhere, all other theories of government were doomed by this Declaration and the American independence that followed it. Tom Paine did not exaggerate: "Despotism felt a shock, and man began to contemplate redress." The Declaration went round the Western World, adding an important stimulus to the revolution in France, the independence of Latin America, the national movements in Germany, Italy, Greece, and Eastern Europe, and eventually the political reformation of England itself.

Small wonder, then, that in America the Declaration became the focus of that sense of special destiny and vocation which most vocal Americans had long associated with their country. Just as the Puritans had felt akin to the Israelites, chosen by God for a holy experiment in rule by conscience on new soil, so George Washington's generation felt themselves to be the vanguard of a new political dispensation. They were a watershed in human history, agents of what John Adams had called "a grand scheme and design in Providence for the illumination and emancipation of the slavish part of mankind all over the earth."

Added Adams: "The institutions now made in America will not wholly wear out for thousands of years. It is therefore of the last importance that they should be right." In this self-conscious spirit was our Constitution written. It was to be the test of the basic question whether men, as Alexander Hamilton put it, can achieve good government by "reflection and choice," or whether they must always be governed by "accident and force."

The Constitution was not a universal document in the same sense as the Declaration. It was a working document for Americans, not for Laplanders or Chinese. It has nevertheless proved an adequate political franchise for Americans while they subdued a continent, added 37 new States, fought seven wars and changed from an agricultural Federal Republic into an industrialized democratic Nation. We have seen fit to amend the Constitution 22 times but not to change a word of the preamble, which is a summary statement of what the founders thought to be the true purposes of government—any government. Here are those purposes: "To form a more perfect Union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty."

Focus of patriotic reverence

These purposes, and the principle of strong but limited government under law which imbues it, have made the Constitution a focus of American patriotic reverence second only to the Declaration. It is a much stronger focus of loyalty, for example, than the American land, for all this land's purple majesty and beloved rocks and rills. An English visitor in 1837 remarked on the transient place-sense of this migratory people: "Give the American his institutions, and he cares little where you place him." Said Hawthorne, "We have so much country that we have really no country at all." The land has been an inestimable stimulus to effort and to wealth, but the system that enabled every man to take up his pursuit of wealth and happiness has been the most valued part of the whole. The American system has always been held to be far wider than American geography. As Walt Whitman said, "O America, because you build for mankind I build for you."

By Whitman's time the United States, like its great poet, was taking pride in the title of "democracy," a word the Founding Fathers had not much liked. Our 19th century legislation—from free schools and no-jail-for-debt to the Homestead Act, not to mention the emancipation of slaves—maintained an egalitarian bent. Its purpose and effect were to widen the suffrage and enlarge the opportunities of the average man. John Locke had made the amount of its emigration a test of whether a country is truly governed by consent or not. Waves of immigration, visibly assimilated, were evidence that America was the most consent-governed country in the world. As one not untypical immigrant wrote home: "Here a highway to honor, wealth, and renown is open to all." Our national mission was to exemplify the success of free self-government, to let our democratic light so shine before men that they could see its good works and become democrats too. Many did, including most of Europe.

The first internationally recognized American historian, George Bancroft, saw American democracy as the highest revelation of God's purpose in history and the consummation of all previous civilizations. "In the fulness of time," he wrote, "a Republic arose in the wilderness of America. Thousands of years had passed away before this child of the ages could be born * * * from her the human race drew hope." This viewpoint, which today sounds primitive or jingoistic, was as self-evident to many 19th century Americans as the rights of man were to those of the 18th. Both were vindicated by continuing success. Indeed, the American experiment was succeeding in so many directions that the sense of national purpose, though no less intense, became somewhat diffuse. Patriotism became identified with practically every virtue except patience. Thus Emerson: "I wish to see America a benefactor such as no country ever was * * * the office of America is to liberate, to abolish kingcraft, priestcraft, castle, monopoly, to pull down the gallows, to burn up the bloody statute book, to take in the immigrant, to open the doors of the sea and the fields of the earth." In the swelling tide of immigration and expansion he also foresaw the advent of "a new race, a new religion, a new state, a new literature."

By the end of the 19th century there were at least four great causes which America could be said to exemplify and which many Americans were eager to urge on the human race. These were:

1. Democracy: Bancroft called it practical Christianity and said: "The duty of America is to secure the culture and the happiness of the masses by their reliance on themselves." The people's voice was the voice of God, and of progress and of civilization as well.

2. Individual liberty: The wisdom of the Founding Fathers in making the free individual the cornerstone of our institutions was proved by his accomplishments. The individual was especially credited with our economic feats and therefore not begrudged his unequal rewards through the free enterprise system. He was the agent of that conquest of poverty which America had anticipated since colonial times.

3. "Pluralism": This became the scholar's word for our harmonious diversity of races, creeds, and conditions. Scientist-Author E. E. Slosson was to define America as "the finest of all the fine arts, the art of getting along peaceably with all sorts and conditions of men." Our pluralistic laboratory proved the beneficence of the Federal system, crowning our good with brotherhood from sea to shining sea. Since federalism had shown that it could govern and harmonize a continent, why not a world?

4. Morality: The universe is moral and civilization depends on morality, said Emerson. Our system was assumed to be in closer touch than others with what Seward called a higher law than the Constitution. The old Stephen Decatur formula, "our country, right or wrong," was offensive to intellectual patriots like Senator Carl Schurz, who amended it thus: "Our country * * * when right, to be kept right; when wrong, to be put right." Kept or set right by reliable methods, the vocal conscience of responsible citizens manifested itself through free institutions.

These four diverse national purposes could get somewhat out of alinement. Such was the case when Theodore Roosevelt came on the scene. Creative individualism had made it seem that America's dominant purpose—as it seems to many today—was merely to get rich. T. R., a great teacher as well as politician, used the White House as a pulpit to stir the national conscience to higher aims than the amassing of wealth. He preached the responsibility of the individual citizen, the social necessity of personal character, the central role of righteousness in democracy. He attacked that optimistic fatalism which assumed the country could always, in a contemporary's words, "slide down hill into the valley of fulfillment" and warned that the rights of men had to be freshly earned every day. He reasserted America's championship of popular rights. He told us that the history of America is now the central feature of the history of the world. He sought to put U.S. foreign policy in the central position in that history, a position it was soon to occupy in fact.

A defiant doctrine

American foreign policy before Teddy Roosevelt was sometimes summarized as the Monroe Doctrine and the Golden Rule. Both were thoroughly consistent with American beliefs. If the Monroe Doctrine seems too defensive today, it was for a century defiant of half the globe. It aimed to keep European autocracy out of Latin America as well as to allow the spread of democracy through our own territorial expansion. It was not just the manifest destiny of continental geography, but also democratic idealism that carried our flag to California, Hawaii, and the Philippines. It was George Bancroft himself who, as Acting Secretary of War, gave the order that sent U.S. troops into Texas in 1846—just as young T. R., as Assistant Secretary of the Navy, sent Commodore Dewey into Manila Bay in 1898.

Preoccupation with our own hemisphere did not always blind us to the cause of freedom and democracy elsewhere. National revolutionaries like Kossuth in Hungary, freely admitting American inspiration, could also count on at least unofficial American support. Commodore Perry in opening Japan, John Hay in proclaiming the Open Door against colonialism in China, Captain Mahan in his lectures at the Naval War College—all were prophets of the fact that American interests were becoming as global as the American cause.

In 1909 the Monroe Doctrine was reanalyzed by Herbert Croly, author of "The Promise of American Life," which greatly influenced T. R.'s thinking. Now that Europe was democratized, Croly argued, Europe's interests, and America's could no longer be considered "essentially incompatible," as some interpreters of the Doctrine had maintained. A time was coming when we would have to assume a wider and more active role. George Washington, in his Farewell Address, had enjoined us to avoid foreign entanglements and "give to mankind the magnanimous and too novel example of a people always guided by an exalted justice and benevolence." These words, said Croly, had been more honored in the letter than in the spirit. The time was coming when we should seek allies in order to build democracy into a world system. In such a system, peace would inevitably depend on the righteous use of superior force, and America's force would be needed on that righteous side.

Croly's contemporary patriots, however, were happier setting a no-longer-so-novel example than leading a magnanimous crusade. They responded more to the idea of a happy American destiny than to a clear American purpose. To Woodrow Wilson fell the sad task of proving the unreality of this distinction and of testing the American devotion to righteousness in a great European war. His war message of April 2, 1917 linked our destiny with that of democracy all over the world:

"The world must be made safe for democracy. Its peace must be planted upon the tested foundations of political liberty. * * * Civilization itself seeming to be in the balance. But the right is more precious than peace, and we shall fight for the things which we have always carried nearest our hearts—for democracy, for the right of those who submit to authority to have a voice in their own governments, for the rights and liberties of small nations, for a universal dominion of right by such a concert of free peoples as shall bring peace and safety to all nations and make the world itself at last free. * * * America is privileged to spend her blood and her might for the principles that gave her birth."

The concerts of free peoples eventually became the Wilson-inspired League of Nations. The League failed for various reasons, but one of them was surely the failure of follow-through in America's political will. Another and even greater war, another and even more pluralistic league called the United Nations, and the Wilson-era failure has at least been patched up. Said Franklin Roosevelt in 1945: "We have learned that we cannot live alone, at peace; that our own well-being is dependent upon the well-being of other nations far away."

The preamble and the stated purposes of the U.N. contain many statements in which Americans can take pride, since they could never have been written had not America long preached and exemplified them—most notably the declaration of equal rights of men and women and of nations large and small. Yet this declaration is made hypocritical by the nature of the U.N.'s membership, which includes Communist states and thus severs the cause of peace from its anchor in freedom and principle. The word "righteousness," which to Wilson as to T. R. was synonymous with the higher patriotism, was not popularized by F. D. R., is not used in the U.N. charter and is seldom heard in its debates.

Our greatest spokesman

Wilson's war message was in many ways the last great documentary link between modern America and the principles that gave her birth. Its echoes of the Declaration of Independence are not mere rhetoric. Those echoes had been enriched for Wilson's generation by the memory of our most profound national experience, the Civil War, and our greatest spokesman of national purpose, Abraham Lincoln.

Lincoln's first show of stubborn grandeur, said Carl Sandburg, was in the passionate seriousness with which he took the words of the Declaration. To him it was a charter of political truth for augmenting the happiness and value of life to all people of all colors everywhere. Because slavery was incompatible with the Declaration, the Declaration was the real issue of the Civil War. But this issue had been so long evaded and compromised that Lincoln could exploit it only within the larger cause of saving the Union. Thus political and military necessities robbed the words of his Emancipation Proclamation of great documentary lightning, but the deed was as fundamental and astounding as anything he said. Forced into the Constitution by war, by conscience, and by the Declaration, the proclamation was what Whitman called "by far the greatest revolutionary step in the history of the United States."

Lincoln's greatness was more than verbal. It lay in the resolution with which he preserved the idea of union through our most tragic crisis. Such resolution could be sustained only by faith in the proposition that all men are created equal. The national purpose that Lincoln stated for the Union was that free government of the people, by the people, and for the people should not perish from the earth.

Since Lincoln's time government by the people has been broadened step by step and deepened here and abroad with a cumulative effect scarcely less revolutionary than the Emancipation Proclamation itself. The abstraction for which Lincoln fought is now operative in more than half the world. Scores of new nations have been born since World War I because of the conviction that men should govern themselves, and the 1960 crop will be at least a half dozen more in Africa alone. Yet the popularity of Lincoln's abstraction has not made democracy any safer. On the contrary, some of the nations for whose freedom we fought under Wilson and Franklin Roosevelt, notably in eastern Europe and the Far East, have long since succumbed to ancient tyranny in its newest and most insidious guise, Communism. In all countries the new tyranny, like the old, is still abetted by ignorance and poverty, and in the poorer ones by a widespread belief that freedom and morality are luxuries—"first the grub, then the morals." Meanwhile in America, suffused in real luxuries, freedom and morality are taken for granted as casually as bread.

This does not mean that the United States has altogether forsaken its traditional purposes in foreign affairs. They have guided our reactions to many new and puzzling challenges, such generally creditable reactions as the Marshall Plan, the North Atlantic Treaty, the defense of Korea, the upholding of the U.N. in the Suez and other crises, the spending of billions for alliances and aid. At vast expense but with fair success, the United States has contained communism since 1949. We have defended the

chance of many nations to choose freedom and establish self-government, from Guatemala to Vietnam.

But at other times and places we have failed to defend this right. From Hungary in 1956 the appeal to American principles for American help was so direct and unmistakable that many Americans, in our Government's blank failure to respond, thought they heard the snapping of a great cord to the most precious part of our past. To others this sound was muffled by the very scope and complexity of the challenge, for tyranny is only one of the conditions of human life that wears a new, confusing and very non-18th century mask.

The whole order of organized power has changed. The once worthy title of "nation" may now denote either a monster or a pygmy state. Both weaponry and economics have made nonsense of long-established boundaries between nations. Strange new alinements seem to be forming, one perhaps being an alinement of races. The scientific and technical revolution, which has already overthrown the social structure of some very old nations, may have overnight changes in store for many others, either from within their own laboratories or from some point in outer space. As for what communism has done to international politics, in the words of a recent Rockefeller Brothers Fund report, "The chessboard itself may be said to have disappeared."

Nation states may no longer be the most meaningful integers of creative political thought. No existing state is or can be safe for democracy or freedom. Whatever may be hoped or feared from regional or racial alinements, any lasting political purpose must take the whole great globe for its arena. Nor is it just the Ghanaian, or the American, whose chance at happiness is threatened by technology. Human nature itself is threatened by dehumanization. A great political purpose today must have something to say about human nature, how to keep it as human and as rational as may be.

Such are the fantastic new conditions in which our old beliefs must find a home, a grave or a toehold. How can we best adapt our beliefs to the conditions? What purposes may rightfully be considered today?

Survival: Sensible patriots have proposed that our true cause today is sheer national survival. They say that this is important enough, and doubtful enough, to engage our full attention. Biology tells us that survival is a primary concern. Yet if survival by military means is meant, modern weapons are two-edged. Our present strategy of nuclear deterrence, if ever tested, could so reduce our population that its survivors, the bearers of our beliefs about liberty and self-government, might prefer to live elsewhere. On the other hand, since America is now the world's chief home and hope of freedom, a refusal to defend it could demoralize the cause of freedom for a thousand years. From this dilemma the only escape is to perceive that survival alone is not an adequate goal.

What is, then? No single goal, perhaps. A great power's foreign policy cannot be reduced to a phrase. The Council on Foreign Relations, analyzing our "basic aims" for the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, made a multiple recommendation: that while maintaining our negative policy of resisting and containing communism, we must at the same time do much more to anticipate "the world's other problems," and try to link the non-Communist nations more closely through more and better institutions of law and order, security, economic development, freedom and peace. A large order—but not necessarily an inspiring one. Although the United States has virtually unlimited responsibilities, can it respond to all alarms everywhere in the free world at once?

Self-government: The one principle that Americans have preached most consistently since their own founding is that men can govern themselves in freedom under law, and that all of them deserve a chance to try. Perhaps this simple message is too 18th century for the world's needs today, or America's complex relation to it. But the millions who have not yet had their chance seldom say so. Self-government is clearly a central purpose for many peoples of the world.

Moral law: Democracy, though we have treasured it, is not the highest value known to man. Indeed, it is only because enough Americans have had still higher allegiances that we have made democracy work.

America's public love affair with righteousness, for example, was not confined to the speeches of T. R. It began with the Mayflower compact, whose ultimate purpose was the quest of God's truth. The same quest underlies our insistence on religious freedom, and the assumption of a moral order in the universe underlies much of our constitutional law. Said John Marshall, the great interpreter of the Constitution: "There are principles of abstract justice which the Creator of all things has impressed on the mind of his creature man, and which are admitted to regulate in great degree the right of civilized nations." Our very right to self-government is derived from "the laws of nature and of nature's God," and to its harmony with these laws democracy owes its moral sanction.

If this moral order of the universe exists in fact—if there is such a thing as the natural law in which our Founding Fathers trusted—then it is surely the highest of man's political purposes to contrive his human institutions in conformity with this order, while realizing that all human institutions are subject to constant change. No more challenging task faces American leaders and intellectuals, if they believe in natural law, than to find its mundane applications in this revolutionary age. Certainly there resides in every human breast a natural instinct for justice, which experience has refined into the world's systems of law. A world that needs peace, which is the work of justice, needs clearer codifications of its sense of justice—i.e., more and better national and international law.

But those of us who make world law our national purpose must be sure the positive laws that we champion enjoy maximum consent. For example, by throwing its economic weight around, the United States can do much to promote free enterprise and freer trade in the non-Communist world. But it could do this better with less friction if Americans should produce a new definition of the right to property, which John Locke and our Founding Fathers considered basic to liberty. Such a definition would have to appear in harmony with natural justice to farmers and workers as well as to businessmen in all industrialized societies.

Private purposes: Many Americans will approve the above-mentioned purposes and still deny that they should be avowed by the Nation or its Government. A consensus of private purposes can give shape and direction to our national life without getting into formal policy at all. Yet in the fatness of these pursy times our private purposes do not add up to anything so firm. As one Air Force lieutenant wrote to Time, "What America stands for is making money, and as the society approaches affluence, its members are left to stew in their own ennui."

As monarchies were said to live by honor, so republics live by virtue. Yet republics have no public means of supplying a lack of virtue in the sovereign people. The public educational system can set and inculcate standards of the mind, and with this aim the Rockefeller Bros. Fund proposed to raise these standards, calling its report on our schools "The Pursuit of Excellence." Even the citizen who thinks that virtue is old fashioned, or that it is none of the State's business, can perhaps subscribe to excellence as a public purpose, and in a context of intellectual excellence, moral excellence (which must always be an individual purpose and achievement) may have a better chance. As T. R. used to say, a patriot will make the most of himself. If enough do, so will the Nation.

These are a few of the paths which thoughtful Americans can follow in their search for a new or renewed national purpose. There are undoubtedly others. But with the background for debate now sketched in, we can proceed in the individual views of Life's eminent contributors.

DESPERATE NEED FOR MEDICAL CARE FOR AMERICA'S AGED

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, we are pledged as a nation to the ideal of bringing to mankind the "four freedoms." But our own senior citizens can know no freedom from want, can know no freedom from fear, so long as the grim specter of sudden and costly illness hovers over them.

We in the Senate, faced with the realities of the international situation, acknowledge the need for economic aid to the peoples of other lands; but how can we expect the older people of our own land to understand why, in the same breath, we deny millions of them any real opportunity for medical care in their old age? This is especially shocking in view of the far greater sacrifice other countries of the free world make to assure adequate medical care for their elderly people.

This is the question posed in many of the letters we receive. I ask unanimous consent to have one letter of this sort printed in the RECORD.

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

DEAR SIR: Was wondering if and when you fellows are going to do something about giving those on social security hospitalization and doctors care. Maybe you can tell me what we are supposed to do when we're sick. The hospitals charge from $15 to $25 a day and that's only for board and room and the doctors bills are extra. I had my wife in the hospital last year one afternoon and overnight and the hospital charged $49. Do something to get hospitalization added to our social security. They raise the taxes on gas and parcel post and everything else and give to the foreign countries but never anything here at home.

Sincerely,

——— ———.

EDGAR E. WITT, OF TEXAS, HAS OUTSTANDING RECORD OF DEVOTED PUBLIC SERVICE

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, a dedicated, able, faithful public official is soon to leave the Washington scene.

Edgar E. Witt, of Waco, Tex., Chief of the Indian Claims Commission, has written a record of fairness, of diligence, and of successful service with that Commission which could serve as a model for any public official serving on any commission in Washington.

Governor Witt—as a former lieutenant Governor of Texas—he is called "Governor" in his native State—was a leading public official of the State of Texas before he came to Washington. After having served on other Government commissions, he became Chief of the Indian Claims Commission at the age of 68, an age at which most men have retired.

In the 13 years he has served as Chief of the Indian Claims Commission, he has written as many opinions as have all the other justices of the Commission combined. In every case in which he has dissented, his dissent has been upheld on appeal.

When Edgar E. Witt retires to Texas, he should take with him the thanks of officialdom of Washington and the appreciation of the citizenry of this Nation for a job well done.

In the Dallas Morning News for Monday, May 16, Mr. Walter C. Hornaday, the able chief of the Dallas News Washington Bureau, has written a very fine article entitled "Retirement Due for Claims Chief." As a long-time friend of Edgar E. Witt, I am glad to see him receive this recognition, and I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in full in the RECORD.

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

[From the Dallas Morning News, May 16, 1960]

RETIREMENT DUE FOR CLAIMS CHIEF

(By Walter C. Hornaday)

WASHINGTON.—When Edgar E. Witt of Waco was named Chief Commissioner of the Indian Claims Commission in 1947, he had reached an age when most men are taking it easy in retirement.

Witt, a former Lieutenant Governor of Texas and a learned and skilled lawyer, assumed his duties at the age of 68.

He has been the Commission's only head during its 13 years of existence. He and his two colleagues on the Commission have wrestled with some tough questions involving Indian tribes who claimed they were cheated and otherwise financially abused in years gone by.

Witt is retiring from his job on June 30 at the age of 81. It was time and the rules of bureaucracy, not ill health or lack of physical and mental vigor, that is causing him to step down.

Under the regulations, Chief Witt should have been moved out some years ago, but no one noticed his calendar age as the Commission continued to function as well, perhaps even better, than it ever had.

The Indian Claims Commission, under Witt's direction, charted new courses in the law as it handled the cases brought before the agency.

The act creating the Commission gave it authority to settle claims in law and equity and on other bases and then added: "Claims based upon fair and honorable dealings that are not recognized by any existing rule of law or equity."

"This means applying the yardstick of fair and honorable dealings by our Government with the Indians," Witt said. "No other act I know of writes that into law."

The Indian tribes had 5 years in which to file claims. The cutoff date was in August 1951. Through 1959, the Commission allowed claims involving 20,602,341 acres of former Indian land and final judgments of $17,655,606 out of claims amounting to $123,824,395.

Some of the cases go back more than 100 years and are steeped in history at the time the white man, frequently backed by the Federal Government, was seizing Indian lands and paying the tribes little, even threatening them with disaster if they refused to accept the offers.

Edgar Witt was born near Salado, Bell County. He received his academic and law education at the University of Texas and began practicing law in Waco in 1906. He served as a State senator 12 years and was elected Lieutenant Governor in 1930 and 1932, serving under Ross Sterling and Mrs. Miriam Ferguson. In seeking his second term without opposition, he received at that time what was the largest vote any person seeking State office had ever piled up.

Witt made an unsuccessful bid for Governor in 1934.

Shortly after leaving the Lieutenant Governor's office, Witt was employed by the Dallas Chamber of Commerce and other interests to work for a $3 million legislative appropriation to help finance the Texas Centennial. Witt's efforts were successful and Congress followed with a similar appropriation.

Witt's long-time friend, Senator Tom Connally, told then President Franklin D. Roosevelt about Witt, and the Waco man was named chairman of a special Mexican Claims Commission to distribute $5,500,000 the Mexican Government had offered to make available to settle claims resulting from destruction of American property during revolutions. The Commission finished its work ahead of time. When Witt asked Roosevelt to terminate the agency, a shocked President said:

"I never heard of a Democrat quitting office before his job terminated."

Witt returned to Waco to resume the practice of law but was recalled to Washington in 1943 as Chairman of the American-Mexican Claims Commission. This was another agency to settle claims of American citizens against Mexico due principally to expropriation of American-owned land. This job ended in 1947.

Senator Connally and President Truman decided Witt was the perfect man for the job of heading the Indian Claims Commission when it was cerated. Witt knew little if anything about Indians, and a mild objection was raised against his Senate confirmation on that score. One group thought an Indian should be picked but the Senate believed otherwise.

Connally, with a twinkle in his eye, told Witt at the time that he thought, when he had urged his appointment to the Mexican claims agencies, that he was lining him up with a job that didn't require any work.

"But a lot of lawyers who have seen you operate are urging me to recommend you for this new job," Connally added.

Lawyers and others having contact with Witt on the Indian Claims Commission during the last 13 years want him to remain in spite of his 81 years.

They have pointed out that during the last 2 years he has rendered almost as many opinions and findings of fact as have been rendered by his two colleagues. They also refer to the fact that when the Chief Commissioner dissented from his colleagues, the U.S. Court of Claims has agreed with Witt's viewpoint in every instance.

Chief Judge Marvin Jones of the Court of Claims, a Texan, has indicated he would tell President Eisenhower that Witt shouldn't be allowed to retire if the White House asked his opinion.

Witt and his wife, the former Gwyn Johnstone of San Antonio, plan to live in either Austin or Corpus Christi when they return to Texas. Witt said almost all of his friends in Waco are dead.

BREAKUP OF THE SUMMIT CONFERENCE

Mr. HART. Mr. President, many comments have been made about the breakup of the summit conference, and we can expect many more comments to be made. I doubt whether we can expect any more reasoned or more moving comment than that made in an editorial published on yesterday in the Detroit News. The title of the editorial is "Requiem for a Summit—Innocence Age Ended."

I hope the editorial will receive very wide reading, and I ask that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the Detroit News, May 22, 1960]

REQUIEM FOR A SUMMIT—INNOCENCE AGE ENDED

Man must always look up, but today we look up to a summit that no longer is there. It is lost in a sky red with abuse. Yet the angry storm clouds that have made a mockery of our hopes do not have to be the shroud for our good intent.

The forecast is for more storms. But in the winter of our discontent and demolished hopes we cannot retreat to the foothills. We must go on, persevering for peace. We have failed, but we must still look upward.

We learn from failure. What have we learned this time?

We have learned something about ourselves.

We have learned that we have spy planes. We learned that we had violated another nation's aerial sovereignty and that because of equipment and men and luck we had been doing so unscathed for some time. We have been engaged in a dirty business which is made no more clean by the fact that neutrals who plan no war are engaged in it, too. Our age of innocence is past.

We were glad to think that the men who lead us had taken this elementary precaution to give us somewhere near an even break in a nuclear world where surprise attack and evil are concomitant. We were sorry we had been caught. But also we were dismayed by the Washington bungling that followed the denouement.

We had shot our U-2 arrow in the sky and when it fell we were not sly. We were just plain stupid. Never in the field of human handouts have so many owed so little to the few in authority who confused ourselves, our allies, and the uncommitted world by saying what they did not mean and meaning what they did not say.

We and the world have learned about Nikita Khrushchev and what he represents.

The last few yards to the summit for us were the toughest. Yet when we got there it was the bully boy who had baited the propaganda trap for us, who saved us from a fate worse than obloquy.

He who professed to want a world with no arms threatened to unleash his. He whose protestations of peace had given hope to the smaller NATO nations so near his frontier shattered his own loving cup. In fact, the only spirit of Camp David left in him was a raging hangover. He tore off his own mask. He was revealed as a Santa Claus with horns and an empty sleigh when the world had been led to expect from him the priceless gift of peace.

If we had bungled with a U-2, he fell flat on his face in exploiting our error. Some of our allies, nervous at being involved in our spying, were fortified in their will to maintain the Western alliance. We didn't get them back into line. Khrushchev clubbed them back.

He had won neutral good will by being a prime organizer of a meeting to reduce world tensions. He lost it by breaking up the meeting. He had nothing to offer but tears and blood.

Where do we stand now?

It is the tragedy of a generation that can split an atom that it cannot splice a divided world. We have created a nuclear terror and now are scared at living with it. And we know that if our ring finger was not on the pushbutton marked "retaliation" we might not even be living to be scared.

We and the Communists talk of uncommitted nations in the cold war, forgetting that in a hot one we commit all mankind because radioactive fallout knows no frontier of neutrality. We must, therefore, still press on to try to save ourselves, the neutrals and the Russian people themselves.

All this we know as the requiem for a summit begins. Yet it is not a time for morticians. We may beat our breasts, but we need not bury our hopes. Man never has, and that is why he can still look up even when no summit is there.

POLITICAL PARTICIPATION: THE 1960 SITUATION

Mr. HART. Mr. President, American political history reflects periods when the role of the trade-union movement in political action, and the role of business in political action, have been hotly debated. Because ours is a society which requires the broadest possible understanding and participation in developing the answers to our public questions, I have always felt that participation by both groups was proper and to be encouraged. In recent months, a great American corporation, the Ford Motor Co., has planned, and has now put into action, an imaginative and responsible program which will encourage political action and participation by all of its employees. It is my hope the program will prove most effective. The management of the Ford Motor Co. must have devoted much time and effort in the creation of this program, which is known as Ford effective citizenship program.

I ask that a speech which Thomas R. Reid, of the Ford Motor Co., gave at Detroit, Mich., on May 6, outlining the program be printed in the RECORD following my remarks. I ask this in the hope the speech may come to the attention of others who share the concern of Ford, and who may be moved to undertake a comparable effort. Since politics is the housekeeping job of a democracy, it is imperative that this free people pay close attention to this housekeeping job, lest we fail the test which is ours in this 20th century.

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

POLITICAL PARTICIPATION: THE 1960 SITUATION—MANAGEMENT PROGRAMS TO ENCOURAGE PARTICIPATION

(Remarks of Thomas R. Reid, of Ford Motor Co., at Industrial Relations Research Association, Detroit, Mich., May 6, 1960)

The great game of politics in America has become a spectator sport. It is like baseball—everybody loves to read about it and talk about it, but only a few of our millions of people participate actively for the full season in the two major leagues of either politics or baseball.

I have no plea to offer today for more sandlot baseball players, desirable as that may be, but I do urge that factory workers, farmers, housewives, businessmen, and other citizens of whatever occupation play a more active role in public affairs and politics.

The encouragement of political participation is not a union-management matter. This is something which clearly should be outside the realm of labor-business controversy and just as clearly is a matter of transcendent importance to all of the American people.

Anyone who approaches this subject in the context of business versus labor reflects an attitude already far too prevalent in America that practically everything in the public domain, including even the American system of representative government itself, has a labor side and a management side.

I say these things so bluntly at the outset of my remarks because I have been concerned from the time I first was invited to appear on this program about the wisdom of scheduling separate treatments of the labor point of view and the management point of view on this subject. The format itself suggests a debate or a disagreement.

In spite of this concern, I wanted to accept the invitation to participate in your program today because:

1. The subject of encouraging political participation is of such vast importance to the American people that free and open discussion of it should take place wherever the opportunity is presented.

2. There is active participation of the academic profession in the association. The widespread influence of what professors and teachers will be saying on this subject in our schools and colleges is so vital to a clear understanding of the topic for years to come that every opportunity to present the facts to the academic world should be welcomed.

The course of public affairs customarily has been shaped by the professional politicians and a relatively few interested individuals. This has come about not only because they have had so much to say on the subject while others have remained apathetic and silent, but because the politicians and these individuals too, oftentimes, have taken the trouble to inform themselves and work at this business of government while others have not. I would be the last to criticize those who are active and articulate in public affairs. My contention is simply that there should be more activity, more participation, more voices raised from all segments of American society, if we are to retain government of, by, and for the people.

Government in this country cannot be the private preserve of the professional elite, the political elite, the financial elite, or the organized elite of any category. In this age of specialization, it is interesting that two of the most fundamental responsibilities we have in a democracy—parenthood and political participation—are largely entrusted to amateurs. Parents have no choice. Once the offspring arrives he has to be taken care of—and parents learn by doing. It is different with our political responsibilities, however. No one really is forced to assume them. We can always let George do it—let him and Sam and Bill make the decisions and run our town, or our country, for us.

It seems far less important to me who does the encouraging of citizenship participation than that there be a great deal of encouragement from all quarters. I don't think of this as a question at all of whether unions or business should encourage participation—I simply think that everybody who loves his country should encourage participation.

This movement toward greater interest in political affairs that we have seen just in the past year or so should not be confined to business people. Everybody belongs in the act. It is every bit as desirable that lawyers, doctors, housewives, bricklayers, and bankers be encouraged toward more active citizenship participation by the organized groups to which they belong.

In short, there is absolutely nothing wrong in any group in our society with organizational influence over any category of citizens encouraging more active participation by such citizens. There is everything right about it.

Now, I recognize full well that exhortation alone will not produce wholesale citizen participation in public affairs. We are not going to see the great mass of the American people battering down the doors of their political clubhouses seeking admission. Apathy will always be with us so long as men retain their human shortcomings.

But I am not too discouraged by this. I hold to the optimistic view that a meaningful measure of new participation can be achieved by:

1. Creating a climate of positive encouragement;

2. Repairing the unfavorable public image of politics and politicians; and

3. Making politics familiar, acceptable, and convenient for people.

Business, and in particular the public relations and advertising fraternity, likes to think it knows something about shaping public images. Probably no group in America is in a better position than business to do something to correct the unfavorable public image of politics. One reason is that business is itself partly responsible for creating and fostering that unfavorable image. And the aversion toward politics heretofore so typical of business has had far more serious implications than just undermining the effectiveness of business in its dealings with government. It is not too much to say that it has tended to undermine the vigor of our free democratic system.

Prof. Andrew Hacker, the Cornell University political scientist, made this point in his widely quoted study on "Politics and the Corporation," published by the Fund for the Republic in 1958. He holds that the American corporation has helped to remove a great body of the middle class from any real participation in our political processes. And he shows that historically we have depended heavily on middle-class participation in public affairs for the success of our democratic system.

His indictment of the corporation was not that it seeks to dictate the political behavior of its people, but rather that its net influence is to discourage any participation by them in political affairs.

It is interesting to reflect that the many business firms which have announced political participation programs have been in remarkable agreement as to their fundamental philosophy. Considering the diversity in size, interest and management personalities of these many business firms, it is amazing in a way that there has been so little difference in the underlying tenets of the programs announced in the last year or so.

The businessmen in politics movement really began to gain momentum in America when businessmen finally admitted to themselves that representative government in America could best be served by urging able people to become active in both political parties and abandoned the idea that the only hope for America was building up one party and tearing down the other.

I don't know exactly how this particular business philosophy came into being. Some say that a brief paper by Raymond Moley first enunciated the principle subsequently so widely accepted by business. Others say that it just grew, like Topsy, and suddenly emerged full-blown upon the American scene. I do know that the first time we ever saw it in writing or considered stating it for our own company occurred on January 7, 1959, when I prepared a memo as a

draft policy for a Ford Motor Co. public affairs program. I said in that memorandum: "The proper role of the corporation in government and politics is twofold:

"1. The corporation should express its position on public affairs issues and legislation at all levels of government in which it has interest, either favorable or opposed, because anything which affects its business becomes its business.

"2. The corporation has no business in politics as a corporation but it has a responsibility as a community of interest in modern society to encourage its members of management and its employees to voluntary participation as individual citizens in the political party of their choice.

"I have in mind on this that there has been a great deal of confusion in interpreting the reawakened interest of corporations in government and politics as a move on the part of corporations to use their power and their money to strengthen the Republican Party in the same way the big labor unions have used their power and their money to strengthen the Democratic Party. I do not believe this is right. I believe that corporations' direct participation in a single political party would only compound the error and eventually make a farce of our two-party system by lining up corporate power and money in support of another party. The preservation of the two-party system is integral to the American governmental system and the real objective should be to improve the interest and participation of all citizens in both political parties and in governmental affairs to keep government representative of all the people."

This was adopted and continues to be our program. It is essentially the program of all businesses with public affairs programs in America today. Although the same statement of fundamentals may have been expressed in a thousand different ways in as many articles and speeches since January 7, 1959, this remains the essence of the business position on this subject. It thus far has met every contingency which threatened it. I think it accurate to say that it has won the support of the press, the public, the politicians and the people generally. I am sure this political philosophy for the businessman is here to stay.

This, incidentally, points up a significant difference between the company and the union approaches to political participation. While the general business attitude is that it is not a proper function of the company to take sides in a partisan way, the unions do so as a common practice. The AFL-CIO nationally has endorsed candidates for President. Local labor bodies endorse candidates for local and State offices, and much of the weight of the union organization is thrown behind the favored candidates.

Organized labor can and should press its views on the issues affecting it with vigor and candor, and it can and should urge union members to participate in political affairs. But I want it understood that I do not condone the employment of the union organization or of union funds for partisan political purposes, wherever that occurs. It is not right for a company to do it. It is not right for a union to do it.

But espousing a philosophy is one thing and putting it into practice is quite another. For purposes of illustration, I would like to outline to you how Ford Motor Co. launched its public affairs program.

Essentially, we have done three things: we have declared our intention to speak out as a corporation on important public issues; we have encouraged our employees to participate in political and governmental activities within their party; and we have tried to do our part in encouraging the spread of this activity by suggesting programs that may prove useful to smaller businesses and other organizations.

When we started, we had several things in our favor. We had a management that was wholeheartedly in favor of such a program, and we had a civic affairs office of 10 years' standing to serve as a nucleus for our new organization. In 1959, our management authorized the following expanded public affairs program:

1. A top management civic and governmental affairs committee, whose members include the chairman of the board and the president, was created to review legislative and governmental issues that affect the company and was charged with formulating positions on these issues.

2. A staff of public affairs specialists was assembled to engage in public affairs research and to plan and carry out a civic and governmental affairs program.

3. Eight regional offices were established to provide field services throughout the country. These offices were staffed with men with special knowledge of their area. One of their functions is to give direct assistance to local company management in civic and governmental activities.

4. An information program in public affairs was established. Management is reached through public affairs bulletins, employees are reached through plant newspapers, and dealers are reached through regular dealer publications.

Of course, we have always done some of these things. We have made our views known to stockholders, employees, elected representatives, and the public generally. We have spoken out on issues, testified before congressional committees, and participated in any activity that was important to us. But we hadn't recognized the importance of these activities to the health of the corporation and to our political system. Furthermore, we hadn't placed the emphasis where it belonged—on the individual.

In an effort to stimulate bipartisan interest in governmental affairs, Ford Motor Co. recently announced a novel plan aimed at encouraging its employees to work for and financially support the political party of their choice.

Meetings have been held in company locations throughout the United States during April to explain the plan, known as the Ford effective citizenship program.

The new program provides employees an opportunity not only to learn the mechanics of this country's political system but also to volunteer for service with and to contribute financially to the party of their choice.

The political training course, consisting of eight 2-hour sessions, to be held after working hours, and the party activity plan will be offered initially to supervisory employees of the company.

Because of practical problems involved in reaching the company's 120,000 hourly employees in plant locations throughout the United States except by mail, the company has communicated information on the program to them by letter, and will later distribute to all employees printed informational material on political processes.

The political party participation plan provides employees with an opportunity to decide voluntarily whether they wish to engage in politics, and to what extent.

It is not a discussion of issues, nor is it propaganda for anybody's views about legislation. Rather it will provide an understanding of the processes and techniques of political party committees, conventions, and election procedures in all levels of government.

At the risk of some repetition in order to illustrate the spirit of our communications, let me read to you at this point the full text of a letter sent in the first week in May to Ford Motor Co. employees, signed by the appropriate executive of each plant or office:

"The company encourages all its employees to take an interest in political affairs in the party of their choice as a citizenship responsibility. Under our free system of government such participation should be truly representative. Each party depends on the voluntary participation of individual citizens to maintain its program. Each party also depends on the voluntary contributions of individual citizens to cover the cost of political party operations and campaign expenses. These costs are particularly high in an important presidential election year like 1960.

"In order to provide a convenient method for Ford employees to contribute to the party of their choice, a simple contribution plan has been developed. The plan is designed to safeguard completely the privacy of each employee's party choice and to assure the employee that the company will have no knowledge of the confidential voluntary action that he takes as a private citizen.

"Enclosed for your use are a contribution card; an inner envelope and an outer envelope.

"If you wish to make a contribution, simply place your check, or cash if you prefer, with the card properly filled in, in the inner envelope. Then seal it and check the party to which you are contributing on the front of that envelope. Then, place it in the outer envelope, seal that envelope and drop it in one of the collection boxes which will be placed at convenient locations throughout the plant beginning Monday.

"Do not write your name or otherwise identify yourself on either sealed envelope.

"For your information, checks intended for the major political parties should be made payable to the (Democratic State Central Committee, or to the Republican State Finance Committee.)

"The contribution envelopes will be turned over directly to the proper representatives of the political party you have checked on the inner envelope. The collection boxes will be kept in the plants throughout the week beginning May 9.

"Which party you contribute to and in what amount you contribute is entirely up to you. Any support you give to the political party of your choice will help to strengthen our American political system.

"Signed by plant manager or appropriate local executive."

The contributions plan has the endorsement of the UAW-CIO. Following discussion of the proposed procedure with company officials, Ken Bannon, director, national Ford department, UAW, addressed a letter to presidents of all Ford local unions encouraging cooperation.

The initial indications of response to our new Ford effective citizenship course have been most encouraging. To date, with returns in covering over half of our supervisors throughout the country, we find that 31 percent of those attending the presentation sessions are enrolling in the course.

We know, naturally, that no such 8-week course will transform a neophyte into a skilled politician, or anything near it. What we do hope is that we will whet the appetite of at least some of the participants for more direct involvement in political affairs.

In one of our first courses, one of the men was asked to find out who his party precinct chairman was. He called the county committee, was informed that the post was vacant, and was asked to take it himself. He did, and he is now up to his elbows in local politics. And I'll bet he is having the time of his life. This little occurrence undoubtedly is being repeated time and again all over the country where business people are taking this type of course.

It is not our purpose to develop candidates for office, incidentally. However, if experience to date is any guide, some of our employees will certainly run for office and be elected. Hundreds already have served, or are serving, in some public office, normally a part-time one.

We firmly believe in helping to strengthen government in this way, and we give such employees all the recognition we can. We note their election or appointment in our employee publications, and often Mr. Ford writes them a personal letter of congratulations.

In addition, we have extended nationwide our practice of publicly presenting Community Service Awards to those employees, hourly and salaried, who have achieved success in any type of public service. And we have recently announced a leave-of-absence policy for those elected to full-time public office. This policy safeguards certain rights and benefits while the employee is away from the company. He is provided in effect somewhat the same assurances that are given to employees inducted into military service.

This brings me to the final activity I want to discuss this afternoon. Our civic and governmental activities are tailored to Ford Motor Co., one of the country's largest corporations. Many organizations, whether business concerns, professional associations, or other groups would find such a program beyond their scope. At the same time, they have an interest in political participation and we are looking for program guidance.

While a number of the larger companies have taken the lead in combating apathy and encouraging activity, they cannot do the job singlehanded.

Companies with less than 1,000 employees have 62 percent of all business employment. Even if all the larger corporations adopted and carried out effective participation programs, their efforts would have limited effect.

Recently, we suggested this nine-point program as suitable for adoption by most American business firms:

1. Study the problem of impact of governmental and political affairs at all levels of government on the individual business firm and determine the extent to which public affairs matters directly affect its business operations.

2. Consider the social responsibility of the company to the community, State, and Nation in advancement of the public interest.

3. Establish a written policy on company statements pertaining to public issues and legislative action on issues directly affecting it, and on encouragement of employees to express their individual convictions and participate in the political party of their choice.

4. Inform and educate employees on the importance of citizen participation in public affairs and political activity through discussion meetings or political training courses.

5. Take inventory of employees active in civic, governmental, or political affairs and give them suitable recognition.

6. Arrange for elected representatives in city governments and State legislatures to visit the company plants and offices and for key company executives to become acquainted with their Congressmen and Senators.

7. Devote a reasonable percentage of the total content of house organs, management bulletins, and other communications with employees, to the subject of public affairs and political participation.

8. Designate an executive within the company with functional responsibility for civic and governmental affairs, with the portion of his time allotted to it depending on the size of the company and the scope of the program undertaken.

9. Regard the public affairs program as a continuing added dimension of company activity; as a positive, affirmative program that must help meet community and national needs as well as needs within the company.

This is a course of practical, positive political action that may be adopted by any company in America.

Before I close, I would like to say that people sometimes ask us what motivates the businessman to enter politics. I have given you most of the reasons already, but let me answer one or two specific questions that often arise.

We are sometimes asked if we are not trying to create a big business party in this country, to build a massive business lobby, or to out-politic organized labor.

We do not consider our program an effort to do any of these things.

We have no intention of trying to create a big business party. A corporation, as such, has no business dealing in party politics. Should business align itself with either political party, it would be the surest way of creating a labor party.

As for creating a business lobby, let me make it clear that, acting as a corporation, we intend to articulate a business point of view on the public questions that concern us. We feel it is part of the democratic expression of all interested parties to make known the stand of the company on such matters, and we do not intend to be bashful.

At the same time, we realize that we must formulate a point of view that serves the public interest. It is often difficult to resist narrow, self-interested objectives. We realize that. But we are convinced that we must apply ourselves to public problems and attempt to offer truly constructive solutions.

Finally, we are not trying to outbid organized labor's interest in the political field. Mr. Henry Ford II said recently: "Despite the growing political power of labor unions, I think it would be a great mistake for businessmen to regard political activity in negative, stop-union terms. Business and unions could well be together on issues more often than they are apart."

The real issue in citizenship participation is not management versus labor but pressure groupism versus total democracy. There is nothing wrong with our Government or political system that participation by more people won't cure.

THE SUMMIT CONFERENCE—PARTISAN ATTACKS

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, unfortunately the spirit of Camp David, which both the Republican Party and the Democratic Party hoped would offer an avenue for peace, is dead. But here in the Senate Chamber, in the course of debate by many Members of the Senate, including the minority leader, we find that the spirit of the Republican campaigns of 1952, 1954, and 1956 is very much alive. We have been given a "flashback" to the 1952 speech by Vice President Nixon, at Texarkana, when he said that President Truman, Secretary Acheson, and Mr. Stevenson "are traitors to the high principles in which many of the Nation's Democrats believe. Real Democrats are outraged by the Truman-Acheson-Stevenson gang's toleration and defense of communism in high places"; and to his statement on television, in 1954, "Isn't it wonderful that we finally have a Secretary of State who isn't taken in by the Communists, who stands up to them?"

Today, we have had the rather peculiar spectacle of Republicans trying to document a defense of the administration with an English translation of a repudiated interview by a Frenchman with a leading American, the titular head of the Democratc Party.

It was also said that Senator KENNEDY, one of our most distinguished candidates for the Presidency, had stated that President Eisenhower should apologize to Premier Khrushchev. It was attributed to the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY]; but it never has been shown that such a statement definitely was made by him.

Mr. President, once I was a newspaperman; and I know something of the errors and confusions which come from discussing in two languages vitally important matter of State. I certainly am ready to take the word of Governor Stevenson that he did not say what he was quoted as saying in regard to pulling out of Berlin; and I believe that extreme attempts to stretch the truth, in order to give a wrong impression, have been made by Republican Members of the Senate today in the quotations which have been bandied about. They referred to statements made by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] when he was being interviewed. Obviously the interview by the Portland Oregonian was an extemporaneous matter, probably between speeches or between television appearances. He was asked about the Summit. What Senator KENNEDY finally said—and I do not believe this has been denied—was that he felt the President should express regrets over what had occurred. To determine what went on before that statement is like trying to read the minds of Members of the Senate as they search for words with which to express their meaning properly.

As Senators scraped the bottom of the barrel, to "document" these two alleged statements it is reminiscent of another Senator who once waved papers and shouted "I hold in my hand * * *." We are tired of that sort of procedure.

Mr. President, Americans are tired of the attacks which are made strictly for the purpose of diversion, in an attempt to light another fire, to try to direct attention somewhere else. If the members of the Republican Party here today are serious about bipartisanship, why did not all of them support—as some of them did—the proposed investigation of these matters which was advocated by the respected chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], whose remarks were echoed by the acting majority leader? They said it was going to be a factfinding inquiry, not a witch-hunting expedition. They said the inquiry would be made in as intelligent and as sane and as quiet a manner as the facts and the situation would possibly permit. Instead of supporting that approach, the Republicans seem to want to turn this into a sort of mock trial to try to discredit one of the leading candidates and the man who is the titular head of the Democratic Party.

I think if they had wanted to make a constructive speech—and one for which I would respect them—they could have

defended one of the seven fatal presummit blunders that led to the summit collapse, and gave to Mr. Khrushchev a tailormade excuse for breaking up the summit conference. None of them did so.

I heard no Republican speaker defend any of the seven tragic steps so clearly outlined by Governor Stevenson in his speech in Chicago last week. I do not know why they are trying to duck defending these steps, or how they can duck defending them, unless they are willing that someone should investigate them.

Certainly, Governor Stevenson was not the first person to point out these tragic errors. One of the great institutions of our country is the American press. The American press, no matter what their political orientation, universally reported this tragedy step by step. This was not just true of Democratic newspapers. Many of them which are extremely hostile to the Democratic Party published documentation of every single instance cited by Governor Stevenson in his speech in Chicago. If that be true, and considering the Governor's speech in this context, why do not the Republicans defend the administration against the charges of the press throughout the United States, rather than placing all their emphasis on Governor Stevenson's speech, and defend the tragic blunders that prejudiced our position to our great disadvantage at the summit? It would be far more valid for them to do that. I have never seen a time when the press of the United States so universally printed the cold, hard facts, regardless of the impact they may have had. Many writers have done a great job. I regret that I cannot place all the stories in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I do ask to have printed in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a number of columns which have appeared in the Nation's finest newspapers within the last few days. They are columns entitled "The Spy Business," by Walter Lippmann, "The U-2 in Paris," by Walter Lippmann, "First of All," by Walter Lippmann, "The Summit Tragedy," by James Reston, "Paris, How To Turn Defeat Into Victory," by James Reston, "The Democrats' Message to Eisenhower," by Arthur Krock, and "The Grim Outlook After the Summit," by Marquis Childs.

There are times of desperate national need when the American press redeems, in burst of greatness, the debt of all the sensationalism which it tolerates. This is such a time. Here, then, are the beacons of American journalism—Lippmann, Reston, Krock, Childs—burning with a light they only achieve when fueled by national necessity.

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

[From the Washington Post]

THE SPY BUSINESS

(By Walter Lippmann)

In the whirl of incidents following the capture of the spy plane the administration has ventured, perhaps the right word for it would be stumbled, into an untenable policy which is entirely unprecedented in international affairs. Our position now seems to be that because it is so difficult to collect information inside the Soviet Union, it will henceforth be our avowed policy to fly over Soviet territory, using the territory of our Allies as bases.

Although the intention here is to be candid and honest and also to make the best of a piece of very bad luck, the new policy—which seems to have been improvised between Saturday and Monday—is quite unworkable.

To avow that we intend to violate Soviet sovereignty is to put everybody on the spot. It makes it impossible for the Soviet government to play down this particular incident because now it is challenged openly in the face of the whole world. It is compelled to react because no nation can remain passive when it is the avowed policy of another nation to intrude upon its territory. The avowal of such a policy is an open invitation to the Soviet government to take the case to the United Nations, where our best friends will be grievously embarrassed. The avowal is also a challenge to the Soviet Union to put pressure on Pakistan, Turkey, Norway, Japan, and any other country which has usable bases. Our Allies are put on the spot because they must either violate international law or disavow the United States.

Because the challenge has been made openly, it is almost impossible to deal with this particular incident by quiet diplomacy.

The reader will, I hope, have noticed that my criticism is that we have made these overflights an avowed policy. What is unprecedented about the avowal is not the spying as such but the claim that spying, when we do it, should be accepted by the world as righteous. This is an amateurish and naive view of the nature of spying.

Spying between nations is, of course, the universal practice. Everybody does it as best he can. But it is illegal in all countries, and the spy if caught is subject to the severest punishment. When the spying involves intrusion across frontiers by military aircraft, it is also against international law. Because spying is illegal, its methods are often immoral and criminal. Its methods include bribery, blackmail, perjury, forgery, murder, and suicide.

The spy business cannot be conducted without illegal, immoral, and criminal activities. But all great powers are engaged in the spy business, and as long as the world is as warlike as it has been in all recorded history there is no way of doing without spying.

All the powers know this and all have accepted the situation as one of the hard facts of life. Around this situation there has developed over many generations a code of behavior. The spying is never avowed and therefore the government never acknowledges responsibility for its own clandestine activities. If its agent is caught, the agent is expected to kill himself. In any event, he is abandoned to the mercies of the government that he has spied upon.

The spying is never admitted. If it can be covered successfully by a lie, the lie is told.

All this is not a pretty business, and there is no way of prettifying it or transforming it into something highly moral and wonderful. The cardinal rule, which makes spying tolerable in international relations, is that it is never avowed. For that reason it is never defended, and therefore the aggrieved country makes only as much of a fuss about a particular incident as it can make or as it chooses to make.

We should have abided by that rule. When Mr. K. made his first announcement about the plane, no lies should have been told. The administration should have said that it was investigating the charge and would then take suitable action. We should then have maintained a cool silence.

This would have left us, of course, with the unpleasant fact that our spy plane had been caught. What really compounded our trouble, and was such a humiliation to us, is that before we knew how much Mr. K. knew we published the official lie about its being a weather plane. Then finding ourselves trapped in this blatant and gratuitous lie, we have tried to extricate ourselves by rushing into the declaration of a new and unprecedented policy.

[From the Washington Post]

THE U-2 IN PARIS

(By Walter Lippmann)

As of Monday, afternoon, eastern time, there is only the faintest chance that the summit meeting will not break up. It is certain that the President will not go to Russia, the invitation having been withdrawn. Thus the attempt to arrive at a truce in the cold war and to relax the tensions has, unless there is a diplomatic miracle, ended in a tragic fiasco.

The issue on which the conference has been disrupted is the flight of the U-2, or more precisely the position taken by the President and his administration. We must remember that when the plane was captured, Mr. Khrushchev opened the door to the President for a diplomatic exit from his quandary; he did not believe, said Mr. K., that Mr. Eisenhower was responsible for ordering the flight.

Undoubtedly Mr. K. knew that Mr. Eisenhower must have authorized the general plan of the flights but he preferred to let the President say what in fact was a sorry kind of truth, that he did not authorize this particular flight. The diplomatic answer would have been to say nothing at the time or at the most to promise an adequate investigation of the whole affair. Instead, Mr. Eisenhower replied that he was responsible, that such flights were necessary, and then he let the world think even if he did not say so in exact words that the flights would continue. This locked the door which Mr. Khrushchev had opened. It transformed the embarrassment of being caught in a spying operation into a direct challenge to the sovereignty of the Soviet Union.

This avowal, this refusal to use the convention of diplomacy was a fatal mistake. For it made it impossible for Mr. Khrushchev to bypass the affair. Had he done that, he would have been in a position of acknowledging to the world, to the Soviet people, to his critics within the Soviet Union, and to his Communist allies, that he had surrendered to the United States the right to violate Soviet territory. No statesman can live in any country after making such an admission.

The news from Paris on Monday shows that Mr. Eisenhower had already realized that his making an avowed policy of the flights was a crucial mistake which had to be corrected. On Saturday there was, it appears, a briefing of the correspondents to tell them that we had never meant to say that the flights would continue. On Sunday in a broadcast in this country Mr. George V. Allen said the same thing. And on Monday the President told Mr. Khrushchev that the flights over Russia have been suspended "and are not to be resumed." A week ago this might have sufficed to quiet down the affair.

The withdrawal was, however, late, and it may prove to have been too little. For during the past week the flight and the way it was handled have given the Soviet Government a rich opportunity to weaken the ring of America's allies around Russia. Those who say that Mr. K. has seized upon the opportunity solely in order to make propaganda have not, I think, realized the gravity

of the disaster which has befallen us. For the Soviet Union there is in this much more than propaganda. There is an instrument for disturbing if not disrupting the encircling alliance.

It would be wishful thinking to suppose that the Soviet Government will not seize this opportunity to push countries like Norway, Iran, Pakistan, Turkey and Japan into pledges and into measures which in some considerable degree neutralize them as American air bases. Morally and legally these allies of ours are defenseless against these Soviet demands.

The Soviet Government is at least as interested in neutralizing our allies around her borders as she is in neutralizing West Berlin. We dare not hope that the Soviet Government will not make the most of the opportunity which has so unexpectedly and so unnecessarily been opened up to her.

Before the affair of the plane, there had been, as Mr. Reston wrote on Monday from Paris, a strong indication that Mr. Khrushchev was very uneasy about the prospects of the summit meeting. I myself was one of those who talked to his personal emissary, Mr. Zhukov, when he came to Washington in April. The burden of Mr. Zhukov's complaint was that about March 15 American policy had suddenly hardened against a negotiation about the status of West Berlin, and that this was a reversal of the understanding given to Mr. K. by the President at Camp David.

Almost certainly, therefore, the affair of the plane offered Mr. K. an opportunity to make a diplomatic gain against the small encircling allies from Norway to Japan. If he was stymied in Berlin, he had the chance to recoup elsewhere. We have not heard the last of the troubles of the encircling allies.

There is not much comfort for us in this. For our own blunders provided Mr. K. with his opportunity.

At this writing it is still conceivable that a way will be found to carry on in Paris. Let us hope so.

[From the Washington Post, May 19, 1960]

FIRST OF ALL

(By Walter Lippmann)

Amid the wreckage, and as we recover from the shock, the long work of rebuilding will have to begin. Where must it begin? It must begin at the point where the most critical damage has been done. Where is that point? It is not in what Mr. Khrushchev said or did to us. It is in what we did to ourselves. It is that we "first did help to wound ourselves."

The wound has been made by the series of blunders on the gravest matters in the highest quarters. These blunders have not only angered the Russians and wrecked the summit conference but, much worse than all that, they have cast doubt among our allies and among our own people on our competence to lead the Western alliance on the issues of peace and war. Mr. Khrushchev's harsh and intemperate language has produced a reaction and evoked sympathy for the plight of the President. But we must have no illusions about the depth and the extent of the loss of confidence in American leadership, in the judgment, sagacity, and political competence of the Government in Washington.

This is the damage to which we must address ourselves. We are a free people, and one of the blessings of a free society is that, unlike an unfree society, it provides a way to deal with error and correct mistakes. This is to investigate, to criticize, to debate, and then to demonstrate to the people and to the world that the lessons of the fiasco have been learned and will be applied.

In a situation like ours the damage to our prestige would be irreparable if we all rallied around the President and pretended to think that there was nothing seriously wrong. For that would prove to the world that the blunders will not be corrected but will be continued, and that our whole people are satisfied with bad government. It is the dissenters and the critics and the opposition who can restore the world's respect for American competence. We cannot do this by pretending that the incompetence does not exist.

These are harsh words. But in what other words shall we describe the performance on Sunday night when the Secretary of Defense, who is in Paris as one of the President's advisers, ordered a worldwide alert of American combat forces? On Sunday night Mr. Macmillan and General de Gaulle were still struggling to find some way out of the affair of the spy plane. Yet this was the time chosen by the Secretary of Defense to stage a worldwide readiness exercise which, though not the last stage before actual war, is one of the preliminary stages to it.

Why Sunday of all days? This blunder was not the work of some forgotten colonel on a Turkish airfield. This was the work of the Secretary of Defense and of the President. The timing of the exercise was just a shade worse than sending off the U-2 on its perilous mission 2 weeks before the summit. The timing of the so-called exercise makes no sense whatever. For if the alert was concerned with a possible surprise attack, when in the name of common sense could there be less danger of a surprise attack on the Western World than when Mr. K. in person was in Paris?

Unhappily, too, Secretary Gates exercise was just about as incompetently administered at the top as was the affair of the spy plane. This time, it appears, the top people forgot to say anything about the exercise to their press officers who did not know what to say, and were not even in their offices, when the public was being frightened by the exercise.

A great government faced with a most formidable adversary, itself the leader, champion and mainstay of the non-Communist world cannot be conducted in such a reckless and haphazard way. That is the damage that first must be repaired before we can begin to deal with the general international wreckage, and to regain our confidence in ourselves.

[From the New York Times, May 19, 1960]

THE SUMMIT TRAGEDY—BREAKDOWN OF PARLEY SHAKES WORLD'S FAITH IN WISDOM OF TOP LEADERS

(By James Reston)

PARIS, MAY 18.—The tragedy of the Paris Conference, which ended tonight, is that it shook the confidence of the world in the wisdom and judgment of the two nations that hold the key to war and peace.

What troubled Paris tonight was not primarily what President Eisenhower and Premier Khrushchev would do now—which nobody knows—but the realization that the two most powerful nations in the world are also the least experienced of the great powers: both subject to the element of accident, to the ingrained habits of the past and to the whims of personal pride and caprice.

This was the conference that everyone lost. It did something no one thought possible: It outfailed the Paris Conference of 1919. After 41 years President Eisenhower, Premier Khrushchev, Prime Minister Macmillan and President de Gaulle made Wilson, Clemenceau, Lloyd George and Orlando look good.

It was this sense of uncertainty about the giants of the world that dominated the atmosphere in Paris today. Here was Mr. Khrushchev this afternoon in the great hall of the Palais de Chaillot shouting at the West, paying deference to the glowering Marshal Rodion Y. Malinovsky on his left and threatening to smash American planes like an impudent cat against a wall.

EISENHOWER SILENT AND ANGRY

Here, too, was the President of the United States, angry and silent, visiting cathedrals while his allies praised his dignity and sympathized with the failure of his last great chance for an East-West accommodation, but condemned in private his absent-minded behavior on the reconnaissance flights over the Soviet Union.

Everyone was trying to be very considerate and hopeful about the mess, but all had to admit it was a mess, brought on by the unplanned blunders of Washington and the savage, planned reaction of Moscow.

The general reaction to the two men was quite different. One was restrained, the other was violent; one was silent and defensive today, the other loud and offensive.

One was trying to remove misunderstandings, the other was exploiting them. But the main point was that both were shaking the world, one by accident and the other by design.

The nub of the whole thing seemed to be that both President Eisenhower and Premier Khrushchev, for different reasons, had lost control over the direction of the immense power they are supposed to govern.

The fact that the President came here and announced that he had grounded all flights over the Soviet Union for the rest of his term in office is clear enough proof that, if he had been aware of the fact of these flights at this sensitive moment, he would not have approved the flight of the U-2 that was downed in Soviet territory on May 1.

CONFIDENCE IN UNITED STATES SHAKEN

The President has conceded this here in his private talks with Mr. Macmillan and General de Gaulle. They do not condemn his objective or his personal motives: in fact, he is so obviously disappointed by the melancholy turn of events since the sky-spy case that the British and French leaders are more sympathetic to him now than ever before.

Nevertheless, the lack of control and discipline over the Central Intelligence Agency by General Eisenhower, and the failure of the State Department to retain civil authority over the administration's intelligence-gathering activities have inevitably shaken the confidence of the allies in the judgment of the Nation that is their primary line of defense.

Mr. Khrushchev lost control too, apparently for different reasons. General Eisenhower led his party out of isolationism, but Mr. Khrushchev has been engaged in the even more delicate operation of fraternizing with the "capitalist enemy."

By doing so, he was going against the militant Communist philosophy that nothing matters except the class struggle. Many of his own powerful associates in the Communist party's Central Committee apparently did not approve of the manner in which he was hobnobbing with the capitalists, and the Chinese Communists felt that this whole process of itinerant good fellowship was bound to create what they called "ideological confusion" within the Communist world.

So long as it appeared that Mr. Krushchev might sweet-talk the Russians into West Berlin, his jaunts were tolerated. But when this dream began to fail, and particularly when it was discovered that President Eisenhower was responsible for sending the U-2's over Soviet territory, the other leaders of the Soviet Union, it is felt here, demanded a change—with or without Mr. Khrushchev's approval.

Western leaders who were present at the Monday meeting at the Elysée Palace with Mr. Khrushchev got the impression that the Premier was nervous and perhaps even a little unhappy in his about-face role. But by this afternoon, he was as hard as Vyacheslav M. Molotov and as vivid and vituperative as Andrei Y. Vishinsky.

The last time Mr. Khrushchev saw Paris he was the benign and jovial "Mr. K". He made a special point then with President de Gaulle that their conversations should be held without anyone present except the interpreters.

JOVIALITY IS PUT ASIDE

This week all was changed. The "jovial Mr. K." became the arm-waving "naughty Nik," and Marshal Malinovsky was there as a witness of his every word and move, even when Mr. Khrushchev said goodby to President de Gaulle.

None of this was missed by the press of the world or the diplomatic corps of Paris, and the inevitable reaction was not only that the giants were quarreling—which always terrifies the world—but that they were blundering in a most extraordinary way.

This was particularly true of Mr. Khrushchev after he got well into his new role. He overplayed every card he had. He was rude and primitive. He was not only a boor, but what is worse in Paris, he was a bore. And instead of splitting the Allies, he even drove the press of London and Paris to the President's support, which is not easy to do.

There are the things that have spread the feeling of uneasiness about the leadership of the great powers. The two men who started out to reduce tensions ended up by increasing them here in Paris, and the question now is how far the present "dukes-up" attitude will go.

About this, no one really knows, probably not even Mr. Khrushchev. For until he gets back to Moscow and reports to the Central Committee, there is no way of knowing what will happen to Berlin, or for that matter, what will happen to Mr. Khrushchev.

[From the New York Times, May 20, 1960]

PARIS—HOW TO TURN DEFEAT INTO VICTORY

(By James Reston)

PARIS.—The official line of the U.S. Government on the summit conference is almost as surprising as the conference itself. For the White House theme, put out nightly by James C. Hagerty and his aids at official briefings, is that U.S. officials won a victory here over Nikita Khrushchev and solidified the Western alliance.

Even when allowances are made for the difficulties of any U.S. spokesman at the summit, this is an extraordinary claim, and it is all the more astonishing and even disturbing because some of the American officials actually believe it.

They justify their conclusion very simply. They merely leave out the U-2 spy incident and the contradictory explanations which followed it in Washington. All that, they say, is old stuff, whereas what happened in Paris, rather than Sverdlovsk, was pretty good.

On this sharply limited ground, there is something to be said for the argument. Nobody could have been worse than Khrushchev in Paris. It is not only that he was badmannered and inaccurate, but there were times in yesterday's press conference when he seemed almost out of control.

In the face of this obvious determination to try to humiliate and intimidate President Eisenhower, it is also true that President de Gaulle and Prime Minister Macmillan rallied to the President, and De Gaulle in particular handled a difficult situation with serenity and skill.

CATALOG OF DEFEAT

There is another gain: Unlike the summit conference of 1955, which concealed the hard realities of the East-West struggle (again with the aid of Mr. Hagerty's press-agentry), this one at least dispelled the rose-colored fog of the last few years and exposed the unpleasant truth.

Nobody is against expressions of sympathy for the sad conclusion of the President's efforts at accommodation, but the truth is unpleasant and dangerous, and it is not going to be handled by adding jingoism to sloppy staff work and absentminded administration in the White House.

This whole thing is not a victory for anybody. It is a serious defeat for Secretary of State Herter and his aids who did not alert the President to the dangers of these flights before the summit. It is a serious defeat for Allen Dulles and the Central Intelligence Agency for not coordinating the timing of the May 1 flight with the State Department's summit plans.

It is a serious defeat for the President and his whole system of delegating presidential power to subordinates at critical moments in the history of the Nation. It is a serious defeat for Prime Minister Macmillan, who defied 300 years of British diplomatic experience and pressed relentlessly for summit diplomacy. And it is a serious defeat for Khrushchev and his policy of coexistence.

There would be no point in going over this tiresome catalog of gloomy facts if there was any evidence that the President was now prepared to put his official house in order, but there is no evidence of this. On the contrary, we are now told officially that the relationships between the White House and the CIA, the State Department and the CIA remain the same.

SELF-PITY, SELF-DECEPTION

The events of the last few weeks have not only exposed the weaknesses of the National Security Council system within the U.S. Government but dramatized the failure of the alliance members to plan together in their common interest.

There has seldom been better paper preparation for any conference since the war than for this summit. Literally hundreds of thousands of words were written and exchanged among officials in Washington, Paris, and London. But the British and French knew nothing about the U-2 flight on May 1, and neither did the Turks, Pakistanis and Norwegians, who are now under threat of rocket retaliation from Moscow as a result.

Everybody in the top rungs of the U.S. delegation here agrees that the test of the alliance now lies ahead on Berlin. It is not going to be possible to coast and wait for the next administration. The pressure is starting now at a time when the confidence of the alliance in Washington's judgment has been badly shaken.

This is inevitably going to call for better administration in the United States and better coordination within the alliance, and these things are not likely to occur in a mood of self-pity or self-deception.

[From the New York Times, May 19, 1960]

THE DEMOCRATS' MESSAGE TO EISENHOWER

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, May 18.—The Democratic leadership policy toward the international crisis produced by Premier Khrushchev's sabotage of the summit conference is implicit in the telegram sent to President Eisenhower yesterday by four principal party spokesmen, and in a speech made to the Senate today by Majority Leader JOHNSON.

This policy is to keep the Nation united in the aftermath of the U-2 espionage episode, including the collapse of the summit conference, and to make certain the Soviet Premier realizes he cannot look to a Democratic administration for concessions on matters of principle he could not force upon the current Republican administration. The policy, furthermore, is to make sure Mr. Khrushchev fully understands that he cannot count on the Democratic leadership in Congress to make a partisan political issue of the astonishing series of recent Government stumblings in an operation area full of the explosives which could set off a nuclear war.

To understand the purposes of the telegram sent to President Eisenhower and signed by Speaker Rayburn, Senators Johnson and Fulbright, and Adlai E. Stevenson it is necessary first to know that it was sent yesterday before the summit conference had collapsed, not today after this had happened. The message was written and dispatched on information that there was to be another attempt to convoke the meeting with Mr. Khrushchev as a participant.

Noting that the Soviet Premier had mentioned "6 or 8 months" as a waiting period before a summit conference he would find any reason for attending, which, of course, meant after President Eisenhower's successor had been chosen, Senator JOHNSON drew two conclusions: One, that the Soviet Premier thought he could do more profitable business for his side with the Democrats in power; and, two, that it was in the paramount interest of the United States to inform him that assumption was unfounded.

In consultation with the other signers it was agreed that the President was the proper channel of views "to be conveyed" to the Premier (by any means the President might choose); also that this procedure furnished direct assurance to the President from responsible opposition leaders of their full support of him as the representative of the American Government and people. For a time today it was not made clear that the message was sent yesterday in the belief the summit conference might still convene. But when the timing became known, an impression died away that the Democratic leaders were suggesting the impossible, knowing it was, as a pretty hollow campaign gesture.

The same leadership attitude was inherent in a statement by JOHNSON to the Senate concerning means whereby Congress and the American people could learn the facts behind the U-2 episode. "We shall treat errors," he said, "as mistakes to be corrected, not as a leverage to separate our Nation." There will be "a cool and objective assessment of whatever mistakes have been made," but "under conditions and circumstances * * * to contribute to the information of the American people and the strengthening of the country * * * not as a search for scapegoats."

These words could be taken to forecast a formal congressional inquiry into the sorry executive U-2 record of quickly exposed denials and amateurish confessions, culminating in impression possibly left by the President's announcement at Paris, in an atmosphere of compulsion created by Premier Khrushchev, that the State Department was bluffing again when it left open the implication that the U-2 overflights would continue.

It appears, however, that the majority leader will not lend his influence to establish this kind of inquiry. Apparently he confidently expects the President to give the full facts in the U-2 record to the key congressional leaders and as much of these to the public as his estimate of security permits. It remains to be seen whether either account will furnish the answer to these prevalent questions:

Did the U-2 espionage overflights become so much of a "milk route" that nobody in the security complex gave a thought to the special hazard if an expedition were inter-

cepted at the time Powers' was? If nobody did, was this the consequence of poor judgment, entrenched bureaucracy or a mechanical lack of the coordination between act and policy that the National Security Council and the "secret subcommittee" of the Operations Coordinating Board were established to provide?

[From the New York Times, May 20, 1960]

THE DEMOCRATS' MESSAGE TO EISENHOWER—II

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, May 19.—There are occasions when a political party's interest and that of the Nation coincide and the result is an act of constructive statesmanship. The latest instance was the telegram of support which four Democratic leaders sent to President Eisenhower Tuesday afternoon when Western efforts were continuing in Paris to persuade Soviet Premier Khrushchev not to sabotage the summit conference.

The service of the telegram to the national interest was plain on its face. It demonstrated to Premier Khrushchev and to the American people that the opposition political party in the United States stands solidly with the party of the administration behind the President in this crisis. It also notified Mr. Khrushchev that, if his suggested postponement of 6 or 8 months implied belief that a Democratic President would yield to demands President Eisenhower had firmly rejected, he was very badly mistaken. And this statement of the Democratic position by four of its principal spokesmen—Speaker Rayburn, Senators Johnson and Fulbright, and Adlai E. Stevenson—further promoted the national interest by the precept of unity it commended to the American people.

The service of the telegram to the special interest of the Democratic Party in this presidential election year was not visible on the surface. But the signers were fully aware that the message to President Eisenhower and its contents would have this effect. They were also fully aware that this step needed to be taken promptly to protect the Democratic Party and its national ticket from the curse of preference by the Soviet Premier that he had indicated in his 6 or 8 months delay proposal and in his violent attacks on President Eisenhower and Vice President Nixon.

These threaten to create a psychology of interference by Mr. Khrushchev in the American electoral process. History has shown that this tactic by the representative of a foreign government can be fatal to the American political party for which it indicates a preference. The hazard unquestionably would be greater for the Democrats if they permitted a public impression to take root that the Soviet Premier has reason to hope for substantial concessions from a Democratic regime.

TWO-EDGED POLICY

Thus he supplied one of those occasions when essential political party strategy is indivisible from an act of the highest national statecraft. And Senator JOHNSON, in proposing the message to the President that was made authoritative by the identity of the signers, put his party in the happy position where it could achieve both objectives by a single stroke of policy. Though there is dissatisfaction in the ranks of the majority leader's veto of a formal congressional inquiry into the official sources of the incredible series of administration errors in the U-2 episode and the veto may be overridden in some committee, Democratic approval of the Paris message has been virtually unanimous.

But behind the nonpartisan front it presented to Premier Khrushchev there is a tumult of speculation in the political community over the effects of what happened this week in Paris on the prospects of the Presidential candidates. The questions being deeply debated are: Which Democratic aspirants for the nomination did Mr. Khrushchev's violent performance at Paris help or hurt? Will the collapse of the summit conference and its causes make Vice President NIXON a stronger or a weaker Republican nominee? Will party estimates of this bring any change in the prospective mood at Chicago?

It is far too early even to guess at answers that new developments in international tensions could alter fundamentally. But the following is a composite of the speculations heard among politicians here:

The new critical aspects of the world situation have raised the Democratic convention stock of JOHNSON and Stevenson. They also have given Senator SYMINGTON a better opportunity to exploit his pioneer criticisms of the Eisenhower military defense programs. They tend to accent unfavorably Senator KENNEDY'S youth and administrative inexperience. NIXON will be hurt in the campaign by his obligatory defense of Executive handling of the U-2 episode, but Khrushchev's attacks will make his nomination even more certain and help his electoral prospect.

Currently all this is only dope. But American politicians and people are incurably addicted to its use.

[From the Washington Post, May 20, 1960]

THE GRIM OUTLOOK AFTER THE SUMMIT

(By Marquis Childs)

PARIS.—With the end of negotiation between East and West—the ruin of the summit conference means scarcely less than that—the cold war warriors will try to take over both in the Soviet Union and the United States. The extent to which they succeed will be the measure of the danger in which the world now stands.

Of that peril there cannot be the least doubt. In a fall from the summit, where the Western powers had until quite recently talked themselves into a strange and unreal complacency, it is hard to stop at a halfway point.

The faction in Washington that has consistently opposed any understanding with Soviet Russia, however limited, is well identified. It consists, on the one hand, of the hard-core anti-Communists who are convinced that the Communist system is so immoral, wicked, and menacing to Western civilization that a policy that sanctions its existence is not acceptable. Somewhat less emotional but no less implacable are the men in the Atomic Energy Commisison and the Pentagon who are convinced that America's policy must be one of strength pushed to a point at which in one way or another it will overwhelm the Soviet Union.

The danger inherent in these attitudes is evident enough. At its furthest limit are the Pentagon planners who prepare detailed papers to prove that the United States can absorb 40 million casualties in a nuclear war and yet emerge the eventual victor. They will now be pushing for more ready alerts, greater defense appropriations, and an end to all contacts with the enemy to the east.

In the Communist bloc the faction convinced of the inevitability of the cold war is harder to define but it may be equally important in the equation of uncertainty and fear that we now confront. It is on the opposition of these elements that the best explanation of Prime Minister Khrushchev's violent and intractable behavior here in Paris may be found.

Little noticed outside the Communist bloc, a drumfire of attack on Khrushchev has grown louder in recent months. Coming in its purest form from Red China, the attack has centered in Khrushchev's heresy in the weird subterranean world of the Marxist-Leninist doctrine.

When President Eisenhower at his press conference last week not only accepted responsibility for the U-2 plane incident but seemed to be saying that he approved the continuance of such flights, Khrushchev was put in an extremely embarrassing position.

Whether, as satellite observers here insist and some Westerners agree, Khrushchev waited until Sunday night for a sign that Eisenhower would voluntarily disavow the flights is perhaps now irrelevant. What is important is that Khrushchev was compelled to react with a violence that would prove to his critics that he had discovered the error of his ways.

After all, as the American Ambassador to Moscow, Llewellyn Thompson, confirmed in reports to Washington, the Soviet Premier was preparing for Eisenhower's visit to Russia in June such a welcome as rarely has been accorded a citizen, to say nothing of a foreigner. This was being done for a hero of peace whose halo had been fastened on under Khrushchev's direction. With the unmasking of this hero Khrushchev was driven to react in violence.

But propaganda and violence to one side, there is a large element of genuine fear in the Soviet reaction to the U-2 episode. To ignore this, to assume that the cold, calculating Soviets have made every move at Paris out of cold calculation, is to indulge in a kind of ostrichism especially dangerous for this moment.

The Russians seem to have been anxious up until now to deny nuclear weapons to the Red Chinese. But what if Peiping, against the background of their rightness in the doctrinal dispute over communism versus capitalism, demands such weapons?

Once such weapons have spread throughout the two blocs, the chances of averting nuclear war are narrowed to a vanishing point. The boastful planners in Red China have proclaimed that they can absorb 200 million casualties in nuclear war and with their vast territory and vaster population they will be the only real survivor.

[From the Washington Post, May 19, 1960]

BOTH SIDES LOSE IN U-2 FRACAS

(By Robert Hotz)

The whole truth of Francis Gary Powers' 1,400-mile penetration of the Soviet Union in a Lockheed U-2 on a Central Intelligence Agency mission of photo and electronic reconnaissance has not yet been told.

Mr. Khrushchev's most blatant lie is his statement that the U-2 was hit by a Red Army antiaircraft missile at an altitude of 65,000 feet near Sverdlovsk after it had penetrated the air defenses of the Soviet Union for some 1,400 miles. This lie was necessary because the citizens of the U.S.S.R. could understandably grow uneasy over the admitted ability of the U-2 and other specialized aircraft to penetrate Soviet airspace consistently with impunity.

The fact is, and Mr. Khrushchev undoubtedly knows it, that Powers' U-2 had an engine flameout at the altitude that it and other U-2 aircraft cruised safely beyond the reach of the Soviet air defense system. The flameout forced Powers to descend below 40,000 feet where the denser atmosphere made an attempt to restart his jet engine feasible. Either Powers failed to restart his engine or his plane was damaged at this relatively low altitude.

Another obvious lie was used to bolster this originally false claim for the Soviet air defense system. A picture of some badly battered scrap from an Aeroflot TU-104 crash near Sverdlovsk last February was officially released by the Soviets labeled as the U-2 wreckage to convey an impression of terrible damage wrought by the antiaircraft missile. When this fake was exposed by

Lockheed's U-2 designer, C. L. (Kelly) Johnson, the remains of the genuine U-2 were finally produced for an exhibition in Moscow's Gorki Park.

Further contradiction of the missile hit scored at 65,000 feet was the Soviets' own claim that they recovered most of the U-2 photo and electronic reconnaissance equipment in good condition, were able to examine the cockpit ejection system in detail and to retrieve miscellaneous gear from the cockpit intact.

Nor is Mr. Khrushchev telling the truth when he announces that the Soviets have switched completely from bombers to ballistic missiles and that they no longer are producing or developing or exercising bombers because they are obsolete for modern warfare. The U.S.S.R. is still producing long-range jet bombers, although at far from maximum possible rates.

When we turn to the record of our own Government agencies involved in the U-2 adventure the record of deliberate falsification is equally bad. The series of interagency bungles give us a quesy feeling over what might happen in a real emergency with survival or defeat hinging on the speed and acumen of the official reaction.

First, there are the ivory tower researchers of the old NACA now with NASA who had their hard-won reputation for scientific integrity shredded overnight by the exposure of their role as unwitting dupes of the Central Intelligence Agency.

This damage to NASA's scientific integrity may count for little in the calloused calculations of CIA supersleuths, but it will do irreparable harm in the international scientific community where this country has many of its stanchest friends.

The official U.S. policy as finally stated by President Eisenhower some 10 days after Powers' U-2 hit the Siberian earth also carries some future forebodings.

It officially commits the United States to a continuous and deliberate policy of violating the Soviet airspace and formally makes espionage an integral part of U.S. policy. Although virtually every American citizen can see the need for continuous surveillance of the Soviet Union by whatever effective methods are available and will tacitly support these efforts, it is quite another matter to publicly announce that espionage and violation of another country's territory have become an official policy.

Third, of course, comes the Central Intelligence Agency, in this incident stripped of all its protective secrecy, and standing nakedly exposed in an incredibly amateurish performance compounded from inadequate training, faulty execution and rather transparent cover operations. Apparently, all that was adequately provided in this operation was the $30,000-a-year salaries for the pilots. Whatever reasons impelled Francis Powers to decline to carry out the traditional self-destruction orders of the espionage agent apprehended redhanded by the enemy may never be known. Suffice to say his embarrassing survival was not in the best tradition of either USAF, the agency that originally trained him, or CIA, the Agency that hired him without training him properly in its specialized requirement.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I could put into the RECORD dozens of editorials from papers like the Chicago Sun-Times, papers that have never supported the Democratic Party during the Eisenhower epoch, in which they concede the blunders.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD a full-page article from the Chicago Sun-Times of yesterday, outlining what these are. No one in his right mind would think the Chicago Sun-Times represents a position hostile to President Eisenhower.

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

[From the Chicago Sun-Times, May 22, 1960]

POLITICKING ON THE U-2

(By Milburn P. Akers)

The gift of 20-20 hindsight possessed by so many is now being demonstrated anew by some of the political opposition to President Eisenhower.

Few persons would contend the entire U-2 incident was conducted without fault. It wasn't. Nonetheless there is no assurance that the critics would have done any better, if as well, or that, had they been at the helm, the summit conference would have convened and solved any of the world's tensions even partially.

By this time it is obvious to most persons that Soviet Prime Minister Nikita S. Khrushchev went to Paris with the intention of aborting the conference as quickly as possible. It is equally obvious that he used the U-2 incident merely as an excuse for doing so.

Why he wrecked the conference which he himself had long sought is undetermined except by some of the theorists, many of whom will have a new theory in another week or less. His reasons, if any, will be clear some day. When they are, the U-2 and matters related to it will not be numbered among them.

To consider errors in the handling of the U-2 incident calmly, as mistakes to be corrected, not as a leverage to separate our Nation, as has been suggested by Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON, Democrat, of Texas, is statesmanship.

To treat them otherwise is politics.

Men's motivations are difficult to determine. So whatever motivations Adlai E. Stevenson may have had in his Thursday speech to Illinois Democrats can be left to his own conscience to determine. But the speech itself raises a lot of questions which Stevenson himself did not answer.

The occasion was political.

It is difficult to imagine anything more political than the manner in which Stevenson marshaled the various events in the U-2 incident and commented upon them. At no time did he concede that it is essential for the United States to obtain military intelligence. At no time did he concede that the Soviets have and are engaged in widespread espionage intended to obtain similar information. Everything done by the administration subsequent to the U-2 disclosure was a mistake, according to Stevenson.

He asserted that, as a consequence of the U-2, and events subsequent to it, Russia would no longer negotiate with the present administration.

To suggest, as Stevenson did, that only a Democratic President can negotiate with Khrushchev is politics, simple but not pure.

True, Stevenson did not say that in so many words. But no other construction can be placed on his statements.

He did say "they [the administration] have helped make successful negotiations with the Russians—negotiations that are vital to our survival—impossible so long as they are in power."

Vice President NIXON is an integral part of the administration. He is the likely Republican nominee for President. Unless Stevenson specifically excludes NIXON from the administration, which he didn't, and which he cannot, he was saying that negotiations with the Russians can be resumed only if the Democratic nominee is elected in November.

Stevenson said Democrats must "help the American people understand the nature of the crisis, to see how we got into this predicament, how we can get out of it, and how we can get on with the business of improving relations and mutual confidence and building a safer, saner world in the nuclear age."

Stevenson's speech didn't accomplish this result; didn't answer the questions he himself raised.

He merely said, in effect, that a Republican President had gotten us into a mess and suggested that only a Democratic President could get us out of it.

It's impossible to read any other interpretation into his verbiage.

Supposedly, Stevenson will amplify his indication that the Democrats have the solution for the "building of a safer, saner world in the nuclear age."

That's what every one wants, of course. But some persons must be forgiven if they have reservations that all this can be accomplished merely by a change of administration.

Unfortunately, Khrushchev, his colleagues, and their successors will have something to say about it, too.

Will Mr. K. and company recede from their position on West Berlin, merely to cite one example, as a consequence of the election of a Democratic President?

Stevenson's somewhat partisan speech may have served a partisan purpose.

It will not rank among the greatest.

[From the Chicago Sun-Times, May 22, 1960]

ADLAI GAINS GROUND

(By John Dreiske)

Ofttimes accused of being a bit of a starry-eyed amateur at practical politics by the professionals of his own Democratic Party, Adlai E. Stevenson has shown them he can be very practical indeed.

In fact, many of them privately but enthusiastically applauded Stevenson's apparent recognition of the fact that "bungling at the summit" currently is the biggest issue the Democrats have in the 1960 elections.

The former Illinois Governor showed himself to be not only a practical politician but a canny one as well. He was the first prominent Democrat to put into words the wonderment of many ordinary folks over the handling of the spy plane incident.

Stevenson now has an issue and he isn't likely to let go of it. He seemed to be appropriating the role of loyal opposition leader who has respect for the Presidency but sheds all hypocrisy in bringing out that the specific incumbent is not infallible and that there is evidence to indicate that he is not.

It is likely that Stevenson helped himself toward the Democratic presidential nomination at the July 11 Democratic convention in Los Angeles.

The opportunity to make himself an issue which, in a sense, was ready-made and to exploit it came at a most opportune time. Stevenson's principal competition for the nomination, Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY Democrat, of Massachusetts, was embroiled in a crucial Oregon primary on the eve of the voting when caution probably dictated no chance-taking.

But Stevenson, with little to lose and much to gain, could take the chance he did take that he would not be denounced by the general public for being a bit of a traitor by not adhering to charitable sweetness and light treatment of the President.

Stevenson said he thought it "unfortunate" that the spy plane fuss and the summit collapse should have occurred in a campaign year. He must be credited with the realistic knowledge that, as they clamor for "unity" to support the President right or wrong, the Republicans are playing politics right to the hilt.

Whether he has hurt his own cause or not, Stevenson probably has done his party a service whichever nominee it selects at Los

Angeles. Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON is the most likely GOP presidential nominee at the moment; failure at the summit is now highlighted as Republican failure and NIXON is a Republican, an important part of the Eisenhower administration.

Republican efforts to disassociate NIXON from Ike's handling of the spy plane matter leading to the summit collapse probably will be difficult to say the least. Such efforts must include a sort of public shelving of Mr. Eisenhower himself. In such a circumstance, a party split is something to be looked for and then maybe Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller, of New York, can run through this hole in the line. At any rate, any possible GOP split is, of course, to the Democrats' advantage. And Stevenson has spectacularly set the stage for such a division.

Mayor Daley's withholding of approval of Stevenson's sentiments expressed at Thursday night's $100-a-plate fund-raiser at the Conrad Hilton Hotel was notable and probably will chill those Illinois convention delegates who look to Daley for their national convention cue.

The mayor's reluctance might be traced to his reported loyalty to KENNEDY'S candidacy. It could logically be presumed, perhaps, that Daley would not want to seem to be switching to Stevenson at a time when even the flick of a facial expression is interpreted by eager pundits as an expression of partiality toward this candidate or that.

It should also be noted that, with his 7-minute speech, Stevenson ran the official star of the evening, CHESTER BOWLES, right out of the spotlight.

[From the Chicago Sun-Times, May 22, 1960]

FACTS NEED FACING

(By Joseph Alsop)

PARIS.—After the ugly scenes of the aborted summit meeting, it is wise to make up a sort of balance sheet of facts to be faced.

The first fact that needs facing, alas, is the grave loss of prestige and confidence that President Eisenhower has suffered. As Walter Lippmann has written, it is right that men of all parties should rally to the President, but it is also wrong to be self-deluding. The affair of the U-2 has caused America's greatest friends in the Western alliance to conclude that America's present leadership is bumbling and maladroit.

The second fact to be faced is less painful to American self-esteem but decidedly more alarming. The leadership of the other great world bloc is even more dangerous and implacable than all but the worst of pessimists had imagined in their gloomiest moments.

After seeing Nikita S. Khrushchev do everything but froth at the mouth and chew the carpet at his incredible press conference, a great many observers in Paris began to use the grim adjective "Hitlerian." But those who know the man best believe that he was doing this from calculation.

But even if Khrushchev is not semilunatic, as Adolf Hitler was, the consolation is trifling.

As for the third and final fact to be faced, it flows directly from the second. A major effort to strengthen the military defenses of the West is now a matter of great urgency.

There are two reasons why a strengthened defense effort is now urgent. No one doubts Khrushchev is capable of striking at the United States and the West with every bomb in his arsenal.

The main things that need doing are the same things that were discussed during the debate on national defense at the beginning of the year. Appropriations are needed to inaugurate a maximum airborne alert of the Strategic Air Command's entire force of B-52 bombers. The airborne alert ought to begin now, and continue at full strength until the U.S. striking power in long-range guided missiles has been massively augmented.

Similarly the buildup of the long-range missiles ought to be increased in every way possible, and every dollar should be appropriated that can be used to speed the two reconnaissance satellite projects, Midas and Semos. In addition, the affair of the U-2 plainly proves the shortsightedness of the policymakers who have cut back production of the B-52H bomber almost to zero.

Here is a bomber with the range, speed, and altitude characteristics that will allow it to imitate the U-2's performance. It can go almost where it will in the skies above the Soviet Union, just as the U-2 did for so long. It is not menaced, so far as is known, by improvements in the Soviet air defense system, whereas the B-52, flying at lower speeds and at somewhat lower altitudes, may well be menaced later on.

It is hard to understand how any policymaker can have all but stopped production of the B-52H bomber, with the example of the U-2 before his eyes. But this is what was done. And this is what should now be undone as far as possible.

More costly defense programs; still deeper distrust of the Kremlin; apologies needed for our own leadership's performance—they make an unpleasant list, but we have now been warned. It can be very dangerous indeed if the warning is ignored.

Mr. MONRONEY. We have before us today this documentation by an almost unanimous American press, and yet we find the minority leader going to a French correspondent, to a story carried in a French newspaper, translated back into English and printed here, and denied by the man who was allegedly quoted, and saying "I hold in my hand the documentation."

Then we have this example, and this is only an example, of turning the word "turncoat" into "turn quote," or vice versa. Now "turn-quote" is an interesting word, but in Webster's giant dictionary, where there appear the words "turn back," "turn out," "turn over," "turn tail," and all the other "turns," I cannot find "turn quote."

It seems to me it might be an afterthought. I do not blame anyone for wishing to change that word of opprobrium against a respected American.

It seems to me, in times like these, we ought to do what the press itself is doing, and ask the questions, "Who? What? When? Why? Where?" What happened to so diminish America's world stature on the eve of the summit conference? Was this flight necessary? Why the original handling of it and the blunder of calling it a weather plane? Why give to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration—one agency of government which, if we are to reach an understanding on science with the other nations, should be above suspicion—the handicap of being used to cover intelligence operations? Why, after the denials, and counterdenials, and reasons that were manufactured, then admit that this was done, and admit it had been done for 4 years? That factor was not in question at all.

Then why did we leave in question for so many days whether these flights would be continued? The world's press interpreted official statements to mean that they would be continued, on the eve of the conference. Then, when that position was changed, apparently someone forgot to notify the information officer. When it was possible to have those facts go to the world and the Paris Conference, the message somehow did not get out.

But the worldwide alert did receive publicity attention. Mr. President, out West people did not reach for their guns at a poker table, unless they saw some danger of shooting. Certainly I would not have thought the alert to be necessary with Khrushchev in France, so that a catastrophic thermonuclear war would result in losing the Russian Chief of State.

It seems to me the best way to go about this matter is to have an investigation, which I think the Foreign Relations Committee can make, into the presummit position. There was much complaint about it. The distinguished Senator from Tennessee and many others complained before the Senate that there not much preparation was being made. Little did we know that the preparations some people, somewhere, somehow, were making were dangerous, more dangerous than the lack of programs for the success of the summit.

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

Mr. MONRONEY. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. SYMINGTON. First, I wish to congratulate the Senator from Oklahoma for one of his typically clear presentations to the Senate. Every Member of this body knows he speaks only with the facts. In my opinion, this morning he has made a great contribution to the security of our country.

I ask the Senator: Is it not the function of the legislative branch to look into matters of this character in order to find out how they happened, and make recommendations on a constructive basis so as to prevent their happening in the future?

Mr. MONRONEY. I agree completely with the Senator. Democracy can only purify, correct, and eliminate future error by constructive criticism. The only ones who can properly do this—I think the only ones who should do this—are the opposition. It is the duty of the opposition at least to point the finger at the need. This we have done. Our leading Democrats are criticized in the most intemperate language for pointing the finger at some things which the newspapers in the United States have universally decried as blunders.

As Governor Stevenson said:

> We cannot sweep this whole sorry mess under the rug in the name of national unity. We cannot and must not. Too much is at stake. Rather we must try to help the American people understand the nature of the crisis, to see how we got into this predicament, how we can get out of it, and how we get on with the business of improving relations and mutual confidence and building a safer, saner world in the nuclear age.

This is the day of loyal opposition.

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

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that chronological statement of the facts with respect to the U-2 incident be printed in the RECORD, in support very completely of the position taken by the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. MONRONEY. Does the Senator have that information prepared?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I have the information.

Mr. MONRONEY. I am delighted to have it printed in the RECORD.

Mr. President, I welcome this information, because it is very important if we are going to face this program like men instead of like children. We should not try to say, in the name of national unity, that we must continue to tolerate great, tragic errors which go on uncorrected.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The article to which I refer was written by the Associated Press, and was published May 17, 1960. The headline is "Chronological Account of U.S. Reports on U-2."

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator says it is an Associated Press article?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Yes.

Mr. MONRONEY. I think we can all trust the Associated Press not to editorialize on behalf of the Democratic Party.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the Senator. I again congratulate the Senator.

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

CHRONOLOGICAL ACCOUNT OF U.S. REPORTS ON U-2

Following is a chronological account of conflicting statements and comments about the spy plane incident as made by administration spokesmen and agencies.

May 6 (5 days after the flight), an announcement by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration:

"One of NASA's U-2 research airplanes, in use since 1956 in a continuing program to study gust-meterological conditions found at high altitudes, has been missing since about 9 o'clock Sunday morning, when its pilot reported he was having oxygen difficulties over the Lake Van, Turkey, area.

"If the pilot continued to suffer lack of oxygen, the path of the airplane from the last reported position would be impossible to determine. If the airplane was on automatic pilot, it is likely it would have continued along its northeasterly course.

"The pilot, as are all pilots used on NASA's program of upper atmosphere research with the U-2 airplane, is a civilian employed by the Lockheed Aircraft Corp., builders of the airplane.

May 6: Comment by State Department Spokesman Lincoln White at a news conference:

QUESTION. "Has there been any change in the orders under which the planes continue to operate in the vicinity of the Soviet border?"

Mr. White: "There is no change to be made. This gentleman (the pilot) informed us that he was having difficulty with his oxygen equipment. Now our assumption is that the man blacked out. There was absolutely no—n-o—deliberate attempt to violate the Soviet airspace."

May 7: Statement by the State Department:

"As previously announced, it was known that a U-2 plane was missing. As a result of the inquiry ordered by the President it has been established that insofar as the authorities in Washington are concerned there was no authorization for any such flight as described by Mr. Khrushchev.

"Nevertheless it appears that in endeavoring to obtain information now concealed behind the Iron Curtain a flight over Soviet territory was probably undertaken by an unarmed civilian U-2 plane.

The "necessity for such activities as measures for legitimate national defense is enhanced by the excessive secrecy practiced by the Soviet Union in contrast to the free world."

"It is in relation to the danger of surprise attack that planes of the type of unarmed civilian U-2 aircraft have made flights along the frontiers of the free world for the past 4 years.

May 7: Comment by White House Press Secretary James C. Hagerty when asked about a report that Mr. Eisenhower has ordered a halt to all further spy fights over Russia:

"I know of no such order."

May 7: Statement by Secretary of State Herter:

"In accordance with the National Security Act of 1947, the President has put into effect since the beginning of his administration directives to gather by every possible means the information required to protect the United States and the free world against surprise attack and to enable them to make effective preparations for their defense.

"Under these directives programs have been developed and put into operation which have included extensive aerial surveillance by unarmed civilian aircraft, normally of a peripheral nature but on occasion by penetration.

"Specific missions of these unarmed civilian aircraft have not been subject to Presidential authorization."

May 9: Comment by Mr. White at second news conference:

Mr. White: "As this statement says, it is incumbent upon us to take any measures we can to guard against surprise attack."

Question: "You realize that a normal interpretation of this would be that we intend to continue?"

White: "Well, I will leave it to your interpretation."

May 12: President Eisenhower said at his news conference:

"No one wants another Pearl Harbor. This means that we must have knowledge of military forces and preparations around the world, especially those capable of massive surprise attack. The safety of the whole free world demands this."

"We do not use our Army, Navy, or Air Force for this purpose, first to avoid any possibility of the use of force in connection with these activities, and second because our military forces, for obvious reasons, cannot be given latitude under broad directives but must be kept under strict control in every detail.

"The normal agencies of our Government are unaware of these specific activities or of the special efforts to conceal them.

"How should we view all this activity? It is a distasteful but vital necessity."

May 12: U.S. note replying to Russia's protest:

"In its note, the Soviet Government has stated that the collection of intelligence about the Soviet Union by American aircraft is a 'calculated policy' of the United States.

"The U.S. Government does not deny that it has pursued such a policy for purely defensive purposes. What it emphatically does deny is that this policy has any aggressive intent, or that the unarmed U-2 flight of May 1 was undertaken in an effort to prejudice the success of the forthcoming meeting of the heads of government in Paris or to return the state of American-Soviet relations to the worst times of the cold war.

"Indeed, it is the Soviet Government's treatment of this case which, if anything, may raise questions about its intention in respect to these matters."

May 15: Comments by George V. Allen, Director of the U.S. Information Agency, in replying to questions on a television panel show (ABC's "College News Conference"):

Mr. Allen: "I will say that I know that the spokesman of the State Department who gave out the information was acting in entirely good faith when he said that it was a weather plane.

"There has been a great misunderstanding that I would like to correct today. Mr. Herter, the Secretary of State, has not said that we are going to continue to fly. He has said that there is an obligation and a responsibility on the part of the Government of the United States and of the free world to try to obtain information to guard against surprise attack but he has not said that we are going to continue to fly. He hasn't said one way or another."

May 15: Vice President NIXON, answering questions on the television program "Open End":

"There is never a right time to make one of these flights if you're going to get caught.

"The plus is this. You realize that this flight clearly demonstrates the feasibility of the 'open skies' proposal of the President.

"This flight demonstrates that unarmed planes can take photographs without causing any damage, any harm at all to commercial aviation or the national security of the country over which the flights are made."

May 16: Mr. Eisenhower's remarks at summit meeting in Paris:

"We pointed out that these activities (plane flights) had no aggressive intent but rather were to assure the safety of the United States and the free world against surprise attack by a power which boasts of its ability to devastate the United States and other countries by missiles armed with atomic warheads.

"There is in the Soviet statement an evident misapprehension on one key point. It alleges that the United States has, through official statements, threatened continued overflights. In point of fact, these flights were suspended after the recent incident and are not to be resumed."

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield briefly?

Mr. MONRONEY. I am happy to yield.

Mr. CLARK. It occurs to me—and I ask my friend from Oklahoma if he agrees with me—that this would be a good place to ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a series of eight questions concerning the chronology of events about which the Senator from Missouri has spoken. These questions were asked by a number of Members of the House of Representatives of President Eisenhower. In my judgment, these eight questions go to the heart of this situation. I commend my friends in the other body for taking this action. I ask the Senator to request that the questions be printed.

Mr. MONRONEY. I wish we could have the names of all those asking the questions. I think already some 35 or 40 brilliant young Members of the other

body have signed the statement. Does the Senator know the names of those who have signed?

Mr. CLARK. I know that Representative CHESTER BOWLES and Representative JAMES ROOSEVELT are among the ones who have signed, but I do not have the names of the others.

Mr. MONRONEY. Representative METCALF is another.

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

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

COPY OF QUESTIONS ASKED BY GROUP OF HOUSE LIBERAL MEMBERS IN LETTER TO PRESIDENT EISENHOWER ON MAY 20, 1960

We are distressed over the collapse of the summit meeting and the damage to our prestige and leadership in the world. The cause of world peace has been endangered. We believe that Congress and the people must ask the following questions. We believe it is the administration's responsibility to answer these questions:

1. Why was the U-2 flight over the Soviet Union ordered just prior to the summit meeting?

2. When the U-2 incident became public, why was a series of contradictory and false statements issued by administration officials—and who was responsible?

3. Why did the administration order a worldwide military alert from Paris on the eve of the summit?

4. Why did the administration first indicate that as a matter of national policy it would continue manned flights over Russia, and then reverse itself and say that it had ordered them discontinued?

5. Was it necessary to compromise the announced peaceful role of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) by using it as a cover for an espionage operation?

6. Why was there no coordination between the agency responsible for the U-2 flight and the agency responsible for our diplomatic functions?

7. Why did the President announce in advance that as our Chief of State he might return to Washington before the conference ended?

8. Has the traditional American policy of civilian supremacy over the military been impaired?

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

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I desire to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma and to congratulate the Senator upon the clarity of his remarks, and his service to this body and to the American people by answering the scurrilous attack made within these walls today upon two great Americans. The very party which calls for unity is doing everything it can, by this type of scurrilous attack, to assure there will not be any unity.

The attack made upon these two great Americans was a typical example of partisan Republican so-called bipartisanship.

The distinguished Senator from Oklahoma has clearly exposed the fallacy of the attack.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank my distinguished colleague.

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

Mr. MONRONEY. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I cannot resist suggesting some additional documentation for the points the distinguished Senator has been making.

Mr. MONRONEY. I would welcome the information.

Mr. MUSKIE. On this past Sunday I happened to be in Des Moines, Iowa. I purchased a copy of the Des Moines Sunday Register, for May 22, 1960. The lead editorial had the following to say with respect to one of the distinguished Democrats who has been referred to so vehemently this morning:

But the President knows also that a period of harsh questioning and some political maneuvering is ahead in this election year. The speeches made Thursday night by Adlai E. Stevenson, the titular head of the Democratic Party, and by U.S. Representative CHESTER BOWLES, an adviser on foreign policy to presidential candidate JOHN KENNEDY, make this very evident.

The views and criticism of such responsible and well-informed leaders as Stevenson and BOWLES are welcome. The administration's handling of foreign policy is a proper matter for discussion at any time, and especially during a presidential campaign. Restraint, of course, is called for.

Mr. Stevenson did exercise restraint in his talk. It was made after he had earlier signed a telegram, along with Senators Johnson and Fulbright and House Speaker Rayburn, sent to Mr. Eisenhower in Paris. This telegram was intended to make it clear to Soviet Premier Khrushchev that he could not expect concessions from a Democratic administration that would not be made by a Republican administration.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD in its entirety at this point.

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

[From the Des Moines Sunday Register, May 22, 1960]

IKE'S SAD HOMECOMING

It was a sad, not a triumphal, homecoming for President Eisenhower when he returned to Washington Friday. His primary goal in his last year in office has been to bring about some easing of tensions between the Soviet Union and the United States, some tangible progress toward agreements that would end the cold war and make a war of annihilation impossible. These hopes are now crushed by what happened at the summit conference in Paris.

The sympathy of all Americans, Republicans and Democrats alike, is extended to Mr. Eisenhower at this time. This is the meaning of the big reception he received in Washington and of such heart-warming events as a "Welcome Home Eisenhower" day in far-off Oelwein, Iowa. It is not, of course, rejoicing over the failure of the summit conference.

The President can be assured, we feel certain, that there is unity in the United States on basic goals, of resistance to Communist aggression and of a desire, as Mr. Eisenhower said in Portugal, to work with other members of the United Nations and our partners in NATO "in the common cause of peace and justice for all men."

But the President knows also that a period of harsh questioning and some political maneuvering is ahead in this election year. The speeches made Thursday night by Adlai E. Stevenson, the titular head of the Democratic Party, and by U.S. Representative Chester Bowles, an adviser on foreign policy to Presidential Candidate John Kennedy, make this very evident.

The views and criticism of such responsible and well informed leaders as Stevenson and BOWLES are welcome. The administration's handling of foreign policy is a proper matter for discussion at any time, and especially during a presidential campaign. Restraint, of course, is called for.

Mr. Stevenson did exercise restraint in his talk. It was made after he had earlier signed a telegram, along with Senators Johnson and Fulbright and House Speaker Rayburn, sent to Mr. Eisenhower in Paris. This telegram was intended to make it clear to Soviet Premier Khrushchev that he could not expect concessions from a Democratic administration that would not be made by a Republican administration.

Mr. Stevenson did not express the view, as had Senator Kennedy, that the President of the United States should have apologized to Khrushchev about the U-2 spy incident. He said Khrushchev had made an "impossible" demand on Mr. Eisenhower. He also pinned the blame for the wrecking of the summit conference on Khrushchev—but contended that the administration by its "carelessness and mistakes" had made it very easy for the Soviet Premier to wreck the conference. Mr. BOWLES took a similar view: he called for "constructive" debate and a reexamination of the administration's record on foreign relations.

There is very good reason to believe that Khrushchev would have wrecked the summit conference if there had been no U-2 incident and its aftermath of diplomatic blundering. Just why, when he had worked so strenuously to get a conference, is uncertain. The most likely theory is that Khrushchev had finally realized that he couldn't get concessions he wanted from the West on the Berlin and Germany issues. Pressures from Red China and from Communist rivals in Russia are other possible explanations.

But mistakes were made by the administration in its handling of the U-2 affair. The explanation for these mistakes, which may or may not be made in the near future, may clarify the situation somewhat. The mistakes indicate the need, as James Reston points out in his article on today's editorial page, for studying the relationship between the White House and the CIA, whether the National Security Council system is functioning properly and whether there is a failure to coordinate our activities with those of our NATO allies.

A presidential campaign is not the ideal time for studying these problems. But they can't be entirely ignored just because there is a campaign. So foreign policy, and the administration of it, will be an issue.

We can only hope that the discussion and debate will be kept on a high level which will make it clear, to the Communists and to our allies, that there is national unity on our goals and aspirations.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, would the Senator from Oklahoma appreciate having some additional documentation?

Mr. MONRONEY. I would appreciate it. I think we are making a pretty good record. Certainly it is a physical impossibility to print the hundreds upon hundreds of stories, all in the same vein, with regard to the error, the blunder, and the need for correction, which the Senator is documenting from these papers published far away from Washington, D.C. I am sure these are not Democratic newspapers.

Mr. MUSKIE. No. The documentation which I now offer the Senate is from the grassroots—from the Maine grassroots. I suggest to the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma that the Maine voters are restrained people. They are not inclined to write inflammatory letters.

I picked up these three letters on my way to the floor, simply as an illustration of the kind of mail I am receiving these days on this subject. I read to the Senator a part of one of the letters:

DEAR SENATOR MUSKIE: I wish to express my opinion of the recent "summit conference."

The Russians never got a chance to sabotage the conference, we did it first.

I read another selection from the same letter:

Mr. Eisenhower had no right to so disgrace the United States. I am furiously resentful of the whole performance as well as embarrassed by it. This is my country, too. We had better start electing Presidents who are young enough to keep their wits until they finish their terms.

I read from a letter from another constituent:

Reluctantly, I feel obliged to express to you my bewilderment and horror at the manner in which our Government is handling its foreign policy. I resent having to appear, out of loyalty, to condone behavior which I consider to be both disgraceful and inept.

The same constituent also writes:

Could it be that the President, with his apparent distaste for work, has left too much control to undesirable underlings? We have a right to know what is being done in our name since the contradictions and the propaganda of the Government have rendered their policy and their methods entirely unintelligible.

I quote from one further letter from a constituent:

DEAR SENATOR MUSKIE: This letter is written as a protest at the inept handling, by the administration, of the U-2 incident. But, more particularly, at the series of blunders perpetrated after the incident.

This constituent further says:

I have been a registered Republican in the State of Maine for 25 years. I shall vote Democratic in the presidential election.

I offer these few excerpts from letters by constituents for the RECORD, to indicate there is a cry which I have heard from all over the country for answers to questions which are deeply troubling people. I may say I traveled this past weekend into Minnesota and Iowa. These are people at the grassroots, people who have no political axes to grind whatsoever.

I think the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma is rendering a distinct service to the country by asking these questions.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank my distinguished colleague for the great contribution he has made by adding to the RECORD, particularly the sage comments of his constituency. We know Maine people are not generally as explosive in their character or as quick to make judgments as are people from some other parts of the country.

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

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to my distinguished colleague.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I ask my friend from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] if he does not agree that one of the sad characteristics of this recent episode is the fact that it shows a lack of coordinated organization between vitally important departments of our Government.

Mr. MONRONEY. I quite agree. The distinguished Senator from Missouri has labored for days on end and for years back to point out from his own vast experience where there are gaps in communication resulting in lost motion and misunderstanding, and the failure to coordinate with others who are vitally concerned. The Senator has repeately done this, and I think the Nation should be grateful.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the able Senator for his kind remarks.

I have pointed out for years that in my opinion the present organization is not only unnecessarily costing the taxpayers many billions of dollars annually, but also is not giving the Nation that type and character of security so necessary in this nuclear space age. If we do not reorganize our defenses and our whole diplomacy around the world on the basis of progress instead of continuing to let them drift in tradition, not only will we continue to waste money, but also we do not have adequate security.

Does not the Senator agree with me that the latest incident verifies the fact we must coordinate our entire governmental structure on a more modern basis if we are to bring peace to the world?

Mr. MONRONEY. I certainly agree with the Senator completely and praise him for the work he has done in trying to push toward that direction from the seat he occupies on the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, what is so terrible about the speech of Adlai Stevenson? Let me read the first three paragraphs, which have not received wide press coverage:

It appears that this year's campaign will be waged under the darkest shadows that ever hovered over the world, the mushroom clouds of a nuclear war that no one wants. This terrible danger, and how to overcome it, will and should overshadow every other issue.

For the chances of a more stable world, which seemed to be brightening, have been rudely reversed by the breakdown of the summit conference in this historic week.

Premier Khrushchev wrecked this conference. Let there be no mistake about that. When he demanded that President Eisenhower apologize and punish those responsible for the spy plane flight, he was, in effect, asking the President to punish himself. This was an impossible request, and he knew it.

SERIES OF BLUNDERS

But we handed Khrushchev the crowbar and the sledge hammer to wreck the meeting. Without our series of blunders, Mr. Khrushchev would not have had a pretext for making his impossible demand and wild charges. Let there be no mistake about that either.

Then the Governor details the well known point with which we all agree about what happened in the sending of the U-2 plane over Russia. He goes on:

We Democrats know how clumsy this administration can be.

That is not an unusual statement for a Democrat to make. I expect that we shall be making it continually as long as Republicans are in power, and when they go out of power the Republicans will reverse the process upon us. So there is no slanderous misstatement of fact in Mr. Stevenson's speech; it is a restrained statement of a Democratic observation.

We are not likely to forget the fumbles that preceded the Suez crisis on the eve of the 1956 election.

But nothing, of course, can justify Mr. Khrushchev's contemptuous conduct, especially after President Eisenhower had announced that our espionage flights had been called off. But his anger was predictable, if not his violence. How would we feel if Soviet spy planes based in Cuba were flying over Cape Canaveral and Oak Ridge. And also we could predict with certainty his efforts to use the situation to split the Western Alliance and intimidate the countries where our bases are situated.

I do not think there is much debate about that.

Republican leaders are now saying that in this grave crisis we must all rally round the President in the name of national unity. Our respect for the Presidency will find us joined in salute to President Eisenhower upon his return. We resent deeply and bitterly the gross affront to the President and his office.

NO QUESTION ABOUT UNITY

There is no question about national unity in a time of crisis. But errors must be corrected, and must not forget that the opposition party also has an obligation to our country and to our allies whose security is also involved. It is the duty of responsible opposition in a democracy to expose and criticize carelessness and mistakes, especially in a case of such national and world importance as this. We must see to it that we profit from such grave mistakes and misfortunes.

It is particularly regretable that this happened in an election year. And we can already predict what the Republicans will tell the people in the months ahead.

They will say that President Eisenhower's patience and dignity in Paris scored a diplomatic triumph by exposing Khrushchev's insincerity.

They will say that the Russians are hoping that a "softer" Democratic President will be elected in November. They will tell the people that a vote for the candidate the Russians distrust is a vote against appeasement.

I think we have had a sample today of what the line will be. We will hear again that the Democrats are soft on communism and that an effort to negotiate for peace and to avert thermonuclear war is a selling out of this Nation. We apparently must not discuss the realities of our situation with anyone.

Mr. President, I can find no quarrel with this speech. I believe it is an excellent speech. I believe it is a statesmanlike speech. Instead of general condemnation of the scathing attack which Adlai Stevenson is supposed to have made, let us find out where the attack is in error. Let us discuss the facts.

Mr. President, in closing I wish to say I have seen a sample of the reaction from Des Moines and other parts of the country. Let me say in behalf of a grateful Nation, thank God for a free press. This was an hour which required courage, and it found the press of all political faiths not willing to sweep any of the hard, critical facts under the rug.

Let me say also, Mr. President, that in times of crisis our political system, so much maligned, inevitably produces a leader adequate to the task; and that if the situation is sufficiently desperate, the American people have yet to fail to recognize and welcome his leadership.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks the complete statement from the wisest voice in the Democratic Party and the most influential voice in the Western World, Adlai Stevenson, of Illinois.

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

[From the Washington Post, May 20, 1960]

TEXT OF STEVENSON'S SPEECH ON SUMMIT CRISIS

It appears that this year's campaign will be waged under the darkest shadows that ever hovered over the world—the mushroom clouds of a nuclear war that no one wants. This terrible danger—and how to avert it—will and should overshadow every other issue.

For the chances of a more stable world, which seemed to be brightening, have been rudely reversed by the breakdown of the summit conference in this historic week.

Premier Khrushchev wrecked this conference. Let there be no mistake about that. When he demanded that President Eisenhower apologize and punish those responsible for the spy-plane fight, he was in effect asking the President to punish himself. This was an impossible request, and he knew it.

SERIES OF BLUNDERS

But we handed Khrushchev the crowbar and the sledgehammer to wreck the meeting. Without our series of blunders, Mr. Khrushchev would not have had a pretext for making his impossible demand and wild charges. Let there be no mistake about that either.

We sent an espionage plane deep into the Soviet Union just before the summit meeting. Then we denied it. Then we admitted it. And when Mr. Khrushchev gave the President an out by suggesting that he was not responsible for ordering the flight, the President proudly asserted that he was responsible. On top of that we intimated that such espionage flights over Russia would continue. (At this point if Khrushchev did not protest he would be condoning our right to spy—and how long could be keep his job that way?) Next we evidently reconsidered and called off the espionage flights. But to compound the incredible, we postponed the announcement that the flights were terminated—just long enough to make it seem we were yielding to pressure, but too long to prevent Mr. Khrushchev from reaching the boiling point.

ALERT CARD NOTED

And, as if that wasn't enough, on Sunday night when there was still a chance that De Gaulle and Macmillan could save the situation, we ordered a worldwide alert of our combat forces. Is it unreasonable for suspicious Russians to think such a series of mistakes could only be a deliberate effort to break up a conference we never wanted anyway?

We Democrats know how clumsy this administration can be. We are not likely to forget the fumbles that preceded the Suez crisis on the eve of the 1956 election.

But nothing, of course, can justify Mr. Khrushchev's contemptuous conduct, especially after President Eisenhower had announced that our espionage flights had been called off. But his anger was predictable, if not his violence. How would we feel if Soviet spy planes based in Cuba were flying over Cape Canaveral and Oak Ridge? And also we could predict with certainty his efforts to use the situation to split the Western alliance and intimidate the countries where our bases are situated.

Republican leaders are now saying that in this grave crisis we must all rally round the President in the name of national unity. Our respect for the Presidency will find us joined in salute to President Eisenhower upon his return. We resent deeply and bitterly the gross affront to the President and his office.

NO QUESTION ABOUT UNITY

There is no question about national unity in a time of crisis. But errors must be corrected, and must not forget that the opposition party also has an obligation to our country and to our allies whose security is also involved. It is the duty of responsible opposition in a democracy to expose and criticize carelessness and mistakes, especially in a case of such national and world importance as this. We must see to it that we profit from such grave mistakes and misfortunes.

It is particularly regrettable that this happened in an election year. And we can already predict what the Republicans will tell the people in the months ahead.

They will say that President Eisenhower's patience and dignity in Paris scored a diplomatic triumph by exposing Khrushchev's insincerity.

They will say that the Russians are hoping that a "softer" Democratic President will be elected in November. They will tell the people that a vote for the candidate the Russians distrust is a vote against appeasement.

It will be our duty, it will be the duty of all thoughtful, concerned citizens to help the situation and to face the hard inescapable facts; that this Administration played into Khrushchev's hands; that if Khrushchev wanted to wreck the conference our Government made it possible; that the administration has acutely embarrassed our allies and endangered our bases; that they have helped make successful negotiations with the Russians—negotiations that are vital to our survival—impossible so long as they are in power.

MUST SEEK UNDERSTANDING

We cannot sweep this whole sorry mess under the rug in the name of national unity. We cannot and must not. Too much is at stake. Rather we must try to help the American people understand the nature of the crisis, to see how we got into this predicament, how we can get out of it, and how we get on with the business of improving relations and mutual confidence and building a safer, saner world in the nuclear age.

For in this age, unprecedented in human history, all of us, Americans and Russians alike, have one common enemy. The enemy is the danger of war. We must defeat the enemy together. Despite his hysterics last night, Mr. Khrushchev says he still believes in peaceful progress by negotiation. Let us hope he proves it, and let the United States come into the United Nations not content with the ordinary speeches, not content with the usual anti-Russian majority votes, but with constructive, positive, affirmative proposals to restore the hope of peace.

To those who will see nothing but Russian vice and American virtue, to those who will cry "appeasement" to any acknowledgement of our mistakes I say that this is the toughest kind of common sense. For there is no future for any of us in a spiraling arms race propelled by mounting suspicion and distrust on both sides. The fact that Khrushchev seems to have lost his temper in Paris makes it all the more important that we not lose ours—or our heads.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I again wish to congratulate the Senator for his statement. I think it might well be capped by this quotation from Murrey Marder which appeared in the Washington Post for Sunday, May 22, 1960, entitled "The American in Paris Practically Squirmed." I would like to read a section of the story. The writer refers to the time of agony in Paris:

During that time, searing words echoed around the world to the gross embarrassment of the United States; words like "aggressor," "bandit," "treacherous," "apologize," "punish," "guilty." The American on the scene who was only an observer and not a participant subconsciously squirmed under the indignity being heaped on his Nation and President, no matter what his political affiliation.

He squirmed, too, over the bumbling stumbling record of U.S. actions in the U-2 affair, which caused headshaking in the corridors, bars, and hotel lobbies here by the nationals of every American ally. He squirmed most while Khrushchev, like a master showman, was "milking" every minute of the greatest East-West propaganda battle in recent years. The United States, feebly and fumblingly, was drawing its only effective defense from the fact that it was being pushed too far.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the RECORD in my remarks the entire text of the story by Murrey Marder.

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

[From the Washington Post, May 22, 1960]

THE AMERICAN IN PARIS PRACTICALLY SQUIRMED

(By Murrey Marder)

PARIS.—It was like watching a sad, old-fashioned film where the movements are too fast and jerky and you don't quite know whether to laugh or cry. This was high drama at the pinnacle of world affairs, but low comedy and satire and melodrama kept intruding, and the stage revolved so rapidly that it mixed them all up together.

The American knew before he came that a global storm was probably in the making at the summit, but the speed and fury with which it broke was not anticipated. Suddenly it was over, in the erratic, contradictory rush of events which often merge to form a major moment of history; the world's two leading powers had collided head on, and their relationship to each other and to the rest of the world was altered.

What the American present felt most deeply was not that Soviet Premier Khrushchev had turned more menacing about West Berlin, or disarmament, or nuclear test suspension—or even that the summit had ended before it began: underneath these facts was something more profound, the Soviet Union, second to the United States in industrial power and world influence, had "told off" the United States in some of the most insulting language ever used against a major world power—and had gotten away with it.

A DIFFERENT CHALLENGE

Perhaps, as American officials claim, the United States did come out of the encounter with a net gain in weight of world public opinion. Perhaps Khrushchev overplayed his threats and warnings and the Soviet Union will have to back off later. A final answer awaits future events.

But at the moment, the American on the scene is struck by the fact that while the Soviet sputniks, Lunik and space satellite demonstrated physical power, the collapsed summit meeting recorded a new kind of direct, blunt challenge to America's influence, prestige, and honor.

Short, squat Nikita Khrushchev, the son of a peasant, who schemed and elbowed his way to the leadership of a still rough, raw nation, was telling the proud President of the leading nation on the globe to get down on his knees and humble himself before the world. Unless he did, the momentous conference which the President came here to attend could not start.

The fact that the President did not do so, and turned away in disgust, only partially dims Khrushchev's triumph. For the President went as far as the strained dignity of the United States would permit without groveling before the Soviet leader, over the admitted transgression of Russian territory by an American plane on a spying mission.

HOPELESS MEDIATION

For 3 days, from Sunday to Tuesday, when it was formally admitted that the conference had failed, attempts were made to mediate the differences between the Soviet and American leaders, although there was never any doubt that the original demands were repugnant and uncompromisable for President Eisenhower.

During that time, searing words echoed around the world to the gross embarrassment of the United States; words like "aggressor," "bandit," "treacherous," "apologize," "punish," "guilty." The American on the scene who was only an observer and not a participant subconsciously squirmed under the indignity being heaped on his Nation and President, no matter what his political affiliation.

He squirmed, too, over the bumbling, stumbling record of U.S. actions in the U-2 affair, which caused headshaking in the corridors, bars, and hotel lobbies here by the nationals of every American ally. He squirmed most while Khrushchev, like a master showman, was "milking" every minute of the greatest East-West propaganda battle in recent years. The United States, feebly and fumblingly, was drawing its only effective defense from the fact that it was being pushed too far.

CONTROLLED ANGER

In the spectacular windup Khrushchev press conference of Wednesday, the description of the Soviet Premier in some news reports as "raging" or "almost incoherent with anger" were hardly fitting. Khrushchev indeed worked himself into several outward furies. He gestured violently. He used coarse language. He was undoubtedly really angry over embarrassing holes in Soviet defenses disclosed by public revelation that for years American reconnaissance planes have penetrated Soviet territory.

As a citizen of any country, and particularly Russia, would be, he was affronted and insulted by foreign violation of his nation's borders. But there is a great difference between a Khrushchev and a shrill, reckless, fanatic Hitler.

The Soviet Premier by no means allows his emotions to go beyond his control. He measures every reaction purposefully. Specifically, he allots his time for anger, for mirth, for scorn, for mockery.

Much more than marking his heights of anger, Khrushchev's performance here marked his heights of triumph. He toyed publicly with the United States, undoubtedly enjoying himself hugely. No one ever before has mocked the power of the United States in such terms of derision and scorn.

Khrushchev's famous remark, "We will bury you," was a boast which the United States could scoff at, but this time he had the United States on the defensive, its morality tarnished, its dignity sullied, its righteousness pinched.

"Look what self-assurance," he baited President Eisenhower, "what generosity. Even children are told, if you have made mischief, admit it and say, I shall not do it again."

Physical power lacking can be gained; missile or satellite gaps conceivably can be closed. But honor wounded, nose punched, "face" lost cannot be measured precisely. To the American in Paris they seemed at least equally damaging to a great nation.

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

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I commend my friend from Oklahoma for the splendid address he has just concluded. I am particularly grateful that he inserted the entire text of Governor Stevenson's speech in the RECORD.

I should like to read the last few sentences to my friends across the aisle, because they seem to me to be sentences which every patriotic American can agree upon.

Let us hope he proves it and let the United States come into the United Nations not content with ordinary speeches, not content with the usual anti-Russian majority votes, but with constructive, positive, affirmative proposals to restore the hope of peace.

To those who will see nothing but Russian vice and American virtue, to those who will cry appeasement to any acknowledgment of our mistakes I say that this is the toughest kind of common sense. For there is no future for any of us in a spiralling arms race propelled by mounting suspicion and distrust on both sides. The fact that Khrushchev seems to have lost his temper in Paris makes it all the more important that we not lose ours—or our heads.

I commend this sound advice to my colleagues across the aisle.

Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Oklahoma if he has had occasion to read and perhaps put into the RECORD the text of the statement issued by the Democratic Advisory Council, which appears in the press this morning.

Mr. MONRONEY. I think it would be appropriate to put it in the RECORD. I have not had a chance to clip it.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the statement issued by the Democratic Advisory Council be printed in the RECORD at this point in our remarks. I read, for the benefit of my friends across the aisle the final two paragraphs of the statement:

The Democratic Party stands solidly behind the President in any sound efforts he may undertake to salvage, from the wreckage of the Paris meeting, the means whereby the peace of the world can be assured.

Above all, the United States must be ready, along with its allies, to take part in the earliest possible renewal of meaningful negotiations at the United Nations and elsewhere for agreement on disarmament and the settlement of outstanding questions.

I am sure my friend from Oklahoma agrees with me that what we want is some benefit from the mistakes which have been made, and that we will come forward with a positive policy, and not cry over spilled milk, although we must find out what the facts are. Our only obligation is to continue to try to create a climate in this body in which this can be set up successfully with the cooperation of the Senate on both sides of the aisle, instead of getting into *political* strictures, which I regret very much our friends on the other side of the aisle saw fit to start this morning.

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

[From the New York Times, May 23, 1960]

TEXT OF STATEMENT BY DEMOCRATIC COUNCIL

All Americans resent the manner in which Mr. Khrushchev treated the President of the United States in Paris. Mr. Khrushchev killed the summit meeting. He thereby did incalculable harm to the cause of peace. But the Eisenhower-Nixon administration handed him the opportunity to do so by embarking on a policy which it knew and had declared to be unsound, and by handling the incident of the American U-2 plane in a manner for which there is no precedent.

President Eisenhower had declared repeatedly that he would attend a summit conference only if preliminary negotiations had shown substantial progress toward a settlement. In this he was right. Yet he went to Paris in the full knowledge that no progress had been made toward the settlement of the issues which most threaten the peace of the world: Berlin and the arms race. In this he was wrong, and disaster followed.

The foreign policy of the Eisenhower-Nixon administration is in shambles. It has become obvious that the operations of the Government of the United States in its most important areas are chaotic. The integrity of the word of the United States has been put into doubt. The danger of an all-destructive nuclear war has been increased.

Citizens of our country have not only a right but a duty to speak out on these important matters. If the Democratic advisory council were to keep silent in this grave hour and with regard to issues of such historic importance, it would fail to meet its responsibilities. Constructive criticism is the very lifeblood of mature representative government. Only thus do we correct past errors and avoid future mistakes.

RESPONSIBLE CRITICISM

The need now is for responsible criticism and for constructive proposals to lay the groundwork for the creative actions which are required if we are to get on with the all-important task of building peace.

During the first 2 weeks of May 1960, the foreign policy of the Eisenhower-Nixon administration collapsed. After the Soviet Government announced that the U-2 plane had crashed on Russian territory, the Eisenhower-Nixon administration floundered in a series of contradictory statements put out by a number of different agencies. First, it was said that a weather observation plane whose pilot had oxygen trouble had strayed into Soviet territory. Then it was said that this was a reconnaissance flight but that it had been undertaken without authorization from Washington. Then it was said that similar flights had been undertaken before and it was implied that they would continue. Then the President assumed responsibility for this particular flight and declared such flights to be vital to the security of the United States. Vice President NIXON took the same line. Finally, and in spite of his earlier declaration that they are vital to the Nation's security, President Eisenhower declared that he had suspended all such flights for the duration of his administration. As the head of the Washington bureau of the

New York Times wrote yesterday: "President Eisenhower was responsible, directly or indirectly, for the greatest series of humiliating blunders suffered by the United States in a decade."

These events were not just an isolated series of blunders. They were the result of deep-seated deficiencies in our foreign and domestic policies and in the management of our Government. Our foreign policy has failed not because of the recent blunders related to the summit meeting but because of its fundamental lack of purpose and integrity. We failed in May 1960, because we had been failing before.

COMPETENCE QUESTIONED

The fiasco in Paris raises again the whole issue of the lack of competence of the present administration. Our disarmament policies provide a typical exemple of the chaotic condition of the executive branch of the Government. The executive branch is deeply divided on the issues of disarmament and, more particularly, on the cessation of atomic tests. Yet the conflicts dividing the Government have never been resolved definitely by the President. They have been glossed over by meaningless formulas, or else they have been referred back to the respective agencies to gloss them over by similarly meaningless formulas.

The first lesson which we must learn from the recent debacle is, therefore, the urgent need for the restoration of the President's authority within his own house.

The contemptuous and insulting fashion in which Mr. Khrushchev dared to deal with the President of the United States in Paris was intolerable. We must, however, recognize that Mr. Khrushchev's conduct was a direct reflection of his confidence in Russian power and his lack of respect for our strength and prestige. The events in Paris have made it clear that the inadequacies of the United States in building economic growth in developing science and education, and in strengthening its defenses are contributing to the dangers to world peace.

Moreover, these same shortcomings which tempt the Soviets to excesses tend to weaken the confidence of our allies not only in our strength but also in the wisdom and competence of our Government.

NO ROOM FOR DESPAIR

The reverses which have befallen us can well be turned to good advantage if we learn the lessons which the events of recent weeks teach us. We must not allow dismay at these recent events to turn into despair. We must see to it that out of the wreckage of the Paris meeting we build new strength in our own country and in all the world, and a new drive for a world at peace.

If there ever was a time for national debate, that time is now. We urge that this debate be carried on without rancor and without motivation of mere partisan advantage. Regardless of our differences we are all Americans. We are facing an unprecedented danger. Unless America is able to restore her damaged prestige, the principles to which we are so deeply committed will be increasingly in retreat in all parts of the world.

We hope that out of the present confusion may be born new policies, new understandings, and new attitudes which will lay the foundation for peace among nations and dignity for all men.

While we are considering and debating these issues and policies, elementary prudence and common sense demand immediate action.

We must tighten up the processes by which our national security policies are formulated and executed.

We must expand our economic growth for security here and abroad.

We must step up our defense program.

We must increase the effectiveness of our aid to the underdeveloped countries of the free world.

These things ought to be done at once—vigorously and in full cooperation with the NATO countries and with our friends and allies in this hemisphere, in Asia, and in Africa.

The Democratic Party stands solidly behind the President in any sound efforts he may undertake to salvage, from the wreckage of the Paris meeting, the means whereby the peace of the world can be assured.

Above all, the United States must be ready, along with its allies, to take part in the earliest possible renewal of meaningful negotiations at the United Nations and elsewhere for agreement on disarmament and the settlement of outstanding questions.

Senator KENNEDY, in approving the statement by telephone, took exception to one paragraph. His position as the leading prospect for the Democratic nomination made his comment significant.

The paragraph criticized President Eisenhower for going to the summit conference despite the fact that "no progress had been made toward the settlement of the issues which most threaten the peace of the world: Berlin and the arms race."

DEFENDS PRESIDENT

Senator KENNEDY said:

"While summit meetings should be preceded by meaningful negotiations, given the state of world opinion and that of our allies, the President, under then existing circumstances, could not have avoided attending the conference without harm to the prestige of the United States."

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania for his helpful remarks; also for putting in the resolutions of the Democratic Advisory Council.

CALL OF THE CALENDAR

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, at pages 11 to 13 of the legislative calendar, there appear 31 resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration, which relate to authorizing the printing of committee reports and payments of gratuities to relatives of deceased employees of the Senate.

I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed with the call of the calendar for the passage of measures and resolutions to which there is no objection, beginning with Calendar No. 1377 and concluding with Calendar No. 1407.

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

DISTRIBUTION OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD TO FORMER MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

The bill (S. 3036) to authorize the distribution of copies of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to former Members of Congress requesting such copies was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 73 of the Printing Act, approved January 12, 1895, as amended (44 U.S.C. 183), is amended by inserting after the paragraph relating to ex-Presidents and ex-Vice Presidents a new paragraph as follows:

"To each former Senator, Representative in Congress, Delegate from a territory, or Commissioner from Puerto Rico, upon request to the Public Printer, one copy of the daily."

MEMORIAL TO MARY McLEOD BETHUNE

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 502) authorizing in the District of Columbia a memorial to Mary McLeod Bethune was announced as next in order.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I trust the Senate will give its stamp of approval to this measure, which authorizes the erection in the District of Columbia of a memorial to the incomparable Mary McLeod Bethune. This memento in stone will immortalize the life of a wonderful woman whose life was dedicated to the quest for knowledge.

It will stand as a lasting tribute to a great woman who has walked among us and left her mark in so many hearts. The career of this woman is a lesson in perseverence and accomplishment. She served her Nation and her people well, both in filling important positions in the Federal Government and in founding institutions of learning.

Hers was a life devoted to the development of knowledge to be used for good works. It was a life devoted to the search for knowledge, not merely for its own sake, but as a source of service, as the handmaiden of understanding, as the key that would open doors and lead her people toward the self-fulfillment that is the hunger—the spiritual hunger—of each and every one of us.

Mary McLeod Bethune has earned her monument. It is in the hearts of all who have been touched by her love, by her genius, by her devotion to the cause of giving meaning and substance and nobility to the lives of those privileged to dwell in the wide circle of her influence.

It was my privilege just last weekend to participate in an important activity of another of Mary McLeod Bethune's lasting monuments, the National Council of Negro Women, of which she was the founder and organizer. This outstanding conference demonstrated well the outstanding manner in which the national council is carrying on the work and promoting the ideals of its founder.

It is significant that the memorial honoring Mrs. Bethune will also commemorate the 100th anniversary of the signing of the Emancipation Proclamation. In her life and works she exemplified the great fruits of that historic pronouncement and it is therefore doubly appropriate that they be linked in this lasting tribute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

PRESENTATION OF OFFICIAL FLAG OF THE UNTED STATES TO SENATORS AND REPRESENTATIVES FROM THE STATE OF HAWAII

The resolution (H.J. Res. 546) authorizing the Architect of the Capitol to present to the Senators and Representatives in the Congress from the State of Hawaii the official flag of the United States bearing 50 stars which is first flown over the west front of the U.S. Capitol was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF PANEL DISCUSSIONS ENTITLED "INCOME TAX RESCISSION"

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 558) providing for printing additional copies of the panel discussions entitled "Income Tax Rescission" was considered and agreed to.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF VETERANS' BENEFITS CALCULATOR

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 579) authorizing the printing of additional copies of a Veterans' Benefits Calculator was considered and agreed to.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS ON CIVIL RIGHTS

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 586) authorizing the printing of additional copies of the hearings on civil rights was considered and agreed to.

PRINTING OF A HOUSE DOCUMENT

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 607) authorizing the printing of a House document of the pamphlet entitled "Our American Government, What Is It? How Does It Function?" was considered and agreed to.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF FINAL REPORT OF SELECT COMMITTEE ON IMPROPER ACTIVITIES IN THE LABOR OR MANAGEMENT FIELD

The Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 90) authorizing the printing of additional copies of the final report and indexes to hearings and reports of the Select Committee on Improper Activities in the Labor or Management Field, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with an amendment to strike out all after the resolving clause and insert:

That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Government Operations not to exceed three thousand additional copies each of parts 2 and 3 of the final report of the Select Committee on Improper Activities in the Labor or Management Field (S. Rept. 1139, Eighty-sixth Congress, second session), pursuant to S. Res. 44 and S. Res. 249, Eighty-sixth Congress.

The amendment was agreed to.

The concurrent resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS PERTAINING TO JOINT COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC ENERGY

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 91) authorizing the printing of additional copies of hearings before the Subcommittee on Agreements for Cooperation of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy on amending the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 with respect to exchange of military information and material with allies during the 2d session of the 85th Congress was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be reprinted for the use of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy two thousand additional copies of the hearings before the Subcommittee on Agreements for Cooperation of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy on Amending the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 with respect to exchange of military information and material with allies during the second session of the Eighty-fifth Congress.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF COMMITTEE PRINT PERTAINING TO NATIONAL WATER RESOURCES

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 94) authorizing the printing of additional copies of a committee print containing the reports of the States to the Senate Select Committee on National Water Resources was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Senate Select Committee on National Water Resources four thousand additional copies of the committee print, prepared by that committee, containing the reports of the States to the committee on their water resources and problems.

PRINTING AS SENATE DOCUMENT REVISED EDITION OF INTERNAL SECURITY MANUAL

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 96) authorizing the printing of a revised edition of the Internal Security Manual as a Senate document; and providing for additional copies was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed as a Senate document a revised edition of the Internal Security Manual; and that five thousand additional copies be printed for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRINTING AS SENATE DOCUMENT COMPILATION OF STUDIES ON UNITED STATES-LATIN AMERICAN RELATIONS

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 99) to print as a Senate document a compilation of studies on United States-Latin American relations was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there shall be printed as a Senate document a compilation of the studies on United States-Latin American relations prepared under the direction of the Subcommittee on American Republics Affairs of the Committee on Foreign Relations, pursuant to S. Res. 330, agreed to July 31, 1958, as amended by S. Res. 31, agreed to February 2, 1959, and S. Res. 250, agreed to February 9, 1960.

SEC. 2. There shall be printed ten thousand additional copies of such Senate document. Such additional copies shall be for the use of the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Subcommittee on American Republics Affairs.

PRINT AS SENATE DOCUMENT STUDIES ON U.S. FOREIGN POLICY

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 100) to print as Senate document a compilation of studies on U.S. foreign policy was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there shall be printed as a Senate document a compilation of the studies on United States foreign policy prepared under the direction of the Committee on Foreign Relations, pursuant to S. Res. 336, agreed to July 31, 1958, as amended by S. Res. 31, agreed to February 2, 1959, and S. Res. 250, agreed to February 9, 1960.

SEC. 2. There shall be printed ten thousand additional copies of such Senate document. Such additional copies shall be for the use of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF REPORT OF SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

The resolution (S. Res. 277) to print for the use of the Select Committee on Small Business additional copies of its 10th annual report was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Select Committee on Small Business of the Senate, three thousand additional copies of Senate Report Numbered 1044, Eighty-sixth Congress, second session, entitled "Tenth Annual Report."

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF REPORT ON PROBLEMS OF THE AGED AND AGING

The resolution (S. Res. 278) to print additional copies of the report on the problem of the aged and aging was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare three thousand additional copies of its report to the Senate pursuant to S. Res. 65, Eighty-sixth Congress, first session, entitled "The Aged and Aging in the United States: A National Problem".

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF SENATE REPORT NO. 807 ENTITLED "FEDERAL DISASTER RELIEF MANUAL"

The resolution (S. Res. 281) authorizing the printing of additional copies of

Senate Report No. 807, 86th Congress, entitled "Federal Disaster Relief Manual," was announced as next in order.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Over, by request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be passed over.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF QUESTION-AND-ANSWER REVIEW OF ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

The resolution (S. Res. 299) authorizing the printing of additional copies of the question-and-answer review of the St. Lawrence Seaway was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Foreign Relations eighty thousand additional copies of a question-and-answer review of the Saint Lawrence Seaway.

PRINTING OF STAFF REPORT ON LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS ON FEDERAL PROJECTS

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 302) to print for the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare a staff report on labor-management relations on certain Federal projects, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with an amendment, in line 2, after the word "Welfare," to insert "three thousand," so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare three thousand additional copies of the committee print of the Eighty-second Congress, second session, entitled "Labor-Management Relations in Federal Projects Involving the Davis-Bacon Act", a staff report to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF FINAL REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON UNEMPLOYMENT PROBLEMS

The resolution (S. Res. 303) to print for the use of the Special Committee on Unemployment Problems additional copies of its final report was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Special Committee on Unemployment Problems three thousand nine hundred additional copies of its final report to the Senate pursuant to Senate Resolution 196, Eighty-sixth Congress (S. Rept. 1206, Eighty-sixth Congress).

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS ON "ORGANIZING FOR NATIONAL SECURITY"

The resolution (S. Res. 306) to print additional copies of hearings on "Organizing for National Security" was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Government Operations one thousand five hundred additional copies of the hearing entitled "Organizing for National Security", which was held by that committee during the second session of the Eighty-sixth Congress.

PRINTING OF STUDY ENTITLED "EXPORTS, IMPORTS, AND THE U.S. BALANCE OF INTERNATIONAL PAYMENTS"

The resolution (S. Res. 307) to print, with illustrations, a study entitled "Exports, Imports, and the U.S. Balance of International Payments" was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the study entitled "Exports, Imports, and the United States Balance of International Payments" prepared by Doctor Howard S. Piquet, Senior Specialist in International Economics of the Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress, be printed as a Senate document, with illustrations.

PRINTING OF 61ST ANNUAL REPORT OF THE NATIONAL SOCIETY OF THE DAUGHTERS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION AS A SENATE DOCUMENT

The resolution (S. Res. 318) to print the 61st Annual Report of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution as a Senate document was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Sixty-first Annual Report of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution for the year ended April 1, 1958, be printed, with an illustration, as a Senate document.

PRINTING OF 62D ANNUAL REPORT OF THE NATIONAL SOCIETY OF THE DAUGHTERS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION AS A SENATE DOCUMENT

The resolution (S. Res. 319) to print the 62d Annual Report of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution, as a Senate document, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Sixty-second Annual Report of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution for the year ended April 1, 1959, be printed, with an illustration, as a Senate document.

PRINTING OF REVISED EDITION OF "ELECTION LAW GUIDEBOOK"

The resolution (S. Res. 320) to authorize the printing of a revised edition of the "Election Law Guidebook" was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That a revised edition of Senate Document Numbered 97 of the Eighty-fifth Congress, entitled "Election Law Guidebook," be printed as a Senate document.

MARY A. RUESCH

The resolution (S. Res. 314) to pay a gratuity to Mary A. Ruesch was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Mary A. Ruesch, sister of Belva M. Ratchford, an employee of the Senate at the time of her death, a sum equal to seven months' compensation at the rate she was receiving by law at the time of her death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

ILLYENE MARDEN AND OTHERS

The resolution (S. Res. 313) to pay a gratuity to Illyene Marden, Vera Davis, Roy McGuigan, and Art McGuigan was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Illyene Marden and Vera Davis, nieces of John J. Kenney, and Ray McGuigan and Art McGuigan, nephews of John J. Kenney, an employee of the Senate at the time of his death, a sum to each equal to two months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and other allowances.

ELIZABETH M. HICKEY AND OTHERS

The resolution (S. Res. 312) to pay a gratuity to Elizabeth M. Hickey, Edward D. Murphy, and Walter D. Murphy was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Elizabeth M. Hickey, daughter of James W. Murphy, and Edward D. Murphy and Walter D. Murphy, sons of James W. Murphy, an Official Reporter of Debates and Proceedings of the United States Senate at the time of his death, a sum to each equal to four months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

ELLA JOHNSON

The resolution (S. Res. 315) to pay a gratuity to Ella Johnson was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Ella Johnson, widow of Robert Johnson, an employee of the Architect of the Capitol assigned to duty in the Senate Office Buildings at the time of his death, a sum equal to six months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

CONNIE YOUNG

The resolution (S. Res. 316) to pay a gratuity to Connie Young was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Connie Young, widow of Charlie A. Young, an employee of the Architect of the Capitol assigned to duty in the Senate Office Buildings at the time of his death, a sum equal to six months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

MARY NELL SISSON

The resolution (S. Res. 317) to pay a gratuity to Mary Nell Sisson was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to

Mary Nell Sisson, widow of W. D. Sisson, an employee of the Senate at the time of his death, a sum equal to three months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

REPRINTING OF JOINT COMMITTEE PRINT ENTITLED "SUMMARY-ANALYSIS OF HEARINGS ON BIOLOGICAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS OF NUCLEAR WAR"

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 97) authorizing the reprinting of the Joint Committee print entitled "Summary-Analysis of Hearings, June 22–26, 1959, on Biological and Environmental Effects of Nuclear War" was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be reprinted for the use of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy six thousand additional copies of the Joint Committee print entitled "Summary-Analysis of Hearings, June 22–26, 1959, on Biological and Environmental Effects of Nuclear War" printed for the use of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy during the Eighty-sixth Congress, first session.

AGRICULTURAL AND FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION APPROPRIATION BILL, 1961

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, is the Agricultural Appropriation bill before the Senate at the present time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is not before the Senate.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Is it on the calendar?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is on the calendar, but not before the Senate.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that it be laid down and made the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the bill by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. Calendar No. 1467, H.R. 12117, making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I merely wish to have the bill laid down as the pending or unfinished business. If it is possible during the day, we shall try to debate the measure and, if we can, reach the third reading of the bill. There will be no votes on the bill today if we reach it, but if we do get to third reading, there will be a yea-and-nay vote on the appropriation bill tomorrow.

Mr. KUCHEL. I am not familiar with the position which the members of the Committee on Appropriations on this side of the aisle may take with respect to the bill. I ask the Senator from Montana whether, if any investigation on our part determines that they desire to offer amendments, he will be a little flexible with respect to the time element.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Oh, yes, indeed. I may say that I discussed this subject this morning with the minority leader, the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], and with other Senators. All things being agreeable, they would just as soon have the bill taken up this afternoon.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank the Senator from Montana.

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 Committee on Appropriations, with amendments.

THE IMPACT OF THE SHIPBUILDING INDUSTRY UPON THE NATIONAL ECONOMY

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, yesterday, May 22, was officially designated as Maritime Day by Presidential proclamation. This affords me a timely opportunity to make certain remarks and comments on the merchant marine and maritime industry of this Nation. I have always felt that this vital segment of our national defense and our national economy has not received a sufficiently vigorous emphasis and attention commensurate with its status of importance.

INTRODUCTION AND HISTORY

Prior to World War I, the United States had virtually no maritime industry. Our foreign trade was conducted by ships of other nations. It became necessary for us to construct vessels in order to maintain our trading position during the period of neutrality between 1914 and 1917 when British, French, and German vessels were denied to us.

In 1916, the Congress enacted a Shipping Act "to establish a U.S. Shipping Board for the purpose of encouraging, developing, and creating a naval auxiliary and naval reserve and a merchant marine to meet the requirements of the commerce of the United States with its Territories and possessions and with foreign countries; to regulate carriers by water engaged in the foreign and interstate commerce of the United States; and for other purposes."[1] We found it difficult and expensive to become a maritime power in a very short period of time.

After the outbreak of hostilities in the spring of 1917, an intensive program was instituted to build ships to transport troops and supplies to the European battlefront and to act as auxiliaries to our growing Navy.

At the end of World War I, many of these costly shipbuilding facilities were abandoned, the vessels were sold, scrapped, or laid up, and within a very few years most of our international trade was again transported by ships flying foreign flags.

The Merchant Marine Act of 1920 ostensibly provided "for the promotion and maintenance of the American merchant marine," but it repealed "certain emergency legislation" and provided "for the disposition, regulation, and use of property acquired thereunder, and for other purposes."[2]

In 1928, the Congress enacted a Merchant Marine Act "to further develop an American merchant marine, to assure its permanence in the transportation of the foreign trade of the United States, and for other purposes."[3]

On March 4, 1935, President Franklin D. Roosevelt presented to the Congress a report which had been prepared by an interdepartmental committee known as the "Committee on Shipping Policy," appointed June 18, 1934, by the Secretary of Commerce, together with another report from the Postmaster General on ocean mail contracts prepared pursuant to an Executive order of July 11, 1934.[4]

In his message to the Congress, President Roosevelt said:

> I present to the Congress the question of whether or not the United States should have an adequate merchant marine.
>
> To me there are three reasons for answering this question in the affirmative. The first is that in time of peace, subsidies granted by other nations, shipping combines, and other restrictive or relating methods may well be used to the detriment of American shippers. The maintenance of fair competition alone calls for American-flag ships of sufficient tonnage to carry a reasonable portion of our foreign commerce.
>
> Second. In the event of a major war in which the United States is not involved, our commerce, in the absence of an adequate American merchant marine, might find itself seriously crippled because of its inability to secure bottoms for neutral peaceful foreign trade.
>
> Third. In the event of a war in which the United States itself might be engaged, American-flag ships are obviously needed not only for naval auxiliaries, but also for the maintenance of reasonable and necessary commercial intercourse with other nations. We should remember lessons learned in the last war.
>
> In many instances in our history the Congress has provided for various kinds of disguised subsidies to American shipping. In recent years the Congress has provided this aid in the form of lending money at low rates of interest to American shipping companies for the purpose of building new ships for foreign trade. It has, in addition, appropriated large annual sums under the guise of payments for ocean mail contracts.
>
> This lending of money for shipbuilding has in practice been a failure. Few ships have been built and many difficulties have arisen over the repayment of the loans. Similar difficulties have attended the granting of ocean mail contracts. The Government today is paying annually about $30 million for the carrying of mails which would cost, under normal ocean rates, only $3 million. The difference, $27 million, is a subsidy, and nothing but a subsidy. But given under this disguised form it is an unsatisfactory and not an honest way of providing the aid that Government ought to give to shipping.
>
> I propose that we end this subterfuge. If the Congress decides that it will maintain a reasonably adequate American merchant marine I believe that it can well afford honestly to call a subsidy by its right name.

[1] The Merchant Marine Act, 1936, the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946, the Merchant Marine Act, 1920, the Shipping Act, 1916, and the Merchant Marine Act, 1928 (as amended through the 84th Cong.), 85th Cong., 1st sess., report by the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, p. 139.

[2] Op. cit., p. 112.

[3] Ibid., p. 155.

[4] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 79, pt. 3, 74th Cong., 1st sess., Mar. 4, 1935, pp. 28, 59–60.

Approached in this way a subsidy amounts to a comparatively simple thing. It must be based upon providing for American shipping Government aid to make up the differential between American and foreign shipping costs. It should cover, first, the difference in the cost of building ships; second, the difference in the cost of operating ships; and finally, it should take into consideration the liberal subsidies that many foreign governments provide for their shipping. Only by meeting this threefold differential can we expect to maintain a reasonable place in ocean commerce for ships flying the American flag, and at the same time maintain American standards.[5]

On April 15, 1935, Senator Royal S. Copeland, of New York, introduced a bill, S. 2582, 74th Congress, to implement this program.[6] It ultimately became the Merchant Marine Act of 1936. This basic legislation established as a declaration of policy that:

SEC. 101. It is necessary for the national defense and development of its foreign and domestic commerce that the United States shall have a merchant marine (a) sufficient to carry its domestic water-borne commerce and a substantial portion of the water-borne export and import foreign commerce of the United States and to provide shipping service on all routes essential for maintaining the flow of such domestic and foreign water-borne commerce at all times, (b) capable of serving as a naval and military auxiliary in time of war or national emergency, (c) owned and operated under the U.S. flag by citizens of the United States insofar as may be practicable, and (d) composed of the best-equipped, safest, and most suitable types of vessels, constructed in the United States and manned with a trained and efficient citizen personnel. It is hereby declared to be the policy of the United States to foster the development and encourage the maintenance of such a merchant marine.[7]

This act also created an independent agency known as the U.S. Maritime Commission.[8] Later it was abolished by Reorganization Plan No. 21 of 1950, and its functions were transferred to the Department of Commerce.[9]

The wisdom of this act was quickly justified by the situation which confronted the United States as we approached World War II. Once again, foreign shipping was unavailable and it became imperative for us to construct vessels on an emergency basis to handle our cargoes during the period of so-called neutrality, prior to Pearl Harbor. Lend-lease shipments as well as normal commercial trade were completely dependent on American shipping, since German submarines and British cruisers made it virtually impossible for other nations to carry our cargoes with any degree of safety.

After the United States became a belligerent, American shipbuilding of all types was expanded, since we had the task of feeding our Allies and supplying our troops in every theater of action during World War II. At the conclusion of this conflict, the United States once again had a large surplus of ships, and the fleets of other maritime powers were depleted due to enemy action.

This relative advantage did not continue for any lengthy period because American vessels had been hastily constructed. Many of them had inadequate engines, had a low speed capacity, and could not compete with the newer and more modern ships which other maritime nations rapidly started to build. One of the final acts of President Truman was to send a message to the Congress concerning the maritime subsidy programs. On January 16, 1953, he advised Congress as follows:

I believe that the one compelling justification which now exists for subsidizing an American-flag merchant fleet is the national defense requirement. For this purpose, we cannot reasonably expect to keep in active peacetime operation the number of ships that would be needed in the event of war. We must instead concentrate upon maintaining a modern and efficient nucleus fleet, capable of rapid expansion in the event of mobilization. We must supplement this active nucleus with a well-maintained reserve fleet of inactive vessels, and with an effective shipbuilding industry.[10]

It should be noted that an effective shipbuilding industry was an essential element of our program of maintaining our defense posture without accumulating all of the vessels that would be needed during a period of hostilities. President Truman continued:

If we satisfy fully such defense requirements for an active fleet, we could at the same time satisfy, in large measure, whatever requirements may exist for an American merchant marine for national economic and national prestige reasons.

Since the cost of supporting even the presently subsidized fleet has grown substantially in recent years, the Government should, I believe, be most hesitant to undertake commitments for even broader subsidies, unless a compelling national defense need is established.

Since most of the ships now in operation are adequate in size and speed to meet existing competition, the shipping lines have little incentive to incur the higher capital costs of postwar replacements until their present ships reach a normal retirement age of 20 years. This problem could be overcome by a temporary amendment to the 1936 act, authorizing the Maritime Board to provide liberal trade-in allowances as a special incentive for advance replacement of a portion of the present fleets.[11]

In May 1954, the Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation, Mr. Robert Murray, presented a report which had been prepared by the Maritime Administration, in cooperation with the Defense Department, to the Commerce Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. This report recommended the construction of 60 new commercial vessels a year which would provide the nucleus of a wartime merchant fleet while avoiding the problem of block obsolescence.

In addition, it concluded that the United States needs approximately 36,000 shipyard workers as a peacetime nucleus on which to base a future wartime building program. In 1953 there were only 23,000 workers employed in our large coastal shipyards. Secretary Murray believed that during 1954 this force would decline to about 10,800 workers, and to 1,200 workers by 1955, unless a 60-ship annual building program was instituted.[12]

The Murray report made nine specific recommendations. Among them were the following:

1. Appropriations for pending applications for construction-differential subsidy: The Department of Commerce should request appropriations to cover the Government's share of the cost of construction of ships for which construction-differential subsidy applications are pending. New ship construction should be financed privately to the greatest extent possible. However, if Government financing is required requested appropriations should exclude the purchaser's down payment.

2. Construction revolving fund: The revolving fund authorized under section 206 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, should be made available for use in connection with ship construction, conversion, betterments, research and development. There should be authorized for deposit in this fund: (1) appropriations for ship construction; (2) receipts from sale of ship mortgages; (3) interest and principal payments on ship mortgages owned by the Government; and (4) sale and charter receipts. Reports on the activities with respect to the source and application of such funds should be made periodically to Congress.

3. Procedure for the determination of construction subsidy: The Department of Commerce should request legislation to facilitate the determination of construction-differential subsidy rates. Provisions required are: (1) The Board should be authorized to determine construction-differential subsidy rates for major types of vessels, i.e., cargo, combination, and tanker, to be effective for a certain period of time; (2) language in existing law that has given rise to controversy should be clarified; and (3) the Comptroller General should be required to audit the construction subsidy rate as determined by the Federal Maritime Board within a period of 30 days.

4. Accelerated depreciation for new vessels: The Department of Commerce should request legislation to provide that any vessel contracted for after July 1, 1954, and delivered prior to January 1, 1962, may be depreciated on a 20-year basis. In addition, the owner should be authorized to take additional depreciation on a sliding scale basis as follows: (1) an amount not to exceed 3 percent each year if the ship is delivered before January 1, 1962; and (2) if in connection with such construction a vessel of less than 20 years is traded in pursuant to section 510 of the Act, an additional one-half of 1 percent per year depreciation should be allowed for each year the vessel is less than 20 years old. Such depreciation should be used in the year taken to reduce the unpaid balance of any mortgage outstanding against the vessel and subsidized operators should be required to deposit such depreciation in their statutory reserve fund.

5. Trade-in-and-build tanker program: The Department of Commerce should urge

[5] Op. cit., pp. 2859–2860.

[6] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 79, pt. 5, 74th Cong., 1st sess., Apr. 15, 1935, pp. 5617–5618.

[7] The Merchant Marine Act, 1936, the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946, the Merchant Marine Act, 1920, the Shipping Act, 1916, and the Merchant Marine Act, 1928 (as amended through the 84th Cong.), 85th Cong., 1st sess., report by the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, p. 1.

[8] Ibid.

[9] U.S. Government Organization Manual, 1959–60, pp. 689–690.

[10] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 99, pt. 1, 83d Cong., 1st sess., Jan. 20, 1953, p. 449.

[11] Ibid.

[12] Daily report of executives, the Washington Daily Reporter System, division of the Bureau of National Affairs, Inc., Washington, D.C., No. 85, May 3, 1954, p. A-1.

enactment of legislation dealing with the trade-in-and-build tanker program similar to that sponsored by the Department during the 1st session of the 83d Congress. This legislation authorized the Maritime Administration to acquire tankers which are at least 10 years old under the terms of section 510 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, for the purposes of creating a national defense reserve of tanker vessels and of encouraging the construction of modern tankers in U.S. shipyards. Under section 510, the Government is authorized to acquire an old vessel and grant an allowance against the purchase price of a new vessel. Consideration should be given to the use of a statutory formula for establishing trade-in values in lieu of the present method of section 510 of the 1936 Act.[13]

As has already been indicated, the American merchant marine was then already approaching an advanced state of obsolescence. The Murray report said:

Eighty-one percent of the 1,297 ships in the commercially-operated U.S. fleet were built during World War II, and will become 20 years old during the 1961–65 period. Thus, if the fleet is replaced only as ships become obsolete, a total of 936 keels will have to be laid during the 1961–63 period. This would require 174 shipways, while only 63 are available.[14]

NATIONAL DEFENSE

Following the passage of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, there was a general acceptance of the concept that our national security required not only American-flag ships on the high seas, but shipbuilding and repair facilities within the continental United States.

This approach was consistent with the Buy-American Act which provided that the Federal Government should show a preference to American firms in purchasing goods and services for its own needs so as to preserve those industries and skills which would be necessary in time of war.

At that time, our war mobilization plans were based on the view that any war in which we might become engaged would undoubtedly be a protracted conflict. Under such conditions, many vessels would be lost. In order to maintain a continuous flow of supplies and personnel to distant theaters of action, it would be necessary to replace those ships destroyed by enemy action and to construct many additional ones to meet the added burdens of war mobilization. Furthermore, we would have to meet the deficiencies in our available supply of shipping due to the fact that foreign ships formerly carrying our cargoes would no longer be in a position to do so.

Within the past 18 months, the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Office of Civil Defense and War Mobilization have reappraised our defense needs based on the concept that a probable future war would be of very short duration because of the use of nuclear weapons and ballistic missiles.

Accordingly, they recommended a complete reevaluation of our strategic and critical stockpile requirements as well as a review of the shipbuilding program. Under this premise, only vessels already in service could play a substantial role in achieving a victory.

It would be difficult to challenge the thesis that a war involving nuclear weapons on a worldwide scale would be of short duration. However, there is a serious question as to whether any major powers, aware of the fact that other belligerents also possess such weapons, would be willing to be the first to authorize their use. In World War II the troops of all belligerents as well as the civilian populations in many European countries were supplied with gas masks and every possible precaution was taken against the hazards of gas warfare. While every participating country had its own noxious gases, they were never used because each of the warring nations was unwilling to face the retaliation which would ensue if such a method of warfare were adopted.

Although the United States during the Korean conflict had exclusive possession of the atomic bomb it, too, was not used. During the past 10 years, in addition to the fighting in Korea, there have been armed conflicts in French Indochina, in Algeria, in Egypt during the Suez crisis, in Lebanon, and in many other parts of the world. Yet, military operations were conducted entirely with conventional weapons.

There is every reason to believe that if a minor war should occur, we would make every effort to avoid extending its dimenmensions by using these new modern weapons. Accordingly, under such conditions, we might expect that our forces would be deployed overseas, and it would be necessary to maintain once again a supply of ships and shipbuilding facilities as we have done in our past military conflicts.

In recent months, there has been a further reappraisal of the military and strategic stockpile requirements on the premise that if major producing facilities are destroyed in a nuclear war, vast amounts of material will be required in order to reconstruct our economy. A factor for this contingency has now been included in the computation of stockpile requirements. The maintenance of shipyards also is essential to provide for the reestablishment of our normal way of life after a nuclear conflict is ended, should such an eventuality develop.

Inasmuch as our privately owned shipyards are spread along the Atlantic, Gulf, and Pacific coasts, and the Great Lakes it is unlikely that they all would be destroyed in any type of war. If this ultimate tragedy should befall our Nation, we certainly would require a shipbuilding industry as a part of the necessary base to restore once again civilization for those fortunate few who may have survived the holocaust of a nuclear war.

Everyone is concerned with government economy, and no program should be accepted without question or challenge. In comparison with the farm subsidy program which accumulates quantities of unneeded food and fiber, however, the Federal assistance to the shipbuilding industry represents a very small outlay. In fact, the Federal Budget provides roughly $150 million to assist in ship construction.[15] This includes the construction-differential subsidy, the development of new ships, the construction and design of nuclear-powered vessels, and other similar projects. In a way, these expenditures may be regarded in the same context as those for civil defense. Perhaps they are not productive in the sense that in a peaceful world we could secure more needed goods and services from these expenditures. It would be possible to acquire necessary shipping from foreign yards, but if such a course were adopted, we would soon lose the facilities and the skills to maintain our maritime position should an emergency arise.

In appraising this program, it might be well to compare it with civil defense which, also, is a burden on the taxpayer and contributes nothing to our economic advancement. The 1960 budget recommended allocating $25 million for Federal contributions to the States to be matched equally with State funds for civil defense programs.[16] It also included provisions for $14 million to purchase emergency supplies and equipment,[17] $12 million to finance, on a consolidated basis, the civil and defense mobilization functions of other Federal agencies under clarified and expanded assignments of responsibility,[18] and $7 million for research and development on measures and plans for evacuation shelters and the protection of life and property.[19] These activities would cost the Federal Government $58 million.

Even though our citizens derive no immediate satisfaction from these expenditures, the Federal Government would be derelict in discharging its proper responsibilities if it made no provision for a civil defense program.

There have been frequent criticisms that the program recommended by the President is inadequate, and Governor Rockefeller has long advocated the construction of shelters which would ultimately cost billions of dollars. In this context, the small amount of Federal funds necessary to maintain essential shipbuilding facilities becomes a relatively insignificant item in the total Federal Budget.

While some contend that we might purchase our ships abroad for less money, it must be remembered that in many cases our bottoms are more costly because features have been incorporated in their design to facilitate their immediate conversion for military use. In many cases, the plans and specifications demand fireproof construction, special bulkheads, advanced hull designs of a secret nature to insure maximum speed, and other special devices which are classified. It would be impossible to maintain military security and yet disclose the essential technical information to a foreign builder so that these engi-

[13] Op. cit., pp. A–2, A–3.
[14] Ibid., p. A–4.

[15] The Budget of the U.S. Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, Washington, D.C., 1959, p. 418.
[16] Ibid., p. 69.
[17] Ibid., p. 70.
[18] Op. cit., Budget, June 30, 1960, p. 72.
[19] Ibid., p. 71.

neering concepts could be incorporated in the construction of a ship destined ultimately to fly the American flag.

The steamship *United States* provides a perfect example of this advanced construction. It is completely fireproof and has held the speed record on the Atlantic crossing ever since it was commissioned. Probably no one outside of the naval service and the Maritime Administration really knows the maximum speed that the steamship *United States* is capable of attaining.

Facilities to construct new ships are not sufficient since in a protracted conflict there will be many opportunities to repair damaged vessels and restore them to active service. If they incorporate these classified military features, then it becomes essential that all repair work be performed under the American flag.

FREE ENTERPRISE AND SUBSIDIES

Many Americans who believe in a system of free competitive enterprise abhor subsidies of any kind. They believe that the elimination of trade barriers, monopolies, and Government interference with a free market will best promote the economic welfare of everyone. In fact, this is the doctrine which was enunciated so clearly by Adam Smith in "The Wealth of Nations."

While Adam Smith showed that free trade would maximize the opulence of every country, it is significant that he recognized that opulence must give way in a world beset by animosities. One of the impediments to free trade in the England of Adam Smith's time was the act of navigation. This act placed a heavy burden (tariffs and other restrictions) on foreign trade. Adam Smith, however, stated:

> The act of navigation is not favorable to foreign commerce, or to the growth of that opulence which can arise from it. * * * As defence, however, is of much more importance than opulence, the act of navigation is, perhaps, the wisest of all the commercial regulations of England.[20]

The full text of Adam Smith's views taken from "The Wealth of Nations" provides ample justification in a world beset with existing tensions for subsidizing our ship construction industry. Book 4, Chapter II, of "The Wealth of Nations" states:

> The first is, when some particular sort of industry is necessary for the defense of the country. The defense of Great Britain, for example, depends very much upon the number of its sailors and shipping. The act of navigation, therefore, very properly endeavors to give the sailors and shipping of Great Britain the monopoly of the trade of their own country, in some cases, by absolute prohibitions, and in others by heavy burdens upon the shipping of foreign countries.
>
> When the act of navigation was made, though England and Holland were not actually at war, the most violent animosity subsisted between the two nations. It had begun during the government of the long parliament, which first framed this act, and it broke out soon after in the Dutch wars during that of the Protector and of Charles II. It is not impossible, therefore, that some of the regulations of this famous act may have proceeded from national animosity. They are as wise, however, as if they had all been dictated by the most deliberate wisdom. National animosity at that particular time aimed at the very same object which the most deliberate wisdom would have recommended, the diminution of the naval power of Holland, the only naval power which could endanger the security of England.
>
> The act of navigation is not favorable to foreign commerce, or to the growth of that opulence which can arise from it. The interest of a nation in its commercial relations to foreign nations is, like that of a merchant with regard to the different people with whom he deals, to buy as cheap and to sell as dear as possible. But it will be most likely to buy cheap, when by the most perfect freedom of trade it encourages all nations to bring to it the goods which it has occasion to purchase; and, for the same reason, it will be most likely to sell dear, when its markets are thus filled with the greatest number of buyers. The act of navigation, it is true, lays no burden upon foreign ships that come to export the produce of British industry. Even the ancient aliens duty, which used to be paid upon all goods exported as well as imported, has, by several subsequent acts, been taken off from the greater part of the articles of exportation. But if foreigners, either by prohibitions or high duties, are hindered from coming to sell, they cannot always afford to come to buy; because coming without a cargo, they must lose the freight from their own country to Great Britain. By diminishing the number of sellers, therefore, we necessarily diminish that of buyers, and are thus likely not only to buy foreign goods dearer, but to sell our own cheaper, than if there was a more perfect freedom of trade. As defense, however, is of much more importance than opulence, the act of navigation is, perhaps, the wisest of all the commercial regulations of England.[21]

America has endeavored to follow the advice of Adam Smith, and in keeping with this philosophy, we have lowered our tariffs. Except for a few agricultural commodities, we do not employ import quotas, and there are no currency or monetary controls on our foreign trade.

We have never advocated providing a merchant marine that could handle our entire foreign trade as the Congress has always accepted the fact that many maritime nations through the sale of shipping services secure needed dollar exchange to purchase products produced here in the United States where we have a comparative advantage over other nations.

WHY DOES IT COST MORE TO BUILD VESSELS IN AMERICA?

American costs, unless offset by great comparative advantage, will be higher than those in other countries in almost every instance. This is demonstrated by our loss of gold, which has paid for the imports of goods and services we have purchased from abroad.

In 1949, U.S. gold stocks reached a postwar high of $24.6 billion. At the end of 1958, they stood at $20.6 billion, a decline of $4 billion. The reduction in the year 1958 alone totaled $2.3 billion.[22] The final data for 1959 will show a further reduction in our gold reserves. In fact, the monthly figures show a falling gold stock for every month since January 1958. While a $20 billion gold stock provides an adequate base for our currency, it must be self-evident that a decline of about 10 percent a year can no longer continue without completely destroying our own economic system. This, perhaps, is the best way for us to fully appreciate the impact of imports on our economy, since an excess of demands for dollar payments abroad over purchases from us will sooner or later be reflected in our monetary reserves. These terms are used broadly as they include goods, services, and capital investment.

President Eisenhower, in his State of the Union message delivered to the Congress on January 7, estimated that expenditures would total $79.8 billion in the 1961 fiscal year.[23] Based on previous budgets, major national security expenditures included for the Department of Defense, the atomic energy program, and military assistance aspects of the mutual security program, as well as stockpiling and other activities authorized by the Defense Production Act will total more than $45 billion, or in excess of 55 percent of the total budget request.[24] There is only one way that these costs can be met, namely through taxation which ultimately must be reflected in the price of every product as well as in the wages and salaries of all our employees. Insofar as the United States is forced to assume a disproportionate share of the effort to preserve the free world, its prices are less competitive than they otherwise might be.

Until recently Western Germany has had no sizable military budget, and this has been an important factor in enabling her producers to operate with lower costs and hence quote lower prices in the world's competitive markets.

While the President has proposed an $80 billion budget, total payments to the public by the Federal Government in the 1960 fiscal year, including the operations of the many trust funds, will represent a total of almost $95 billion.[25] The total gross national product in 1958 was $437 billion so that actually 21.7 percent of our total production is channeled through the Federal Government.[26] To this must be added the vast sums for the maintenance of State and local governments. Taxes on American wages and salaries provide a large portion of the funds to maintain this structure in one form or another, and many of our labor unions in formulating their demands at the bargaining table have begun to think

[20] Abbott, Leonard Dalton, ed. "Masterworks of Economics," Doubleday & Co., New York, 1946, "An Inquiry Into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations," by Adam Smith, p. 162.

[21] Op. cit., Abbott, Leonard Dalton, pp. 161–162.

[22] Federal Reserve Bulletin, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, January 1959, Washington, D.C., p. 86.

[23] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, House of Representatives, vol. 106, No. 2, Jan. 7, 1960, Washington, D.C., p. 138.

[24] "The Federal Budget in Brief, Fiscal Year 1960," Executive Office of the President, Bureau of the Budget, Washington, D.C., p. 18.

[25] Ibid., p. 54.

[26] Economic Report of the President, Jan. 20, 1959, Washington, D.C., p. 139.

exclusively in terms of take-home pay. Hence, increasing costs of government will eventually be reflected in less competitive world prices.

It is apparent to any observer of the Washington scene that it will be a miracle if the President's proposed budget for the 1961 fiscal year, which starts July 1, will survive the onslaughts of those who are determined to authorize new public works programs, public housing, and many other desirable projects, without any consideration as to how we are to pay for them without destroying our economic base.

For years to come, it will be necessary for American producers to be far more productive than their foreign competitors, merely in order to maintain their share of our own market, while we undertake the many tasks to which we are committed in the world struggle against communism. This will result in situations in which we shall have to resort temporarily to various devices, in order to relieve pressures which could be destructive.

In many fields of activity, American products, even though our wage rates are far higher than those prevailing in other countries, have no difficulty in competing for a large share of the world market. An examination of these products invariably shows that they are manufactured by industries in which the productivity of labor is high because the efforts of each worker are supplemented by a large capital investment. In most instances there must be some relationship between the wage rates paid within any given community for jobs requiring comparable skills. A large segment of American industry can afford to pay relatively high wages and still compete in world markets, because of our mass-production techniques. These industries determine the general level of wages. Products can be mass produced, so that individuals with relatively little skill can perform most of the manufacturing operations. This is made possible by extensive expenditures on special tools, dies, and fixtures; and these expenditures can be recovered only if many identical units are produced.

In shipbuilding, as in the construction industry, higher skills are needed, as compared to the needs in most of the mass-production industries. However, mass-production techniques cannot be used in shipbuilding or in the erection of most buildings, as each building or each ship is a unique, tailormade product.

In the case of construction, foreign competition is impossible, since a building or a highway must be developed on the site; and the wages for those employed on a project, although linked to the wages paid those in the mass-production industries, presents no competitive problem. This premise is not valid in the case of ship construction, because foreign yards will always be able to furnish vessels at lower costs. Unlike buildings, ships can be sailed into an American port.

The following table contrasts the average straight time and hourly earnings for a number of basic industries, including all manufacturing. It should be noted that domestic shipyard and construction wage rates compare favorably with the highest found in American industry:

AVERAGE STRAIGHT-TIME HOURLY EARNINGS [1]

[September 1959]

All manufacturing industries	$2.14
Durable goods industries	2.28
Primary metal industries	2.66
Blast furnaces, steelworks, and rolling mills	3.10
Machinery (except electrical)	2.51
Transportation equipment	2.71
Motor vehicles and equipment	2.78
Aircraft and parts	2.65
Ship and boat-building and repairs	2.60
Nondurable goods industries	1.95
Products of petroleum and coal	2.91
Petroleum refining	3.03
Rubber products	2.47
Nonmanufacturing industries:	
Contract construction	3.16
Nonbuilding construction	2.85
Building construction	3.26

[1] Survey of Current Business, U.S. Department of Commerce, Office of Business Economics, December 1959, Washington, D.C., pp. S-14, S-15.

A similar problem prevails with respect to operating subsidies. Americans will not become seamen unless their prospective earnings compare favorably with those in other available occupations here in the United States. Although immigration is restricted, our treaties of navigation make it possible for foreign seamen to enter our ports and to carry our cargoes. All of the enactments described in the introductory section of these remarks clearly show that the Congress and the Administration, under both Democratic and Republican control, agree that a subsidy program is the only available and practical means to maintain a naval auxiliary. It also insures that our ships are constructed in American yards, thus providing a margin to meet the demands of a protracted military conflict.

The funds provided by the Congress to further American ship construction do not represent a net outlay. They are a gross cost. While no accurate data on the taxes paid by shipbuilding employees are available, in December 1959, there were 123,500 shipbuilding employees [27] in the United States, and they were making an average weekly salary of $102.18.[28] Depending on the individual's personal circumstances, the Federal Government derives a substantial revenue from the personal income taxes paid by these workers. In addition, it receives corporate income taxes paid not only by shipbuilding industries, but also by the countless supplying firms, as well as by their employees and stockholders. Hence, the net subsidy, after the payment of all the taxes on the income generated by this activity, is a very small sum.

[27] Shipbuilders Council of America, annual report, Apr. 1, 1959, New York, table 20.

[28] Op. cit., Shipbuilders Council of America, annual report, table 7.

SHALL WE BUILD SHIPS OR SUPPORT DEPRESSED AREAS?

When the United States entered World War I, there were virtually no American-flag ships. Although American shipyards built only 24 vessels of 2,000 tons and over in 1914, by 1919 this number had been increased to 680 vessels.[29] Construction from then on decreased steadily, until in 1935 only two steel, self-propelled merchant ships were constructed in private shipyards.[30]

In 1936, the newly formed Maritime Commission again expanded the shipbuilding program. While in that year only eight ships were built, the number increased year by year; and by 1943, because of the need that World War II had created, American ship construction reached an all-time peak. Federal subsidies to maintain and promote the merchant marine at a time of maximum war effort in 1943 cost $3,576 million.[31] In order to build 1,661 ships under such conditions, 1,655,500 people were employed in our shipyards and related industries.[32] Needless to say, there was unnecessary waste and inefficiency in a program which required an expansion of this magnitude, because many workers needed extensive training, and were ill-suited to the requirements of the tasks before them. In addition, absenteeism was high; and acute problems, including those because of the needs for additional housing, schools, police and fire protection, developed because of the migration of workers to coastal areas. Vessels built under these conditions were not only costly; in many cases, they were inefficient and uneconomic for normal commercial use when the war ended.

As the war drew to a close, ships were no longer needed for defense purposes, and we were plagued with a surplus of bottoms. Yet, the United States could not adopt a policy of allowing all of our existing yards to discontinue operations. By 1954, there were only 355 shipbuilding and repairing establishments.[33] As of April 1959, they employed only 149,700 persons.[34]

Ship construction, of necessity, must be performed where there is ready access to the high seas. As a result, many of our shipyards are located in towns which are dependent upon them for their economic well-being. In such a situation, the abandonment of an active operation represents a loss of income for the entire area, for usually no other industries in which the employees will readily be able to find work are close at hand.

Although there have been frequent proposals to assist so-called chronically

[29] Shipbuilders Council of America, annual report, Apr. 1, 1959, New York, table 23.

[30] Ibid.

[31] "Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1950," U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, 71st ed., Washington, D.C., p. 313.

[32] Op. cit., Shipbuilders Council of America, annual report, table 20.

[33] The Economic Almanac of the National Industrial Conference Board, 1958, Thomas Y. Crowell Co., New York, p. 188.

[34] The Handbook of Basic Economic Statistics, Economic Statistics Bureau of Washington, D.C., vol. XIII, No. 7, July 1959, p. 51.

depressed areas, the elimination of ship-construction subsidies would create numerous new ones. Those who advocate Federal programs to relieve this condition describe depressed areas as those which have "lost certain historic locational advantages, where local enterprise and initiative have usually been smothered and repressed by the existence of persistent and chronic unemployment" and which have "low financial resources" and are, therefore, "least capable of raising the capital required for long-term bold programs for rehabilitation." [35]

Chronic unemployment necessitates an expensive burden which absorbs vast sums in unemployment compensation and relief payments. Because the citizens of such areas have little purchasing power, they do not contribute a proportionate share to the Nation's output or to local, State, and Federal tax revenues.

It would be ironic for the Federal Government to attempt to reduce budgetary expenditures by abandoning a tried and proven program of ship-construction subsidies, and then later be confronted with additional appropriations for Federal aid to depressed areas which will produce no return whatsoever. Furthermore, the efficacy of any such program, in terms of restoring such an area to a healthy economic condition, is still to be proven.

As an example of what might happen if the ship-construction subsidy program were discontinued, an examination of the conditions prevailing in Newport News, Va., is illustrative. Of the city's 120,418 people, 12,500 are employed in ship construction.[36] This represents more than 10 percent of the community's total population, including children, retired persons, and housewives. At an average weekly salary of $90, these employees earn about $58 million a year.[37] A discontinuance of shipbuilding activities at the Newport News Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co. not only would represent a temporary loss of jobs for those employed; but, because within the immediate area there are no other industries which could absorb these workers, it would constitute almost a permanent loss of their incomes. Unless their families were able to relocate themselves in other communities, the present employees would be forced first to accept unemployment compensation, which, based on their normal earnings, would represent a cost to the State of Virginia of approximately $20 million. Ultimately, they would be forced to accept relief or public assistance; and, in many cases, this, again, would involve Federal funds to match State funds. In addition, the Federal Government would no longer receive the revenues derived from either the corporate or personal taxes which formerly were produced from this economic activity.

While data has been assembled respecting Newport News, this approach would apply to other yards on the east coast, such as the Bath Iron Works, at Bath, Maine; to yards on the Gulf coast, such as the Ingalls Shipbuilding Corp., at Pascagoula, Miss.; and to yards on the west coast, such as the National Steel & Shipbuilding Corp., at San Diego. Other yards are located in major metropolitan areas, such as New York, Boston, Philadelphia, and Baltimore. If their workers were displaced, they might find employment, but they would probably receive lower wages in another occupation, where their skills could not be used to their maximum effectiveness.

If unemployment were more than 10 percent of the entire population, which implies a much higher percent of the civilian labor force, the community would be classified as a depressed area, which, by definition in the Area Redevelopment Act, S. 722, of the 86th Congress, is one where unemployment is at a level of 6 percent or more in a period when the economy as a whole is in a healthy condition.[38]

The political and budgetary implications of measures to assist depressed areas are indicated by the fact that both major parties proposed, in their 1956 platforms, Federal aid to meet this problem. Within the past 5 years, four congressional committees have considered legislation on this subject.

In 1958, S. 3683, of the 85th Congress, was passed by both Houses of the Congress, but was pocket-vetoed by the President on September 6, 1958.[39] This bill provided for an Area Redevelopment Administration under a Commissioner. The proposed responsibilities for this new Federal bureaucrat were defined as follows:

> The Commissioner would designate as industrial redevelopment areas, those areas suffering from substantial and persistent unemployment, and as rural redevelopment areas, those areas with a large number and percentage of low-income families and substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment. An overall program for the economic development of each area would then be prepared and approved by the Commissioner. This program would be prepared by the leaders of the area with the advice and assistance of the appropriate State and local authorities and the Area Redevelopment Administration.
>
> The Commissioner could make loans for industrial projects in industrial redevelopment areas out of a revolving fund of $100 million. He could make loans for industrial projects in rural redevelopment areas out of another $100 million revolving fund. These funds would be obtained by borrowing from the Treasury. The Commissioner could also make grants for public facilities from appropriated funds of $75 million a year.
>
> The Commissioner could give information and technical assistance to redevelopment areas. Financial assistance under the urban redevelopment program under the Housing Act of 1949 could be given in redevelopment areas. The Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare could provide information and financial assistance in connection with vocational training programs and the Secretary of Labor would be authorized to arrange for subsistence payments up to 13 weeks to persons receiving such vocational training, but not then receiving unemployment compensation.[40]

If American shipyards are abandoned, the dislocations will extend beyond the coastal areas. Once again, employees working for suppliers to the maritime industry are, in many cases, primarily dependent upon it for employment. Accordingly, if we adopt a policy of eliminating ship-construction subsidies, based on the premise that it is cheaper to build American ships abroad, it will have far-flung consequences. As an example, there are approximately 33 companies which manufacture structural shapes or sheared and universal plates.[41] These are important in the construction of vessels. Over one-third of the facilities devoted to the production of these finished steel products are situated in areas which might well become depressed if the level of economic activity slackens, and if shipbuilding there is discontinued.

The Area Redevelopment Act, S. 722, introduced by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], was passed by the Senate, by a vote of 49 to 46, on March 23, 1959,[42] and was passed by the House on May 4, 1960, by a vote of 201 to 184. It provides for total authorizations of $251 million, distributed as follows: $75 million for the purpose of loans to establish new plants in industrial areas, $75 million for loans to establish plants in rural areas, $50 million in loans to construct needed public facilities, $35 million for grants to public facilities, $10 million for subsistence payments for retraining, $1.5 million for vocational training grants, and $4.5 million for technical assistance.[43]

The bill provides the following criteria in order to define eligibility for depressed-area aid:

1. Unemployment of 12 percent of the civilian labor force persisting for 12 months;
2. Unemployment of 9 percent of this group for 15 out of 18 months;
3. Unemployment of 6 percent of this group for 18 out of 24 months.[44]

The proponents of this measure define their objectives in the preamble of the bill, as follows:

> The Congress declares that the maintenance of the national economy at a high

[35] Area Redevelopment Act, report of the Committee on Banking and Currency, House of Representatives, 86th Cong., 1st sess., together with minority and individual views on S. 722, H.R. 360, Washington, D.C., May 14, 1959, p. 6.

[36] Editor and Publisher Market Guide, Editor and Publisher Co., Inc., New York, 1959, p. 444.

[37] Ibid.

[38] Area Redevelopment Act, report of the Committee on Banking and Currency, together with minority and individual views to accompany S. 722, U.S. Senate, 86th Cong., 1st sess., Rept. No. 110, Mar. 18, 1959, p. 15.

[39] Op cit. Area Redevelopment Act, H. Rept. No. 360, p. 2.

[40] Area Redevelopment Act, report to accompany S. 3683, Rept. No. 2099, 85th Cong., 2d sess., House of Representatives, Washington, D.C., July 1, 1958, p. 3.

[41] Directory of Iron and Steel Works of the United States and Canada, American Iron and Steel Institute, 28th ed., New York, 1957, pp. 468, 469.

[42] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 86th Cong., 1st sess., vol. 105, No. 47, Mar. 23, 1959, p. 4438; vol. 106, No. 81, May 4, 1960, p. 8798.

[43] Op. cit., Area Redevelopment Act, H. Rept. 360, p. 7.

[44] Op. cit., Area Redevelopment Act. H. Rept. 360, p. 31.

level is vital to the best interests of the United States, but that some of our communities are suffering substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment; that such unemployment and underemployment cause hardship to many individuals and their families and detracts from the national welfare by wasting vital human resources; that to overcome this problem the Federal Government, in cooperation with the States, should help areas of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment to take effective steps in planning and financing their economic redevelopment; that Federal assistance to communities, industries, enterprises, and individuals in areas needing redevelopment should enable such areas to achieve lasting improvement and enhance the domestic prosperity by the establishment of stable and diversified local economies; and that under the provisions of this act new employment opportunities should be created by developing and expanding new and existing facilities and resources without substantially reducing employment in other areas of the United States.[45]

The Department of Labor makes regular reports on 149 communities, in terms of the percentage of unemployment prevailing among the civilian labor force. Based on these studies, early in 1959, approximately 20 of these areas would meet one of the criteria set forth in S. 722 for depressed-area aid.[46] The Administration, the Republican and Democratic congressional leadership, as well as the supporters of the more liberal bill referred to above, are in agreement that depressed areas constitute a serious problem, which justifies some Federal assistance. At the present time, most existing depressed areas fall into one of the following categories:

Coal-mining towns in Pennsylvania, West Virginia, eastern Kentucky, and sections of adjoining States; particularly hard hit are anthracite mining areas such as the Wyoming Valley of Pennsylvania—for example, Scranton, Pa.

New England towns in which textile employment has materially declined; for example, Lawrence, Mass.

Areas where employment in railroad shops was reduced as a result of dieselization of the railroad industry; for example, Altoona, Pa.

Resort and other areas which have never established a solid industrial base sufficient to support full-time employment of the community's labor force; for example, Asheville, N.C.

Towns in which the economy depended on a natural resource which has been largely exhausted—northern Michigan, Minnesota, and Wisconsin towns formerly dependent on copper or iron mining or lumber; for example, Iron Mountain, Mich.[47]

One-industry towns are characteristic of many shipbuilding industries. Before discarding existing programs which enable us to maintain necessary facilities, careful consideration must be given to the ultimate cost to all taxpayers of creating additional depressed areas. These costs include not only possible Federal grants, but, in addition, the loss of existing tax revenues. Most important is the loss of personal dignity for the individual directly concerned, and, for the community, the loss of the skills he possesses.

Inasmuch as shipbuilding subsidies are admittedly the only means of meeting the urgent problems of national defense under a series of probable conditions in a future emergency, it is foolhardy to attempt to save less than $150 million in gross outlays and thereby destroy an essential industry. Furthermore, these savings are ephemeral. The ultimate cost includes a loss of revenues as well as expenditures to support new nonproductive Federal programs.

Ships or any other necessary element in our national defense are preferable to make-work projects which are implied in all of the depressed area legislation which has been before the Congress. Under existing world tensions, and with rapid technological progress on so many different fronts, we cannot afford to become dependent on other nations to provide advanced designs for our merchant marine and naval auxiliaries.

[45] Bill analysis, American Enterprise Association, Inc., 86th Cong., 1st sess., Rept. No. 7, Washington, D.C., Feb. 25, 1959, p. 8.

[46] Op. cit., bill analysis, p. 2.

[47] Ibid.

FOREIGN POLICY PROBLEMS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to make a few comments on some of the foreign policy problems which confront the Republic. I am not surprised at the Republican attack which has been made today on the floor of the Senate on Adlai Stevenson, because the Republicans very well know that if Adlai Stevenson should be nominated at the Democratic National Convention in Los Angeles, he would be overwhelmingly elected President of the United States in November 1960.

This is a typical Republican downgrading strategy which we on this side of the aisle must expect in the months ahead. In fact, we must expect it regardless of which Democrat is nominated.

Adlai Stevenson is one of the greatest minds in American public life, and the White House calls for a great mind. We have sorely needed one in the White House for almost 8 years.

As Democrats we have the responsibility in the campaign ahead to discuss openly and frankly with the American people the issues of American foreign policy.

I want the RECORD to show this afternoon that I stand behind every word Adlai Stevenson spoke in his Chicago speech which has been referred to. I am glad the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] has already put it in the RECORD. It was a typical, statesmanlike speech from Adlai Stevenson.

It is my opinion and judgment that if the American people had elected him as President of the United States in 1952, we would not be as close to war today as we are. I wish to say to my Democratic colleagues I think they ought to stop the practice of sneezing every time President Eisenhower coughs about a foreign policy matter. The Democrats have themselves to blame, in large measure, for the plight in which our party finds itself in regard to the matter of foreign policy, because we have had too many Democratic leaders who have been rubber-stamping a wrong foreign policy.

The Democratic Party owes it to the American people to take the foreign policy issue to the people and give them a choice on foreign policy.

It is my opinion that if we continue to follow the Republican foreign policy for many more years, we shall be in the midst of a nuclear war, out of which no one will be victorious, because, in my judgment, the evidence is abundantly clear that neither side can win a nuclear war.

Therefore, because this issue has been raised on the floor of the Senate today, I wish to make a few statements about it for the RECORD.

AMERICAN PEOPLE UNINFORMED ON FOREIGN POLICY

The United States and Russia are equally feared and jointly feared, and rightly so, in many parts of the globe, as the two great threats to the peace of the world. I know the American people want peace; we, the people, are dedicated to peace; but the sad fact is our Government is following a foreign policy that is bound inevitably to end in a nuclear war, unless the American people make it very clear to the leadership of the country that they want that policy changed. How can they make it clear? The American people are uninformed on American foreign policy due to the fact that the Eisenhower administration, during the last 8 years, has taken the people a long way down the road to Government by secrecy. Government by secrecy does not end up in freedom. Government by secrecy frequently ends up in war. And we are on the way.

The time has come, in my judgment, when the Democratic Party should offer to lead the American people back to the Wilsonian doctrine of open covenants openly arrived at, and make clear to the American people, in the historic campaign ahead, that we are through with secret diplomacy, that we are going to stop rubberstamping the secret diplomacy of the Eisenhower administration. Therefore, it is time we make clear to the American people that, as the Democratic Party, we are through with undercutting and undermining the United Nations, and that we propose to return to a sound democratic policy of seeking to follow the doctrine of international decisions based upon law, and take our case to an international organization, such as the United Nations, with such reforms in the United Nations as are sorely needed.

We are, in my judgment, in an immoral nuclear armaments race, an armaments race that cannot be reconciled by a single moral principle to which we bow our heads on Sunday. Those principles of morality ought to be practiced the other 6 days of the week, as well as revered on Sunday.

We are in danger of writing a sordid chapter in world history by a continuation of an immoral nuclear armaments race along with a nation the leadership of which we know to be amoral. Is it

not an historic commentary that the great, moral Nation of the United States is permitting itself to be drawn into an immoral nuclear armaments race, without paying attention to the other part of the paradox in which we live?

MILITARY SPOKESMEN ON FOREIGN POLICY

We live in a paradox, Mr. President. We live in a paradox in which we have to keep ourselves so militarily strong that Russia will understand she will have everything to lose and nothing to gain by an aggressive action against the free world. But, Mr. President, if that is the end of our goal, if that is the sum and substance of our procedures with regard to foreign policy, then the end result is bound to be war.

I listened to testimony of an expert, not very many weeks ago, who was talking about what would happen in a moderate nuclear war. He made very clear that there is not such a thing, of course, as the possibility of a moderate nuclear war, because the probabilities are that if a nuclear war should start it would be a total war, and all the bombs would be dropped in a relatively short period of time.

Speaking hypothetically about a moderate nuclear war, this expert said such a war would result, in the first 10 days, in the loss of 50 million lives in the United States and more lives in Russia and Europe. Let us try to reconcile that, Mr. President, with moral principles. We simply cannot forget that history goes on and on. Nations rise and fall.

Mr. President, it happens to be our patriotic duty, as I see our patriotic duty, to do what we can to give the greatest guarantee of an ever-rising America for centuries to come, rather than to follow a foreign policy which, in my judgment, increases the risks of war month by month.

We only have to sit and to listen to the top military brass testify, Mr. President, to know how dangerous is the period in which we live.

There is one thing the Democratic Party ought to make perfectly clear. It is that if the Democrats are elected to power in November 1960 the military will stop issuing foreign policy statements. The military under a Democratic administration, will learn once more a lesson which it seems to have forgotten, that the job of the American military group is to administer a foreign policy determined by a civilian government and not in any way to interrupt it or usurp it.

Periodically, Mr. President, we listen to statements by Admiral Burke as to what is going to happen in the Formosa Straits or in the Caribbean, and we listen to statements by the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff in regard to foreign policy. If we had a President who thoroughly understood the meaning of a civilian government, Mr. President, that top brass would have been removed from control immediately after it violated its constitutional duty to stay out of foreign policy determinations.

BIPARTISANSHIP DEAD

Mr. President, I point out to my Democratic colleagues that under this administration there has been no bipartisan foreign policy at any time, from the time the present President of the United States took his oath of office after his election in 1952 to date. Oh, there have been some conferences with leaders now and then at the White House. I am afraid some of my Democratic colleagues have permitted a little window dressing to go a long way with them. The honor of being briefed has taken the place of real consultation.

The Democratic Party has had no voice in helping to determine American foreign policy under the Eisenhower administration. There has been, in fact, no bipartisan foreign policy. That is why I am always surprised when I pick up the newspapers and read statements by Democratic leaders rubber stamping a foreign policy, after the fact, of the Eisenhower administration.

Mr. President, of course, in an hour of crisis we can always be counted upon to close ranks behind any President of the United States, Republican or Democrat. But I am one Senator who is not going to close ranks behind a President in connection with a wrong foreign policy prior to our getting into a situation where we are at war and before we have exhausted every possibility of correcting a wrong foreign policy by a wrong President. Mr. President, this President of the United States has been wrong many times on foreign policy since he has been in office.

I offer no apology to the American people. I am proud to let my descendants read my record of dissent with this President in regard to foreign policy time and time again.

Well I remember my refusal in 1955 to go along with the Formosa resolution and the warning which the Senator from New York and the Senator from Oregon gave the Senate on that historic occasion—that the Formosa resolution would settle nothing, that the Formosa resolution would increase the danger of war. So it has, Mr. President, and that danger is increasing year by year.

DEMOCRATS FAILED TO SUPPORT UNITED NATIONS

Mr. President, I think it is well understood that within the next few years Red China will have nuclear weapons. Can we think that the Formosa resolution, at that time, is going to be a contribution to peace? If the Democrats had not followed Eisenhower on the Formosa resolution in 1955, if they had supported the Senator from New York and the Senator from Oregon, as we pleaded on the floor of the Senate, taking a position of seeking to get the United Nations to accept a trusteeship over the Formosa Straits, with the United States guaranteeing to the United Nations that it would militarily defend Formosa and the Pescadores, we would be nearer to peace in the Formosa Straits than we are today.

But the Democrats rubberstamped what I consider to be that wrong foreign policy of this administration, which was a foreign policy, again, outside of the United Nations, and which represented once again the record of the Eisenhower administration for unilateral action outside the United Nations rather than through it.

History will record that the Eisenhower administration has bypassed the United Nations time and time again on the major issues which have threatened the peace of the world. The Middle East doctrine is another example. Once again the majority of the Democrats rubberstamped it. More of them stood with us on that than in regard to the Formosa Straits, Mr. President, but even in that instance we heard the pleas for unity. We heard the plea, "You cannot let the President down." We heard the plea, "The President, right or wrong."

That is dangerous doctrine, Mr. President. We have a duty, as Senators—at least, as I see my obligation, I do—to try to correct a wrong Presidential policy. I say, most respectfully, that we Democrats have done a rather poor job of that under this administration. I am glad to see that eyes are, at long last, opening, and at least the Democratic voters of this country—and I will also say, many fine independent and Republican voters of this country—are beginning to recognize that the Eisenhower administration foreign policy, if long continued, is going to lead us into war.

That policy has to be stopped, Mr. President. We have to stop it by stopping our support of the President of the United States every time he circumvents the United Nations, every time he resorts to secret diplomacy, and every time he keeps from the American people the facts about our foreign policy which endanger the people.

DEMOCRATS MUST OFFER ALTERNATIVES

Mr. President, it is one thing to criticize the Republican foreign policy but it is another thing to tell the American people a constructive program which ought to take its place. That is the responsibility of the Democratic Party, in my judgment. We must come forward with a constructive program, rather than constantly be sneezing as Eisenhower coughs, on foreign policy, rather than constantly standing up in the Congress of the United States to plead for unity behind the President on a wrong foreign policy. We have, first, a duty to lay out what is wrong with the administration's foreign policy; and then to offer a constructive program to replace it.

Mr. President, I like the way Adlai Stevenson talks. I like the way Adlai Stevenson thinks.

I like the programs which Adlai Stevenson has presented to the American people for a number of years. I remember the courage of Adlai Stevenson in 1956 in regard to nuclear testing. That was the act of a great man; and we all know the smear job that was done against him by the Republicans in 1956. They were talking then as NIXON has been talking in the past few days—"You are an appeaser if you criticize American foreign policy."

Let me point out that if we do not start criticizing the Eisenhower administration foreign policy, if we do not bring some reforms in regard to it, and if the Democratic Party does not begin in the Congress by offering constructive suggestions to replace the Eisenhower foreign policy, I repeat that within a few

years we shall be at war; and out of that war there will be no victory for the United States and the Western Powers, or for Russia. It will not be the end of civilization; it will merely be the end of American civilization and Russian civilization. There will be much civilization left, but it will be in Asia, Africa, and Latin America, because I am satisfied that a nuclear war would be bound to result in the simultaneous destruction of the civilizations in Europe, the United States, and Russia. I do not think there is any way of stopping it once the trigger is pulled on the first hydrogen bomb. There would be such a chain reaction of the pulling of triggers that it would be merely a matter of days until we had only a remnant of Western civilization and Russian civilization.

So I say to the Democratic Party that the time has come for it to come forward with a constructive program to meet the threat of war, because if we continue the program of the Eisenhower administration, in my judgment our country will end up with war in a very few years. I have said before, and I say again, that if we get into a critical war in which aggression is committed against us, of course we will stand united behind whoever is the President of the United States for the duration of that war, if we have any chance at all of surviving, which I think is highly remote.

Mr. President, I do not share the Democratic talk that we must not even whisper and criticize the Eisenhower policies with regard to foreign policy. In my judgment President Eisenhower and his administration have gotten us into the precarious position we occupy in this dark hour in American and world history.

MANY BELIEVE WE SHOULD FIGHT RUSSIA SOON

If my major thesis is correct—and I am satisfied it is—that this nuclear armament race is immoral, that this nuclear armament race will never stand the moral judgment of history which follows us, then we ought to be at work trying to win the peace, rather than giving aid and comfort to those within our country who are trying to sell the sinister propaganda across America, "We must fight Russia some time anyway; we are probably in a better position to fight her now: So let us get on with fighting her."

My heart is heavy when I reflect on how widespread that sinister propaganda already is. We call it the preventive war theory, an expression which I have heard from the lips of the high brass in this country. In 1955 I argued against the Formosa resolution because I knew the testimony before us had disclosed that we were considering a preventive war resolution. I again raise my voice in opposition to preventive war propaganda in the United States.

If we continue to follow the policy of the Eisenhower administration we shall end with a preventive war, but I do not think it is too late to win the peace. It will call for some courage. It will call for the raising of horizons. It will call for the return to and the putting into practice of a great American ideal.

I know that when I raise my voice lustily and make a plea for implementing a system of international justice through law my critics are heard to say, "That is what happens when you put a professor in politics. He becomes impractical."

I have many answers to the criticism, but I will give only one at this moment in the form of a rhetorical question: I would have these critics tell the American people what is practical about a nuclear war. What is practical about a nuclear war? I can think of no greater impracticality.

Even when the war would be over such civilization as would survive for centuries would live in chaos, because if we stop to reflect for a moment on the chaotic conditions of this globe following a nuclear war, the sad thing is that all the problems which confronted us before the war would have to be solved by the world that remained after the war. The war would solve nothing.

We are told that it would get Russia out of the way. I am satisfied it would get Russia out of the way—and the United States, too; and I do not wish to see the United States put out of the way. I think we have the system of government, and a system of ideals which come nearest to making it practically possible to implement the great spiritual beliefs and teachings to which we are all dedicated as religious men and women in this country. What concerns me so much is that the course of action which we are following cannot be reconciled with those spiritual principles.

CONSTRUCTIVE ALTERNATIVES NEEDED

So once again I plead this afternoon for an effort to implement a system of international justice through law; and I make these suggestions, which I hope will be considered constructive.

First let me say, before I submit such a list, that no one can hold any brief for the course of action the United States took in regard to the spy plane, and no one can hold any brief for the course of action that Khrushchev took, either.

I am a member of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate; and as a member of that committee I know the huge sums of money within our authorizations which are going into so-called intelligence work, which is but a polite name for spy work. Everyone else ought to know, and I presume does know, that, of course, we spend great sums of money for espionage, and so does every other powerful nation. Of course, we have spies in many parts of the world and we know that other countries do, too, including some of our friends in our own country.

We certainly have no doubt about the fact that Russia has spies. But I was highly amused to hear the alibi given by the Vice President of the United States, Mr. NIXON, in talking about the spy plane incident. He sought to attract attention to the fact that there had been a couple Russian spies detected in Massachusetts some months ago.

That is no surprise to anybody. But if I have ever listened to a non sequitur argument, that is one, and I am accustomed to hear such arguments from the Vice President of the United States. What does the detection of intelligence personnel have to do with a course of action followed by the United States in regard to what is interpreted around the world as a form of constructive aggression? That is exactly what the sending of the spy plane over Russia was. It was a form of constructive aggression. We can alibi it and rationalize it all we want to, and we can wave the American flag into tatters over it, but the fact remains that our friends and enemies alike around the world are going to decree that we cannot justify our course of action in the spy plane incident under international comity well recognized in the field of espionage.

At no time, as I sat in the Committee on Foreign Relations or on the floor, and as I voted for the use of funds for intelligence work, was there even a whisper from anyone within the administration, military or civilian, that any of that money would be used for the sending of an instrumentality of war over a foreign sovereign power.

I am satisfied that if any such suggestion had been made, the result with respect to the request for authorization would have been a great deal different, both in committee and on the floor of the Senate. The administration did great damage to the standing and prestige of the United States by following a policy which has shocked our friends around the world in sending an instrumentality of war in the form of a spy plane over Russia.

Let us not forget, in these days of high hysteria, bordering almost on panic, in the thinking of many people, one never knows when such an incident will cause some misguided, uninformed, emotionally aroused person in some foreign country to make a false deduction as to the purpose of such a plane, and a nuclear war will be started thereby.

It was a risk that the administration had no moral right to ever run. They ran it. The plane was shot down. I do not know what the facts are. We hope to get the facts after a thorough investigation. I do not know yet how the plane was shot down.

I am not convinced by any statement coming out of this administration that it was not shot down by a land-to-air missile. There are reasons to doubt the statement. I am satisfied that this administration would like to save face, if it can, with regard to this unfortunate and stupid mistake it made. I do know that one of the pleas made to us for a long time in the Senate for crash programs in connection with the development of land-to-air missiles was that, we were told—and I violate no secrecy by saying this, because this has appeared in periodicals and press reports throughout the country—that the Russians were ahead of us in land-to-air missiles.

The result was that huge sums of money were appropriated for Bomarc—over $3 billion. On the basis of the latest findings, the record of Bomarc is not so good. Of course we know, when we appropriate huge sums of money for these programs, that some of them are not going to be the success we hoped they would be, and that some of them

are going to be failures. I am not greatly concerned about the fact that we appropriated that money. The program apparently resulted in failure. I would vote to do it again. I will do it tomorrow if the administration can come forward with a program that shows an appropriation may help us speed up a crash program on land-to-air missiles. I say that because I have voted in the past and will continue to vote in the future for those appropriations which are necessary to let the Russians at all times know that they have everything to lose and nothing to gain by an aggressive course of action against the free world.

WEAPONS ARE NOT ENOUGH

What I am trying to bring before my country is that merely an arms race will not win the peace. An armaments race will not do that but, in my judgment, will surely assure a nuclear war in our time. That we cannot justify, unless we know that we have done everything that possibly can be done by moral people to try to set up a system of international justice through law which can enforce a total disarmament program.

Khrushchev shot the plane down. One would expect it from an amoral people. International comity and recognized principles of international morality dictated that he not follow that course of action. He has one of the best jet fighter armadas in the world. There are some people who think that they are better than our own. I am not expert enough to testify on that.

However, I raise the point that it is good enough so that there is great concern on the part of our experts as to the comparison between our jet fighter armada and Russia's. All he needed to do was to send three or four of his jet fighters to that plane and surround it and give it orders to ground itself. If it violated that request, then and only then, in my judgment, under the rules of international law, in such a situation, would he have been justified in shooting it down.

He did not follow that course. I have a hunch that he saw a great opportunity. He knew as well as we did that Bomarc has been no great success, and he seized the opportunity to make a demonstration to the world in regard to land-to-air missiles. I think that is a great probability. Be that as it may, he did get a great propaganda advantage over us. Then, having followed that course of action, he went to the summit undoubtedly with a determination to humiliate not only the President of the United States, not only the Presidency of the United States, but also the American people. He wanted to bring into disrepute the President as a man, the position, and the American people.

PRESIDENT DID WELL AT PARIS

Although I have been highly critical of President Eisenhower's foreign policy on many issues, I wish to say that the President went as far in the Paris conference as he could go with honor. He deserves credit for announcing at the very beginning that it was the plan of this Government to suspend any further use of spy planes. That should have been said, and that is all that the President needed to say, if Khrushchev really wanted to have the summit conference be a vehicle and a forum for negotiation and agreement on peace.

Obviously, he did not want that. Therefore, I wish to say that in my judgment the President of the United States conducted himself at the Paris conference within the proprieties, and Khrushchev did not.

I listened to Khrushchev's press interview. I could close my eyes at times during that interview and almost come to the conclusion that I was listening to Hitler, because there were sections of the interview which had many of the characteristics and overtones and undertones of the type of totalitarian propaganda that Hitler preached at his height.

Be that as it may, Khrushchev is a reality. Be that as it may, Khrushchev is at the head of a government that obviously is our potential enemy. Therefore, I believe that, with honor and within procedures that will protect the security of our country, we must proceed now to find out what we can do and to answer the question, "Where do we go from here?"

I am not one to cry over spilled milk. It is better to survey the facts that get us into a position in which we find ourselves at any given time.

But after I have surveyed that position, then I always ask myself the question: Where do we go from here? The Russians apparently thought that they might get more propaganda value by having this matter referred to the Security Council. I think we all know that the Security Council cannot solve it, and undoubtedly will not solve it.

There is not much hope that the Security Council can solve the great problem which confronts us, the problem of winning the peace, by bringing about a sure-proof, enforceable, total disarmament program in our time. I am not an "overnighter." I recognize that such a peace will not be won overnight. It will not be won in 2, 3, or 5 years.

In fact, to secure such a peace probably will consume many years. However, I want to stress that we ought to be taking forward steps toward winning the peace, rather than marching in reverse, as we are at present. I am satisfied we are marching toward war not toward peace. So I wish to make a few suggestions this afternoon which I think we ought to try to implement in the years immediately ahead.

If we do the negotiating within the framework that I suggest this afternoon; if we have the nations of the world negotiating for peace; then, interestingly enough, we will have a form of moratorium on war at the same time, because if the nations of the world are negotiating for peace, the probability will be increased that they will not proceed to fight one another in a war.

ROLE OF RED CHINA NEEDS TO BE UNDERSTOOD

So there are a few reforms which I think we ought to stand for in the field of foreign policy as it affects all nations. Let me stress the word "all" for a moment, because no longer can we divide the world into those nations with whom we will converse, and those nations against whom we will drop an American iron curtain.

Of course, I refer specifically to Red China. No one in this body hates the form of government of Red China more than does the senior Senator from Oregon. Nevertheless, we are following a blind, myopic policy with respect to Red China, because I am satisfied that Red China will be a nuclear power within 10 years. We cannot possibly start negotiating for peace leading toward a total disarmament program, and not include Red China.

This does not mean that the senior Senator from Oregon advocates the immediate recognition of Red China. I do not; although I point out to the American people that Red China has never asked to be recognized. Red China has never made a request for diplomatic recognition on the part of the United States.

However, I hope the time will come when we can recognize Red China with honor to ourselves. We cannot do that now. We cannot do it until we get some very definite proof that we can rely on the commitments of Red China which will show that we can count upon Red China to keep her international commitments.

There are two such commitments which we have the right and also the duty, it seems to me, to ask of her, in order to demonstrate to the world that the United States stands upon its principles of recognition. One of those criteria is the criterion that a nation must demonstrate to us or satisfy us that we can count upon it to keep its international commitments.

So I refer to the allegations which we have made, over and over again, and which I think were merited, that Red China has violated the Korean truce time and time again. The second allegation is that Red China has not followed the recognized procedure of civilized nations in respect to the treatment of our captured nationals. We must ascertain the facts.

Therefore, I suggest that as a condition precedent to any proposal that the United States recognize Red China diplomatically, the United States, through the United Nations, ought to ask Red China to permit a survey or an investigation to be made by an appropriate team of the United Nations concerning the extent, if any, to which Red China has kept to her international commitments in respect to the Korean truce, and in respect to her treatment of American nationals whom she has allegedly tried in her courts and sentenced to various types of punishment in Red China.

Does anyone think for a moment that the United States would object to a similar survey to be made by the United Nations in the United States, in case any sovereign power alleged that we were violating the well established principles of civilized nations in the matter of handling prisoners, or in the living up to our treaty or truce obligations? Of course we would not.

The point I am making is something different from that of diplomatic recognition. I am simply asking for recognition of the fact that if an attempt is made to work out a disarmament program, a part of the world cannot be left out of that disarmament program. It does not follow that because we recognize the right of Red China to a voice in negotiations with respect to worldwide disarmament, we are, in effect, thereby diplomatically recognizing her.

U.N. VETO POWER SHOULD BE ELIMINATED

So if we expect to establish a system of international justice through law, which will promote and attain total nuclear disarmament, then we must look to the existing procedures available to us. When we do that, we see that many of those procedures will have to be changed. We ought to be exercising leadership in making proposals for a change in the international rules which already exist in those organizations of which we are already members.

Thus I refer to the veto power of the United Nations. Certainly, that power must be eliminated. We know the history of the veto power. There are those who have written authoritatively and spoken authoritatively of the San Francisco Conference and have pointed out that when the American delegation at that Conference split over the veto issue, then the veto became a certainty, because the Russians were insistent upon the veto power.

Many persons at the San Francisco Conference were against the veto power. But when the American ranks broke over the issue, then there was no question, from that time on, that the veto power would go into the charter, and it did. It finally became a part of the charter, as the record shows, and with the vote of the American delegation, too. That was a great mistake.

There were only a few of us on the floor of the Senate at the time the San Francisco charter came before this body for ratification, and who spoke against the veto power in the charter. It was obvious at that time that that particular section of the charter was bound to rise to plague us, and it has risen to plague us many, many times.

It will not be possible to have the veto power removed immediately, but I believe it can be removed. As we marshal the leaders of the world behind a request for a modification of the veto power, in due course of time the Russian leaders themselves will come to recognize that they will have to assume the responsibility for losing the peace, if they are unwilling to make a concession in a matter which makes so much commonsense as the elimination of the veto power. I do not know how many years it will take, but I believe that the very discussion of it, that the making of it the subject of one or more special sessions of the General Assembly of the United Nations for world debate, discussion, and resolution, if possible, will have an effect on the exercise of the veto during the period of time the discussion is taking place.

The discussion of these problems, in and of itself, will further the cause of peace in the international councils of the world as they are carried on through the procedures of the United Nations.

U.N. MUST BE CORNERSTONE OF U.S. POLICY

Third, I suggest that the time has long passed—is long overdue—when the United States also will serve notice on the world that we are going to stop our end runs around the United Nations; that we are going to stop circumventing the United Nations, that we are perfectly willing to lay our cases on their merits before the procedures of the United Nations, before the tribunals of the United Nations, before the General Assembly of the United Nations, for open world surveillance.

Therefore, Mr. President, I think public opinion in this country should give heed to the need of the United States to notify the world that we are going to help strengthen the United Nations, instead of continue to weaken it.

INTERNATIONAL LAW MUST BE STRENGTHENED

Fourth, I wish to point out that there is no existing body of international law sufficient in depth to be applied to all the international issues which arise to endanger the peace. International law, as it now exists, is, after all, very limited in scope. Therefore, if we are to set up a system of international justice through law, we must expand the existing body of international law, so that as each threat to the peace arises, as each dispute between and among nations occur, there will be a set of principles which can be applied for the adjudication of those disputes, thus eliminating the kind of policy the United States has been following, namely, one of threatening massive retaliation, of proposing to keep 25 percent of our bombers in the air at all times, loaded with nuclear bombs.

What a shocking bit of news that was when it went around the world. How shocking it was to make such a statement, and then profess that we are seeking peace, when people in other parts of the world know that the nuclear weapons on any one of those bombers could go off by accident or by design or by disobedience of orders, and could start a holocaust. We have to start to square our actions with our talk for peace; and such a proposal as that is not a proposal of peace, but threatens war. Instead, we must have something to supplant the American policy of military threats.

The sad thing is that around the world we have the reputation—and with cause—of being threateners, just as Khrushchev has the reputation of rattling the saber. One of the sorriest things in the history of this administration was the proposal for mass retaliation; and the sad thing is that the Democrats as a body did not oppose it. Too many Democrats went along with that proposal, and, in my judgment, aided and abetted the Eisenhower administration in following the wrong policy for some 8 years.

If we are to expand international law, so there will be a body of law to which we can turn before international tribunals, if rule and reason are to be applied to international disputes, we must be willing to submit disputes which are subject to adjudication under existing international law to the tribunals of the United Nations which are provided for the handling of such cases. But we do not do so in regard to any matter of consequence. We may do so in regard to some little fishing dispute or some minor dispute in regard to a vessel or in regard to a question about harbor damages. But when there is a major issue, such as that over the Formosa Straits or that in regard to the Middle East or a good many issues which have arisen in connection with our mutual security program, we simply lean back and proclaim our sovereign rights, wave the flag, and say we are going to decide this for ourselves. But whenever we do that, we lose more and more prestige around the world.

So I suggest that we begin to apply the judicial articles of the United Nations Charter, and that we carry a peace offensive against Russia whenever we have a chance to do so, by calling upon Russia to join us in submitting disputes not only to the World Court, but, under the articles of the United Nations, also to other tribunals which can be set up by agreement under the judicial article of the United Nations Charter, for the settlement of such disputes.

That will start expanding international law with a body of precedents, much in the same way that the great common law was built up. The common law is a body of judicial precedents; and we should now be engaged in the process of building up a body of precedential law for international-law tribunals to apply to disputes which threaten the peace of the world, as they arise from year to year.

But more than that must be done. We also must expand international law by "a statutory process or procedure." I suggest that we can do so by calling a series of extraordinary sessions of the General Assembly of the United Nations from time to time, with the agenda limited to specific questions for debate and negotiation, the purpose being to arrive at the adoption of resolutions, with the understanding that they will have the force and effect of international law until they are repealed. Is that idealistic? Yes, it is. Is it theoretical? Yes, it is. Is it practical? It is highly practical, because, as I have said before, the only thing that is practical happens to be to put to work an ideal in the field of foreign policy and also in the field of governmental domestic policy.

But the sad thing is that the Eisenhower record on this matter is practically nil; and the sad thing is that too many Democrats have rubber stamped the Eisenhower position on that issue.

It is time for the Democratic Party either to fish or to cut bait on the matter of foreign policy, and in the months ahead to come forward with a constructive foreign program which will lead to peace, instead of the Republican program which rapidly is taking us down the road toward war.

A series of such conferences over the years—and let it be remembered that earlier in this speech I pointed out that I am discussing a program which, in my

judgment, may take as long as 20 years but, nevertheless, we should get on with the work, and should have conferences of the sort I have suggested through special sessions of the General Assembly—will, in my judgment, promote the cause of peace and strengthen the chances for peace, and will bring us closer to a total nuclear disarmament program, without which, in my judgment, in our time we shall wind up with a nuclear war.

PEACE OFFENSIVE NEEDED

But for the immediate future—and I close with this suggestion—I believe we have a right to look to our allies around the world to rise to their obligations at this hour. I believe the heads of great governments, such as those of Great Britain, Canada, France, Italy, and India—those of all the free nations of the world—ought right now be joining in focusing attention on the need for the adoption of a system of international justice through law for the settlement of these disputes, leading to a total disarmament program.

If ever there was a time when the United States needed the moral support and backing of her allies, that time is now; and I am speaking of the need to take to Khrushchev a peace offensive within and through the United Nations.

But we are not doing so, because time and time again we have demonstrated that we are not willing to submit specific questions to the processes of the United Nations for final determination. So I make the plea that our allies join in asking for an extraordinary session of the United Nations in the immediate future, because, in my judgment, it has got to be done through the General Assembly, not through the Security Council. In the first place the Security Council cannot speak for all the nations in the world, and only a few nations are on the Security Council. But every nation, large and small, has a stake in peace. Every nation, large and small, has a stake in what the United States, Great Britain, France, and Russia do.

SUMMIT MEETING SHOULD BE HELD AT U.N.

That is why I have been heard to say before, as I protested the kind of summit conference that was called in Paris, that, in my judgment, we should not proceed in that kind of summit conference. I think it was a mistake from the beginning.

Any summit conference in which we participate, as I have said for a long, long time, should be conducted under the jurisdiction of the United Nations, with the Secretary General of the United Nations sitting as permanent chairman of that conference, and with any arrangements or agreements reached in that summit conference going to the United Nations for approval.

Why? Because if that is not done, in my judgment we shall return to international power politics. International power politics will not produce peace. It never has. The use of international power politics, throughout the history of mankind, has produced only intervals between wars, because always the nonparticipants resent the fact that a few powerful nations decide the fate of the rest of the world.

I make it a point of getting myself briefed on broadcasts coming from southeast Asia, Latin America, and Africa. I say to Members of the Senate they had better get themselves briefed on what is coming out of southeast Asia, Africa, and Latin America these days. Those radio broadcasts indicated to me that loud dissents were already beginning to arise among the nonparticipants at the summit conference, and questions were being asked.

One can call it any kind of propaganda he desires; nevertheless, it is a reality. One cannot deny that it is being beaten into the eardrums of millions and millions of people in that part of the world, people who in numbers greatly exceed our population, and people who have to be won over to freedom if freedom is to survive. In my opinion, freedom will not survive if it is limited to the United States and the Western nations. It will survive in the decades ahead only if we win over to freedom the people in those parts of the world to which I have referred.

Mr. President, we will not sell international politics to them. They want none of it. Why should they? Would we?

I heard it said earlier this afternoon by the Senator from Pennsylvania or the Senator from Oklahoma—I think it was the Senator from Pennsylvania—when he quoted extensively from the Stevenson Chicago speech, from which I quoted a few minutes ago, what the reaction would be in our country in case a Russian spy plane was over our country. We know what the reaction would be. Can we not hear the clamor? There would be those who would want to break off diplomatic relations immediately. There would even be those who would want us to go to war.

In regard to the matter of international power politics, there are millions of people who want none of it; but they can be brought along, and they will cooperate if we give them a voice. That is why I made the suggestion, in which I hope our friends around the world will join us, and I hope our country will exercise leadership in proposing, that we start, in the immediate future, in the United Nations building in New York City, a series of conferences open to the world, to which will be invited the head of every state in the world, large and small, for the purpose of laying down the blueprint for peace, of telling the world the concessions he is willing to make in behalf of his country, for the cause of setting up a system of international justice under law, with the immediate goal of total disarmament, to be enforced by a police system agreed upon by the United Nations to enforce such a disarmament program.

I know there are those who will say, "Too idealistic. Too theoretical and impractical." But again I ask the question, What is practical about a nuclear war?

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

Mr. MORSE. In just a second.

I think the world is up against it, and I think the world has no choice but either to go to war in our generation or to give the world a system of permanent peace, which can be attained only by bringing to an end this immoral nuclear armaments race.

I yield for a moment to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. I wish to commend the Senator from Oregon for the fine speech he is making in support of a peaceful solution of the world's difficulties. I thank him for joining me and the Senator from Oklahoma and a number of other Senators earlier today, who made the specific point that our job is to continue that search for peace, regardless of the calamities and blunders which resulted in the breakup of the summit conference. While it is important to establish what went wrong in the summit conference, and who made the mistakes, and why, the more important matter is not to be turned aside from the one great goal of this generation, which is peace, and cessation of nuclear testing, and surrender of nuclear weapons, and international agreement to bring about world peace through world law.

Our zeal in that cause should not be abated one iota by reason of anything that has happened in the world in the last 6 weeks.

I ask the Senator from Oregon if that is not the great task which lies before America as the leader of the free world, and whether we do not have to create in the Senate a climate in which that task can be pursued assiduously, and in which those who do pursue it get the plaudits of this body, and not one in which there is a feeling that they are doing something unpatriotic or being soft on communism?

Mr. MORSE. I could not agree more with the Senator from Pennsylvania. That is the burden of my whole speech this afternoon.

NATIONS SHOULD PUT BLUEPRINT FOR PEACE BEFORE U.N.

This is not the first time the Senator from Pennsylvania and the senior Senator from Oregon have stood shoulder to shoulder on the floor of the Senate in the interest of permanent peace. But I want to stress the fact that we have got to come forward with what I consider to be constructive, practical proposals for establishing that procedure. I have made specific references to those goals. The one point I was on—and I reiterate it—when I gladly yielded to the Senator from Pennsylvania, who has been so helpful on this speech, was that we should invite, and others must join us, the heads of all States, large and small, to participate in an extraordinary session of the United Nations, which has nothing to do with membership in the United Nations at all. I would like the head of every nation, large and small, whether that nation is a member of the United Nations or not, to have an opportunity to take a world platform in the United Nations Building in New York City and lay down his nation's blueprint for peace, and the concessions that nation is willing to make in order to establish what the Senator from Pennsylvania, I, and others in the Senate have been urging for many, many years in the

Senate, namely, the establishment of a system of international justice through law for the purpose of enforcing peace.

Mr. President, that is going to take weeks and perhaps months. I am all in favor of taking as much time as we need, because, I repeat, if we have the heads of state around the world devoting themselves to the consideration of programs for peace, in my judgment, we shall have an unwritten moratorium on war. These nations are not going to be fighting each other so long as they are seeking to work out a peace program. I think we need that time, Mr. President.

I happen to think a tremendous amount of good can come from such a program as I am outlining, because I am satisfied there is not a spot on the world today in which the people are not greatly concerned about the danger of a nuclear war. The hearts of mankind, generally speaking—including, I am satisfied, the overwhelming majority of the rank and file people of the Soviet Union of Russia—want peace.

We know we are dealing with some irresponsible leaders in various parts of the world, but they happen to be a reality. We must stop, it seems to me, trying to escape from reality in this field of working for peace. We have to recognize that at least those leaders whom we consider to be irresponsible have to be drawn out into the open. We have to carry to them and to the world, through the United Nations, the great ideals of the United States for peace.

I happen to think that even at the head of state level we might be in for some very pleasant surprises as to the amount of progress which could be made in developing a program for peace. People would have to come and go at the conference. I recognize that, in many instances, about all we could expect would be to have the head of state come to lay out his program. If a head of state did not want to come in person but wanted to send a foreign minister to speak on his behalf, that should be his right. I think most heads of state, however, would come themselves.

After the heads of state had laid out their programs, Mr. President, it would be necessary for them to go back to attend to administrative and executive duties at the heads of their governments. After the heads of state program had been laid out before the world I think the next step should be negotiations and diplomatic exchanges among the foreign ministers.

It is at that point, Mr. President, I think months could be spent, and very profitable negotiations could be had, again under the auspices of the United Nations, in trying to see what agreements and understandings the foreign ministers could reach.

Third, Mr. President, I propose, after the foreign ministers have done the best they can in regard to trying to reach an agreement upon the program for the various phases of this very important problem of peace, to which I have alluded this afternoon, that the recommendations and proposals go back once more to the General Assembly of the United Nations for the purpose of a determination of what agreements can be made within the United Nations, among the members thereof, at least with respect to a disarmament program.

Mr. President, highly theoretical as it may be dubbed, I happen to think this has a terrific amount of commonsense, because if the leaders of the world really want peace the road I offer them is the road they should travel, toward the citadel and the cathedral of world peace, rather that the road which I think they may travel if we do not take spiritual leadership in the world, before it is too late—the road toward nuclear war. I do not think we have much time left. We have only our generation, at the most.

Franklin Roosevelt never spoke a greater truth than the truth he spoke in the depths of the depression, when he uttered the words which are more applicable today than they were in the depths of the depression, that our generation has a rendezvous with destiny. I think our generation, Mr. President, has a rendezvous with a great decision, war or peace. If the decision is war, America will be no more. If the decision is peace, then mankind will have the opportunity to rise to those great heights of civilization which still are high for us to climb, the great heights which I believe God intended for us. But God also intended that we do our share, and that share calls at this historic hour, in my judgment, for our trying to lead the world into putting into implementation and practice the great, divine teachings which I think God intended us to follow.

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, I heard quite by accident a statement by the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon on television during the Oregon primary campaign, which I assume originated from Oregon. This was long before the collapse of the summit. I thought the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon in 2 minutes made more sense than any other statement I had heard on television. At that time the Senator spoke of the necessity for moving into the United Nations with this terribly important problem.

Would not the Senator from Oregon agree that after some 3½ years of trying to ease the tensions in the world, of trying to eliminate fear and suspicion, we are in a worse situation than we were in 3 years ago?

Mr. MORSE. There is no doubt about it. That is part of the burden of my speech this afternoon.

Mr. CARROLL. Would not the Senator from Oregon agree with the junior Senator from Colorado that we went into the so-called summit conference under the most adverse conditions? We had to have as our bargaining agent Mr. Macmillan of Great Britain or President de Gaulle of France. We were not there on equal terms. How much better would it have been if we had gone to the United Nations. Would not the Senator agree with that?

Mr. MORSE. I do not know what the record will show, but, as the Senator knows, I think the record will show that probably as many as four to six times, at the very beginning of the talk about having a summit conference 2 or 3 years ago, the Senator from Oregon spoke on the floor of the Senate against a summit conference held outside the United Nations.

From the very beginning, I have urged that all summit conferences be held under the United Nations, with the Secretary General serving as permanent chairman of the conference and with the understanding that the deliberations of such a conference and any proposed agreements reached would come to the General Assembly of the United Nations for approval.

I have said that for some years now because I think the United States is repeating a great mistake of history. We are participating in international power politics, in the kind of summit conference which was proposed. I think those are always bound to end in historic failure.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. Would not the Senator agree that at one time, in June of 1950, I think, when a serious crisis confronted the world, we met it through collective action through the United Nations in Korea? It was an unhappy event. We had to go to Korea. The results did not satisfy anyone, but at least we avoided world war III.

Would not the Senator agree that when we had the second great international crisis, in the Middle East, we again functioned through the United Nations?

I am no special champion of a theoretical United Nations, but I agree with the Senator from Oregon when he says that we must use the machinery of the United Nations when we are in a critical situation such as this. The United Nations should be used because not only big nations are concerned, but all the nations of the whole world will be affected in event of an atomic war. I should think all nations should be given a chance to find out what are the facts in this case.

May I say to the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] that I read the wire service reports on some of the violent attacks that were made today upon Adlai Stevenson and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY]. I was not on the floor at the time the remarks were made. I cannot understand the motivation. Have we reached the point in America where American citizens are not entitled to know whether the leadership of their Government has its fingers on the control of the military? Have we reached the point in our history when we cannot determine whether civilian authorities are supreme over the military?

I was not on the floor of the Senate at the beginning of the debate, but I heard the able Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD]. I have withheld any criticism of the failure at the summit until the President came back to Ameri-

can soil, because I did not want to embarrass him while he was on foreign soil. However, I think we now have held our fire long enough. I think we are now entitled to know the answer to this one question: Who initiated the U-2 flight on May Day? Why was it done on May Day? Who did it? Did the President of the United States know the flight was in motion?

Mr. MORSE. May Day is one of the great Russian holidays.

Mr. CARROLL. Exactly. Why did this flight take place virtually on the eve of the conference? Over 10 years ago when I was in the Congress I knew that there were forces within this Nation which believed in preventive war. I ask today whether there might be persons in the military who wished to torpedo the summit conference. Was there someone in the Central Intelligence Agency who wished to torpedo the conference? Perhaps there are people within these departments who do not desire to ease the tensions and have peace in the world.

These are the questions to which we are entitled to have answers, and as representatives of the people we are entitled to have our committees investigate and determine the answers. The Senator from Oregon sits on the important Foreign Relations Committee. I hope that if the Committee on Foreign Relations conducts hearings, as the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] is reported in the press to have predicted, these questions will be asked. I know the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] will be at every one of those hearings and he will attempt with all his might, power, and eloquence to determine this basic question: Why was this spy plane permitted to make its flight on May Day and just preceding the conference? Who was responsible?

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. CARROLL. If the Senator will permit me to make a further observation, I am frightened when I think of the possibilities of trouble arising from one of our outlying bases. We have delegated enormous power and authority to the military. The military are composed of human beings, and therefore are not perfect. Some military man could make an error in judgment and an atomic bomb might be released. That military man might set in motion a chain of events that could bring on the greatest man-made disaster in the history of the world.

We are living in a new age, in a new era, and Adlai Stevenson, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] are among those who are saying the people are entitled to know our weaknesses and where the imperfections are in our society.

Who initiated the May Day flight? Was it done out of stupidity? Did our President know it?

It is not enough for the President to say, "I am responsible." Of course he is responsible because under the Constitution he formulates foreign policy. It is not a question of responsibility. The question is, Who did it? Who killed cock robin? Who did this monstrous thing? The American public are entitled to know the answer.

What I have said is not in criticism of the President of the United States. I wish to make that point perfectly clear. Such criticism on this issue at this time would be premature. Why? We need the facts, and that is why I commend the able Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], I commend the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] and others who say, "We are going to have a hearing." But let us not wait too long.

Following up the statement of the able Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], I suggest that only a fool today would believe that in 6 or 8 months all damage which has been done will be restored. All the fear and the suspicion that existed during the Stalin regime has now been greatly accelerated. It will not be 6 months, 8 months, a year or 2 years.

I can see only one course ahead and that is working together in the General Assembly of the United Nations. We cannot rely on the action of the Security Council because of its veto power. The General Assembly in discussing these issues can discuss surveillance of planes, disarmament, and perhaps through this medium we can again remove some of the fear and suspicion. If we do not do so history will record that if this great Nation and the other leaders of the world among our allies do not get together to settle this question, there will not be much history left.

Mr. MORSE. Those who write will not be American historians. Perhaps some in Asia may write the history.

Mr. CARROLL. The Senator is exactly correct.

If the Senator will yield for one further observation, I have just had placed before me a news ticker dispatch which comes from Denver. This is a UPI dispatch.

DENVER.—The Denver Post said editorially today that Adlai Stevenson had a perfect right to criticize the administration's ineptness before the summit meeting and that "it is a proper subject for the political campaign."

The Post, which has supported the Republican candidate in the past two presidential elections, also said that former Democratic National Chairman James Farley "should know better about the proper role of the opposition in a democracy."

After Stevenson had criticized the administration's presummit activities Farley in turn criticized Stevenson for making the matter a political issue.

Stevenson had said the administration gave Khrushchev a crowbar with which to wreck the summit meeting through the U-2 plane incident.

The Post said in an editorial headed "Come Off It, Mr. Farley," that Stevenson "neither implied that the administration deliberately helped wreck the summit, nor did he hint that Americans were anything but united behind the President in his humilitating trials."

"But Stevenson did say that GOP tactics were very inept before the summit, which is true, and he did say that this is a proper subject for the political campaign, which is also true," the Post said.

Mr. President, the Denver Post is a Republican independent newspaper. The Denver Post twice gave its wholehearted support to President Eisenhower. It extolled his virtues day in and day out. But the editors also have courage. They have had the courage to point out the President's weaknesses time after time, whether they dealt with western reclamation, water pollution, or the depressed area problems which affect the State of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] so vitally.

The Denver Post has provided outstanding leadership in the Western States against the manner in which this administration has run the Federal Power Commission. The Denver Post has charged the FPC with failure to protect the public interest.

This newspaper then is one of the outstanding independent Republican newspapers in the Nation, standing most of the time, in my opinion, in the public interest. The reason I cannot give it a 100-percent rating is that it did not support me all the time. But it is a very fine newspaper, even though it did not support me in the last election.

Mr. MORSE. It even opposed me in Oregon before the last election.

Mr. CARROLL. I am not under any political obligations to the Denver Post, but I am pleased to tell my colleagues in the Senate that once again it puts its finger right on the issue. The issue is not an attack upon President Eisenhower. The issue is not an attack upon the President of the United States. The issue is crystal clear. The issue is whether the American people are entitled to know who is running their Government. If the President is running the Government, then who has sabotaged the cause of peace? We are not concerned especially with Khrushchev. We will take care of Khrushchev in our own time, but I agree with the Senator from Oregon that we ought to take care of Khrushchev and all his cronies in the forum of the United Nations and let the people of the world participate.

We do not have to give up our sovereignty. We have only one short opportunity left. The main point is that I am in support of the able Senator from Oregon. As I say, we have only one short opportunity left before some fool launches us into atomic war. I thank the Senator for yielding to me.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from Colorado very much for his wonderful contribution to my discussion on the floor of the Senate this afternoon.

I agree with almost everything he said. I certainly agree with his thesis. I am not at all surprised to find that there is opposition to Stevenson by the Republicans and the Farleys. We have opposition to Stevenson within our own party, as well as opposition by the Republicans.

There are those who are very anxious to see that he be not nominated at the Democratic convention. They recognize that, if nominated, unquestionably he will come out the victor. They have the right to oppose any nominee they wish to oppose. I am not at all surprised by Mr. Farley's criticism of Mr. Stevenson,

because I am well satisfied as to where he stands in the fight within our party so far as the Democratic nomination is concerned.

The second thing I wish to say is that I reserve only one dissent from the observations the Senator from Colorado has made, and that was with respect to the course of action we followed with relation to the Middle East doctrine. In my judgment we did not make use of the United Nations procedure, as we should have. I made pleas at the time that we ought to take to the United Nations certain proposals for commitments from countries of the Middle East prior to exercising our right—and we have the right—to enter into agreements with those countries.

I felt at the time that we would have greatly strengthened the cause of peace if we had required or sought to require an agreement through the United Nations with respect to certain conditions before the fact, before we made the agreement under the doctrine.

But other than that the Senator from Colorado has expressed the thesis of the Senator from Oregon. Our difference is that I would have made greater use of the United Nations in that instance than we did. I am grateful indeed to the Senator from Colorado for strengthening my record this afternoon as history will read it on the subject which I rose to discuss.

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. I ought to say, to keep the record clear, that Jim Farley is my friend. We must remember that there are some political differences in the State of New York. For example, Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt and former Senator Herbert Lehman support Stevenson. In 1956 Jim Farley was a strong Stevenson supporter. Now he may have another candidate. However, that is no reason for him to speak as harshly as he has about Adlai Stevenson. My able friend from Oregon, who is on the floor today, if he does not read it tonight, will probably read tomorrow morning, that another friend of mine, former President Harry Truman, is on the news wires today. He wrote an article for Look magazine, on Adlai Stevenson. This current article has nothing to do with the statement on the summit by Stevenson. However, he is not speaking in any commendatory terms about Adlai Stevenson. It is obvious that he has a candidate too. He has a right to have one. Therefore, I believe that people must look at these statements——

Mr. MORSE. I had one until last week.

Mr. CARROLL. Yes. The Senator from Oregon had a very good candidate. Many times good horses do not run strong for a short stretch. The junior Senator from Colorado has been that type of candidate. I have to have a longwinded campaign, sometimes lasting 6 or 8 years before I am successful. Some runners are not sprinters. I wish to say to the Senator from Oregon in conclusion, if I may, with respect to these statements, that I am absolutely convinced that Stevenson has a deep-seated feeling that this issue affects the survival of this Nation, and that he feels that we must raise this issue with the people of the Nation. I am confident that Stevenson did not raise this issue as a partisan political issue, but because he believes we must discuss these matters.

For more than 2 years the junior Senator from Colorado has been trying to stir up interest in Stevenson as a candidate. I do not know Governor Stevenson well. He is more an acquaintance of mine. I have met him only a few times. However, I look upon him as a great political and philosophical leader. He represents a new era in politics. I believe that is also true of JOHN KENNEDY. I think it is true of the new group that is emerging in the Democratic Party. I think it is true of other candidates. It is true of the distinguished Senator from Oregon. And that is nothing new about him. He has been ahead of the field for years. That is true of Senator SYMINGTON and Senator JOHNSON. I look about the Chamber to see if there are any other candidates. [Laughter.]

We are moving into a new era. My friend the able Senator from Montana has advocated—and I supported his resolution in 1957, when only a few of us stood here with him on the floor of the Senate—some supervision over the Central Intelligence Agency. I do not like the idea of voting money for an Agency and not knowing a little about what it is going to be used for. Only a selected few Members of the body know what CIA is doing. I do not like that. I represent a million and a half people, and I am entitled to be able to go home and say to the people a little something about what the CIA is doing.

Mr. MORSE. Let me correct the Senator's statement on that point. There is not any select group in the Senate that knows what CIA is doing. I am a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations. There are many things I cannot find out about what they are doing. They use the top secret label against us, too.

Mr. CARROLL. I can understand that some things ought to be kept secret. But we ought to have general knowledge about the guidelines and about the controls and about who gives orders and who makes reports.

Mr. MORSE. I should like to make this comment at this point. I do not think anything should be kept top secret without a check, under our system of government. It cannot be spread out worldwide, but at the same time I do not believe in vesting any branch of our Government with police-state power and top secret power, where there can be no check upon its administration.

That is a step in the direction of police-state powers. I have always opposed it. I happen to think that the elected representatives of the people can be trusted with the type of top secrets that any President or any head of the CIA can be trusted with. Most of the people who do have access to top secrets have never been elected to political office in their lives. So I do not buy the argument that we should not have a check on the President of the United States in respect to this matter of top secrets.

We can have a check on it without having it known throughout the country and known throughout the world. I am not going to give any man, even the President of the United States, unchecked power, because that is what brings about tyranny in times of crisis.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, of course I agree with that. The Constitution provides for that. I wish to make this personal reference. I had personal knowledge at one time that President Truman, when he was President, would get every morning at 9 o'clock a report from his intelligence liaison, so that he might know what was going on. He got those reports every morning. I assume that this is being done with President Eisenhower.

Mr. MORSE. Let us hope so.

Mr. CARROLL. There may be some things withheld from him. I reiterate this because I think it is very important. I think that all Americans are entitled to know, of course, who gave the order for the May Day flight. Why was it done on May Day? What was its purpose? Was it done stupidly, blindly; was it merely a colossal blunder, or was it some force working even against Eisenhower and against the administration, to blow up this conference? I think we are entitled to know what the facts are.

I thank the Senator for yielding.

Mr. MORSE. I should like to say to the acting majority leader that I am about to yield the floor. Would he like to have me suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Not at this time.

Mr. MORSE. I yield the floor.

YI YOUNG AN

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1289, S. 2681.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2681) for the relief of Yi Young An.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, in line 8, after the word "said", to strike out "Yin" and insert "Yi", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Yi Young An, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Staff Sergeant and Mrs. John L. Brown, citizens of the United States: *Provided,* That the natural parents of the said Yi Young An shall not, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the pertinent parts of the report as they relate to the desirability of this measure.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the report (Rept. No. 1252) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill, as amended, is to grant to the minor child adopted by citizens of the United States the status of a nonquota immigrant which is the status normally enjoyed by alien minor children of U.S. citizens. The bill has been amended to correct the spelling of the beneficiary's name.

STATEMENT OF FACTS

The beneficiary of the bill is a 19-year-old native of Korea, presently residing there, who was adopted in Korea on February 22, 1960 by citizens of the United States. He receives his full support from them. His adoptive father has served continuously with the Air Force since 1943 as a chaplain. After attaining the rank of lieutenent colonel he was retired under a reduction-in-forces program, and thereafter enlisted and is presenly serving a tour of duty in Korea which terminates in June 1960. After retirement in 1963 he plans to resume his ministry in the Southwest Texas Conference of the Methodist Church. The adoptive parents of the beneficiary were married in 1938 and have a 13-year-old daughter. Information is to the effect that they are financially able to care for him.

A letter, with attached memorandum, dated December 16, 1959, to the chairman of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary from the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization with reference to the bill reads as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE,
Washington, D.C., December 16, 1959.

Hon. JAMES O. EASTLAND,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: In response to your request for a report relative to the bill (S. 2681) for the relief of Yi Young An, there is attached a memorandum of information concerning the beneficiary. This memorandum has been prepared from the Immigration and Naturalization Service files relating to the beneficiary by the Houston, Tex., office of this Service, which has custody of those files.

The bill would confer nonquota status upon the 19-year-old alien to be adopted by U.S. citizens. It also would provide that the natural parents of the beneficiary shall not, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act. It is noted that there is a difference in the spelling of the beneficiary's name in lines 5 and 8 of the private bill. According to the records of this Service the correct spelling is Yi Young An.

As a quota immigrant the beneficiary would be chargeable to the quota for Korea.

Sincerely,

J. M. SWING,
Commissioner.

MEMORANDUM OF INFORMATION FROM IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE FILES RE YI YOUNG AN, BENEFICIARY OF S. 2681

Information concerning this case was obtained from Mr. and Mrs. John L. Brown, foster parents of the beneficiary.

Yi Young An, a native of Korea, was born on July 18, 1940. He has never been in the United States. He presently resides in Korea with Mr. Brown and is fully supported by him. The foster parents intend to adopt the beneficiary under the laws of the State of Texas when he arrives in the United States. The beneficiary is the son of Yi Man Sok and his wife, Pak Pun Sik, both residents of Korea. They have agreed to his adoption.

Mr. and Mrs. John L. Brown are U.S. citizens by virtue of birth in Athens, Tex., on Otcober 30, 1912, and Calcasieu Parish, La., on February 28, 1910, respectively. They maintain their principal residence in Nome, Tex. Mr. and Mrs. Brown were married in Georgetown, Tex., on August 6, 1938, and have testified that this is their only marriage. They have a 13-year-old daughter, Doris Kay Brown. Mr. Brown has served continuously in the U.S. Air Force since March 3, 1943, and he plans to make the Armed Forces his career. His present rating is staff sergeant, and his annual income is $4,200. Mrs. Brown is employed as a teacher in the public-school system at Nome, Tex., with an annual income of $4,250. Their joint assets consist of $14,200 in U.S. savings bonds, insurance with a face value of $17,000 a checking account of $6,000, and other real and personal property valued at $5,000.

Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH, the author of the bill, has submitted the following information in connection with the case:

21ST FINANCE DISBURSING SECTION,
APO 381, San Francisco, Calif.,
August 22, 1959.

Hon. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH,
Senator from the State of Texas,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

HONORABLE DEAR SIR: I am writing to inquire whether it would be possible for you to give me assistance in securing a special bill for the admission to the United States of a Korean national whom I plan to adopt in order that I might give him an education and other opportunities for development which I feel that I am in position to offer. For your preliminary consideration, I submit the following information:

I am 48 years of age, married (22 years), wife 49 years old. Both are in excellent health. We have one child 13 years old. Unfortunately after the birth of our daughter, we found that we could have no other children. I am a Methodist minister, of the Southwest Texas Conference; I served as a chaplain in the Air Force from March 1943 to February 1958, at which time I became a victim of the reduction-in-forces program. I still hold my Reserve commission in the grade of lieutenant colonel. After the reduction-in-forces, I enlisted in the Air Force in order to qualify for retirement. Upon retirement (1963) I will again resume my place in the conference as a pastor or missionary. I feel that I am financially able to undertake this project (if one can call an act of love for another a project) without any strain on either my financial or physical well-being.

The young man, whom I plan to adopt (or sponsor), is 18 years old. He has lived with or worked for Americans since the age of 10. He is the third son in the Korean family. Although both his parents are living, they are agreeable to both the adoption and his emigration from Korea. This boy has worked for me during my tour in Korea, and from observation—and closely at that—I can honestly say that I have never met a young man with a higher character quality than this lad. In spite of the many temptations which have presented themselves to him while in his status as houseboy to the GI's, he has never adopted the profanity or loose moral habits so common to many of the other "boys" who find it profitable to cater to the wishes of the man they work for. His habits and character bespeak the excellent family background from which he comes. Both his mother and father are practicing Christians—Methodists. His older brother, who is now in the Republic of Korea Air Force, hopes to become a Methodist minister, if the opportunity could be found to further his education in that direction—which assistance I may be able to secure through the help of some local church which may sponsor his training. As for my boy, I plan to place him first in a special school or private tutor to prepare him for entrance into Lon Morris Junior College, Jacksonville, Tex., and then to Southern Methodist University. Because of the extreme poverty of the family all the sons, except the youngest, have had to stop school at the end of the free-school period, which roughly is equivalent to our grammar school. I have checked his school record and find that he stood sixth in the class of almost a hundred children. He has a ready and eager mind, and I feel that he will have no difficulty in pursuing his studies.

I shall appreciate you advising me of the proper steps I should take in this matter. I am due to return to the United States in March of 1960, and I should like very much to be able to take the boy with me as I go. If I have to await the normal quota for Korean immigration the time would be a minimum of 5 to 6 years, since he does not qualify for a student visa or passport. By that time he would be too old to undertake the training contemplated for him.

With best wishes, I remain

Sincerely yours,

JOHN L. BROWN,
Staff Sergeant, USAF, AF18553644.

P.S.—Sir, I failed to mention that my home address is Nome, Tex.

21ST FINANCE DISBURSING SECTION,
APO 301, San Francisco, Calif.,
February 6, 1960.

Hon. RALPH YARBOROUGH,
Senator from the State of Texas,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR YARBOROUGH: I am writing in reference to a bill for the relief of Yi Yong An, S. 2681, 86th Congress, 1st session, which you so kindly introduced in my behalf and that of my adopted son. I wish to report that I have been informed that the adoption has been approved by the district court of Seoul, Korea, and that as soon as the matter has been recorded in the Myon Office (similar to the county court in the States), I shall receive the certificate of adoption.

I am most happy with the progress of events. I have extended my tour of duty in Korea in order to secure concurrent travel with the boy upon my return to the States. I am now due to return on or about June 1, 1960. However I read an article in the January issue of the Coronet magazine which has filled me with some uncertainties and anxieties. The article is entitled "When Uncle Sam Gets Sentimental," by Al Toffler. One particular paragraph in the article appeared to be significant as far as this case is concerned:

"Not every private bill is passed. In fact, the majority are shelved. Only the most meritorious are acted upon. For they require passage by both Houses of Congress and signature by the President."

Since so many of my plans and hopes hang on the outcome of this particular piece of legislation, as far as school for the boy and other plans for his welfare are concerned, I wonder if you could give me any idea of its status in the committee and if any additional information is needed. I have heard nothing since supplying the Immigration and Naturalization Service at Houston, Tex., with all the information they requested. I realize that I may be acting like a new father, but if you've never had a son in the family and had just acquired one, I think you could understand my concern.

Thank you for your special interest in this matter, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

JOHN L. BROWN,
Staff Sergeant, USAF, AF18553644.

21ST FINANCE DISBURSING SECTION,
APO 301,
San Francisco, Calif., February 29, 1960.
Re S. 2681, a bill for the relief of Yi Yong An.
SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

HONORABLE DEAR SIRS: I enclose herewith a photographic copy of the certificate of adoption of the Kimchon district court, Kimchon, Republic of Korea, of Yi (the Korean symbol 01 being variously rendered in English as Lee, Rhee, or Yi) Yong An, for whom Senator YARBOROUGH, of Texas, has introduced a bill of relief, S. 2681, September 11, 1959.

Is it possible for you to advise me of the progress the bill is making. I am due to return to the United States about the 1st of June and would like very much to have the boy accompany me on the journey.

Sincerely yours,
JOHN L. BROWN,
AF18553644, Lieutenant Colonel,
USAF Reserve.

SEOUL DISTRICT COURT, REPUBLIC OF KOREA,
CERTIFICATION OF ADOPTION

1. Adopting father:
(a) Name: John Larkin Brown.
(b) Domicile: Jefferson County, Tex., United States of America.
(c) Date of birth: October 30, 1912.
(d) Occupation: U.S. Air Force.
(e) Nationality: American.
2. Adopting mother:
(a) Name: Doris Bean Brown.
(b) Domicile: Jefferson County, Tex., United States of America.
(c) Date of birth: February 28, 1910.
(d) Occupation: Housewife.
(e) Nationality: American.
3. Adopted child:
(a) Name: Yong An Lee.
(b) Domicile: 499 Kaikwang-Dong, Kenyung-Myun, Keumneung-Kun, Kyungsang-Bukdo, Korea.
(c) Date of birth: April 28, 1943.
(d) Occupation: None.
(e) Nationality: Korean.

I hereby certify that in the matter of the adoption of the above-named child adopted by the above-named adopting father and mother, concerned laws of the Republic of Korea have been complied with and that said adoption is legal and valid as of

Date 22d day of February 1960.

———, ———,
Judge, District Court of Kimchon, Republic of Korea.

The committee, after consideration of all the facts in the case, is of the opinion that the bill (S. 2681), as amended, should be enacted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN REAL PROPERTY TO THE STATE OF FLORIDA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1370, H.R. 9818.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 9818) to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to the State of Florida.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to commend very highly the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] upon the wonderful cooperation he extends to me in respect of the long-established, 1946 Morse formula principle in connection with the disposal of Federal property.

The bill under consideration provides that the fair market value, as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture, shall be paid for the property. This is completely in conformity with the Morse formula. I am delighted with and appreciative of the action of the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I appreciate the kind comment of the Senator from Oregon. So that the RECORD may show, briefly, what is involved, there was a tract much larger than the 500 acres to which the bill relates.

An old resettlement project was conveyed, or allowed to be conveyed, from the Federal Government to the State for an average price of some $54 an acre, provided it be used for forestry purposes. It now appears that the State needs 500 acres of this larger tract for the building of a new penitentiary.

The bill provides, as the Senator from Oregon has already stated, that the State of Florida must pay, if it secures this land, the market value of such land as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture. I know of no possible objection to such a provision.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MEDICAL INSURANCE FOR RETIRED OLDER PERSONS

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, on Thursday, May 19, I discussed in the Senate the bill introduced by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], S. 3503, to provide medical insurance for retired older persons. I placed in the RECORD an analysis of the McNamara bill, but now I find that this memorandum was an earlier draft, later revised to provide for 2 days of skilled nursing care for each day of unused hospital care, instead of 1½; and 2⅔ days of home health services for each day of unused hospital care instead of 2 days. Cost estimates also were revised to include these changes. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the revised analysis of the McNamara retired persons medical insurance bill.

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

MEMORANDUM BY SENATOR PAT MCNAMARA, CHAIRMAN, SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE ON PROBLEMS OF THE AGED AND AGING

ANALYSIS: RETIRED PERSONS MEDICAL INSURANCE ACT

Major provisions:

1. Cover under a system of prepaid health insurance all retired aged (men over 65 and women over 62 who are not employed).

2. Provide for 90 days of hospital care per year, or

3. One hundred and eighty days of care in a skilled nursing home, or

4. Two hundred and forty days of care at home in a supervised home health program.

5. Provide diagnostic outpatient services for such items as laboratory tests and X-rays.

6. Pay for a portion of the cost of very expensive drugs.

7. Provide for research and demonstration programs to improve quality and efficiency of health care.

Relevant data bearing on the above provisions follow:

1. We estimate that this bill will cover 14.8 million men and women as follows: 11.3 million OASI beneficiaries; 1.7 million who are receiving old age assistance and no OASI; 1.8 million other retired aged—men over 65 and women over 62.

The act would exclude from its coverage all men and women and their spouses who are working full time. In the ordinary case, these men and women will be covered by a group health insurance policy. The bill is thus limited to the retired aged.

2. Estimates of cost for the above provisions: Total cost, computed as conservatively as possible, is estimated at $1,578 million or $106 per capita (that is, per retired person): 11.3 million OASI beneficiaries would be financed by a one-quarter percent increase in the social security tax on the employee and employer; 1.7 million old age assistance recipients would cost $180 million to come from general revenue fund; 1.8 million other persons would cost $190 million, to come from the general revenue fund.

3. Hospitalization:

This bill provides for 90 days' hospitalization for the aged but aims at reducing excessive use of hospitals through the following features:

Provision is made for diagnostic services as a preventive program.

An incentive is provided to use nursing homes and home health services instead of hospitals when not needed.

4. Skilled nursing home care:

For each day of unused hospital care, the bill provides 2 days of care in a skilled nursing home following a physician's certification.

Total days authorized, 180.

5. Home health services:

For each day of unused hospital care, the bill provides 2⅔ days of home health services by a community-sponsored agency.

Total days authorized, 240.

6. Outpatient diagnostic services:

The bill provides for preventive services through early diagnosis of incipient illness by means of X-ray and other laboratory tests.

7. Very expensive drugs.

A portion of the cost of very expensive drugs prescribed by a physician using generic names is included in the insurance program. The amount and kind of coverage is to be determined by the Secretary after a year's study.

8. Effective date:

The bill would provide for phasing the effective dates of the various benefits so as to provide an opportunity to build up the financing fund, conduct adequate planning and develop the necessary facilities:

Hospitalization effective July 1, 1961, and not later than January 1, 1962.

Nursing homes, January 1, 1963, and not later than July 1, 1963.

Home health services, January 1, 1962, and not later than July 1, 1962.

Diagnostic outpatient services, July 1, 1961, and not later than January 1, 1962.

Very expensive medicines, July 1, 1962, and not later than January 1, 1963.

The Secretary of HEW would be authorized to designate the dates within these periods when the act would be effective.

9. Summary of costs:

The one-fourth percent increase on the OASDI tax on employer and employee and

three-eighths percent on the self-employed would be sufficient to finance the medical benefits for the retired OASI beneficiaries.

Three hundred and seventy million dollars from the general fund would finance the medical benefits for those not eligible for OASI benefits.

Partially offsetting this $370 million appropriation are current Federal expenditures for:

Medical care under old-age assistance, $153 million.

Medical care for other groups who would be covered, $85 million.

Thus, it is estimated that net additional costs to the Federal Government would be approximately $132 million.

10. Research and demonstration:

The bill would direct the Secretary of HEW to conduct research on the health care of older persons and on improvements in the quality and efficiency of health services.

The Secretary is also authorized to conduct appropriate demonstration programs on how to meet the health needs of older persons as effectively and efficiently as possible in their communities.

11. Other important provisions:

Persons receiving social security benefits or old-age assistance payments are automatically eligible for benefits. Other individuals who have not earned in the preceding month more than the amount set in the retirement test under OASI will be covered.

The Secretary is to publish annually a listing of hospitals, nursing homes, and home health agencies which are included for payments under the act. It is expected that for hospitals, the Secretary may use the AHA accrediting service; and that for nursing homes, only those will be included which meet adequate standards for care and rehabilitation.

State health agencies can be given authority to inspect whether standards are being met and whether professional services are adequate.

The bill authorizes the Secretary of HEW to administer the act with a national health service advisory council.

The Secretary may use the services of private nonprofit organizations in administering the program.

Railroad retirement and Federal employee pensioners could come under the program at any time such legislation is enacted.

MANDATORY IMPORT PROGRAM

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I learned only a few days ago of a very disturbing development in my State of Kansas concerning one of our most important industries—petroleum production. I refer to the price reduction of 20 cents a barrel instituted on Monday of this last week covering more than 15,000 barrels daily of oil produced in Kansas. This action, coming as it does on top of several other price reductions over the past few months, points up the serious need to take a second look at some of the factors which are causing this continual deterioration in the petroleum industry in my State of Kansas as well as in the Nation as a whole. These price reductions are already having a serious impact on the ability of petroleum producers to continue to find and develop the necessary reserves that are absolutely essential to us for national security.

In my State of Kansas, crude oil production averaged about 310,000 barrels daily during the first 4 months of this year, compared with 337,000 the same period last year, a drop of 27,000 barrels daily, or 8 percent. In May, the Kansas production allowable is cut another 25,000 barrels per day and actual production during the first week in May was down almost 50,000 barrels per day or 15 percent from the same week last year. As things now stand, no improvement in this situation is now in sight.

The combination of depressed prices and reduced markets for Kansas crude has caused severe curtailment of exploratory and development activity. Exploratory crews active during the first quarter of 1960 are down 15 percent from a year ago level. The average number of rotary rigs active this year is down 18 percent and the total number of wells drilled to date is down 24 percent.

I understand that for the Nation, during the first 4 months of this year, there have been more than 22 specific price cuts ranging from 4 cents to 20 cents per barrel. Product prices of the four principal products have dropped 23 cents per barrel in the past year. These various factors spell out only one thing—the petroleum producing industry is in a serious condition which if not remedied could become chaotic.

Mr. President, this situation in light of recent worldwide developments only serves to point up the urgent need for our Government to take a real cold hard look at the situation to determine if its policies on petroleum imports are adequate to assure this Nation of a strong and healthy domestic petroleum producing industry.

Mr. President, I would be the first to emphasize that there are many causes other than oil imports which are contributing to the sad state of affairs we now find in our domestic petroleum industry. We must recognize that the inroads being made into crude oil markets by natural gas liquids, natural gas, which is priced at the wellhead at artificially low prices due to Federal regulation, and many other factors are serving to depress domestic crude oil production as well as crude oil prices. However, on analysis, it can be seen that the biggest adverse factor in the picture is that of petroleum imports. Just because there are other adverse factors, it does not mean that we can ignore the biggest one—imports.

As is quite well known, a little over a year ago, President Eisenhower instituted what is commonly known as the mandatory oil import program. This action was taken in line with policies laid down by Congress in which we declared that the President shall act to curb imports of a commodity whenever they are found to be a threat to national security.

Following the institution of this firm governmental program, the people in my State took heart and set about increasing their search for and development of new oil reserves in line with the announced goal behind the program. However, this was a short-lived situation. It was not long before evidence began to develop that although the mandatory import program had stemmed the tide somewhat the actual level of imports was too high. The latest statistics show that even with the mandatory import program, imports are now running at a rate higher than at any time in our history. Back in 1954, the Cabinet Committee on Fuels established by the President declared that imports in excess of the 1954 ratio would be a threat to national defense. At that time, the ratio of imports to domestic crude production was 16.6 percent. Today, total imports are running at a ratio of 25.4 percent, the highest ever. It must be noted that these totals include residual fuel oil which we do not produce in sufficient quantities in this country to meet our needs. However, excluding residual fuel oil, the facts show that the other oil imports are running far in excess of the total which the Cabinet Committee in 1954 declared must not be exceeded if our national security position is to be preserved.

Mr. President, as I mentioned earlier, imports are only one factor but a big factor. I, therefore, urgently call upon the President and the responsible officials in Government concerned with oil import policies to immediately take a cold, hard look at this situation and see if the goals they laid down when import controls were established are being met. This situation calls for immediate action as I understand the administrator of the program is now in the process of establishing the allowable imports for the second half of 1960. Once these are established, it would be very difficult to change them. Therefore, I urgently suggest that a reevaluation be made right now of the total level of imports to the end that sufficient reductions can be made to assure that our national security goals will be met.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION APPROPRIATIONS, 1961

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1467, House bill 12117, so that the bill will become the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ENGLE in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 12117) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. RUSSELL obtained the floor.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. 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. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. RUSSELL obtained the floor.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I am very glad to yield to the acting majority leader.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO 10 O'CLOCK A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I should like to make a request which may, in the end, turn out to be tentative.

I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate adjourns tonight, it adjourn to meet at 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

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

LIMITATION OF DEBATE ON VETO BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE AREA REDEVELOPMENT BILL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at 2 o'clock tomorrow, a yea-and-nay vote be taken on the proposal to override the President's veto of the depressed areas bill, with the time to be divided equally between the proponents and opponents of the measure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, by that statement, I assume the acting majority leader means the time is to be controlled by the leadership.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes; by the majority leader and by the minority leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the unanimous-consent request is agreed to.

ORDER FOR LIMITATION OF MORNING HOUR TOMORROW

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to ask the acting majority leader if it is contemplated that there be a morning hour tomorrow.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I presume there will be a morning hour, which I hope will not take up too much time; but, in order to overcome that particular aspect of the problem, I ask unanimous consent that there be a morning hour tomorrow, and that the morning hour be concluded by 11 o'clock a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the unanimous consent request is agreed to.

The unanimous-consent agreements subsequently reduced to writing, are as follows:

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENTS

Ordered, That when the Senate concludes its business today it adjourn until 10 o'clock a.m. tomorrow (Tuesday, May 24, 1960); that morning business be in order, and that at 11 o'clock a.m. the Senate proceed to the consideration of the question of overriding the veto of the President of S. 722, the Area Development Act; that at the hour of 2 o'clock p.m., the Senate proceed to vote by yeas and nays on said question, and that the intervening time be equally divided between the proponents and the opponents, and controlled, respectively, by the majority leader and the minority leader. (May 23, 1960.)

RESEARCH ON CONVERSION OF SALINE WATER TO FRESH WATER

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I rise to announce my cosponsorship of the bill (S. 3557) introduced by the distinguished majority leader [Mr. JOHNSON of Texas], together with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], and others, to provide for accelerated research and development of practical means for converting saline water to fresh water suitable for consumptive use.

The bill removes present restrictions of time and money on the desalinization program, and provides loans to communities to build developmental conversion plants.

While desalinization of seawater is not expected to provide a direct supply for interior States like mine, at least, not very soon, we in Utah have a real interest in seeing our sister States, and California in particular, develop adequate water supplies from seawater.

Today, Utah and southern California both look to the same source—the Colorado River—for much of the water to support a rapid growth of population and industry. California has just received a blow in the recommendation of a special master of the U.S. Supreme Court for division of the water of the lower Colorado.

We in Utah have long been at odds with California over the division of the Colorado waters between the lower and the upper basin States. The real solution to the problem, however, is for us to work together to develop an alternative means of providing California with the water she needs. This would then relieve pressure to claim for California a larger portion of the Colorado streamflow. The upper basin States would be safe in their use of the water.

Since all of the Nation's present supplies of water that are inexpensive and readily accessible are already in use, we look to a means of making available the enormous resources of the sea.

The Office of Saline Water has done a creditable job with the funds and personnel it has. Three experimental plants will soon be under construction, and plans are going forward for the establishment of the two more that have been authorized by Congress.

I agree with the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], however, that, despite real efforts, we are losing this water race. Our progress on desalinization is too slow, and present storage and conservation efforts are not keeping pace with increased water demand.

Our society has reached the place where the necessities and uses of water are so tremendous that they stagger the imagination. It has taken us 352 years to build up our population of 180 million Americans. Yet the Census Bureau assures that the number will double in the next 40 years.

This means that the Nation as a whole will require 2½ times as much municipal water in 1980 as was used 5 years ago. And the statistics on the coming water needs of agriculture, manufacturing, metal fabricating, and the new synthetics industries, which have been previously cited in the Senate and with which the Members are familiar, tell the same story.

Mr. President, there is another aspect to America's water problem that has particular significance in view of the tragic international developments of the past week.

As the Senate is aware, I had the opportunity of visiting Soviet Russia last fall as head of a subcommittee representing the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and the Committee on Public Works. Our task was to study comparative water and power resource development. One of the points made by the subcommittee report is this—that the Soviet Union possesses the largest water resources in the world. Russia has about 10 percent of our earth's supply of fresh water, compared to our 3 percent.

It is true that a portion of the water in Siberia is difficult to develop because it flows northward into the icebound Arctic Ocean, it is true that much of Russia's water is great distances from the centers of population; but this still leaves Russia with vastly greater water resources than we enjoy.

And, Mr. President, it must be said that the Eisenhower-Nixon administration has failed to recognize the vital character of our water problem, and has refused to follow policies calculated to develop supplies fast enough to keep up with demand. In some cases, our attempts to solve the problem have been ridiculed.

I refer to the vote of Congress to override the President's veto of the public works appropriation bill last session, which Press Secretary James Hagerty was allowed to call the "lure of the pork barrel." Yet these projects were for flood control—to prevent wasting of water; or for small water projects—to use water supplies more efficiently.

And the "no new starts" policy has unreasonably slowed the development of water storage and development projects. Incidentally, this policy was quietly dropped for this election year.

The President even vetoed the bill to use adequate amounts of Federal funds to assist and encourage States and localities to control water pollution. Yet the fact is that we are losing this race also—we are contaminating our water at a faster rate every year.

The leadership in providing adequate water supplies has therefore had to come from Congress. And this leadership is welcomed by the States and municipalities which are daily struggling with this problem.

One forward-looking step taken by the Senate is the appointment of the Select Committee on National Water Resources, which is making a study of the Nation's future water needs and supplies. We have held public hearings in all sections of the country, and are issuing a series of comprehensive reports covering all phases of our water problems. Our report will be made to the Senate next year.

In the meantime, I am pleased to support this move to step up all phases of our saline water program. This bill

provides for improved research, for process development in both pilot and full-scale plants, and for establishment of a needed central testing laboratory. Economic studies will be undertaken to provide communities with the cost figures they need to make intelligent decisions on the possibility of using desalinization for municipal water supply.

In addition, the bill provides for loans to communities to aid plant construction. Many communities could now provide their water supplies more cheaply through commercial desalinization. They hesitate to do so because of uncertainty, the expense involved, and the general lack of knowledge in this field.

In many places in this Nation, we already have a water shortage. The Geological Survey tells us that there were 1,000 communities in 47 States that had to restrict water use in 1957. The Department of Commerce estimates that the cities and towns of America must invest $80 billion in the next 20 years to keep abreast of their requirements for municipal and industrial water. A reasonable expenditure now to provide the research and development to make our greatest potential source of water—the sea—available for human use is one of the wisest investments we can make in the future of America.

AGRICULTURAL AND FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION APPROPRIATIONS, 1961

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 12117) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, do I correctly understand that H.R. 12117, the annual appropriation bill for the Department of Agriculture, has been made the unfinished business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be agreed to en bloc, that the bill as thus amended be considered as original test for the purpose of amendment, and that no point of order be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the unanimous-consent request is agreed to.

The committee amendments agreed to en bloc are as follows:

On page 3, line 7, after the word "stations", to strike out "$67,934,000" and insert "$70,247,600", and in line 10, after "(21 U.S.C. 113a)", to strike out the comma and "or to not to exceed $1,000,000 to remain available until expended for the construction and alteration of buildings."

On page 4, at the beginning of line 1, to strike out "$52,011,000" and insert "$52,236,000", and in line 5, after the word "conditions", to insert a colon and *"Provided,* That no funds shall be used to formulate or administer a brucellosis eradication program for fiscal year 1962 that does not require minimum matching by any State of at least 40 per centum."

On page 4, line 14, after the word "employed", to strike out "under contracts and cooperative agreements".

At the top of page 6, to insert:

"CONSTRUCTION OF FACILITIES

"For construction of facilities and acquisition of the necessary land therefor by donation or exchange, $3,700,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That $300,000 of the amount appropriated herein shall be available for payment of expenses for construction of a headquarters-laboratory building at the National Arboretum, which is hereby authorized to be constructed under contract authorization in an amount not to exceed $1,500,000."

On page 6, line 16, after the word "Agriculture", to strike out "$31,053,000" and insert "$32,053,708," and in line 19, after the word "all", to strike out "$31,553,000" and insert "$32,553,708".

On page 7, line 24, after "(7 U.S.C. 347a)", to strike out "$54,220,000" and insert "$56,220,000"; on page 8, line 2, after the word "all", to strike out "$55,715,000" and insert "$57,715,000", and in line 7, after the word "year", to strike out the colon and *"Provided further,* That all of the additional funds provided herein shall be used to meet expenses at the county level."

On page 8, line 12, after the word "employees", to strike out "$5,875,000" and insert "$5,961,000".

On page 8, line 22, after the word "possessions", to strike out "$2,255,000" and insert "$2,275,000".

On page 17, line 2, after the word "estimates", to strike out "$16,315,000" and insert "$16,605,000".

On page 17, after line 9, to insert:

"Marketing services: For services relating to agricultural marketing and distribution, for carrying out regulatory acts connected therewith, and for administration and coordination of payments to States, $26,579,900, including not to exceed $25,000 for employment at rates not to exceed $50 per diem, except for employment in rate cases at not to exceed $100 per diem pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (5 U.S.C. 574), as amended by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), in carrying out section 201(a) to 201(d), inclusive, of title II of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 (7 U.S.C. 1291) and section 203(j) of the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946."

On page 18, line 25, after "(7 U.S.C. 1766)", to strike out "$4,447,000" and insert "$4,487,000", and on page 19, at the beginning of line 7, to strike out "$2,493,000" and insert "$2,539,000".

On page 19, line 21, after the word "expended", to insert "of which amounts not less than $4,400,000 shall be available to purchase currencies which the Treasury Department shall determine to be excess to normal requirements of the United States: *Provided,* That this appropriation shall not be used for the purchase of currencies available in the Treasury for the purposes of section 104(f) of such Act unless such currencies are excess to the normal requirements of the United States".

On page 20, line 21, after "(7 U.S.C. 1-17a)", to strike out "$930,000" and insert "$941,325".

On page 21, line 18, after the word "expended", to strike out "$310,000,000" and insert "$335,000,000".

On page 22, at the beginning of line 18, to strike out "$50,000,000" and insert "$60,000,000".

On page 25, at the beginning of line 19, to strike out "$30,500,000" and insert "$31,467,650", and in line 20, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$1,000,000" and insert "$1,100,000".

On page 27, line 1, after the word "Department", to strike out "$1,478,000" and insert "$1,523,000"; in line 8, after the word "than", to strike out "one hundred and fifty-one thousand" and insert "two hundred and thirty-three thousand and fifty"; in line 16, after the word "of", where it occurs the second time, to strike out "one hundred and sixteen thousand five hundred and twenty-five" and insert "fifty-eight thousand two hundred", and at the beginning of line 19, to strike out "$90,000" and insert "$45,000".

On page 30, line 8, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$44,726,000" and insert "$45,726,000", and on page 32, line 12, after the word "provision", to strike out the semicolon and *"Provided further,* That none of the funds herein appropriated shall be used to formulate or administer any program which does not provide for maximum use of Government-owned facilities for storing surplus commodities, consistent with the economical operation of the Corporation."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I have a brief statement to make regarding some of the items in the agricultural appropriation bill.

As reported to the Senate, the bill carries direct appropriations in the amount of $4,000,222,683. This bill is $135 million under the budget estimates, and $62.3 million over the figure as passed by the other body. For the regular activities of the Department, $1.3 billion is recommended, which is $11.4 million under the budget requests.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

An appropriation of $1,226,500,000 is carried in the bill to restore capital impairment. This includes $632 million for the balance of losses incurred in fiscal 1959, and $594,500,000 of the estimated losses for fiscal 1960. The difference of $98,500,000 between the estimate and the amount proposed in the bill will have to be restored in some future appropriation bill.

An appropriation of $1,443,634,000 is recommended to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation for the estimated cost in fiscal 1960 of carrying out several authorized programs.

The principal committee changes from the bill as it passed the other body are as follows:

MARKETING SERVICES

First. The restoration to the bill of the "Marketing services" item of $26,579,900. This item was stricken in the House on a point of order.

Mr. President, in this item there is included the sum of $10,296,000 for poultry inspection, as requested in the budget, together with funds requested for several marketing service programs.

The administration has proposed legislation, which is pending before the standing committee on Agriculture and Forestry, dealing with continuation of authority to exempt poultry-food-processing food plants from mandatory inspection.

Unless the Congress enacts the proposed legislation before next July 1, the Department will be required, under the poultry products inspection law, to provide federally supervised inspection to further processing plants which the Secretary is now permitted by law to exempt from inspection. In that event, the Department will be obliged to submit a

supplemental budget request to cover the additional cost of inspection in the poultry-food-processing plants. Included in that category are a wide variety of mixed foods, such as chicken pies, chicken with vegetables of one kind and another, and canned chicken.

CONSERVATION RESERVE PROGRAM

Second. The other major increase recommended by the committee is a restoration of $25 million to make the mandatory rental payments, and for other costs under the conservation reserve program. The program authorization to enter into new contracts has expired, but this appropriation item will be required for several years for the contracts in force. The amount of $335 million is recommended, the same amount as for 1960, which, together with balances carried forward of about $20 million, should provide the funds required for fiscal 1961.

RESEARCH AND EXTENSION

The committee recommends an appropriation of $70,247,600 for the Agricultural Research Service. This amount is $1,265,900 over the budget request and is $2,313,600 over the amount provided in the other body.

The bill includes the full increase in the budget estimate of $1,502,800 for accelerating research to avoid pesticide residues, and an increase of $1,200,000 for utilization research.

The committee recommends several increases outside the budget which, it believes, are urgently needed, totaling $1.5 million over the House bill. It also recommends that $3.7 million be appropriated for the construction of new research facilities for pesticide residues, poultry disease, and management for the National Arboretum, and for plans and specifications for soil and water research facilities.

The committee recommends a $1 million increase for payments to State experiment stations. This is the increase requested in the budget and it was denied by the other body.

For payments to the States for cooperative extension work, an increase of $4 million over fiscal 1960 is recommended. This is $1,135,000 over the budget request.

A provision in the other body restricting the use of increased funds to the county offices has been stricken from the bill.

SOIL CONSERVATION ACTIVITIES

The committee concurs in the action taken in the other body to restore to $250 million the advance authorization for the 1961 ACP program. This is the third successive year that the President's budget has requested a reduction of either $125 or $150 million in the advance authorization for the ACP program.

For programs administered by the Soil Conservation Service, the committee recommends an appropriation of $143,132,000, which is $7.5 million over the estimates and almost $10 million over fiscal 1960.

SCHOOL LUNCH AND SCHOOL MILK

The bill carries a total of $155 million of Federal financing for the school lunch program, of which $45 million is from section 32 funds. This is a $5 million increase over the budget for section 32 funds.

In addition to the $155 million of Federal funds provided in this bill, an estimated $90 million of funds will be available under the special milk program. In addition, surplus foods acquired through CCC operations and surplus removal programs will be available for donation to the school lunch program. In fiscal 1960 these donations of food commodities are estimated to have a value of $73 million.

LOAN AUTHORIZATIONS

The bill provides $280 million authorization for electrification loans. This is comprised of $110 million regular authorization, requested in the budget, a carryover into 1961 of $110 million, and a contingency authorization of $60 million.

For telephone loans, a total available authorization of $141 million is provided. This is comprised of a carryover of $1 million, regular authorization of $80 million, and a $60 million contingency authorization.

The committee recommends regular authorization of $227 million for lending programs administered by the Farmers Home Administration. This compares with $226 million used this fiscal year. This is $50 million over the budget estimate. In addition, a contingency authorization of $40 million is provided.

Mr. President, on tomorrow I can discuss these and any of the other items in the bill, and I shall undertake to answer any questions which may be propounded.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator, the chairman of the subcommittee, a question in regard to an appropriation we have had in Kansas for many years with respect to research funds for a study of electricity in our State, through the Kansas State College. We have, I think, the finest relations between the private power companies in Kansas and the Rural Electrification Administration, working together. Excellent progress has been made. These groups have cooperated by contributing funds, to be used with Federal funds, for the study of uses of electricity.

I have a telegram from the dean of agriculture and the head of the Department of Agricultural Engineering of the Kansas State College, which I should like to have printed as a part of the RECORD, and I should like to ask the Senator if he has any comment in this regard.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, as the Senator has correctly stated, research as to the uses of electricity on the farm has been carried on in various forms for some years. This year, for some reason, the Bureau of the Budget recommended that that project be discontinued, but due to a revision of terms in the appropriation bill, for which the subcommittee can claim no direct credit—we merely approved what came from the other body—the same amount of money has been made available for the work at Manhattan as was expended during the present fiscal year.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, we in Kansas appreciate that very much. We know the money is not wasted. It serves a very useful purpose. I am delighted to learn that the work will be continued.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the telegram to which I have referred be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

MANHATTAN, KANS.

Hon. FRANK CARLSON,
U.S. Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.:

The Kansas Agricultural Experimental Station assisted by funds from Kansas electric power suppliers and cooperating with the Farm Electrification Branch, ARS, USDA, has developed a program of constructive research directed at the betterment of farm living and the improvement of farm production efficiency.

Current research efforts are concerned primarily with utilization of electric equipment and controls to provide comfort conditions for the farm home, to modify and control environment for livestock and poultry, to dry crops and to utilize solar energy as a source of supplemental heat in agriculture.

We understand that USDA research funds may be diverted from this program. Loss of these funds would seriously disrupt the continuity and orderly progress of research that has received wholehearted support from experiment station and industry personnel the past 12 years.

A. W. WEBER,
Dean of Agriculture.
G. H. LARSON,
Head of Department of Agricultural Engineering.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the rural electric cooperatives have requested substantial increases in the item for research.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further in regard to the research program?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am not inviting any amendments, but I wish to support the Senator's statement as to the importance of the work.

Mr. CARLSON. I assure the Senator that I shall not offer any amendments. I desired to make a short comment as to research.

I am delighted to note from the report that the committee has increased the appropriations for research. I notice the committee added several additional research items. I am not going to discuss those, but they are to be found beginning on page 2 of the report. The committee is recommending different establishments in different areas and in different fields.

Mr. President, those of us interested in wheat realize it is a major farm problem and one of the problems in dealing with this subject is the surplus.

Congress has approved legislation which restricts production through acreage controls and votes substantial sums of money for the export of the commodity.

It is my opinion that one place that we are lacking is in research. This appropriation bill recommends $70,247,600 for

research. This research is for all farm research programs and is used directly and cooperatively with State institutions.

It is not my intention to offer an amendment to the pending bill for establishment of a modern grain research laboratory on or near the campus of the State university at Manhattan.

I mention it at this time because in the next session of Congress, I expect to introduce legislation and urge its approval, which would give our Nation a sound, adequately staffed, well-rounded research organization which would be housed in facilities that would be in keeping with the needs for research on wheat.

Our present program of research is handicapped and limited in scope and is progressing more slowly than is necessary or desirable because of the absence of the following types of modern research equipment and facilities:

First. A battery of small controlled temperature-humidity rooms for use on grain storage and grain insect and micro-organism activity as related to conditions of temperature and humidity. Facilities for exploring sealed grain storage would be needed to determine the effect of air composition on grain quality and insect activity.

Second. Modern equipment and instruments for grain quality evaluation research including the latest scientific instruments and small milling and baking equipment for rounding out work on wheat quality particularly in relation to grade standards and to milling and baking performance.

Third. Facilities for employing radioactive tracers for determining airflow patterns, the movement of fumigants, and insect activity through stored grains.

Fourth. Facilities for exploring irradiation treatment for control of insects in stored grains.

Fifth. Pilot plant space in which temporary experimental equipment can be erected for the purpose of testing out new research developments in the area of grain quality maintenance.

Sixth. A small engineering and instrumentation shop.

Seventh. Modern offices and chemical, entomological, and engineering laboratories.

To accomplish the above-mentioned research objectives, a team approach of engineers, chemists, entomologists and other scientists is required. The work of the research team housed in the proposed facilities should be directed toward solution of problems in three broad areas. They are:

First. Quality identification and measurement; in other words, developing a better basic understanding of the inherently useful quality characteristics of wheat and other grains. With this information develop more meaningful grain standards and more objective instruments and methods of measuring wheat quality in the market.

Second. Prevention of damage to wheat quality during drying, conditioning, handling, storage, and transportation would come in for major research attention. New methods and equipment for use in the above operations would be explored. Basic studies of optimum storage environment, moisture equilibrium, micro-organism activity during storage and transportation and basic changes in wheat composition during storage and their effect on milling and baking quality would be analyzed.

Third. Research having to do with the control of insect damage to grain in storage, milling, and transportation channels should be strengthened. A small unit with responsibility for stored grain insect research is now located in Manhattan, Kans., in a wholly inadequate, rented private dwelling and temporary structures in the backyard. Because of the recent problems in the field of pesticide residues, added attention should be given to new chemical treatments and methods of applying chemicals that would control insect infestation and reduce or eliminate residues in grain and grain products.

The Great Plains Wheat Market Development Association, which is an organization representing wheatgrowers in the Midwest, is supporting this program and in the next session of Congress, we hope to come up with some definite figures and will recommend an appropriation for the construction of this wheat research laboratory.

I informed the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee that I shall not offer any amendments at this time, but I serve notice that in the next session of Congress I am going to see if we can provide funds for the establishment of a research laboratory which will go into this subject thoroughly.

I merely bring up this subject at this time because I feel keenly the importance of research in the field of wheat, not only with respect to the type of wheat we export but also with respect to the uses of wheat. I am pleased to see that the committee recognizes the value of research generally.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator.

If the Senator will look into the subject, I think he will find that the appropriations for research, particularly as to the diseases which affect wheat, have certainly not been neglected by the committee over the past several years. Those appropriations have been increased by several hundred percent.

The distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], who is the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, has urged increases over and above the budget request, to deal with such problems as rust and other diseases or plagues which afflict wheat.

I certainly agree with the distinguished Senator as to the importance of research. Some of our friends from the cities say it is a rather anomalous situation to be appropriating money for research at a time when the granaries are full, when we are plagued with surpluses, and when we are reducing farm acreage, but if it had not been for the research which brought down the per unit cost of production for the American farmers, they would be practically out of business. If the cost to produce were as much per unit today as it was many years ago, before some of these new and startling developments in the field of research came about, very few farmers would still be in business in this country.

Research has served a very useful purpose in reducing the losses the farmer has incurred by lowering his per unit cost of production.

I believe in research. We have increased the appropriation every year not only above the figure which came to us from the other body, but also above the budget estimates. We increased the appropriation over $3 million above the budget estimates in this field. We intend to move forward, and we would be delighted to receive the suggestions of the distinguished Senator from Kansas and will give very careful consideration to any suggestions from him as to further progress we may make in this field. It is one of the few areas in which we have been able to do anything for the American farmer.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I rise to pay my respects to the distinguished chairman of the committee, the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the committee for what I believe is a foresighted and a proper program for not only dealing in research of questions relating to wheat but also all agricultural commodities, because, as the distinguished chairman of the committee well knows, all of them are under pressure, and we need not only to provide the proper type of market for products but to find new uses for the products.

Mr. RUSSELL. I did not wish to go into the field of utilization research. We endeavored to increase the appropriation in that area, but despite the advances in the past several years we still have a long way to go in the study of soils, the conservation of water, and other related studies which not only assist in the production of crops, but which will also help in the preservation of the fertility of our soils for generations unborn.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I am very glad to join with my colleague in his commendation of what the committee has done with reference not only to research but also the matter about which Dean Weber of Kansas State University consulted us, which was a research fund with reference to a study that was made. Did I correctly understand the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] to say that that research program will be continued and that funds will be made available for it?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes. The Senator's colleague asked about the item which has to do with rural electrification research, which the budget recommended be discontinued.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. The Senator is correct.

Mr. RUSSELL. Through the reapplication of funds, as the bill now stands and comes before the Senate, it provides for that work to be done for another year at Manhattan, Kans.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I thank the distinguished Senator and the members of the committee for that consideration

because, as I understood from the reports that we had, that was in its completion stage, and provision should be made for completing it.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad to yield to the fighting friend of agriculture, the distinguished Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I thank my friend from Georgia for those kind comments. The bill as approved by the Senate Appropriations Committee I believe represents a reasonable approach to the many involved agricultural problems. I wish to commend the Senator from Georgia for his usual good job in the handling of the bill. Not all farm organizations and other groups got all they wanted, but I think the adjustments made in the bill were necessary ones and the ones which will please the great majority of the Members of Congress as well as people generally.

As the Senator pointed out, there were only two sizable increases in the appropriation bill, and those were necessary ones which had to be made because a point of order was raised on the House floor on the ground that contracts had been entered into regarding the conservation reserve program. The remainder of the increases made by the Senate committee were very worthy ones involving, for example, increases in loan authorizations for REA and RTA, some research items, and some other adjustments. On the whole, as I said previously, I think it is now a very good bill and one which should provoke very little debate on the Senate floor.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator. I think the bill is as well balanced as we can make it in these times.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I wish merely to take time enough to commend both the chairman of the Agricultural Appropriations Subcommittee and the ranking member of the committee and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] on the excellent job they did in respect to the agricultural appropriation bill, not only this year but for several years last passed, and ever since I have had the privilege of being a member of the subcommittee. I believe the fact that American agriculture is now the best in the whole world is due largely to the foresight and the attention which these two men on the subcommittee, composed of able Senators, in particular have given to our requirements.

I become a little tired when I hear people complain because we have enough to eat and wear in this country and a little besides. We can imagine what the situation would be today if we did not have a good supply of wheat, feed grains, and other farm commodities on hand. What happened at the summit conference would have been almost a minor matter compared with what would happen if we became a deficit agricultural country. We could not stand up. The attention given to the preservation of our soil and water resources by the committee headed by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] has been outstanding. If we do not take care of our soil and water resources in this country, it will not make a bit of difference how many missiles we have, or how far they will shoot, because we shall be the underdog in any international controversy which may arise.

I am glad to take this opportunity to thank these leaders of American agriculture who have done such outstanding work.

Mr. RUSSELL. I wish to express to the distinguished Senator from Vermont, for myself, and for the distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] our deep appreciation for his complimentary references. It was a very happy and fortuitous day for the Appropriations Subcommittee when the distinguished Senator from Vermont came to be an ex officio member and brought to the committee the results of his years of experience on the standing Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, as well as his sympathetic interest in the problems of American agriculture, the future of our soils, and in the preservation of our resources.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the livestock producers in Texas suffer tremendous losses each year from screwworm infestation, and there is a tremendous need for an eradication program in the Southwest similar to that which has so effectively brought the screwworm under control in the southeastern part of the country. The distinguished chairman of the subcommittee will remember that I brought this situation to his attention last year, and I was pleased to see that on page 3 of the committee report the committee took cognizance of the menace facing the livestock producers in the Southwest and requested the Department to investigate the feasibility of developing an eradication program and to report to the committee on the feasibility and requirements for such a program.

I have explained to my constituents that the committee would expect the Department to act on this request in the near future, and in any event in time for the report to be considered by the committee during the next session of the Congress, when it considers the appropriation for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year 1962.

I inquire of the distinguished Senator from Georgia if that is his understanding of what the committee had in mind when it included this language in the committee report on page 3?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes. The distinguished Senator from Texas urged the committee last year and again this year to consider the interest of the livestock producers of Texas and the Southwest in the eradication program. We know as a matter of common knowledge that the screwworm has caused heavy losses to those livestock producers.

A number of producers wrote to members of the committee. Judge Montague, who headed the Livestock Producers Association for many years, discussed the matter with me. I have canvassed the subject informally with the Department and they have advised me there are a number of problems which would require intensive research and planning before they would undertake to start an eradication program such as was applied in the Southeast.

The committee has directed the Department to investigate this matter fully and we certainly expect to have a report on this subject not later than the time the Department of Agriculture budget is submitted for fiscal year 1962.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thank the Senator for his complete response to my inquiry. I am very grateful for the interest he always shows to the solution of problems in our section of the country.

FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I note that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] and the Senator from Illinois are in the Chamber. This afternoon the Senator from Pennsylvania made some statements on the floor of the Senate with regard to some statements of mine, as follows:

> I might also add, in connection with the statement of the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, Mr. KENNEDY, as reported in the Portland Oregonian, that the Senator himself said:
>
> "Khrushchev laid down two conditions to President Eisenhower for going on with the summit meeting. One was to apologize. I think that might have been possible to do."
>
> Then the quotation goes on to other matters.
>
> The report in that Oregonian is that:
>
> "Later KENNEDY modified the word 'apologize,' and said the President might 'express regret.' "
>
> It is my hope—

The Senator from Pennsylvania went on to say—

> that neither the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts nor that other candidate for the Presidency, Governor Stevenson, will—either one of them—brand himself as a "turnquote." It is my hope that they will relieve themselves of the curse of suspicion of appeasement, and it is my hope that the unity, which started out so well in support of the President and in support of the administration, may somehow be found again.

Now let me quote from an Associated Press dispatch headed "Summit," which I have just taken from the news ticker, as follows:

> SCOTT replied heatedly that he had not called them appeasers. But he said quotations attributed to them indicated to him they wanted to follow a soft line in dealing with the Russians. He said they should be called before an investigating committee to testify on their views.

Mr. President, is the Senator from Pennsylvania suggesting that I be called before an investigating committee?

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

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. SCOTT. If the Senator will continue to read my notes and other notes which other Senators made, he will note that I did not suggest that he be called before an investigating committee. I suggested that Mr. Boulay, the author of the French newspaper article, be called to testify if the committee saw fit, with

respect to the interview which he allegedly had with Governor Stevenson, and that Governor Stevenson be invited to appear to give his version of the interview.

At another point I said that I see no objection to an investigation of all the facts involving American foreign policy if the Committee on Foreign Relations wished to make such an investigation, and that it might call all the witnesses it wanted to call, including Mr. Boulay and Mr. Stevenson.

I have reread my own notes, and I do not recall at any point ever suggesting that the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, for whom I have a very high regard, as he knows, be asked to appear before any investigating committee. To that extent the Associated Press statement, as read by the Senator from Massachusetts, does not seem to follow the RECORD in the Senate.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I will ask the Senator if he believes that I am under suspicion of appeasement?

Mr. SCOTT. On the contrary; I suggested that the Senator from Massachusetts may relieve himself—and I made the suggestion in good will—of the suspicion of appeasement.

I made reference to a newspaper article printed in the Portland Oregonian, written by Mr. Marvin Shoemaker, which quotes the Senator as saying:

> Khrushchev laid down two conditions to President Eisenhower for going on with the summit meeting. One was to apologize.

Then the report in the Oregonian stated:

> Later KENNEDY modified the word "apologize," and said the President might "express regret."

I may say that if the Senator from Massachusetts feels that President Eisenhower should apologize to Khrushchev, as first reported in the paper, that he now has an opportunity—and I am very hopeful indeed that he will use it—to relieve himself of any suspicion of appeasement, because in my opinion it would be appeasement to have the President apologize. If, however, the Senator's later explanation, with respect to expressing regrets, which he made in Oregon, is correct, and he was misquoted—then, in my mind, it does not qualify him in accordance with my previous remarks.

Mr. KENNEDY. Has the Senator from Pennsylvania any other source, besides the newspaper in Oregon, of the statement which he later said was a misquotation?

Mr. SCOTT. My only source is the newspaper publication itself, and that the byline is by Mr. Marvin Shoemaker, the political writer of the Portland Oregonian. If the Senator is prepared to say that he made none of these statements, and that the newspaper writer is incorrect or made an error in having attributed it to the Senator, I will be very glad indeed to take note of what the Senator says.

Mr. KENNEDY. And from what paper did the Senator get the statement that I had been misquoted?

Mr. SCOTT. I believe the context states that the Senator from Massachusetts made the statement:

> "Khrushchev laid down two conditions to President Eisenhower for going on with the summit meeting. One was to apologize."
>
> Later KENNEDY modified the word "apologize," and said the President might "express regret."

The newspaper article indicates that the Senator himself modified the earlier remark. To be entirely fair, I repeat that, if he did not make the first remark or if he did not make the second remark, I am very happy that those remarks were not made.

Mr. KENNEDY. Does not the Senator think it would have been more in keeping with Senate rule XIX if he had informed me that he was going to make an attack on me?

Mr. SCOTT. I may say to the Senator that it is not always possible to know when the Senator from Massachusetts is available, and that because of the Senator's other obligations, this is probably more true of him than of many other Members of the Senate, and we fully understand it and are in accord with the reasons for the Senator's absences. Further, my remarks were made subsequent to the remarks made by the distinguished minority leader. At the time I rose I had not fully made up my mind as to what references I might make to the material which had already been inserted in the RECORD by the minority leader, including the news item to which I have referred. It occurred at the convening of the Senate today. Certainly I did not intend any discourtesy to the Senator from Massachusetts. However, it is virtually impossible to know when the name of the Senator from Massachusetts will be mentioned in the Senate. That is not the fault of the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KENNEDY. I consider it to be completely the fault of the Senator from Pennsylvania. This is not just another mention of my name. It is a unique situation. I do not recall that any other Senator has ever made the suggestion that I come before the Senate or before an investigating committee to purge myself of the suspicion of appeasement. Certainly the courtesy of advance notice should have been extended to the Senator from Massachusetts by the Senator from Pennsylvania, especially when his remarks were coming close to being a violation of rule XIX, part 2, which states:

> No Senator in debate shall, directly or indirectly, by any form of words impute to another Senator or to other Senators any conduct or motive unworthy or unbecoming a Senator.

The actual record of the Official Reporter uses the word "turncoat." I am aware of the fact that the Senator from Pennsylvania may well have coined an original phrase on later consideration, or he may have made it at that time. But his accentuation was not distinct, and the Official Reporter took down the word "turncoat."

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a correction, because the Senator is proceeding on a line which is not in accordance with what actually happened? Will the Senator yield?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. SCOTT. I call the Senator's attention to the fact that I had written down on a newspaper at the time, on one of the desks here, the word "turnquote" before I spoke it. It was clearly understood in the gallery and was so recorded on the first teletype report of my original remarks; that when someone, on the other side of the aisle, used the "turncoat," I immediately rose to correct him; and the third time I rose to correct him, I used the word "turnquote." I enunciated it quite clearly.

So, although the Senator will have to forgive me if my accent failed at the time, I am certain the press clearly understood the word "turnquote."

It is not a word coined by me; it is not a word in the dictionary, because I have since looked it up; but it is a word commonly used. I have seen it in the newspapers and magazines. It is well known to the press. I may say, too, that the Senator has had many sad experiences with the use of the word.

Mr. KENNEDY. Let me read what I actually did say in Oregon, so that the Senator will be clear about it. This afternoon, after I had heard about the Senator's attack on me—and I would have been glad to discuss his accusations and my statement in Oregon with him, and even with the Senator from Illinois—I called the school in Oregon where I spoke and talked with Mr. Monroe, who is the principal of that school.

A recording of my remarks had been made. I will read what I said, because I think it throws some light on what my thoughts were. I made these statements in answer to questions asked by the students.

There was a series of questions from the students, dealing with the summit, and finally, although Mr. Monroe has only the answer and not the question on his tape—came the question to which I gave the answer which is being discussed here today.

But first let me read the two questions of the students which led to this question:

First, "Do you think the U–2 incident was handled properly by the Government?"

> I do not think that the timing of the U–2 incident is defensible. I think it was obviously the wrong time. Engine failure is always a possibility. Every time we go up in a plane we have to realize that it may come down sooner than we thought. That being true, it seems to me that you always have to consider what the results of that failure will be, and therefore, you would have to consider that there is 1 chance in 5, and 1 in 10, and 1 in 100 chances that a flight a week before the summit would fail and, therefore, it was a risk you would not want to take at that particular time.

Then the next question evidently was whether I thought Mr. Khrushchev would have broken up the summit meeting if there had not been the U–2 flight.

I said:

> No, I don't think that it would have been abandoned. Except for the U–2 incident it would not have had a psychological argument for breaking up. Then the burden

would have been his alone and while the summit may never have been a success, he never would have taken all the responsibility unless he had what he felt was an adequate provocation to justify his position before world opinion. He never would have taken on the burden himself.

Then, while as I have said, the next question is not recorded, Mr. Monroe's recollection was—and the answer which I gave would seem to be responsive to it—that it was:

What would you have done if you had been Mr. Eisenhower?

My response was:

Once the summit had broken up and once Mr. Khrushchev indicated his refusal to continue I don't think that the United States could—but—he said there were two conditions for continuing. One, that we apologize. I think that that might have been possible to do and that second, we try those responsible for the flight. We could not do that. It would be highly unfair because the flight had been authorized and therefore that was a condition Mr. Khrushchev knew we couldn't meet and therefore it indicated that he wanted to break (it) up. If he had merely asked that the United States should express regret then that would have been a reasonable term. To say we should try those involved—quite obviously that meant that he wanted to break it up and we had no alternative but to let him do so.

This statement is quite clear to me, at least, when taken in its context, and particularly taken in the context of the AP story of the same statement—which I have here. I have AP story as carried in the Des Moines Register. It says:

PORTLAND, OREG.—JOHN F. KENNEDY said * * * he would have expressed regret.

Then it says:

KENNEDY, campaigning here for votes in Oregon's presidential preference primary, said: "I certainly would express regret at the timing and give assurance that it would not happen again." He said, "I would express regret that the flight did take place."

Let me be a bit specific about this. It seems to me that my answer should be taken in its entirety and in its context. Among all the newspapermen who were present, including the representative of the Associated Press, no one deduced from my answer that I wanted the President to apologize to Khrushchev. And I did not say that the President should apologize. But I did state that, if necessary to keep the summit going, I would have been willing to express regret at the timing of the U-2 incident. And I do regret the timing because it helped lead to the question of the chances of a successful summit. It certainly lessened the prestige of the United States in the eyes of the world. It has helped destroy the prestige of the President in the eyes of the Russian people which was one of our greatest national assets. And it has given the impression that the President does not completely control some of the military or some of his intelligence officers.

So I would have expressed regret if such an expression would have kept the summit going. That does not make me in any way a party to appeasement. I do not have to come before any investigating committee to rid myself of the suspicion of appeasement. I am not a "turnquote." That statement is wholly inaccurate, because the total explanation of my entire position was in the one answer given to the schoolchildren, and was carried by the Associated Press.

I think this is a difficult time in the life of the United States. I think that quite obviously we on the Democratic side who have a responsibility to suggest alternative courses of action to conduct an examination of our policies so that we may learn from past mistakes. After all, that is a function which the party of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] has assumed on many occasions in the past.

I have never abused the President personally. I do not now advocate a policy which I think would weaken the United States—nor have I ever advocated such a policy. Instead, year after year, I have stood on the floor of this Senate and voted for the appropriations and programs which would have made America stronger—defense appropriations and programs to build up the strength of our education, our economy, and our health. It is these things which are the real test of a desire for a strong America.

I say to the Senator from Pennsylvania, who has been a colleague of mine in both the House and the Senate, and to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], that if the Senator had informed me in advance of his projected attack, I would have given him my entire statement, so that he might know my entire point of view.

Second, I am sure the Senator from Pennsylvania cannot justify his calling me an appeaser or cast a suspicion of appeasement on me. Once we begin to make that sort of charge—and I have already been attacked along a similar line by the Governor of New Hampshire—the great debate of the 1960 campaign will be doomed to become abusive rather than a fruitful discussion of the great problems which confront this Nation.

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

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Does the Senator from Massachusetts regard the Oregonian as a substantial, solid newspaper?

Mr. KENNEDY. I do.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Does the Senator know Mr. Shoemaker?

Mr. KENNEDY. I do.

Mr. DIRKSEN. What is the Senator's estimate of Mr. Shoemaker?

Mr. KENNEDY. He is a good newspaperman.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Does the Senator believe he is a careful newspaperman?

Mr. KENNEDY. I do.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Does the Senator deny that Mr. Shoemaker, in the article which he read, and which I placed in the RECORD, said there was one thing which the Senator from Massachusetts said could be done, namely, that the President could apologize? Does the Senator deny that he used the word "apologize"? Does the Senator deny that statement, if Mr. Shoemaker is a good, competent newspaperman?

Mr. KENNEDY. I am attempting to present my entire answer. I had hoped that when I had presented the entire answer, the Senator from Illinois, with his customary judicious, fair nature, would recognize that any implication that I had said the President should apologize—that I was an appeaser—was a breach of the rules of the Senate.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is the point I am getting at—whether I have treated the Senator from Massachusetts unfairly or not. Did I treat the Senator unfairly?

Mr. KENNEDY. I should say that the Senator from Illinois did not treat me unfairly. The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] did.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. SCOTT. I regret that the Senator from Massachusetts has resorted to what might be called guilt by association by bracketing me with some remark, with which I am not familiar, alleged to have been made by the Governor of New Hampshire. I hope he will not further follow those tactics.

Mr. KENNEDY. Bracketed only by party membership.

Mr. SCOTT. I regret it if I have at any time seemed to be unfair. If I have been unfair, the Senator from Massachusetts has my apology. I do not believe, myself, that I have been unfair.

The Senator's comment seems to be based upon the fact that while many Members of the Senate were in attendance in the Senate when it was called to order, and an item was put into the RECORD by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], I made comments upon a matter already inserted in the RECORD.

If the Senator thinks that was unfair, I am sorry; and, first, I should like the Senator to be sure that he is quite fair, as I am certain he wishes to be. Following my statement to the Senator from Massachusetts—I refer to my statement that I did not suggest that he be investigated by anyone—he said the Senator from Pennsylvania demanded an investigation of the Senator from Massachusetts.

I say to the Senator from Massachusetts that is not a correct quotation of what I said; and I told him that that was not a correct quotation of what I said. However, even after I told him that that was not a correct quotation of what I said, he continued to advert to it.

Further, he admits that the exact words which appear in the article published in the Portland Oregonian were stated by him:

One was to apologize. I—

That is, the Senator from Massachusetts—

think that might have been possible to do.

If the Senator from Massachusetts thinks it might have been possible for President Eisenhower to apologize, how can the Senator from Massachusetts now say the phrase is taken out of context?

Mr. KENNEDY. In the first place, those words are not the precise words that came off the recorder this afternoon.

Mr. SCOTT. The Senator read the same words himself, as coming from his own remarks.

Mr. KENNEDY. The Senator should judge the statement in the context in which the answer was given, and that context was accepted by every member of the press who was there.

Let me read my answer again:

He said there were two conditions for continuing: One, that we apologize. I think that that might have been possible to do; and that, second, we try those responsible for the flight.

The Senator from Pennsylvania stops his version with the words "might have been possible to do," and leaves the clear implication that, therefore, I said we should apologize.

What I said was that if Mr. Khrushchev had proposed the first condition alone—the apology—it was possible that Khrushchev and the President of the United States might have had a meeting of the minds—it was possible that some sort of an agreement might have been reached.

However, my answer went on that the second condition was obviously unacceptable because the flight was authorized by the Government and it was inconceivable that we would punish the men involved. Therefore Mr. Khrushchev knew it was a condition we could not meet, and by making it a condition of resuming the talks he clearly demonstrated that he intended to break off the summit conference. If he merely had asked that the United States express regret, that might have been a reasonable term, and would have indicated a willingness on his part to proceed.

It seems to me that I expressed this view quite clearly in what I said; and the Associated Press, the United Press, and other press agencies took that view. Furthermore, I stated my clarification of it, not at some later time, but in the same paragraph.

Therefore, I merely say that the record will speak for itself, and that I do not have to purge myself of any suspicion of appeasement.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield to me, so that I may, in fairness, make a statement?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. SCOTT. I have not said the Senator from Massachusetts was an appeaser. I said—as nearly as I can remember the words I used; the Senator from Massachusetts now has my notes—that I hoped he would take an opportunity to resist the suspicion of appeasement, which turns on the suggestion that Eisenhower should have apologized to Khrushchev.

The Senator from Massachusetts feels that that statement was taken out of context. I am perfectly willing to abide by the statement of the Senator from Massachusetts and by his own interpretation; and I make it quite clear to this body that I have not said, and I do not now say, the Senator from Massachusetts was an appeaser. I hope that will satisfy the sensitivity of the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania still feel there is a suspicion of appeasement about me?

Mr. SCOTT. If the Senator from Massachusetts feels that he had no intention to appease by making the statement, I will accept the Senator's version as my own.

Mr. KENNEDY. I appreciate the Senator's somewhat grudging response.

Mr. SCOTT. It is not grudging at all. I like the Senator from Massachusetts very much.

Mr. KENNEDY. I never thought the day would come when I would say Harold Stassen's judgment was not completely inaccurate. But I must say perhaps he was wiser than we knew, when he spoke the other day in Pennsylvania.

I think it comes with poor grace for Senators to refer to each other in derogatory terms.

Neither do I think Governor Stevenson has to appear before an investigating committee in order to purge himself of the Senator from Pennsylvania's suspicions.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Moss in the chair). Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. The able Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the able Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], the minority leader, the able Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], and the junior Senator from Colorado all served together in the House of Representatives. The Senator from Pennsylvania was at one time national chairman of the Republican Party. The minority leader, the distinguished Senator from Illinois, has a responsibility to support his President, no matter how fumbling the action taken may have been.

But to accuse the junior Senator from Massachusetts of appeasement, under the evidence I have heard here tonight, is not only unfair, it is ridiculous.

All that needs to be done is to analyze carefully what has been said, and then look at the political partisanship in back of it. It is clearly an attempt to strike down one of the foremost young political leaders in America today, in an attempt to give the impression that he is asking the President of the United States to apologize to Khrushchev, when implicit in every sentence of the statement the Senator from Massachusetts made was that the President might have expressed his regrets. What is wrong with that?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Oh, Mr. President——

Mr. CARROLL. I ask the Senator to let me finish, please.

All America would agree that that might have brought success to the summit—which the President and his minority leader wanted, I am sure. There would have been nothing wrong with expressing regrets.

But Senators try to misinterpret the text of the statement the Senator made to make it appear as a request by the junior Senator from Massachusetts that an apology be made. What is this situation, Mr. President? It is a raw, partisan, political effort to put the Senator from Massachusetts at disadvantage, because they are afraid of the strength he is manifesting throughout the Nation today. That is the sole purpose—a raw, partisan, political effort, which the American public will see through and quickly understand.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield to me?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield, to permit the Senator from Illinois to make a response.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I wish to say to my distinguished friend, the Senator from Colorado, that I am not afraid of anybody or anything. I started out with a very mild expository statement on the subject of crowbars. That is where I started, and that it where I tried to wind up.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. The Senator from Illinois started with a crowbar and a sledge hammer, but he tried to put the junior Senator from Massachusetts between the hammer and the anvil—a raw, partisan, political piece of chicanery. But the Senator from Illinois will not succeed; the American people will not permit him to do that.

Mr. DIRKSEN. But I love the Senator from Massachusetts too much to do that under any circumstances.

Mr. CARROLL. Then why did not the Senator from Illinois abide by the Senate rules?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Because I was talking about Adlai.

Mr. CARROLL. If the minority leader was talking about Adlai, the Senator from Illinois, who is one of the most skilled politicians in the business——

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CARROLL. I mean that sincerely; and the able junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], formerly national chairman of the Republican Party, is another skilled politician. Are they now asking us to believe that they were not trying to "put the tag" on the junior Senator from Massachusetts? I warn you, the American people will not believe it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I can only say to my good friend that his party has not yet had its convention. What we are interested in is what we are going to do to his party in November. We do not know what member of his party will receive the nomination of his party. We have our candidate, and we are going to win in November.

So we are not playing favorites as between all the candidates his party has. We simply want to make sure that the record is clear, and that any "anvils" are kept out of it—because I did not refer to any "anvil"; I referred only to sledge hammers and crowbars.

So I wish to be sure, always, that when they talk about sledge hammers and crowbars, they are talking about a fellow who lived on the land, and knows what a crowbar is, and knows what a sledge hammer is, and knows what they are

used for, and how they are used, and has used both of those instrumentalities a great many times.

Mr. KENNEDY. Let me say that the Senator from Illinois seems to suggest that this type of campaign technique—of suggesting that Senators are guilty of a suspicion of appeasement, and are "turnquotes," and so forth——

Mr. DIRKSEN. Oh, Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. KENNEDY. Does not the Senator feel that this type of debate will not make a great contribution to the discussion of the issues?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Let me say this never would have happened if Governor Stevenson had left one phrase or one clause out of the statement he made to the $100 dinner in Cook County, last Thursday night. There, he said, after the recital of unity and then the responsibility of his party to inform the country, this administration could not carry on these negotiations with the Russians, involving the survival of the country, and had to be taken out of power. And if that is not politics, then I do not know the meaning of the word.

Mr. KENNEDY. It is disloyal. That is what it is; is it not?

Mr. DIRKSEN. What?

Mr. KENNEDY. Would you not be inclined to say that it is disloyal? Would that be the appropriate charge?

Mr. DIRKSEN. No; it is just plain politics, spelled with a capital "P." Having lived in this atmosphere for about 30 years, I think I know a political sentiment when I see it; and when it is in cold print, the English language does have a meaning.

Mr. KENNEDY. Let me ask the Senator from Illinois, who is quite precise, does the Senator see anything inappropriate or in contravention of the rules of the Senate in anything the Senator from Pennsylvania said?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I do not pass on that. I am not sitting up there in the chair. I am not the Parliamentarian.

Mr. KENNEDY. Does the Senator care to make a judgment on it?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I know of no reason why I should, particularly.

Mr. KENNEDY. The Senator is the "leader of the army."

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have high regard for the delicacy of the situation.

Mr. KENNEDY. I, myself, have the same reticence about commenting on it as the Senator from Illinois has.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I know the Senator from Massachusetts never would have made the statement Adlai made in Chicago. He certainly would have made a consistent appeal for unity, even as the majority leader and the acting majority leader have from time to time made on the floor of the Senate, and in which I have always been delighted to concur.

Mr. KENNEDY. Is it proper, then, to say the Senator from Illinois never would have used the words the Senator from Pennsylvania used?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I do not pass on that question. I can never pass on words I have not uttered or with which I have no particular connection. But I know what Adlai said, and I have to get back to crowbars. Someone made the crack about "eating crowbars." I thought that was a nifty expression and that we will hear more about it. But this was nothing more than a visitation on the subject of crowbars and sledge hammers, and I tried to remain within it pretty much.

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

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. I can understand the sensitiveness of the Senator from Illinois——

Mr. DIRKSEN. Oh, I am not sensitive. I am the least sensitive man in this body.

Mr. CARROLL. I can understand how he may have been wounded deeply, because here is a Member of the United States Senate who happens to be the brightest star that has been blazing across the political horizon. The implication is made that he is a turncoat through applying an invented phrase "turnquote" in connection with whether Senator KENNEDY asked for an apology or an expression of regret.

I want to ask the minority leader, who is a very experienced statesman and politician, was it an accident that the Senator from Illinois and the Senator from Pennsylvania got together on this subject, or was it for the purpose of cutting down the junior Senator from Massachusetts?

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

Mr. KENNEDY. Yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I had no idea who was going to be on the floor this noon. I did not know that the majority leader was not going to be here. I did not care. I do my own thinking, when I have a little time, and then I get all the material together, because I have no ghostwriters. I have no staff to get this material together for me. I do it myself.

Mr. CARROLL. The Senator from Illinois does not need ghostwriters.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have not conferred with a single Member on our side or the side of the Senator from Colorado or with a person in any other place as to what was going to happen this afternoon. I had all my ducks in a row. I had 10 documents in a sheaf; and, like a good lawyer—and my friend is a good lawyer—when one goes before the judge, he lays it out and says, "Judge, here are the citations." I made the allegations, and then I gave the citations from Adlai Stevenson's speech on down; and it will be a pretty good campaign document, if that is the way Adlai wants it, because I wanted to be sure that everything, including the whole press dispatch from the Paris newspaper, and the questions and answers, will be there for reference when the time comes.

While I am about it, there was a question as to whether Mr. Robert Boulay, who was the author of this interview for the Paris paper, had an inadequate perception of the English language. Maybe so, but he is the Time-Life correspondent in Paris; and if he does not know English, I had better write Henry Luce a letter. [Laughter.]

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

Mr. KENNEDY. Yes.

Mr. CARROLL. The Senator did this all by himself?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. CARROLL. The sledge hammer and the crowbar?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Oh, no. Adlai did that.

Mr. CARROLL. The Senator from Illinois did it by himself?

Mr. DIRKSEN. No; Adlai did that.

Mr. CARROLL. The Senator did not know that others would be here in the Chamber to help attempt to cut down and hamstring one of the great political figures in contemporary American history?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I would not do it for the world. I have too much affection for the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. CARROLL. I am sure of that. We have heard about sledge hammers and crowbars, but who put the monkey wrench in the summit? If the majority leader and minority leader said that we should have an investigation——

Mr. DIRKSEN. I said nothing about an investigation.

Mr. CARROLL. Oh, the Senator does not want an investigation?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I do not care who wants an investigation. I make the decisions for myself. I know what I want to say. I have some notion about what the English language conveys. I did not say anything about investigation. Now that the Senator has brought up the subject of monkey wrenches, I think we had better add that to Adlai Stevenson's instrumentalities, because he will probably need it.

Mr. CARROLL. Let us be careful that those instrumentalities do not combine to produce nuclear fatalities, brought on by those responsible for the blunders.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have been living in the same State with Adlai for years. I love him. I just disagree with him.

Mr. CARROLL. I may say to the Senator from Illinois I was not talking about him personally, because I recognize the tolerance, the statesmanship, and the political sagacity of the Senator from Illinois. We are talking about a different matter here today.

Will not the Senator from Illinois agree with me, from our years of service in the House, there is nothing about the junior Senator from Massachusetts that shows he is either an appeaser——

Mr. DIRKSEN. I did not say he was an appeaser. I am responsible only for my own words.

Mr. CARROLL. Does the Senator say the Senator from Massachusetts is not an appeaser?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have never used other than the most polite and courteous language to my distinguished friend from Massachusetts; and if I say anything about him, it will be only to toss him a dainty bouquet. [Laughter.]

Mr. KENNEDY. May I say it comes late, but I am a grateful receiver.

Before I take my seat, I wish to point out that the other day the Republican chairman said that—

Loyal Americans will not take kindly to any politician willing to run down the President for the sake of personal advantage.

The key words in that sentence are "loyal Americans."

Under this formulation of the Republican chairman—today and for the next few months—any of us who feel obligated to criticize American foreign policy run the risk, of being accused as "disloyal appeasers" and "turnquotes."

But despite that risk the criticism is going to continue. It is our function and responsibility to criticize when there are weaknesses to criticize. And we propose to meet that responsibility. The Democratic Party would be unworthy of its traditions and its responsibility as a party if it did not fulfill the vital function of legitimate criticism, heedless of whether the Governor of New Hampshire may say we are soft on communism or the Senator from Pennsylvania may say it is necessary that I purge myself of the charges of appeasement. These points—these critical issues—will continue to be debated, and I hope much of this debate will be carried on on the floor of the Senate—as well as across the Nation.

Before I sit down, I thank the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] for their kind remarks.

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

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. SCOTT. I wish to make a further correction. I again invite the attention of the Senator to the fact that I did not use the phrase that he should purge himself of a suggestion of appeasement. The Senator has my notes before him. The Senator knows that I said—as nearly as I can remember, since the Senator has my notes and is holding on to them—that he should resist the suspicion of appeasement. The Senator has made a very good case in so resisting.

I also add that I mentioned earlier I had made a note——

Mr. KENNEDY. The Senator did not say what he says. He is "turn quoting."

Mr. SCOTT. The Senator has my notes.

Mr. KENNEDY. The Senator is "turn quoting."

Mr. SCOTT. The Senator has my notes.

Mr. KENNEDY. The Senator said:

It is my hope that they will relieve themselves of the curse of suspicion of appeasement.

Mr. SCOTT. The Senator accepts that as what I said?

Mr. KENNEDY. I know the Senator wanted to say what he has said, but he did not say it. He did not say "resist;" he said "relieve."

Mr. SCOTT. "Relieve." I accept what I said. I do not withdraw it. The Senator may recall that I made some reference to the question whether I said "turn quote" in the first instance.

Mr. KENNEDY. The Senator does not withdraw the statement?

Mr. SCOTT. I said that there were notes around on some Senator's desk which showed I had that notation. A page, while the Senator from Massachusetts was talking, has found that paper. I leave it with the Senator from Massachusetts, among his mementos. The Senator will see that the word written in my notes is "turn quote."

Mr. KENNEDY. Does the Senator withdraw the statement: "It is my hope that they—" which would include me—"will relieve themselves of the curse of suspicion of appeasement"?

Mr. SCOTT. I will say to the Senator, as I said before, I do not feel that the Senator is an appeaser. The Senator, in the statement which he made, claimed that the statements by a newspaperman were taken out of context. If that is correct—and I have no reason to feel that it is not correct—the Senator has, to that degree, removed himself from the application of my remarks with respect to appeasement.

I desire at all times to be fair with the Senator from Massachusetts, but I do not and cannot withdraw from the RECORD the newspaper report which was put into the RECORD not by me but by the Senator from Illinois. I hope the Senator from Massachusetts understands that.

Mr. KENNEDY. Yes. I appreciate what the Senator has said, and the remarks of the Senator from Illinois.

The statement of Mr. Shoemaker has been added to by the entire statement. I think that the full statement quite clearly shows what I intended to say—my point of view—which was reported, as I said, that way by the Associated Press. Therefore, I am delighted that the Senator has chosen to withdraw his statement.

Mr. SCOTT. Obviously no one questions the courage, the devotion, or the patriotism of the Senator from Massachusetts. My question was pointed up on the newspaper article. We have discussed it thoroughly. The Senator has offered his explanation. So far as I am concerned, I am willing to let it rest with the article and with the Senator's explanation. I assume that that will be satisfactory to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. Not quite as satisfactory as it was a moment ago; but in that case I yield the floor.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, May 23, 1960, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 44) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct the San Luis unit of the Central Valley project, California, to enter into an agreement with the State of California with respect to the construction and operation of such unit, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment, in accordance with the order previously entered, until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 23 minutes p.m.) the Senate, under the previous order, adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 24, 1960, at 10 o'clock a.m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MAY 23, 1960

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Colossians 4: 3: *Continue steadfastly in prayer.*

Almighty God, Thine is the strength which sustains us, the love which redeems us, the sympathy which comforts us, and the light which leads us.

Grant that we may never lose our faith in Thee, even though we are standing amid what seems to be the defeat of our fondest hopes and dreams.

Help us to believe that the vision of universal peace vouchsafed to our minds and hearts is not too lofty and too wonderful to be fulfilled by Thy divine wisdom and power.

Inspire us with steadfast devotion to continue to pray fervently and to labor faithfully that our disappointed and disheartened humanity may soon find the way of peace and men everywhere shall be mingled in an alchemy of brotherhood.

Humbly we offer our prayer in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, May 19, 1960, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 44. An Act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct the San Luis unit of the Central Valley project, California, to enter into an agreement with the State of California with respect to the construction and operation of such unit, and for other purposes.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Calendar Wednesday of this week be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

POSTPONING OF ROLLCALLS TODAY AND TOMORROW

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that any rollcalls today and tomorrow on the passage of any bills or amendments thereto, or a motion to recommit, be postponed to the following Wednesday.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

LOAN OF NAVAL VESSEL TO REPUBLIC OF CHINA

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 9465) to authorize the extension of a loan of a naval vessel to the Government of the Republic of China, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, after line 12, insert:

"SEC. 5. Notwithstanding section 7307 of title 10, United States Code, or any other law, the President may, under conditions which he prescribes, lend one submarine to the Government of Canada for a period of not more than five years and may, in his discretion, extend such loan for an additional period of not more than five years. All expenses involved in the activation of this submarine including repairs, alterations, outfitting, and logistic support shall be paid by the Government of Canada. The authority of the President to transfer a submarine under this section terminates on December 31, 1961."

Amend the title so as to read: "An Act to authorize the loan of one submarine to Canada and the extension of a loan of a naval vessel to the Government of the Republic of China."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BIPARTISAN FIASCO

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, after every unbelievable, fantastic, foreign policy blunder by the United States, there is the inevitable call for unity. The collapse of our abortive attempt at appeasement in Paris is no exception.

The greatest aid to Khrushchev is American unity behind the wrong policy. His best friend so far is and has been this bipartisan foreign policy of the United States. Yalta, Potsdam, aid to the Chinese Communists in 1946 to 1949, United States delay at Panmunjom in Korea, Geneva, Camp David, and now Paris were all defended by a chorus of coverup, censorship, and an appeal to unity and patriotism. This is the surest and quickest road to complete disgrace and defeat of the United States. The late Senator Arthur Vandenberg lost a great opportunity when he joined the bipartisan foreign policy of appeasement and failure. He could have saved Western civilization much anguish by exercising the traditional role of the minority to point out the utter fallacies of Yalta and Potsdam. Through such efforts, the Western peoples could have been alerted to the Communist menace.

Today this bipartisan hayride to destruction must be reversed. We must have a complete change in policy. The Communists must and can be put on the defense. They can be put on the defense by our constant demand that Poland and the captive nations be given their freedom. This bipartisan policy of wasting our strength all over the world, thus pleasing Khrushchev, must be and can be halted. Much of our foreign-aid money should have been and should be spent on making the United States supreme in the air and in space. The greater the mistakes of this so-called bipartisan policy, the greater the clamor for unity behind the same old crowd and the same personnel. We need a change now. Tomorrow will be too late.

QUESTIONS ON NATIONAL POLICY

Mr. KOWALSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. KOWALSKI. Mr. Speaker, speaking on behalf of a large number of Members of this body who last Friday asked the President to answer a series of questions on the U-2 incident and related subjects, I deplore and resent the remarks made by the chairman of the Republican Congressional Campaign Committee.

The questions which we raised are questions which the American people have been asking. They are questions of national policy which affect every American.

When the chairman of the Republican Congressional Campaign Committee accuses us of "following closely the Khrushchev line," he is impugning our patriotism and casting an unwarranted reflection on us as individuals and as elected Representatives of the American people.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that an apology is in order.

I suggest further, Mr. Speaker, that the answers to our questions should come from the President of the United States. The Congress and the people have a right to know.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. RAINS] I ask unanimous consent that the Housing Subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency may be permitted to sit today during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 10809) to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for salaries and expenses, research and development, construction and equipment, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

Mr. ARENDS. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Louisiana has informed me that he has spoken with the minority committee members and they are in agreement on this.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Yes; the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] and the gentleman from California [Mr. McDONOUGH] are here, and they are supporting it.

Mr. ARENDS. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 1629)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10809) to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for salaries and expenses, research and development, construction and equipment, and for other purposes, having met after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 12: That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 12, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter contained in the House bill and in lieu of the matter contained in the Senate amendment insert the following:

"SEC. 4. The sum authorized by section 1(e) for emergency 'Construction and equipment', and any amount, not to exceed $5,000,000 of the funds appropriated pursuant to subsection 1(c) hereof, shall be available for expenditure to construct, expand or modify laboratories and other installations if (1) the Administrator determines such action to be necessary because of changes in the national program of aeronautical and space activities or new scientific or engineering developments and (2) he determines that deferral of such action until the enactment of the next authorization Act would be inconsistent with the interest of the Nation in aeronautical and space activities. The funds

so made available may be expended to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment. No portion of such sums may be obligated for expenditure or expended to construct, expand, or modify laboratories and other installations until the Administrator or his designee has transmitted to the Committee on Science and Astronautics of the House of Representatives and to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences of the Senate a written report containing a full and complete statement concerning (1) the nature of such construction, expansion, or modification, (2) the cost thereof, including the cost of any real estate action pertaining thereto, and (3) the reason why such construction, expansion, or modification is necessary in the national interest. No such funds may be used for any construction, expansion, or modification if authorizations for such construction, expansion, or modification previously has been denied by the Congress.

"SEC. 5. Paragraph 203(b)(2) of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, as amended (42 U.S.C. 2473(b)(2)), is amended by striking out 'ten' and inserting in lieu thereof 'thirteen', and by striking out 'two hundred and sixty' and inserting in lieu thereof 'two hundred and ninety'."

And the House agree to the same.

OVERTON BROOKS,
JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
GEORGE P. MILLER,
OLIN E. TEAGUE,
JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr.
JAMES G. FULTON,
GORDON L. MCDONOUGH,
Managers on the Part of the House.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
JOHN STENNIS,
STEPHEN M. YOUNG,
THOMAS J. DODD,
HOWARD W. CANNON,
STYLES BRIDGES,
MARGARET CHASE SMITH,
THOS. E. MARTIN,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10809) to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for salaries and expenses, research and development, construction and equipment, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report.

Senate amendments one through ten are all of a technical, or conforming, nature. The House recedes on these amendments.

The Senate amended the bill in two other respects, both of which were of a substantive nature. On one of these amendments, the Senate receded and on the other, the House receded.

The first of the substantive Senate amendments (amendment No. 11) provides for an increase of $50,000,000 of emergency authorization authority for "Research and development." The conditions under which the additional authorization provided under the Senate amendment may be used are set forth as follows:

"SEC. 3. The sum authorized by section 1(d) for emergency 'Research and development' shall be available for expenditure to defray the cost of research and development activities which the Administrator has determined to be urgently required in the national interest to exploit technological or scientific breakthroughs, to assure safety of personnel, to fund required research and development program changes, to meet unusual cost variations in research and development activities, and for the other purposes of section 1(b). No portion of such sum may be obligated for expenditure or expended to defray the cost of research and development activities until the Administrator or his designee has transmitted to the Committee on Science and Astronautics of the House of Representatives and to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences of the Senate a written report containing a full and complete statement concerning (1) the nature of the research or development item or activity, (2) the cost thereof, and (3) the reason why the research or development item or activity is necessary in the national interest."

The Senate amendment was agreed to by the managers on the part of the House in order to be sure that neither the space program nor the safety of personnel are jeopardized by lack of funds. In seems apparent that the National Aeronautics and Space Administration has made little or no provisions in its 1961 estimates for contingencies, cost increases, or unplanned program modification. Oftentimes necessary changes, in order to insure safety of personnel and system reliability, such as the Project Mercury Program, cannot be accomplished by reprogramming alone without adverse effects on other important elements of the space program. Furthermore, information has been received that several of NASA's programs have increased in cost over original budgeted estimates. For example, current estimates of the Atlas-Agena vehicle procurement program have increased $14,620,000. Current estimates on the Thor-Agena vehicle procurement program have increased $300,000. Due to decisions to utilize the Centaur engine in the Saturn program, it is now estimated that $1,500,000 must be incrementally funded in fiscal year 1961 to secure availability of Centaur vehicles for planetary missions. In all, original budget estimates are already $20,565,000 less than the revised current estimates. It is understandable that reprograming to fund these revised programs would have serious effects on other important programs.

The managers on the part of the House recognized that it must be anticipated that plans for, and estimated costs of, various individual research and development programs will be subject to continuing change. It is not possible to make precise forecasts for programs in which, in some cases, we are going beyond existing scientific knowledge.

The total authorization in the House bill was for $915,000,000. The Senate amendment increases the authorization to $970,000,000. This includes the $50,000,000 of emergency authorization for "Research and development," explained above, and in addition a $5,000,000 emergency authorization for "Construction and equipment." The latter $5,000,000 emergency authorization was contained in the House bill, but since it was an emergency authorization it was not totaled with the general authorization figure. The Senate amendment included both general authorizations and emergency authorizations to make a total of $970,000,000.

The other Senate amendment of a substantive nature, deleted section 4 of the House bill which provided 30 additional "excepted" positions with 13, rather than 10, of these positions authorized to be paid salaries up to $21,000. The remaining positions would be within the salary ranges $14,000 to $19,000. The House position was that these positions were essential and that the space program could be expected to be slowed down if NASA was restricted in its efforts to employ first-class personnel. The Senate, therefore, receded to the House position. This Senate amendment also writes back into the bill the emergency "Construction and equipment" authority of $5,000,000. This provision was in the House bill and has been rewritten merely for purposes of clarity.

OVERTON BROOKS,
JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
GEORGE P. MILLER,
OLIN E. TEAGUE,
JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr.,
JAMES G. FULTON,
GORDON L. MCDONOUGH,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight to file a report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

PROVIDING COMPENSATION TO JAPANESE GOVERNMENT

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 532) providing for the consideration of S. 2130, a bill to authorize a payment to the Government of Japan, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 2130) to authorize a payment to the Government of Japan. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 532 provides for the consideration of S. 2130 to authorize a payment to the Government of Japan. The resolution provides for an open rule with 1 hour of general debate.

The term "Bonin Islands" as used in S. 2130 includes the Bonin Islands proper, the Volcano Islands, Rosario Island, Parece Vela, and Marcus Island. This group lies about 700 miles south of Tokyo. During the war the Japanese Government evacuated from these islands the 7,000 civilian residents, all of whom were Japanese nationals. Immediately after the war the United States allowed 135 former residents of partial

occidental ancestry to return, but, for security reasons, has refused to allow any others to return.

Under article 3 of the peace treaty with Japan, the United States has the right to exercise all and any powers of administration, legislation, and jurisdiction over the territory and inhabitants of these islands, including their territorial waters.

The former residents of the islands have not been successfully integrated into the Japanese economy and live in distressed economic conditions. The Japanese Government provides them with economic assistance and spends a substantial sum annually for this purpose.

The Defense Department is opposed to the repatriation of the former residents of the islands for security reasons. Failing in its efforts at repatriation, the Japanese Government sought compensation. Initially it requested $12.5 million, but it has now agreed to accept $6 million.

The Department of State and the Department of Defense recognize that the former residents of the islands have a legitimate claim. One problem has been how to determine the land value that would form the basis for compensation. The land has not been used for more than than 15 years. It was decided to base the value on the formula used in the calculation of land values in the Ryukyu Islands, former Japanese islands now under U.S. administration. The figure adopted was $1,060 per acre, or $4 million for the total land value of the islands. To this was added interest dating from April 28, 1952, the effective date of the peace treaty with Japan. This brought the total up to $6 million, the amount contained in S. 2130.

The United States will not adjudicate individual claims. When the money has been appropriated, the United States will enter into a written agreement with the Japanese Government under which the latter will engage to distribute the money to the individual families concerned. The subcommittee was assured that this payment is regarded as adequate compensation by the Bonin Islanders and will constitute full satisfaction and settlement of all claims of the former residents against the United States.

The Bonin Islands situation is unique and the subcommittee was assured that the payment of the claims there do not constitute a precedent.

Our continued indefinite reservation of the Bonin Islands for security purposes makes impossible the repatriation of the former residents in the foreseeable future. Without any compensation the Bonin problem will remain a constant and, quite possibly, growing irritant in United States-Japanese relations.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 532.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I have no objection to the bill and yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR PROMOTION OF ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT IN THE RYUKYU ISLANDS

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 533) providing for the consideration of H.R. 1157, a bill to provide for promotion of economic and social development in the Ryukyu Islands, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1157) to provide for promotion of economic and social development in the Ryukyu Islands. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, House resolution 533 provides for the consideration of H.R. 1157 to provide for promotion of economic and social development in the Ryukyu Islands. The resolution provides for an open rule with 1 hour of general debate.

The purpose of H.R. 1157 is to establish a basis in law for U.S. programs for the promotion of economic and social development in the Ryukyu Islands.

The interest of the United States in these islands is indicated by strategic military considerations of the highest importance. Consequently, the task of administering the islands has been assigned by the President to the Department of Defense, an assignment necessitated by the inextricable linking of civil and military functions there. In the tightly constricted area of the Ryukyus, virtually all activities and policies of the local government directly affect military planning and operations. The proposed legislation would formalize existing arrangements for performing the responsibilities of the United States under the peace treaty with Japan and would provide means for maintaining and increasing the effectiveness of the performance of the basic military mission.

The Ryukyu Islands lie southeast of Japan, northeast of Formosa and the Philippines, and west of the Bonin Islands. Okinawa, the main island, is almost 6,000 miles from San Francisco, 970 miles from Tokyo, and about 920 miles from Manila.

Since 1945 the United States has exercised full powers over the Ryukyu Islands, of which Okinawa is the largest. Prior to the war these islands were an integral part of Japan, but following Japan's surrender they were treated as a separate and distinct territory for the purpose of occupation. Unlike Japan, where occupation was carried out nominally under Allied authority, the occupation of the Ryukyus proceeded solely under American control. The measure of U.S. control was determined by international customary and conventional law as well as unilaterally by the United States. While control was restored to local institutions as they manifested a capacity to exercise it, the United States retained all powers, subject only to limitations imposed by international law.

As the sole occupier, the United States was charged with the responsibility for providing government in occupied territories, including all measures necessary to preserve public order and safety.

Although we have rebuilt and expanded the Ryukyuan economy and have given it new direction, it continues, nevertheless, to be an economy of scarcity, and from the viewpoint of natural resources it will never be anything other than that. Prior to the war, as one of the most indigent prefectures of Japan, it received annual subsidies of from $4 million to $6 million from the Central Government in Tokyo. Today, its population density of over 1,000 persons per square mile is twice that of Japan and one of the highest in the world. A substantial portion of its food requirements is imported each year. It has a serious shortage of industrial and commercial skills and inadequate venture capital to exploit such resources as are available. So, in spite of the reconstruction of the major part of the physical plant and the restoration of normal activity, there remains the difficult task of promoting the welfare and well-being of the Ryukyuan people, of bringing their economy closer to viability, of making them as self-sustaining as possible.

That the action proposed by H.R. 1157 is one which has been considered and approved by the Congress previously is illustrated by the fact that similar legislation has been enacted with respect to the Virgin Islands, Guam, the Philippine Islands and Puerto Rico.

Administrative costs of the civil administration of the Ryukyu Islands will continue to require annual budgetary provision; such costs will not, however, be increased as a result of this proposed legislation. The provisions of section 4 of the bill will provide a level of economic assistance somewhat less than one-half of the average annual amount appropriated for economic aid during the period fiscal years 1947–58.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 533.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I know of no objection to the rule and yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING COMPENSATION TO JAPANESE GOVERNMENT

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 2130) to authorize a payment to the Government of Japan.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, S. 2130, with Mr. JONES of Missouri in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the legislation before us, S. 2130, authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to pay to the Government of Japan the sum of $6 million. The payment of such sum shall constitute full satisfaction in settlement of all claims of Japanese nationals resident on the Bonin Islands arising from use and benefit and exercise of property rights or interests in the Bonin Islands by the United States for security purposes. The term "Bonin Islands" as used in this bill includes the Bonin Islands proper, the Volcano Islands, Rosario Island, Parece Vela, and Marcus Island. This group of islands is about 700 miles south of Tokyo. We are holding these islands for security reasons. We have some very important military installations on these islands.

On June 2, 1959, executive communication 1055, consisting of a letter from the Acting Secretary of State, transmitted a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize a payment to the Government of Japan." This was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and, in turn, referred by the chairman to the Subcommittee on the Far East and the Pacific. Before action was completed by the subcommittee the Senate passed S. 2130 which was referred to the committee. Since this bill is identical with that proposed in executive communication 1055, the subcommittee held hearings on the Senate bill on August 27 and 28, 1959. On August 28 the subcommittee ordered S. 2130 favorably reported to the full committee. On January 20, 1960, the full committee unanimously ordered S. 2130 favorably reported.

To my knowledge there is no opposition to this legislation.

The interests of the United States in these islands was summed up in the communique issued by President Eisenhower and Prime Minister Kishi in 1957:

> The President reaffirmed the U.S. position that Japan possesses residual sovereignty over these islands. He pointed out, however, that, so long as the conditions of threat and tension exist in the Far East, the United States will find it necessary to continue the present status.

The former residents of the islands have not been successfully integrated into the Japanese economy and live in distressed economic conditions. The Japanese Government provides them with economic assistance and spends a substantial sum annually for this purpose.

In conversations with Japanese officials in 1955, 1957, and 1958, Secretary of State Dulles reiterated the opposition of the Defense Department to the repatriation of the former residents. Failing in its efforts at repatriation, the Japanese Government then sought compensation. Initially it requested $12.5 million but it has now agreed to accept $6 million.

The Department of State and the Department of Defense recognize that the former residents of the islands have a legitimate claim. One problem has been how to determine the land value that would form the basis for compensation. The land has not been used for more than 15 years.

During the hearings the subcommittee inquired whether the payment of the Bonin Islands claims involved a precedent for claims by former residents of other islands that had been under Japanese jurisdiction prior to the war. In a memorandum submitted by Assistant Secretary of State Parsons the subcommittee was assured that "the Bonin Islands situation is unique and that the payments of the claims there do not constitute a precedent."

Mr. Chairman, our continued indefinite reservation of the Bonin Islands for security purposes makes impossible the repatriation of the former residents in the foreseeable future. Without any compensation the Bonin problem will remain a constant and, quite possibly, growing irritant in United States-Japanese relations. For this reason I am confident the House will pass this legislation without any dissenting vote.

I reserve the remainder of my time, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD].

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, the chairman of our subcommittee [Mr. ZABLOCKI] has explained the reason for this bill to compensate Japan for land in the Bonin Islands to which the 7,000 persons who owned it prior to the war are not being allowed to return. These persons were evacuated by Japan. They would like to go back and resume cultivation of their land, but our Armed Forces, for good and sufficient reasons, does not want any non-Americans on these islands for the present. There are about 150 persons of mixed blood and Japanese citizenship on one small island. They will not be permitted to go to the other islands.

This is a case in which I believe we are getting more than value received. We have several strategic installations in that part of the world with value up to perhaps $1 billion Our control of these islands and installations is essential to our security in the western Pacific. By making this payment, which has been negotiated between the two governments, we can strengthen our position in Japan where at the present time there is great opposition on the part of some students and others to continued close cooperation between the Japanese Government and our own Government. They use this case as a source of propaganda against the United States.

When we make this payment the Japanese Government takes responsibility for handling those 7,000 former residents of the Bonins who are being barred by us from returning to their homes and property. When the tense world situation is over and we do not need such installations in the Pacific and pull out, the Japanese may want to return them to the Bonins. They can do with them as they please. But we will have discharged fully our obligations and be in the clear.

Control of these islands for as long as we need them is essential to our national security. There should be no opposition to the passage of this bill.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORGAN].

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, the bill now before the House, S. 2130, authorizes a payment of $6 million to the Government of Japan. But the money is not intended for Japan or the Japanese. The ultimate beneficiaries of the payment will be the 7,000 Bonin Islanders who live in Japan and who cannot return to their native soil because our Government, as part of its defense strategy, must continue to occupy the Bonin Islands.

We do not own the Bonin Islands. We are the lawful occupants by the terms of the peace treaty we made with Japan. The payment authorized in this bill will not give us title to these islands. Nor is the payment a rental of any kind. It is compensation that is to be paid to the former residents of the islands because we have taken their land for an indefinite time. The Department of State advised our committee that the sum will constitute full satisfaction and settlement of all claims of these people against the United States.

Thus far the Bonin Islanders have been living on the margin of economic collapse. They are a simple agricultural people with a minimum of skills. Although they are Japanese nationals, they have not been able to establish themselves in Japanese economic life. Some may ask what the future holds for these people after the $6 million is distributed among the 7,000 former residents. No one can answer with certainty. But the sum should provide them with a modest amount of capital to establish themselves on the land or in small commercial activities or to improve their skills in order that they may enter the mainstream of the Japanese economy.

We have a right to occupy these islands. But I submit that we have a responsibility where the exercise of our right brings hardships. Our Government is neither too powerful nor too insensitive to ignore the distress of small and alien people whose plight arises from our need to use their land

for our security. It is because this bill fulfills an obligation on our part that I urge its passage.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa, [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I think we ought to get the record straight. We hear that this $6 million expenditure is necessary for security reasons; and perhaps that is true. Then someone else says that it is necessary to compensate some people for an injustice, to take care of people who are in distress. Then someone else says this expenditure must be made because pressure is being put upon the Japanese Government. If this is for the security of the United States, that is one thing; but if this is for the other reasons that have been stated, I cannot go along at all with spending $6 million because it was the Japanese who evacuated the 7,000 people who are to be benefited. We did not do it; the Japanese evacuated their own nationals and then fortified the islands. From that standpoint I can see no reason why we should compensate anybody for anything.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I would like to add to the statement the gentleman just made that Marcus Island was the first target I bombed in the Pacific. The gentleman will be interested to know that the heaviest fortifications in the Pacific were in Marcus Island, and we suffered perhaps some of our greatest losses there.

Mr. GROSS. Is Marcus Island part of the Bonins?

Mr. PUCINSKI. Yes, that is correct.

Mr. GROSS. The Japanese removed these people, then erected fortifications and we lost many American lives taking the Bonin Islands.

From the standpoint of the Japanese Government and the people who were evacuated I do not think we owe them anything.

If we are now paying for some security purpose, that is a different story. I understand it is proposed to pay $879 or something like that to each displaced person. That is approximately the figure; is it not?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Yes; it comes out to about that.

Mr. GROSS. It is said these 7,000 people have not been integrated by the Japanese. If they have not been absorbed into the economic and social life of Japan by now they probably never will be and the $879 per individual is not going to take care of the situation in the future.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. I can assure the gentleman that the primary reason for this bill is because it is essential to our security. I can best explain it by reading from page 2 of the hearings, a statement by the Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs:

The State-War-Navy Coordinating Committee decided in 1945 that the Bonin Islands should be closed for security reasons to all other settlement. This policy, which has subsequently been reviewed several times, remains in effect.

That is the decision that was made and the reasons for the decision. It has been necessary for us to keep control of these islands.

Maybe we should have taken them in the peace treaty, I do not know. But the fact is we did not take them, and we do not own the islands. Japan owns the islands.

Mr. GROSS. The Japanese Government has residual sovereignty, whatever that means.

Mr. JUDD. The Bonins are not like some of the other areas where we have control. Japan has renounced ownership of those. Here is a case where they own the islands and we need them for the present. Japan has agreed to this arrangement. It quiets all of the claims against us and gives us security—physical, emotional, and military—in that area.

Mr. GROSS. Let us get this down to cases. I can go along with this bill if it is for security reasons.

Mr. JUDD. I give the gentleman that flat assurance.

Mr. GROSS. But I do not go along with it if we are paying off the Japanese.

Mr. JUDD. Neither would I.

Mr. GROSS. Then let us leave out the extraneous and specious statements in behalf of the bill.

Mr. JUDD. The only reason we bring that consideration in is because a troublesome situation has arisen for us and Japan on account of the agitation of some individuals and groups over this issue. The Japanese Government says it can quiet the situation and remove this thorn in our relations and settle the problem with this payment.

Mr. GROSS. I do not think it is going to be done that way. Let me say now that I hope you will not come in here with another bill for $6 million or more in order to placate these people later on.

Mr. JUDD. There is no other situation in the Pacific at all comparable to this.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ARENDS. I may say the gentleman from Iowa, knowing something about this situation, that I add my word of endorsement to this proposition. It is a matter of security and goes directly to the point the gentleman, I know, will agree with.

Mr. GROSS. I appreciate the gentleman's statement, but I want to say again I do not like these other issues being brought in. I do not think we are going to satisfy these people over the years with the payment of $879 apiece. I do not think that is going to happen, and I want to clear the record now and say that we are paying this $6 million for security reasons.

Incidentally, it is interesting to note that the Japanese Government first wanted $12.5 million but in a very short period of time reduced the asking price to $6 million, more than 50 percent. I hope this will be the last we hear of this deal. I do not like it, but if it will take care of a vital security problem, affecting our own people, I will go along with it.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL].

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I do not pretend to be learned in matters of our relations with foreign nations, but I do have confidence in the work of our Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASPINALL. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman is very modest when he says he is not learned in foreign affairs. I consider the gentleman one of the most impressive and learned gentlemen on that subject.

Mr. ASPINALL. Our distinguished floor leader is very charitable in his remarks.

Mr. Chairman, in my opinion, this bill is in the interest of our national security. You heard a moment ago the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI] state that he was one of the first who saw this particular area when our military drive was taken us towards Japan. May I say that the gentleman now speaking is one of the Members of Congress who last saw this area.

It so happens that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has jurisdiction over the Pacific area. We have jurisdiction over the Marshalls, the Carolines, and the Marianas to the west.

In that jurisdiction we have some responsibility over the northern part of the Marianas. This last year it was necessary for the committee, composed of the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK], the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. McGINLEY], the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE], and myself together with a staff member, to go into this particular area. We received permission from the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services to visit in the Bonin Island area. Our committee does not have jurisdiction over the Bonins. However, we thought it would be appropriate for us, with his permission, to go into the area. Accordingly we visited Iwo Jima and Chi Chi Jima. These names mean very much to us. The name Bonin Islands is practically unknown to the American people. But, when I speak of Iwo Jima and Suribachi, you know what we are talking about.

Mr. Chairman, I am interested in this legislation for two reasons, and it is because of these two reasons I wish to secure some information from the committee handling the bill. The first question has to do with the 140 or so citizens of Japan citizenship presently living on Chi Chi Jima Island. I also wish to know if there is any relationship or if any comparison can be made between the moneys that we are to pay

in this particular instance and the moneys which we are paying or are to pay for lands in the Marshalls area.

Last fall when we visited the Bonins we were in the company of Rear Adm. W. R. Eardman. If you do not think that this is an isolated area so far as we in the United States are concerned, you are mistaken. It is very difficult to get into. And, when one finds living in Chi Chi Jima approximately 140 people, many of whom have their family heritage in our own country, names like Savory and Webb from the New England area, descendants of New Englanders formerly engaged in the whaling business, and Washington, another name that is very common there, then he can understand why it is that those 140 have been allowed to return while others have not been given such permission.

There were almost 10,000 Japanese civilians living on these islands during the time just preceding the war. The war came on and most of the civilians were removed to other areas under Japan's jurisdiction. After the fighting was over most of the former residents of the Bonins were found to be in Japan proper. We permitted people of American lineage to return, and that is how the 140 happen to be there at the present time.

In the Marshall Islands to the east, where we have such islands as Kwajalein, we have 70.4 square miles of land area, while in the Bonin Islands we have 45 square miles of land area. There are 14,350 inhabitants living in the Marshalls at the present time. You can see what that land means to them. On Kwajalein, one of the larger islands in the group, the Defense Department has been using the entire area since its occupation by our military forces in 1944. For years we have been negotiating with the Marshallese on a fair value of their land. We do not know how much longer we will have use for it, but probably indefinitely, something like we have with the Japanese in their Bonin Island group. The Marshallese want the title to the land to remain in their names also. We have offered them $500 an acre for an indefinite term of use. Some of the owners have accepted this price; others have not accepted the price offered.

Now, with that in mind, Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI], a few questions. What items of reimbursement are covered by the $6 million? Are they public, private, personal, or liability values?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Private and personal items of reimbursement are covered.

Mr. ASPINALL. Is it not a fact that when people are taken from an area under conquest, by tradition they are usually allowed to return to that area?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. That is true.

Mr. ASPINALL. Here they are not permitted to return.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. They are not permitted to return because we have decided that it is not in our national interest.

Mr. ASPINALL. Where will the title to the land involved remain?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Title to the land will remain with the Japanese, but, in effect, we obtain title to that land since we have indefinite use of these islands.

Mr. ASPINALL. Will this legislation permit claims to be made by individual Japanese against the United States?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. No, sir.

Mr. ASPINALL. Will the present 140 inhabitants of the Bonin Islands—and these are the descendants of the Saveries and Webbs and Washingtons—be able to occupy or use the land as long as the United States remains in possession of the islands?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. On Chi Chi Jima, presumably, yes; on other islands, no.

Mr. ASPINALL. Will the residents of Chi Chi Jima receive their proportionate share of these moneys?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. No. This money is only for those former Bonin Islanders who are not permitted to return to the islands and who are now residing in Japan.

Mr. ASPINALL. Will these inhabitants of Chi Chi Jima be able to get any title to the lands they now occupy?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. No; not under this legislation.

Mr. ASPINALL. Does the gentleman think that this $6 million sum could be considered as rent for the use of the land since 1945 to date? If so, within a few years, if the United States continues to occupy the islands will there be another payment forthcoming?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. No; this is a final settlement. May I point out to my distinguished friend that it is not a rental payment.

Mr. ASPINALL. As I stated just a moment ago, I am interested because of the effect that this has relative to the Marshall Islands of the Trust Territory. For example, on Kwajalein Island, one of the many islands of the Marshall group, the entire area was taken over by the military in 1944. The title still remains with the Marshallese landowners. The High Commissioner of the Trust Territory has been given authority to offer the Marshallese $500 an acre for the use of the land since 1944. The Marshallese, through their attorney, have refused the offer and have brought court action. Now my question is this: How did you arrive at the figure of $1,060 per acre for the land in the Bonins? I realize that land is a very valuable asset to the Japanese but I do not know how it can be more valuable than it is to the Marshallese.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. In answer to the gentleman, it is my understanding that the Department of State in negotiations with the Japanese used land value plus labor and input value of various kinds. I wish to call attention to the statement on page 11 of the hearings where Assistant Secretary of State, Mr. Parsons, in reply to a question states:

> The figure of $6 million is based on the formula used in the calculation of Ryukyuan land values where you assign 40 percent of the production from a given unit of land to land value and 60 percent to labor and imput of various kinds. Then the 40 percent is capitalized at 6 percent; this is multiplied by 16⅔, and you arrive at the figure through that process.

The value of land in the Ryukyus, as the gentleman will recall, is $1,060 per acre.

Mr. ASPINALL. Can my distinguished colleague state whether or not he believes there is any relationship between the formula which his committee has used in this instance and the formula that might be used in determining the values of the Marshallese?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. No; there is no relationship.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASPINALL. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. I would like to add that they have no relationship because in the Marshall Islands we are paying rent. In the Bonins we are paying the Japanese Government the value of the land and it can do as it pleases with respect to these citizens. It intends to compensate them for this land. There is no precedent in this case that could be applied to the Marshalls.

Mr. ASPINALL. May I say that that is exactly what I wanted stated while we are considering this legislation. We do have this legal controversy; we do have a suit in court at the present time and if we are not careful this action might be used against us.

Mr. Chairman, may I make one statement to my colleagues of the House. We held a special meeting with the Bonin Islands Council members when we were on Chi Chi Jima. If my friends would like to have some very interesting reading—it would take about 10 minutes—it would bring to their minds how people who have their heritage in our own country feel about their ties to a country with which they have no common citizenship, but who wish to have such ties in the future, if they can obtain them.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. If the gentleman will yield further, may I suggest that the gentleman insert the minutes of the council meeting at this point in the RECORD?

Mr. ASPINALL. I shall be glad to do that.

Mr. Chairman, the following is the transcript of the hearings of the meeting held by the Council of Chi Chi Jima when our special committee was present in that area:

CHI CHI JIMA, B.I.—MINUTES OF THE SPECIAL BONIN ISLAND COUNCIL MEETING OF NOVEMBER 19, 1959

The meeting was called to order at 19:35. Present were Lt. Comdr. T. G. Rice, military government representative; Rodrick Webb, president; Jerry Savory, member; Jessie Webb, member; Mitsuru Ikeda, member; Frank Gonzales, member. Special guests were Hon. W. N. Aspinall, Representative from Colorado; Hon. D. F. McGinley, Representative from Nebraska; Hon. D. K. Inouye, Representative from Hawaii; Hon. B. F. Sisk, Representative from California; Rear Adm. W. L. Erdmann, COMNAVMARIANAS; Dr. Jack Taylor, Consultant on Territorial Affairs. Guests were Lt. Comdr. L. E. Trabaudo, MC, USN; Lt. (jg.) S. L. Erwin, Assistant OIC; Richard Washington, judge, Bonin Island court.

The military government representative opened the meeting by introducing the House Insular Affairs Committee to the council members. He explained to the committee members that the Bonin Island Council was comprised of five members elected by a general election. The member receiving the most votes sits as President of the council. The term of office is for 1 year. He explained that all persons over 18 years of age were eligible to vote and that we have experienced 100 percent participation as a result of an ordnance whereby a person is fined if they fail to vote. He also explained that the judge of the Bonin Island court is an appointed office and that the council members sat as the court. He told the committee that the council met once a month, and that the minutes were recorded and sent to the Military Governor via the Deputy Military Governor. He explained that the president of the council presided at the meetings. At the request of the president, the military government representative reads the minutes of the previous meeting and then presents to the Council any information that is pertinent received from the Military Governor or Deputy Military Governor, and any other information of interest, i.e., ship and airplane arrivals, problems of a logistic nature, etc. The president of the council then asks each member to present anything that they wish and to bring up any problems that they have been presented with during the previous month. The council discusses and votes on any matter that requires a decision. He explained that revenue is obtained by taxation of gross income. The tax at present is 3 percent. This money goes to the community fund, and is used as the council sees fit. At the present there is $1,831.88 in the community fund. There is only one person on the island receiving their support from this fund; the rest of the islanders are gainfully employed and are self-sufficient. He explained that the economy of the island is increasing each year.

Congressman ASPINALL asked if the resolutions and ordnances passed on by the council were subject to veto by the military government representative.

The military government representative replied that none had been vetoed.

Congressman ASPINALL asked if the military government representative sat with the members of the Bonin Island Council at the monthly meetings.

The military government representative replied that he sat with the council at all meetings, and that he also sat with the Bonin Island court as an advisory member.

Congressman ASPINALL asked if the military government representative acts in an advisory capacity at the council meetings when decisions of a legislative nature, especially those involving raising revenue and appropriating funds are acted on.

The military government representative replied that he did.

Congressman ASPINALL asked the president of the Bonin Island Council if he exercised his prerogative as president by presiding at the monthly meetings or if the military government representative presided at the monthly meetings.

Rodrick Webb replied that he presided at the monthly meetings.

The military government representative again reiterated that due to the close proximity, so many of the civil problems dovetailed with those of the military that he acted in an advisory capacity on these matters. Matters solely of a civil nature were left to the members of the council insofar as possible.

Congressman ASPINALL asked if any member of the Bonin Island Council had ever served in a governing capacity when the Japanese governed the island.

He was informed that no member had served in such a capacity.

Congressman ASPINALL asked the council members if they were satisfied with their present form of government.

He was informed by the council members that they were satisfied.

Congressman ASPINALL asked the Deputy Military Governor if he or members of his staff reviewed the minutes of the Bonin Island Council meetings.

The Deputy Military Governor replied that he personally reviewed the minutes of the council meetings and without exception he has passed on these minutes and has then forwarded them to the Military Governor.

Congressman ASPINALL asked the age of the person receiving help from the community fund.

Jerry Savory, council member, informed him that she herself did not know her true age, but information gathered from other elderly people of the island placed her age in the vicinity of 70 years. He explained that she had no one to care for her and that each month she received provisions paid for by the community fund from the Bonin Island Trading Co.

Congressman ASPINALL asked if there were any other elder people of the island that felt they too should receive help from the community fund.

Jerry Savory said that to his knowledge there were none. He explained that the rest of the elderly people either were still gainfully employed or had children and family to care for them.

Congressman ASPINALL asked if it was more or less the custom of the people of the islands to care for their elder people within the family if such was possible.

Jerry Savory replied that it was the custom.

Congressman ASPINALL asked if the members of the council were paid for their services.

Jerry Savory explained that the president of the council received $10 per month, members $5 per month, and that the judge of the Bonin Islands court received 10 percent of fines imposed.

Congressman ASPINALL asked if there were many cases tried by the Bonin Islands court.

The military government representative explained that very few cases were tried by the court and that the offenses were minor in nature.

Congressman ASPINALL explained to the members of the council that the committee which he represented had jurisdiction over only the unincorporated or Trust Territories of the Pacific but inasmuch as they were to be in this area they had requested permission to visit the Bonin Islands as guests of the Deputy Military Governor and military government representative to meet with the representatives of the people of the Bonin Islands to hear their views and to find out if they were satisfied with their present form of military government, and that they would report to Congress on their findings. He asked if any members of the council had anything they would like to discuss with the committee.

Jessie Webb asked if the committee could give any information on any decisions pertaining to the ownership of the houses and land on which the people of the Bonin Islands lived.

Congressman ASPINALL explained that as he understood it, until land titles could be determined that it would be impossible to give title to any person living on the property.

The military government representative explained that the Bonin Islanders were concerned over titles to property and houses in the event the Japanese again took possession of the islands. He explained that he believed that the houses would belong to the Bonin Islanders as long as the Navy remained on the islands.

Congressman ASPINALL told the council that Senator FULBRIGHT had introduced and the Senate had passed a bill whereby $6 million would be paid to the Japanese Government to settle with the Japanese people that were dispossessed from the Bonin Islands for the property they owned.

Congressman SISK asked when the Japanese originally settled the island.

Jerry Savory explained that Nathaniel Savory and his party of settlers whom the vast majority of the Bonin Islanders are descendents settled the island in 1830, and the Japanese did not settle the island until 1871. The Japanese were not successful in their attempt to settle in 1871 and left the island to return in 1873, this time to stay.

Congressman ASPINALL asked if the Japanese settled on land owned by the Savory settlers or settled on land of their own.

The military government representative informed him that the land acquired by the Japanese was by legal methods as far as known.

The military government representative explained that basically what the Bonin Islanders are concerned with is that with the exception of possibly three, none of them live on their own homesteads and as they develop their homes and property they are concerned about the security of their homes and homesteads. Therefore, they would like to know that if the Japanese Government accepts the $6 million as payment for land rights if they will then be given title to the homes and properties.

Congressman ASPINALL explained that it was his understanding that if the Japanese Government accepts the $6 million in lieu of claims to property by the former Japanese inhabitants of the Bonin Islands, then the U.S. Government would then hold title to the land, at which time a land officer representing the Navy would see that the land was surveyed and that the people that lived in these areas would be protected in their properties.

At this point Congressman ASPINALL read the bill passed by the Senate whereby $6 million would be paid to the Japanese Government for land rights in the Bonin Islands.

Congressman ASPINALL explained that the bill meant that as long as the U.S. Government maintained possession of the Bonin Islands that neither the Japanese Government or the Japanese nationals that were former residents of the Bonin Islands would have any claims against any of the property. In the event that the United States should enter into an agreement to turn the islands back to Japan then there would have to be some provision in that agreement as to the property rights of the Bonin Islanders that have returned and made their homes here.

Congressman SISK said that as he understood the wording of the bill that the payment of the $6 million would be nothing but payment for an indefinite use permit without any title at all, similar to the bill proposed in the Marshall Islands, maintaining the residual sovereignty of Japan, so that if the Japanese came back to these islands they could reclaim their lands without any reimbursement. He asked if he was right in interpreting the bill this way.

Congressman ASPINALL said that he was correct unless provision was made in the final agreement whereby the Bonin Islanders would be protected.

Congressman SISK said that he was pursuing this line of questioning to aid him in determining which position he would take when this legislation reached the House of Representatives. He said he had doubts as to whether the Japanese people had a legitimate claim to the $6 million for the land in view of the fact that the people presently living in the Bonin Islands had a claim due to prior settling of the islands. He asked when the Bonin Islanders were sent to Japan.

Jerry Savory told him that they were sent to Japan in 1944.

Congressman SISK asked if any of the members of the council owned land in the Bonin Islands at that time.

Frank Gonzales said that he owned the land that is presently known as Jack Williams Beach.

Congressman SISK asked if he now lived on that land.

Frank Gonzales said that he did not live on that land at the present.

The military government representative said that it appeared to him that even if provision was made in the final agreement for protection of the Bonin Islanders' property, they would be dependent upon the Japanese Government to honor the provision and would have to go through Japanese courts for that protection.

Congressman ASPINALL said that in his opinion they would be protected by international law and could go to the Hague Court of the United Nations for protection.

Congressman SISK said that if the Japanese broke the treaty, then it would fall under the jurisdiction of international law and would then have to be taken to the Hague court.

Congressman SISK asked that assuming this treaty was written into the present bill, and these islands were returned to Japan, if the Bonin Islanders were fearful of the Japanese not honoring the treaty.

Jerry Savory said that the majority of the Bonin Islands were, but they were especially concerned for the security of the younger generation. He said they all hoped the United States would keep the responsibility of the islands as long as possible.

Congressman INOUYE asked if the sentiments expressed by the Council were those of the people of the island.

Jerry Savory said that they were.

Congressman Aspinall asked approximately what percentage of the people were in favor of the United States retaining administrative control of the Bonin Islands.

Jerry Savory explained that in 1952 when a delegation of Bonin Islanders went to Washington that 100 percent of the people signed a petition stating they wanted the United States to retain control.

The military government representative polled the Council and asked that if they were asked to sign a petition now if the same percentage of people would sign.

Each member of the Council said they believed that 100 percent of the people would sign such a petition.

Congressman ASPINALL asked how the people would feel if the islands to the south were returned to Japan.

Jerry Savory said that he felt the people would be grateful if Haha Jima could be retained in view of the number of young people. He said he felt that they should have more area in which to settle and make their homes.

Congressman SISK asked how far Haha Jima was from Chi Chi Jima.

The military government representative explained that Haha Jima, a larger island than Chi Chi Jima was located 25 miles to the south.

Congressman SISK asked if there were any families presently living on Haha Jima.

The military government representative told him that the island is uninhabited at the present.

Jerry Savory said that if the United States could retain possession of Haha Jima, the large number of young people that will soon reach adulthood would then have a place to settle and make homes for themselves.

Congressman MCGINLEY said that he had heard that there was difficulty in the Bonin Islanders getting married and asked if someone would explain that situation to him.

Jerry Savory explained that due to the close relationship of the Bonin Islanders, that it was not desirable for them to intermarry. Therefore, the vast majority of the male population go to Japan to seek wives.

Congressman ASPINALL asked if the young females of the islands could go to Japan to seek husbands.

Jerry Savory said that although none had, that it was possible for them to do so.

Congressman ASPINALL asked that if they went to Guam or Japan and married, if they would be permitted to return to the Bonin Islands.

Jerry Savory told him that it would not only be possible, but they would be welcomed.

The military government representative explained there was one island woman married to a Saipanese and another to the principal of the school, a U.S. citizen from Hawaii, and that they were quite happy.

Congressman INOUYE asked if the Bonin Islanders were satisfied with their school system and medical facilities.

Rodrick Webb said that they were satisfied.

(NOTE.—The above transcription is but a portion of the minutes. No further minutes were recorded.)

RODRICK WEBB,
President, Bonin Islands Council.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I take this opportunity to congratulate my esteemed friend, the distinguished gentleman from Colorado, and to commend him for his fine presentation. He has a thorough understanding of the problems at hand and has consistently shown deep concern for the security of our Nation and for our position in that part of the world. The gentleman from Colorado has presented in detail arguments why this legislation should be passed. I wish to thank him for his contribution.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, it is timely that S. 2130, which was passed by the other body unanimously, which was reported out by the House Committee on Foreign Affairs unanimously, and which was granted a rule by the Rules Committee unanimously, should come before us today. It is a bill of equity and good conscience, presenting Uncle Sam in the image of fairness and of honesty. It is just and meritorious.

I have said that its consideration today is timely. Only last week, on May 19, the treaty of mutual cooperation and security with the United States was approved by the Japanese House of Representatives after a bitter battle with Communists and neutralists. The Japanese House of Councilors still must give its concurrence. The great majority of the men and women of Japan I am sure have a friendly sentiment toward the United States, but there are elements that are seeking to undermine that sentiment of friendship. The prompt and I hope the unanimous passage of S. 2130 will remove one of the irritants that the enemies of the United States have been using in their propaganda.

Aside from my desire as a Member of the Congress of the United States to join with my colleagues in presenting to the world the image of Uncle Sam always as fair and honorable, I have a personal interest in the passage of this bill. At one time, a few years ago, I had the distinction of representing more Japanese-American constituents than any other Member of the House. That probably is not the case at the present time, but certainly there are not more than three or four congressional districts today in which more Japanese-Americans reside. Mrs. Mary Ono, of my staff at my Chicago office, was the first Japanese-American congressional secretary in the history of the Congress.

There are no finer or more stanchly loyal Americans than those of Japanese blood and descent. The parents of some of the Japanese-Americans in my district as well as in other districts came from the Bonin Islands and they with all Americans of Japanese ancestry are concerned with bettering relations with Japan in the interest of peace and prosperity in the Pacific.

I lunched last week with Shig Wakamatsu, national president of the Japanese American Citizens League, and I am proud to say one of my most distinguished constituents, Mike M. Masaoka, the popular and tireless Washington representative of the league, and John Yoshino. The conversation centered on S. 2130. They thought that the enactment of this legislation was long overdue. It is merely a matter of doing the right and the decent thing, not for the Government of Japan, but for human beings, men and women and children whose lands were taken for military use by our Government and who are in need due to their enforced dislocation. I trust the bill will pass unanimously.

Mr. Chairman, I am extending my remarks to include excerpts from a letter by Mr. Masaoka:

Although it has not been officially acted upon by the JACL because we have not had a Biennial National Convention since 1958, many of our members whose parents are from the Bonin Islands and many more of us Americans of Japanese ancestry, who are concerned with bettering cooperation and relations with Japan in the interests of peace and prosperity in the Pacific, are most assuredly for it.

The bill itself was passed unanimously by the Senate and reported unanimously by the House Foreign Affairs Committee and the House Rules Committee. It has the approval of the State and Defense Departments.

The bill simply corrects an inequity in our treatment of two former Japanese island chains in which residual sovereignty continues to be in Japan but whose administration remains, under the identical provision of the Treaty of Peace, with the U.S. Armed Forces. In the case of the Ryukyus, including Okinawa, Japanese nationals whose lands are used for military purposes by our Government are paid rentals. In the case of the Bonins, however, including Ogawasara, Japanese nationals whose lands are being used for military purposes by our Government have never received compensation of any kind whatsoever from the United States. Moreover, Japanese nationals who are former residents of these islands still are not permitted to return to their native home 15 years after the end of hostilities.

This legislation, long overdue, merely attempts to equalize the treatment accorded to Japanese nationals of both the Ryukyus and the Bonins. It provides authorization for the payment of $6 million to the Japanese Government for distribution to these

former residents of the Bonin Islands. To our mind, this is much too small an amount to be paid, but, since the Japanese Government has agreed to this sum we have no alternative at this time but to agree.

There are realities in the world today that make it more important than ever that we do everything possible to maintain cordial relations with Japan. This is the centennial of diplomatic relations between Japan and the United States. The Japanese House of Representatives approved only yesterday (May 19) the Treaty of Mutual Cooperation and Security with the United States after a long and bitter battle with the Communists, leftists, and neutralists. The House of Councillors must still concur in that ratification. The Prime Minister of the Soviet Union last week threatened Japan, and other nations that allow us to base our planes on their territories, with annihilation by nuclear missiles. Neighboring Red China constantly and continuously tries to lure Japan away from the free world. The President of the United States is scheduled to visit Japan in about a month, while the Crown Prince and Princess of Japan are slated to return that good-will visit this fall. Surely, in the light of these circumstances, there can be no reason to deny the former Japanese residents of the Bonin Islands the same treatment in the use of their lands as we have done and are doing for the Japanese residents of the Ryukyus.

The amount is small, but the principle of discrimination that currently characterizes our consideration of the Japanese nationals of the Ryukyus and the Bonins looms large in the hearts and minds of all the Japanese people, not just those formerly resident in the Bonins. The former residents of these islands have conducted themselves with dignity through the past 15 years since the end of hostilities, even though they have and are suffering privations on the so-called Japanese mainland, never resorting to the undemocratic methods of the totalitarians and the Communists but constantly appealing through the democratic system of petition in the faith that American sense of fair play and good conscience would vindicate their gentlemanly procedures. Now that they are on the threshold of witnessing democracy in action correcting an injustice, we trust that the House of Representatives will not frustrate them and their dreams.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further requests for time, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized to pay to the Government of Japan a sum of $6,000,000. The payment of such sum shall constitute full satisfaction and settlement of all claims of Japanese nationals, formerly resident in the Bonin Islands, arising from the use, benefit, or exercise of property rights or interests in the Bonin Islands by the United States for security purposes, for the period beginning April 28, 1952, and continuing until such time as said use, benefit, or exercise is relinquished by the United States.

SEC. 2. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $6,000,000 to carry out the purpose of this Act.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Colorado seems to want to give the impression that this problem arises as the result of our conquest of the Bonin Islands. I want to reemphasize that this problem grows out of the Japanese evacuation of their own nationals from those islands at the start of the war and their subsequent fortification of the islands and then the military necessity for us to take the islands. So the problem does not grow out of our conquest of the islands as such. These were Japanese nationals who were removed by the Japanese Government and taken to Japan at the start of the war. The care of these people is basically a responsibility of the Japanese Government.

Now, I should like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee a question. In his opinion, will this set a precedent for future payments?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. No, it will not set a precedent. I would like to call the attention of the gentleman to the reply made by the Assistant Secretary of State, J. Graham Parsons, to the very question I asked him publicly, which appears on page 6 of the hearings. I asked:

Are we setting a precedent for future claims in the Pacific?

And he answered:

We have not so foreseen it. There has been no other case that has come to my attention, in my time in the Department at least, where former residents have claimed that they should either be allowed to go back or that we should compensate them.

In other words, he said this would certainly not set a precedent.

Mr. GROSS. And, in the personal opinion of the gentleman from Wisconsin, we are not setting a precedent?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. On the basis of the testimony we have received, I can give the gentleman the unequivocal answer that we are not setting a precedent.

Mr. GROSS. Will Japan reimburse us when we leave the Bonin Islands if and when we no longer need this area for security purposes? In the opinion of the gentleman, will Japan reimburse us for the $6 million to be appropriated?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. No, under the treaty negotiated with Japan, Japan certainly will not be repaying us the $6 million that we are actually giving to the Japanese Government for distribution to the Bonin Islanders who are no longer residents on the islands or permitted to return to the Bonin Islands.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Will the gentleman permit me to ask the sponsor of this legislation whether or not there was any testimony which would indicate that these Japanese nationals while on these islands in any way were helping the Japanese armed forces at the time our own young men were trying to capture those islands?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I will be very happy to answer the gentleman's question. I am sure, if the gentleman read the report, he would see that these former residents of the Bonin Islands were no longer on the islands at the time that we captured them and they were of no assistance to the Japanese either in holding the islands or in fighting our forces. They were evacuated and moved to Japan.

Mr. PUCINSKI. If that is the case, then I think the gentleman from Iowa certainly makes a very strong point. The fact is that these people were evacuated not as a result of any of our activities, but rather as a result of the activities of the Japanese Government, and yet we are being asked to compensate them for their loss.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. But the gentleman from Illinois should bear in mind that we are now preventing them from returning to these islands.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I want to apologize to the gentleman from Iowa personally. I was unavoidably detained. But does the gentleman think he needs a quorum or does it make no difference?

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman from Michigan does not have to apologize to me for anything.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Does the gentleman think he should have a quorum? Do you need any help for this economy program that you have been on?

Mr. GROSS. No; the gentleman from Iowa is not interested in a quorum at this time, but he is interested in all the help he can get in behalf of economy and he knows be can depend upon the gentleman from Michigan.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. JONES of Missouri, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (S. 2130) to authorize a payment to the Government of Japan, pursuant to House Resolution 532, he reported the same back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who have spoken on the legislation may extend their remarks and include extraneous material.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR PROMOTION OF ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT IN THE RYUKYU ISLANDS

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State

of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1157) to provide for promotion of economic and social development in the Ryukyu Islands.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 1157, with Mr. JONES of Missouri in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE] will be recognized for 30 minutes and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE] is now recognized.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, although this bill, H.R. 1157, bears my name, it is actually one which not only is sponsored by the executive branch, and specifically the Army, but also has received the special attention of the Secretary of Defense, who not long ago urged by a letter to Mr. VINSON that the bill be given prompt consideration because of its importance. I might mention that the former Delegate from Hawaii, John A. Burns, who has known the Okinawan people so well, also sponsored this legislation.

A single sentence description of what the bill will do is that it will permit the retention in the Ryukyu Islands of funds which would be used in the Ryukyus for various governmental purposes.

The bill, however, required more detailed description of these funds and their use in the Ryukyus since there are at least three types of funds covered by the bill.

Section 2 of the bill deals with fines, fees, forfeitures, taxes, and other moneys received by the government of the Ryukyu Islands.

At this point, I would like to describe briefly what the government of the Ryukyu Islands is. It is headed by a chief executive who is appointed by the U.S. High Commissioner. The rest of the government, which is made up of mayors and other local governing officials and a unicameral legislature, are all elected officials. In section 2, it is this part of the government of the Ryukyus which is being referred to.

The funds received by the GRI, as it is called, are derived—as the bill indicates—from fines, fees, taxes, and so fourth. In 1960, it is estimated that they will total $22.4 million. These funds are now retained in the Ryukyus and with respect to them, the bill would provide specific legal sanction for this practice.

The section 2 funds are used today and would continue to be used for the cost involved in all of the normal functions of a national government except those pertaining to national defense and international political relations. These functions would, of course, include education, public health and welfare, public safety, public works and services, economic development, and general government.

The next group of funds involved in the bill are those which are the subject of section 3. These are funds which are derived by the U.S. civil administration of the Ryukyu Islands from the several sources set out in the bill itself, that is to say, public-benefit trusts, business type operations, corporations—wholly or partly owned by the civil administration, and from fines, fees, and forfeitures. These funds are estimated to total $3 million in 1960. They would be used for programs approved by the Federal Government for matters such as typhoon relief, aid to municipalities and other similar functions. The funds referred to in (a) and (b) of section 3 are, like the section 2 funds, now retained in the Ryukyus for expenditure for the purpose I have described.

The funds referred to in subsection (c) of section 3, however, now are deposited into miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury. This represents the smallest amount of funds involved in the bill being only about $50,000 for 1960.

Section 4: This section injects a new concept into the financing of activities in the Ryukyu Islands. The funds referred to in this section are Federal income taxes withheld from the pay of U.S. citizens in the Ryukyus. These funds now aggregate about $9 million annually. At the present time, of course, these taxes are covered into the U.S. Treasury. The Federal Government through the annual budgetary process, appropriates funds for the purposes set out in 4 (a) and (b), that is, promoting the economic development and improving the welfare of the people of the Ryukyus, and reimbursing the GRI for services performed by reason of our Armed Forces in the islands.

Under section 4, not to exceed $6 million in any fiscal year could be appropriated to the High Commisisoner of the Ryukyu Islands to be spent for the purposes stated in the section.

With respect to subsection (c) of section 4, I would like to point out that disaster relief funds, which have been provided by the United States up to this time, have been obtained by reprogramming, with serious difficulty and delay, cash proceeds from Public Law 480 commodity sales in other parts of the world. Actually, commodity grants would be continued to be sought to meet the emergency food requirements but section 4(c) would provide funds for rehabilitation construction.

We all know that Okinawa and the Ryukyus generally are subject every year to devastating typhoons. And the care of the people and the rehabilitation of structures destroyed must be considered as an essential part of their fiscal administration.

The question quite naturally arises as to why present procedures of financing in the Ryukyus are not permitted to continue as in the past.

In the first place, the legal authority for the retention of those funds now kept in the Ryukyus is not absolutely clear, and legislation to render this authority clear is, therefore, necessary.

Section 4 of the bill, regardless of its reference to Federal income tax collections in the Ryukyus, is actually nothing more or less than a straight authorization for the appropriation of funds for the specific purposes stated in the section itself. These purposes are, generally, to promote the economy generally of the Ryukyu Islands, to reimburse the government of the Ryukyu Islands for services performed on account of the presence in the islands of our Armed Forces, and for emergency purposes relating to disasters, including typhoons, in that area.

It will be noted that the bill as submitted by the Department has been modified in several respects, the most important of which is through the insertion of language on page 3, lines 7 and 8, which render entirely clear that the Appropriations Committees of both Houses of the Congress will actively participate and, indeed, make all of the final decisions with respect to the funds that are appropriated under this section. The language that I am referring to is as follows: "within such limitations as may be provided hereafter in appropriations acts."

As the bill read prior to the committee's amendments, the language gave every appearance of actually appropriating funds. This action is not within the jurisdiction of the Armed Services Committee. Ours is an authorizing committee. We have neither the desire nor the power to appropriate funds. The Appropriations Committees are the ones to make recommendations in this respect based upon a specific authorization which is being provided in this bill.

Perhaps more important than the specific legal reasons for enacting legislation of this kind is the very special relationship which exists between the people of the Ryukyus and our Government. The Ryukyus are, at least from a lay standpoint, a strange mixture of a foreign country and a country that is not foreign.

Under the treaty of peace with Japan, Japan retained what is called residual sovereignty. This term is extremely difficult to define, but I believe a fair statement of its practical effect is to give the United States complete control over all matters relating to the administration of these islands.

These rights are accompanied by responsibilities, and the responsibilities, too, are rather special in this instance, because, for one reason or another, the entire nonfree world has fastened a most interested eye on Okinawa and the rest of the Ryukyus and it has, therefore, become, as it has frequently been expressed, a showcase of democracy.

This bill will give legal sanction to the retention of essential moneys in the Ryukyus. It will establish a sound relationship, both fiscal and psychological, between those islands and this country—a relationship which all informed persons state to be of paramount importance.

At the recommendation of the Comptroller General, a new section 8 was added to the bill which would render certain that all the financial transactions of the U.S. civil administration in the Ryukyus shall be audited by the General Accounting Office in accordance with the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921 and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950.

Because of questions which quite naturally arise with respect to section 4, I would like to deal with it in a little more detail at this time.

The language in section 4 is by no means unique. Section 4 adopts a policy which has general precedents in the case of the Philippine Islands and Puerto Rico in that in those two places, certain taxes were, and in the case of Puerto Rico are, for exactly the same reason as they would be in section 4.

In addition to these general precedents, there are very specific precedents in the case of the Virgin Islands and Guam. In the case of the Virgin Islands, all of the U.S. income taxes collected there are covered into the treasury of the Virgin Islands and held for use in the Virgin Islands.

In the case of Guam, all Federal income taxes are covered into the treasury of Guam and are for use in Guam.

So we are not embarking on anything brand new here.

I make particular note of these precedents only because of the somewhat unusual language of section 4. Actually, the bill by no means grants authority even remotely as broad as the previous acts of Congress relating to the Virgin Islands of Guam. In those cases, the taxes are actually covered into the local treasury. In the case of the Ryukyus, it is our intention only to indicate in a very general way that some funds are generated through income taxes in Okinawa and the Ryukyus and that within clearly defined limitations, a portion of these can be authorized for appropriation to the Ryukyus for use in that area for the purposes stated.

The authority previously granted for Guam and the Virgin Islands is very much broader than the bare basic authority which is being sought here. Appropriations must still be made under the language of section 4 of the bill. Since, as I indicated previously, the committee carefully amended the bill so as to require that the obligation and expenditure of any of the moneys in section 4 shall be "within such limitations as may be provided hereafter in appropriations acts."

Prior to the war, Okinawa and the rest of the Ryukyus were an integral part of Japan. Following Japan's surrender, they were treated as a separate and distinct territory for the purpose of occupancy. And the occupancy was not under allied authority but solely under American authority.

From 1945, when we took Okinawa by conquest, until 1952, our rights and responsibilities were those expressed in the Hague Convention of 1907 and later carried over to the Geneva Convention of 1949.

In 1952, we entered into a peace treaty with Japan. Under article III of that treaty, the United States obtained the right "to exercise all and any powers of administration, legislation, and jurisdiction over the territory and inhabitants" of the Ryukyus. Japan retained only what is called residual sovereignty.

Because the islands are under the jurisdiction of the United States, they do not qualify for the generous benefits provided for free foreign governments under the Mutual Security Acts or other assistance programs. Neither do they receive the benefits which are accorded territorial and insular possessions of the United States.

Because of this peculiar relationship, which I have said is unique, we have assumed rather unusual responsibilities. One of the hardest of these responsibilities to convey as an idea is the importance of providing the Ryukyus with what I will call a reasonably assured source of revenue for necessary works in the islands and thereby give them a reasonably stable economy.

The committee language will have a strong psychological effect in that it will give strong evidence of our intentions to stay in the islands, help the local people, and provide a truly stable economy.

I think it will be of interest to the Members of the House to know that the Comptroller General has expressed his general agreement with the purposes of this bill in his letter dated March 30, 1959, addressed to the chairman of the full committee. The Comptroller General states:

> We agree that legislation such as that contained in H.R. 1157 is desirable in order to provide a basis in law for the programs referred to therein. Furthermore, the provisions of section 3(b) would serve to remove any doubt as to the authority of the United States Civil Administration of the Ryukyu Islands to create corporations wholly or partly owned or controlled by the Civil Administration which might arise by reason of section 304 of the Government Corporation Control Act.

I have already referred to the Comptroller General's other recommendation with respect to insuring his right to audit the accounts of the High Commissioner.

The one objection which the Comptroller General set out in this letter has, I think, been adequately disposed of through the insertion of language in section 4 which renders entirely clear the fact that the Appropriations Committees and the Congress generally will participate actively in any appropriations made for Okinawa and the Ryukyus pursuant to this section.

The bill is a sound one and is one which has been long needed in order to provide a sound legislative basis for our operations in the Ryukyus. I urge prompt and favorable consideration of the bill as a necessary step toward the proper maintenance of what is without doubt the most important military installation of our country in the Far East.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman mentioned residual sovereignty. Does not Japan have residual sovereignty over the Ryukyus?

Mr. PRICE. Yes; it does.

Mr. GROSS. Do we have residual sovereignty over Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and other islands that the gentleman mentioned?

Mr. PRICE. The real point is how long we are going to be in the Ryukyus. The indications are we are going to be in the Ryukyus for many, many years.

Mr. GROSS. But is there a real comparison as between the Ryukyus and the other islands you have mentioned?

Mr. PRICE. At the present time, I would say that there is.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 1157 has but two purposes. The first of these is to provide clear legislative authority for the retention in the Ryukyu Islands of funds which are today retained in the islands and used for governmental purposes there.

The second purpose which the bill will serve is to provide a legislative basis for the making of appropriations for certain essential programs in the Ryukyu Islands.

Now, what is our interest in Okinawa and the other Ryukyu Islands? Well, it is simply this.

We took Okinawa and the other islands during World War II—took them by combat. At that time, the islands were an integral part of Japan.

At the time of the peace treaty with Japan which was ratified by the Senate on April 28, 1952, Okinawa and the other islands were separated from Japan for all administrative purposes.

Article 3 of the treaty between this country and Japan provided that Japan would concur in any proposal of the United States to the United Nations to place these islands under its trusteeship with the United States as the sole administering authority, and that pending such disposition "the United States will have the right to exercise all and any powers of administration, legislation, and jurisdiction over the territory and inhabitants of these islands."

Under the treaty, Japan did not renounce all right, title, or claim to the islands but it did confer upon the United States what could be called de facto sovereignty.

Ever since that time, there have been really two governments in the Ryukyus. One of them is the GRI, or the Government of the Ryukyu Islands, and the other is our own High Commissioner who is appointed by the Secretary of Defense and who exercises administrative control over the islands.

The Government of the Ryukyu Islands is the local government and is composed completely of people of the Ryukyus.

The GRI is headed by a chief executive who is appointed by the High Commissioner after consultation with representatives of the local legislature. The local legislature consists of a single

House of 29 members who are elected biannually by the various districts in the islands.

Now, the government of the Ryukyu Islands functions in most respects like any local government notwithstanding the fact that the High Commissioner exercises a great deal of veto power over their actions. In the process of running their government, the Ryukyuans, of course, have to provide for the public health, schools, road construction, sanitation, and all of the other things any local government must concern itself with.

In order to carry out these activities, it, of course, must have funds. These funds are derived from the normal sources such as taxes, fees, fines, and such. These will total about $22.5 million for this year. This is their money and they spend it on the governmental functions that I have described.

Now, it is section 2 of the bill which deals with the government of the Ryukyu Islands, the funds which it collects from taxes and so forth and spends for governmental purposes. This money, of course, is all retained in the islands and under the bill will continue to be retained in exactly the same fashion. The reason for section 2 is to give sound legislative authority for the situation which presently exists under the authority of the treaty with Japan. Section 2 does not change anything. It merely gives an existing situation a firm basis in legislative authority.

Section 3 of the bill deals with what I will call the extension of our own Government in the Ryukyus. This is the government headed by the High Commissioner who is also the military commander. His organization also derives certain funds from its governmental activities. These activities are set out in section 3 and include public benefit trusts, business type operations, corporations, fines, fees, and so forth. These will total about $3 million this year.

Now, these funds—except for about $50,000—are today retained in the Ryukyus and are used for those aspects of the High Commissioner's governmental operations.

So, again, section 3, except in a very minor respect, relating to about $50,000 a year, does not change the existing situation at all but does in this instance, too, give a sound legislative basis for a situation which has existed many years. Here, also, the source of the authority so far has been the treaty between our Government and Japan.

Section 4 of the bill, although it might appear on its face to be somewhat unusual, is nothing but legislative authority which will serve as a basis for the making of appropriations by the Congress in an amount not to exceed $6 million each year for the purposes enumerated in the bill itself. That is to say, promoting the economic development of the islands, reimbursing the government of the Ryukyu Islands for services performed for our Armed Forces, and emergency purposes relating to typhoons or other disasters in the islands.

Now, that is all that the bill does. It merely provides sound, well considered basic authority for what is going on today on the one hand and providing clear legislative authority for the making of appropriations for the purposes I have just described.

I have thought it unnecessary to deal with our prime interest in Okinawa and the other islands since this is a matter well known to the Members of this House. It is our most important military base in the Far East and one in which we have invested a very great amount of money. We have been there for a good many years and we will be there for a good many more years to come. Everyone from the President down agrees to this fact and for those who would wish to see from official statements to this effect, I will refer them to pages 9, 10, and 11 of the committee report which provides abundant support for our continued tenure in that part of the world.

This bill is wholly sound legislation and has the approval of the responsible civilian and military officials of the Department of Defense and of the Bureau of the Budget.

I urge support of this bill as one additional step toward the maintenance of our defensive and offensive military power in the Far East.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM], the chairman of the committee that handled this legislation.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to use the 5 minutes because the bill has been well explained by the two gentlemen from Illinois.

When this bill came to our subcommittee I was a little bit worried about it, but the committee went into it thoroughly. After studying it, I felt that it was something that should have been done several years ago because under the present procedure, as you can see from reading the bill and the report and the hearings, they are using these funds received from taxes, fines, and forfeitures without authority from the Congress or without any auditing by the General Accounting Office. This bill requires that they get authority from the Appropriations Committee and it also requires auditing by the General Accounting Office.

The income from these funds runs to something like $9 million a year. Of course the people out there wanted, I believe, $7 or $8 million. We authorized $6 million and put the control back in the hands of the Congress, where it should have been in the beginning. Not only does this have to be handled by the Committee on Appropriations but also checked by the General Accounting Office, which is nothing but sound procedure.

If you will refer to the map on the back of the report and look at the position of Okinawa and the Ryukyus and their strategic position, I believe you will agree that they are the most important islands we are holding today in this troubled world. I do not think we can change that very much at the present time.

Another important factor is that this particular area has the highest density of population of any place in the world. I believe it is 1,000 people or more to every square mile, which is a very high density of population in a section like that. So it is important that we try to stabilize and at least help them as much as they were helped by the Japanese Goverment, because they were appropriating money there to take care of the population before we ever took the islands. So in effect it is what has been done there for many years.

If you will look at the hearings at page 3997, you will notice this is one place that we have been reducing the cost. It has gone down and down every year. We are not spending anywhere near the $6 million and we will not spend that this year. I believe it is something like $1,500,000 or $2 million this year that has been agreed to by the High Commissioner and the authorities there to be spent. So, all in all, I think this bill is a good bill. I think it is a sound measure and one that is in the interest of our national security. We feel this is the right thing to do in the treatment of these people. Also, I think in the long run we are getting out much cheaper than we are getting out in many other parts of the world. The people are growing in stability and they are growing in economic wealth. They are trying to do something and they are doing something. I believe their total budget expenditure runs to something like $30 million a year.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. I would like to ask the gentleman from Illinois, Do I understand correctly that the Ryukyu Islands are being administered under a United Nations trusteeship?

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. No. They are being administered by the United States.

Mr. GROSS. Does the United Nations have anything to do with the administration of the Ryukyus?

Mr. PRICE. No.

Mr. GROSS. I thought somebody said the United Nations was involved.

Mr. PRICE. You may be referring to the statement in the report on the bill which reads as follows:

> Under the terms of article 3 of the treaty, Japan agreed that it would concur in any proposal of the United States to the U.N. to place these islands, as well as certain others, under its trusteeship with the United States as sole administering authority and that pending such disposition "the United States will have the right to exercise all and any powers of administration, legislation and jurisdiction over the territory and inhabitants of these islands."

Mr. GROSS. What have we been paying for the administration of the Ryukyus out of the U.S. Treasury?

Mr. PRICE. Since 1947 we have been appropriating as high as $50 million, down to a million dollars a year.

Mr. GROSS. Is that for the civil administration of the islands?

Mr. PRICE. Yes, and all the matters connected with such administration.

Mr. GROSS. Does that include the building of a powerplant, or was there anything extraordinary involved in the way of expenditure where the figure was $50 million?

Mr. PRICE. This is all for the purposes set out in the bill, including "promoting the economic development of the Ryukyu Islands and improving the welfare of the inhabitants thereof; reimbursing the government of the Ryukyu Islands for services performed for the benefit of and by reason of the presence of the Armed Forces of the United States within the Ryukyu Islands, including but not limited to reimbursement for such services in the fields of public health and safety," and so on.

Mr. GROSS. This is interesting. How did that come from $50 million down to $1 million?

Mr. PRICE. Immediately after the war great expenditure had to be made because of the great devastation there.

Mr. GROSS. In other words, the tax revenue from the natives or local citizens has increased to make up the difference?

Mr. PRICE. That is part of it.

Mr. GROSS. Where else do we divert income tax money as proposed in this bill?

Mr. PRICE. I have a whole list of places here. We did it in the Philippines; we do it in Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, Samoa, and we do it in many other instances. There are at least 20 or 25 instances where we have done it. They are fully listed in the report and in the hearings on this bill.

Mr. GROSS. We have sufficient American citizens there to accumulate $6 million in Federal income taxes?

Mr. PRICE. They collect more than that; they collect on an average of $9 million a year in income taxes alone.

Mr. GROSS. That is paid mostly by military personnel, is it not?

Mr. PRICE. Almost all. There are a few American businessmen there, but mostly it is military.

Mr. GROSS. There are more people there than I suspected.

Mr. PRICE. Yes; it is one of our biggest and most important installations in the Far East.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. DURHAM. I would remind the gentleman that this bill provides a sound legislative basis for our operations in the Ryukyus. This bill also places a limit of $6 million on any annual appropriation; they cannot exceed that.

Mr. GROSS. Then do I understand correctly that the expenditures must be approved by the Appropriations Committee?

Mr. DURHAM. That is correct; we appropriate it here in Congress, and the authorization for that is in this bill.

Mr. GROSS. There is no other way by which the appropriations can be made?

Mr. DURHAM. No; and the activities dealt with in section 3 have to be audited by the General Accounting Office, I might mention.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, there are no further requests for time on this side.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read the bill.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the exercise by the President of the authority over the Ryukyu Islands granted the United States by article 3 of the treaty of peace with Japan, every effort shall be made to improve the welfare and well-being of the inhabitants of the Ryukyu Islands and to promote their economic and cultural advancement, during such time as the United States continues to retain authority over the Ryukyu Islands.

SEC. 2. All fines, fees, forfeitures, taxes, assessments, and any other revenues received by the Government of the Ryukyu Islands shall be covered into the treasury of the Ryukyu Islands and shall be available for expenditure by the Government of the Ryukyu Islands.

SEC. 3. Revenues derived by the United States civil administration of the Ryukyu Islands from the following sources shall be deposited in separate funds, which are hereby authorized to be established by the High Commissioner of the Ryukyu Islands, and shall be available for obligation and expenditure in accordance with annual budget programs approved by the President:

(a) Public-benefit trusts, business-type operations, funds, and enterprises established by the civil administration of the Ryukyu Islands, or its predecessor agencies;

(b) Corporations wholly or partly owned by the civil administration of the Ryukyu Island; and

(c) Fines, fees, and forfeitures received by the civil administration of the Ryukyu Islands.

SEC. 4. Beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and annually thereafter, the Secretary of the Treasury shall ascertain, from information furnished by the High Commissioner of the Ryukyu Islands, the amount of Federal income taxes withheld at the source during the fiscal year, under the internal revenue laws of the United States, from persons stationed or employed in the Ryukyu Islands. An amount equivalent to that so determined, less the estimated amount of refunds and credits, and not to exceed $6,000,000 in any fiscal year, is hereby appropriated to the High Commissioner of the Ryukyu Islands. Such appropriations shall be credited to a separate account to be established by the High Commissioner of the Ryukyu Islands, and shall be available for obligation and expenditures, in accordance with programs approved by the President, for: (a) promoting the economic development of the Ryukyu Islands and improving the welfare of the inhabitants thereof; (b) reimbursing the Government of the Ryukyu Islands for services performed for the benefit of and by reason of the presence of the Armed Forces of the United States within the Ryukyu Islands, including but not limited to reimbursement for such services in the fields of public health and safety, in annual amounts which may be paid in advance to the Government of the Ryukyu Islands; and (c) emergency purposes related to typhoons or other disasters in the Ryukyu Islands. Preference shall be given to programs in which the Government of the Ryukyu Islands participates by sharing part of the costs of contributing other resources. Any unobligated balance in the account in excess of $6,000,000 at the end of any fiscal year shall be transferred and paid over to the United States Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

SEC. 5. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated by the Congress of the United States such sums as may be necessary and appropriate to carry out the provisions and purposes of this Act.

SEC. 6. The term "Ryukyu Islands," as used in this Act, means Nansei Shoto south of twenty-nine degrees north latitude, excluding the islands in the Amami Oshima group with respect to which all rights and interests of the United States under article 3 of the Treaty of Peace with Japan have been relinquished to Japan.

SEC. 7. Nothing in this Act shall be construed to extend the application of any law of the United States to the Ryukyu Islands which would not otherwise be applicable there.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 3, line 2, strike the word "appropriated" and insert the words "set aside".

On page 3, line 3, strike the word "appropriations" and insert the word "credits".

On page 3, line 4, strike the words "credited to" and insert the words "kept in".

On page 3, line 6, following the comma after "expenditure" insert the following: "within such limitations as may be provided hereafter in appropriations acts".

On page 3, line 20, strike "of" and insert "or".

Page 4, following line 12, insert a new section 8 as follows:

"SEC. 8. All financial transactions of the United States civil administration of the Ryukyu Islands, including such transactions of all agencies or instrumentalities established or utilized by such administration, shall be audited by the General Accounting Office in accordance with the provisions of the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921, as amended, and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950, as amended. The representatives of the General Accounting Office shall have access to all books, accounts, records, reports, files, and all other papers, things or property belonging to or in use by such administration, agencies or instrumentalities, and necessary to facilitate the audit. This section does not apply to the Government of the Ryukyu Islands."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. JONES of Missouri, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1157) to provide for promotion of economic and social development in the Ryukyu Islands, pursuant to House Resolution 533, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

BENT'S OLD FORT

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 6851) authorizing the establishment of a national historic site at Bent's Old Fort near La Junta, Colo.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 6851) with Mr. EVINS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on Thursday, May 19 last, the committee amendment had been agreed to and all debate under the 5-minute rule on the bill and all amendments thereto was limited to 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL].

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, this is legislation that would authorize the addition of Bent's Old Fort as a historic site of the national park system. This project has been given satisfactory approval by those having the responsibility for determining the values of such historic places. They have suggested that the legislation is worth while and that this particular facility would fit nicely into our national park system. We debated the legislation at some length last Thursday. I sincerely hope that the bill receives the approval of the House.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, this bill which establishes Bent's Old Fort as a national historic site is a meritorious bill. This legislation has a favorable report from the Department of the Interior, and was unanimously reported by the Subcommittee on Public Lands, and by the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee.

Mr. Chairman, this site was checked by the Advisory Board on National Parks, Historic Sites, Buildings, and Monuments, and was approved by the Board for designation as a national historic site. As I mentioned in the debate on this bill last week, I feel that Bent's Old Fort has such historical significance and importance that it is entitled to this consideration.

I have tried to make it clear, Mr. Chairman, that it may be possible for the Federal Government to acquire the additional land adjacent to the site without cost. I shall certainly do what I can to obtain this land for the National Park Service without expense to the Government.

I again urge the House to pass this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GROSS. Has all time expired on this bill?

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired, and, under the rule, the Committee will rise.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. EVINS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H.R. 6851, pursuant to House Resolution 509, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Under the unanimous-consent agreement previously made in the House, further proceedings on this bill will go over until Wednesday.

Does the gentleman insist on his point of order under those circumstances?

Mr. GROSS. Yes, Mr. Speaker; I insist on the point of order.

The SPEAKER. Did the gentleman just make the point of order that a quorum is not present?

Mr. GROSS. I am objecting to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. There is no unanimous consent that we do not have a yea-and-nay vote on it; is there?

The SPEAKER. There has been such in the House.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. In the House?

The SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Well, I understood that applied only to a certain day. I did not understand it applied forever, to all yea-and-nay votes.

The SPEAKER. The unanimous-consent agreement was entered into late last week that that would obtain today and tomorrow.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That is to say, there is no way to get a yea-and-nay vote on any of these bills if they come up today?

The SPEAKER. Not today.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Or tomorrow?

The SPEAKER. Or tomorrow.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Well, that is certainly a strange sort of unanimous-consent proposition.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] withdraw his point of no quorum?

Mr. GROSS. No, Mr. Speaker; I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the vote will go over until Wednesday. If the gentleman insists on his point of order of no quorum, it will have no effect except to get a quorum, but there will not be any vote on the bill.

Mr. GROSS. With that understanding, Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my point of no quorum.

LAND TO CASTILLO DE SAN MARCOS NATIONAL MONUMENT, FLA.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 8226) to add certain lands to Castillo de San Marcos National Monument in the State of Florida.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H.R. 8226, with Mr. EVINS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on Thursday last, May 19, committee amendments had been agreed to. All debate on the bill and all amendments thereto were limited to 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL].

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, this bill refers to improvements in one of our best and most visited facilities of the National Park Service. The old fort at St. Augustine, Fla., is involved. The proposed improvements are necessary so that the old and renewed place can be visited easily and receive the attention by the visiting public that it deserves. This legislation is necessary and timely. I trust that my colleagues will give their unanimous support to the legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. EVINS, Chairman of the Committee

of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 8226) to add certain lands to Castillo de San Marcos National Monument in the State of Florida, pursuant to House Resolution 510, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INACCURATE STATEMENTS ON FOREIGN AID APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, an editorial and a news feature article published in this morning's issue of the Washington Post and Times Herald make such inaccurate and distorted statements relative to me with reference to the appropriation for foreign aid—and at a time when truth and objectivity are especially needed in dealing with public affairs—that I believe it is well for me to remind the House at this time that these misrepresentations are groundless, completely without foundation in fact.

I have for a number of years been, and now am, the target of a barrage of uninformed attacks and unwarranted pressures, emanating from many and varied sources, both from within and from without the Government. So I say to you now that I can, and will, prove the validity of my stand—even to the doubting ones, if they will only listen—when the foreign aid appropriation bill for fiscal 1961 is brought to the House floor.

My position on foreign aid needs no defense; it needs only to be understood. I have lived with this monstrosity as chairman of the subcommittee handling the money bill for 6 turbulent years, and for 2 additional years prior to that as a member of the subcommittee. If those in high authority would only find the time to listen patiently, with open minds, while unrefuted facts are revealed, they would then readily admit that the amount of funds requested should be drastically and permanently reduced.

There are numerous instances in which we are now supporting governments that are operating with substantial surpluses; and the only justification offered is that we are giving this money not for economic reasons, but for political purposes. It is admitted that we are being subjected to political blackmail.

Many programs and literally hundreds of projects are being started for which no testimony has ever been presented, justification made, or authorization given by or before the committees of the Congress. Some of these undertakings commit us as far ahead as 1975 with obligations which, if carried to a conclusion, would require the expenditure of tens of billions of dollars.

When the bill is brought to the House floor for debate, I will do my best to acquaint the Members and the public with as many phases as I can, within the time limitations, of many of the deplorable conditions prevailing. Meantime, I urge that the Members personally study the thousands of printed pages of the record of our subcommittee's hearings, copies of which should be available by month's end.

There is nothing personal, Mr. Speaker, about my efforts to reduce the spending for foreign aid which, in all of its phases, is costing our country considerably more than $10 billion a year; but I am convinced that just as surely as night follows day, this program will wreck the economic structure and future well-being of our Nation if allowed to continue unchecked and uncontrolled. My conclusions are based upon factual evidence, and not the unsupported wishes of dreamers and schemers.

I stand on this statement, and can prove its validity. I am confident that I will so prove it when the bill is considered by the House.

May I request your further indulgence in order to express my belief that as long as there is world tension there will be incidents which cause emotional upsets. The knowledge that this is so should fortify us, I believe, in our position that unjustified, unproductive funds, wastefully used, should not be provided for worldwide spending programs. We should guard at all times, and particularly so now, against letting our emotions commit us to poorly planned and unrealistic undertakings.

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, once again the question of Federal aid for education has been brought to a focal point of attention. As in past years, there are many individuals and groups pressuring the Congress to enact legislation and appropriate large sums for aid to our public schools. And, as in past years, their thesis is that problems which now face American education are of such magnitude that they can be solved only by a substantial investment of Federal money.

The matter has been discussed and legislation attempted at several sessions since I came to Congress in 1953. I shall not attempt to enumerate the bills that have been proposed in past sessions, before or since I came to Congress, nor shall I cite their fate. Suffice to say that several hundred bills were introduced over the period from 1871 to 1949, to authorize Federal financial assistance for the general support of elementary and secondary schools. A few succeeded in passing either the Senate or the House, but none was ever enacted into law. In more recent years, the Federal aid bills have shifted emphasis to school construction. This is true of H.R. 10128 soon to be considered by the House. If enacted, this would serve only as a prelude to additional Federal aid for teachers' salaries and other educational purposes. In fact, during this session, the Senate passed, on February 4, S. 8, an act "to authorize Federal financial assistance for school construction and teachers' salaries" following almost 3 days of continuous debate, and this bill is now before the House Committee on Education and Labor. One need only read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 2, 3, and 4 to see the interest and diversity of opinion which the question of Federal aid to education has aroused in the other body. The matter is of equal interest in the House, where we are now ready to consider same.

Emerging from the testimony to date on this very important subject is the fact that proponents and opponents of Federal aid for education equally share the desire for a public school system in America which shall be second to none. The method of securing and maintaining such a system seems to be the very crux of the question. There are wide variations as to the extent of need.

Proponents of Federal aid urge forcefully that only by substantial Federal grants can the Nation's schools be maintained and prepared to serve the present generation adequately while readying future generations for their respective responsibilities in a space age.

Mr. Chairman, I propose, if given the opportunity when we discuss H.R. 10128, to offer an amendment which I believe would provide substantial assistance to the schools of our Nation and which would eliminate once and for all the threats implied by and inherent in Federal control of an educational system.

My amendment is as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That 1 per centum of all income taxes collected on individual and corporate income under Federal statutes shall be deemed to be revenue for the State or Territory within which it is collected, for use, for educational purposes only, without any Federal direction, control, or interference.

"SEC. 2. District directors of internal revenue are hereby authorized and directed to transfer to the treasurer, or corresponding official, of the State or Territory within which their respective internal revenue districts are situated, at the end of each quarter, an amount equal to 1 per centum of the taxes from individual and corporate income collected within such State or Territory during said quarter.

"SEC. 3. For purposes of information only, district directors of internal revenue shall report the amounts transferred to State treasurers, or corresponding officials, as authorized in section 2, to the Department of the Treasury, accompanying such report with receipts from the proper State officials verifying the amounts received."

I consider myself among those who have an overwhelming fear of Federal control of education. It is my sincere belief that magnificent progress has been made in the past decade to overcome deficiencies that developed in our public school system over the war years, and I believe we have the most all-inclusive and representative system of education in the world. Having said this, I would add that there is still room for improvement, and that improvement lies in avenues which finances alone cannot reach.

This Congress, in my opinion, must act wisely in the evolution of Federal aid programs, and must look beyond immediate education needs into the far future. Such a forward look can reveal only one picture if we promote an unwise program of Federal financing of education: there will inevitably follow a gradual loss of State and local responsibility for the schools, with a consequent gradual gain of control over the schools and their programs by a centralized body.

In laying the predicate for my amendment, I should like to review as briefly as possible some of the more controversial aspects of the question of Federal aid for educational purposes so that it may be clearly seen in what respects my proposal differs from others that have been introduced on this important subject, and the manner in which I believe hitherto irreconcilable issues may be reconciled.

Among the first questions raised in regard to Federal aid to education are:

First. What is the extent of Federal responsibility for education under the provisions of the U.S. Constitution?

Second. What is the extent of State responsibility under the State constitution?

Third. What precedent do we have for or against Federal aid for educational purposes?

First. Answering the first of these questions, there is nothing in the U.S. Constitution which makes education a Federal function. We are a Nation of 50 sovereign and independent States operating under a Constitution which reserves to them or the people thereof all powers not delegated to the Central Government. To embark on a program of Federal subsidization of education is tantamount to abandoning the principle of States rights and ignoring the constitutional provision that "powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States are reserved to the States, respectively, or to the people."

Second. Nearly all State constitutions have education clauses making public education the concern and responsibility of the State and local communities thereof.

Third. Proponents of Federal aid support their views by pointing to "historical precedents" for such action including the passage of the Morrill Land-Grant College Act; the Smith-Hughes Act for vocational education; the national school lunch program; assistance to schools in federally impacted areas; the GI bills for World War II and Korean war veterans; and, more recently, the National Defense Education Act. They argue that these programs have operated with a minimum of Federal control and with maximum efficiency and contend that the principle for Federal educational aid having already been established, the enactment of additional legislation at this time looking toward alleviating the national education needs would in no way violate our Constitution nor invite Federal controls with unfavorable consequences.

What the proponents fail to observe is that the foregoing programs have not been related to general education, but rather to grants of land or money for the development of certain study areas, for child health programs, or to fulfill definite responsibilities which were a direct result of Federal activity. The Federal Congress has resisted for nearly a century other types of Federal aid legislation which might directly or indirectly influence the minds and thinking of American youth. In this respect, I fervently pray that the Congress will continue to resist.

Next, we come to questions relating to the financing of school needs such as, first, do the States have the fiscal capacity to take care of school needs?

Second. What resources does the Federal Government have which are beyond the reach of the States?

Third. Which has expanded its indebtedness and tax collection more within the past 30 years—the Federal Government or the State and local governments?

First. In response to the first question, proponents of Federal aid claim that schools are woefully underfinanced and that States and local communities are either unwilling or cannot provide adequate taxation to meet ever-growing needs; that only by intervention of the Federal Government, with its superior taxing powers, will a sufficient share of the Nation's income be allocated to educational needs, and thus avert a national calamity.

Recent statistics of the U.S. Office of Education show that in the past two decades enrollments in educational institutions increased 56 percent while educational expenditures increased 642 percent. In considering these figures we must be mindful of the fact that during the period prices more than doubled, but even then a 56 percent enrollment was accompanied by an increase in educational expenditures of 253 percent computed in dollars of constant purchasing power. The comparative tabulation follows:

Educational expenditures and enrollment, 1940–60

School year	Expenditures	Enrollment
	Thousands	
1939–40	$3,199,593	29,751,203
1949–50	8,795,635	31,319,271
1955–56	16,811,651	39,103,059
1959–60	24,000,000	46,480,000
	Percent	*Percent*
Increase, 1940–60	642	56

The percent of national income devoted to education has increased from 3.7 percent in 1930 to 6 percent in 1960, with expenditures for education increasing from $3.2 billion for the school year 1929–30 to $22 billion for the school year 1958–59, a net increase of 580 percent. By contrast, national income increased for the same period from $87.8 billion to $366.2 billion, a net increase of 317 percent. The comparative tabulations follow:

Educational expenditures and national income, 1929–58

	Calendar year 1929 or school year 1929–30	Calendar year 1958 or school year 1958–59	Increase
	Billions	*Billions*	*Percent*
Expenditures for education	$3.2	$22.0	+580
National income	87.8	366.2	+317
	Percent	*Percent*	
Educational expenditures as percent of national income	3.7	6.0	

These figures would seem to indicate an almost phenomenal support of education according to our traditional State and local pattern. Since the end of World War II, the American people have spent $19 billion for public-school buildings. They have spent this, moreover, with very little Federal aid—only $300 million, or less than 2 percent, has been provided by the U.S. Government, which has gone largely for buildings in federally impacted areas.

I am exceedingly proud of the achievements of my own State of Florida where great educational gains have been noted along with other types of growth. I should like to insert in the RECORD a table showing the expenditures of the State of Florida for public education from kindergarten to 2 years on the junior college level, from 1955–56 to 1958–59, and estimates for the biennium 1959–61. The figures show that State and county expenditures for public schools in 1956 amounted to nearly $185 million whereas the estimated expenditures for 1961, that is the last year of the biennium, will be approximately $374 million. You will note that in a period of 5 years the expenditures have doubled. I say this is a remarkable record. This is a record that shows how my great State of Florida has decided, in every way it knows how, to accept its just and proper responsibility in the field of public education. I am sure most of the other States have a comparable significant record of achievement.

State of Florida: State and county expenditures for public schools (grades K–14) 1955–56 to 1958–59 and estimates for the biennium 1959–61

	Actual expenditures				Appropriations and estimated expenditures	
	1955–56	1956–57	1957–58	1958–59	1959–60	1960–61
Operations:						
Minimum foundation program, public schools:						
Instructional salaries	$73,494,358	$80,050,317	$104,251,934	$106,391,602	$118,423,914	$128,392,813
Transportation	3,808,810	3,901,858	4,230,371	4,276,402	4,298,605	4,525,933
Other current expense	7,349,426	7,977,906	8,872,721	11,866,435	9,950,475	10,761,663
Total, minimum foundation program, public schools	84,652,594	91,930,081	117,355,026	122,534,439	132,672,994	143,680,409
Minimum foundation program, junior colleges:						
Instructional salaries	(1)	(1)	1,090,049	1,925,259	2,924,117	3,813,900
Other current expense	(1)	(1)	187,513	350,630	477,415	622,931
Total, minimum foundation program, junior colleges	(1)	(1)	1,277,562	2,275,889	3,400,532	4,436,831
Minimum foundation program, State supervisory service	132,819	136,891	158,080	168,700	203,450	203,450
Minimum foundation program, sales tax distribution to county schools (to enable counties to match State salary and building funds)	0	0	18,000,000	16,633,636	21,078,794	21,493,926
Purchase of textbooks	1,859,432	2,340,450	2,290,872	2,635,000	2,500,000	2,500,000
Public school driver educational fund	0	410,749	559,094	649,500	701,970	777,570
Total State funds for operations	86,644,845	94,818,171	139,640,634	144,897,164	160,557,740	173,092,186
Capital outlay:						
Minimum foundation program, $400 per unit from motor vehicle license fees:						
Public schools	10,360,028	11,945,673	13,012,607	14,165,560	15,079,264	16,891,200
Junior colleges	(1)	(1)	115,980	212,472	259,920	347,200
Additional capital outlay, $200 per pupil increase in ADA	0	0	11,479,602	10,054,243	14,140,000	13,360,000
Additional junior college capital outlay	4,197,652	0	2,003,586	2,529,582	5,540,971	(2)
Total, State funds for capital outlay	14,557,680	11,945,673	26,611,775	26,961,857	35,021,155	30,598,400
Total State funds for public schools and junior colleges	101,202,525	106,763,844	166,252,409	171,859,021	195,577,895	203,690,586
County effort:						
Minimum foundation requirement	21,677,389	23,167,955	26,086,067	31,469,695	38,462,538	42,308,793
Additional county effort	61,908,409	72,214,290	85,485,294	98,530,305	117,537,462	127,691,207
Total, county effort	83,585,798	95,382,245	111,571,361	130,000,000	156,000,000	170,000,000
Total, support of Florida public schools and junior colleges	184,788,323	202,146,089	277,823,770	301,859,021	351,577,895	373,690,586

[1] Junior college funds were included in minimum foundation program-public schools calculations prior to 1957–58.
[2] For biennium.

Source: Budget Director's Office, July 7, 1959.

The State superintendent of public instruction for Florida, in commenting on the 1959 legislative actions, stated:

Financing of public schools was given top priority throughout the session, and an examination of the entire scope of the legislative action pertaining to public schools indicates that education received fair and equitable treatment by the 1959 legislature. The needs of grades 1–12 in the minimum foundation program were met in full, as requested and estimated by the State department of education. No program was eliminated and no program was cut below its current level.

State matching funds for school construction were increased. Additional construction was provided for existing community junior colleges and provision was made for starting needed new community junior colleges * * *.

Allocation of teacher training scholarships was placed on an up-to-date enrollment basis. The summer enrichment program was broadened to include the teaching of academic subjects * * *.

And, equally as important, no legislation which would be considered harmful or detrimental to the future of the public free school system was enacted into law.

To the above, I should like to add that the combined annual budgets for the institutions of higher learning in the State of Florida for the identical periods increased commensurately, as shown by the following figures:

The combined operating expenditures of State supported institutions of higher learning for 1955–56 amounted to $28,194,172. Budgeted for 1960–61 are $50,525,884, an overall increase of $22,331,712. These figures are exclusive of auxiliary enterprises, debt service on revenue certificates or building construction. This is nearly a 90 percent increase in 4 years.

Second. The second portion of the larger question of finances relating to resources of the Federal Government may be answered simply: The Government, of itself, has no funds beyond those which it extracts from taxpayers. Federal aid would merely mean a substitution of the tax collecting power from the States and/or local governments to the Central Government. All money comes from taxpayers.

Third. In regard to the third phase of the question, namely, "which has expanded its indebtedness and tax collection more in recent years—the Federal or State and local governments?" comparative data indicate that Federal taxes increased more steeply, are now leveled at far higher rates, and have become more burdensome than State and local taxes.

Federal taxes multiplied 20 times between 1927 and 1958, State and local taxes 5 times. The following figures illustrate the relative increase:

Federal, State, and local taxes for the period 1927–58

	Federal taxes	State and local taxes
	Billions of dollars	
1927	$3.4	$6.1
1958	68.0	30.4

Federal, State, and local taxes for the period 1927–58—Continued

	Federal taxes	State and local taxes
	Percent of national income	
1927	4.1	7.4
1958	18.6	8.3

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, "Historical Summary of Governmental Finances in the United States, 1959"; "Governmental Finances in 1958, 1959."

And the following table illustrates the relative debt situation:

Federal, State, and local debt for the period 1927–58

	Federal debt	State and local debt
	Billions of dollars	
1927	$18.5	$14.9
1958	276.4	58.2
	Percent of national income	
1927	22.6	18.2
1958	75.5	15.9

Source: "Federal Debt," report of the Secretary of the Treasury for 1958. "State and Local Debt," American Enterprise Association, Inc., Report No. 1, Jan. 15, 1960, pp. 32–33.

In brief, the Federal debt multiplied 15 times between 1927 and 1958, the State and local debt only 4 times. State and local debt declined as a percent of na-

tional income while the burden of the Federal debt multiplied more than three times.

It is claimed that the national debt of the United States now exceeds the combined national debts of all the nations of the world. Under the circumstances, Mr. Chairman, it would seem the height of folly to add to the tax burden of the Nation at this time. We should all bear in mind this statement by Chief Justice Marshall:

The power to tax is the power to destroy.

Closely allied to the foregoing major points in the general discussion of finances is this: Is resistance to higher taxes caused by the increasing burdens of Federal taxes or of State and local taxes?

The heavy burden of Federal taxes has certainly adversely affected the fiscal capacity of State and local governments. Federal taxes have preempted the tax field and severely limited the income of State and local governments. As verification for this statement, I call attention to the results of a questionnaire sent out in May 1959 by Hon. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY, chairman of the subcommittee of the House Committee on Education and Labor, to Governors of States and territories, in conjunction with the committee's consideration of H.R. 22, School Support Act of 1959. The questionnaire and replies formed a supplemental committee report on H.R. 22. Five questions were asked by the chairman which were deemed pertinent to the problem of financing education. In my opinion, and in the opinion of some of the recipients, they were leading questions premised on the assumption and anticipated conclusions that most of the States would declare their dependency on Federal aid for their educational programs. Three items in particular were stressed in the general accompanying letter:

First. That there seems to be a consensus in the country today concerning "national goals in school financing."

Second. That the States are already straining their tax resources to meet current needs.

Third. That increasing taxpayer resistance means a Federal program to equalize the tax burden at the national level is indispensable.

The five questions propounded are these:

1. Considering the political realities in your State, do you consider it likely or unlikely that the combined efforts of your State legislature and local school districts will increase school appropriations to the point that your State will come reasonably close to the national goals outlined above by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Rockefeller brothers report?

2. Does taxpayer resistance to increased school taxes seem to be increasing or diminishing in your State?

3. Is it realistic to look for increases of at least 5 percent each year in school appropriations by the State legislature during your term of office?

4. Judging by the performance of your legislature during the past 4 years could you predict the percentage that schoolteachers' salaries will be increased in your State in the next 5 years?

5. The following conclusion appeared in the Rockefeller report: "It is the weakness in the State and local taxing systems more than anything else that gives rise to current proposals for increased Federal support of education. For those who wish to resist or postpone the resort to Federal funds and at the same time not constrict educational services there seems to be only one alternative: a thoughtful, painful, politically courageous overhaul of State and local tax systems." Is such overhaul presently under way in your State?

We are interested in all of these questions, but primarily interested at this point in question No. 2. Many of the Governors quickly distinguished between "taxpayer resistance to increased taxes" as such, and "taxpayer resistance to increased taxes for school purposes." Many acknowledged an increased resistance to all types of taxation, but not specifically to school taxation. When citizens understood the needs for school programs, they generally favored school taxes. The only fly in the ointment seemed to be the dearth of local taxes by virtue of the more lucrative sources of taxation having been usurped by the Federal Government.

Now let us take a look at the interest in and need for so-called Federal aid for education, as well as the financial picture with respect to schools, coming directly from the heads of States, that is, the Governors or their spokesmen.

Nine of those addressed did not even reply. Most of the replies—a total of 25—were noncommittal, merely giving a résumé of the laws affecting the financing of their school systems. The majority seemed to imply that their laws were inadequate. One State, Arkansas, indicated the financial outlook was not good, but expressed no desire for Federal aid. Ten of this noncommittal group indicated excellent financial backing and outlook for their public schools; in some instances the outlook was better than the so-called national goals cited by Chairman BAILEY in his letter. Fourteen were completely noncommittal and merely cited their laws.

Many Governors objected to the assumption underlying the proposed questions, namely, what actually constituted national goals. The Governor of Virginia criticized the questions as "too limited in source and number to constitute a solid basis for assuming that they represent a consensus for national goals, and any attempt to broaden the source of opinion on this important matter is weakened by requesting answers to specific questions that in themselves stem from a doubtful assumption."

Eight Governors categorically denied any need for Federal aid and were strongly opposed to same.

Four Governors only came out strongly for Federal aid: Alaska, Michigan, Minnesota, and Nebraska. Alaska as a Territory had always had aid through the Department of the Interior and the transition to statehood would entail difficulties without continued support for the Alaska educational system.

Michigan indicates a bad financial situation, though one is left to wonder if the cause is political or financial. In any event, she would favor Federal aid. Nebraska seems to be in a desperate plight and would favor relief. Minnesota thinks it could do a better educational job with Federal aid.

Three additional States have no real objection to Federal aid: Colorado does not need help, but does not object to Federal aid; Maryland and North Carolina prefer local and State control, but are not especially opposed to Federal aid even though they do not need it.

Lastly, there are several States outspoken against Federal aid to education. These include Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Montana, North Dakota, South Carolina, Virginia, and Texas. Comments of some of the governors are enlightening:

The Governor of Iowa says:

The mechanism of Federal aid to education will not make available economic resources not already available to the various States and the local political subdivisions financing public school systems in this country.

The Governor of Indiana says:

Excellent local support has been given to public education in Indiana.

And he points out that:

Americans have always regarded public education as the particular province of local communities, and history has demonstrated that when the people lose control of the education of their children—and vest it in one centralized authority or bureau—that socialism, nazism, fascism, and communism can more easily gain control of the government with the immediate and complete loss of individual freedom.

The Governor of Kansas says:

In a moment of hysteria, it is possible that the country may be stampeded into action that will destroy further the traditional responsibilities of local governments in providing for the educational needs of the citizens. * * * It is my opinion that given anywhere equal opportunity the local and State governments are better able to solve educational problems than are members of a Federal bureaucracy.

The Governor of Montana says:

Rather than being trapped by a loaded question of the "when did you stop beating your wife?" variety, I would like to point out that, in my opinion, as Governor of Montana, that the educational needs of Montana and Montanans are best determined by those at the local and State levels, rather than from a distant office in Washington or New York.

The Governor, incidentally, gives a remarkable picture of support at the State level in Montana.

The Governor of North Dakota says that with appropriate tax overhauling "we would not need Federal aid for education. I consider it likely that the combined efforts of our State legislature and local school districts will increase local school appropriations to continue the advancement of and improvement in public education. Taxpayer resistance seems to be decreasing as far as school support is concerned."

The Governor of South Carolina says:

I would like to say we are very proud of our program and we propose to continue that program through State efforts. Two years ago the special Presidential Commission studying the so-called national emergency in public schooling found that in only 13 States in America is a child not being denied an education for the lack of a classroom or a schoolteacher. Low per capita income South Carolina is one of these 13. We do not want Federal aid. We do not need Federal aid.

The Governor of Virginia, among other things, says:

Virginia is recognized nationally for its sound fiscal policy in governmental affairs. * * * Despite the fact that Federal programs in health, welfare, and the like have required matching funds locally to such an extent that the residual resources have correspondingly dwindled for education, it would appear wise to reflect carefully before embarking on elaborate Federal aid programs in general education under the guise of national defense. The power of control that inevitably accrues to the holder of the purse string can often be visibly guarded when applied to ships and roads and buildings. It subtly escapes this scrutiny, however, when applied to training the mind of youth in the form of education. * * * It is not the seen enemy we fear half so much as centralized control of the affairs of the mind.

And the Governor of Texas, in quoting from a report of a committee appointed by him says:

The advancement and continuing support of public education is a fundamental obligation of State and local government. A free society must develop its human potential by identifying, nurturing, and wisely using its talents.

In other words, the Governors of the several States, as I analyze their replies as objectively as possible, do not appear to feel the need of Federal aid as legislation presently before this Congress contemplates. Though not asked to specifically comment on their attitudes toward Federal aid for education, many nevertheless spoke out against it and did not even attempt to answer the main questions that were asked them. Many have problems of taxation, but they feel there is no special resistance to taxation when it is known that it is for school purposes. I am sure that all realize that if the Federal Government spent less they would certainly have more to spend on their own respective State services.

Much of the clamor for Federal aid revolves around the alleged problem of classroom shortage and the inability of State and local governments to finance school construction rapidly enough to overcome the present gap and the ever-widening shortages predicted for the foreseeable future. This particular facet of Federal aid is the one selected for primary emphasis at this time and is, indeed, the main purpose of H.R. 10128. If enacted, it would be an opening wedge for the National Government to step into the educational picture. Where this bill calls for a billion dollar appropriation, this would be a mere bagatelle to the billions that would be demanded in the future. Statistics offered in the committee report on H.R. 10128, and in various studies by staunch proponents of Federal aid, are in no way conclusive of the need for Federal aid to alleviate shortages. Here are some of the statistics offered in support of Federal aid, derived from reports of the U.S. Office of Education:

Estimated shortage, 1950, 250,000 classrooms.

Estimated shortage, 1953, 312,000 classrooms.

Estimated shortage, 1954, 370,000 classrooms.

Interestingly enough, I understand these figures were obtained on the basis of a nationwide school facilities survey which cost $5 million.

In 1956 the Committee for the White House Conference on Education reported the result of its own shortage survey at 198,625 classrooms. During the autumn of 1956, and the 3 succeeding years, the U.S. Office of Education showed the following classroom shortages, as compiled from information furnished by the State departments of education:

Estimated shortage, 1956, 159,000 classrooms.

Estimated shortage, 1957, 142,300 classrooms.

Estimated shortage, 1958, 141,900 classrooms.

Estimated shortage, 1959, 132,400 classrooms.

According to their own figures, this would represent a reduction in classroom shortage between 1954 and 1959 from 370,000 to 132,000. There is such variation in the reports from the State departments of education that grave doubt has been raised regarding the accuracy of these estimates; however, we may assume that they are indicative of the general overall picture of classroom shortages.

A comparison of classrooms in use with pupil enrollment from surveys made in 1954 and 1959, respectively, shows:

	1954	1959	Increase (+) or reduction (−)
Classrooms in use	983,000	1,279,000	+30
Pupil enrollment	30,045,000	35,990,000	+20
Pupils per classroom	30.6	28.1	−2.5

A recent forecast of classrooms needed for the next decade is 610,000. To take care of an increased enrollment of 8.7 million students, it is alleged that 312,000 new rooms are needed; a backlog holdover of needs from the 1959 survey is indicated at 132,000 rooms; and for anticipated abandonments which must be replaced, an additional 166,000 will be needed. This would average 61,000 classrooms per year during the decade, whereas classroom construction without any Federal money, averaged 66,700 per year, during the past 5 years. If the States make the same effort during the next decade as they have in the past five, classrooms can be constructed to meet increased needs without any Federal intervention. Moreover, if there is a lessening of State and local support as a result of Federal assistance, the picture would be far less optimistic so far as the final net results are concerned. The American people have spent an average of $1 billion per year since the end of World War II on school construction. I raise the question: would they continue to make the effort to raise $1 billion annually for the next 10 years, if the Federal Government enacts a Federal assistance program? I believe the answer to this question would be the same today as that which was given in May 1957 when Time magazine sampled opinion. The May 13, 1957, issue of Time magazine carried the following:

Of all the items in President Eisenhower's domestic program, few seem less likely to succeed than Federal aid for school construction. But would the defeat of this proposal be as great a calamity as its backers insist? Last week Time surveyed 48 States to find out. The answer: No. Though the Nation as a whole must keep building classrooms faster than ever before, a surprisingly big proportion of the States do not need—or do not want—any help from the Government.

Some of the States which got off to a slow start in meeting their increased classroom needs have now taken positive action in that direction. Alabama may be cited as an example. Last August the State legislature authorized a substantial aid program to be financed by issuance of $100 million of State bonds. This will take care of two-thirds of the reported existing shortage of classrooms in the State of Alabama. Others are taking similar action.

The minority views included in the committee report on H.R. 10128 point up with great clarity the weaknesses of this bill. They deserve our strictest scrutiny. They complain that "neither the Subcommittee on General Education, nor the full committee, held any public hearings on the subject of this bill, or the bill itself, in the present session of Congress. There is a positive need for such hearings."

The objectivity and reliability of the committee's favorable recommendations are open to question in view of the significant progress that has been made in meeting needs during the past several years, without any Federal aid, and the relative decline in backlog estimates. The minority wisely states the obvious, namely, that "no adequate and effective program of Federal aid can properly ignore the rapidly shifting patterns of need and response which have taken place in education in this country."

With specific reference to backlogs, page 16 of the report states:

We do not question the existence of some backlog. We do believe, however, that there is and will continue to be an irreducible minimum backlog of classroom need, regardless of any question of Federal aid. To the extent this exists, and for other reasons discussed later in this report, the urgency of the presumed classroom shortage is considerably diminished.

On page 18, the report further states:

It is also evident that the construction peak has been crossed and within 5 years the number of classrooms required to keep fully abreast additional needs will be only half as much each year as actually have been built in the past few years.

Much credence has been given to the distress signals created on the ground of alleged school district debt limitations. Proponents of Federal aid for school construction claim that over the years "more and more school districts have exhausted their resources," and can no longer build their own classrooms. A careful reading of pages 22 and 23 of the minority views on H.R. 10128 show that such districts are an infinitesimal part of the whole; that—

The 237 borrowed-up districts reported in the last survey amount to only six-tenths of 1 percent, or 6 out of every 1,000 of the Nation's 40,000 school districts. The enrollment in these districts is less than 1.5 percent of the U.S. total.

In other words, the fiscal capacity of only a limited number of the 40,000 school districts in the Nation has been exhausted. One member of the committee very aptly raised this question:

Why, indeed, should we spread nearly a thousand million dollars tax money around the country in order to help these districts?

Another weakness pointed to by the minority is that H.R. 10128, if enacted, would allocate funds without regard to need or financial ability to construct schools. It constitutes a sort of Government "payola" whereby the States are led to expect something for nothing, whereas, in reality, none will ever recover what it is compelled to put into the program by way of additional taxation. In fact, many, including some of the poorer of the States, may find themselves in the position of being taxed without any appreciable possibility of recovering on their investment for this reason. Section 7(a) states:

The amount allotted to any State under section 4 for any year shall be reduced by the percentage (if any) by which its State school effort index for such year is less than the national school effort index for such year. The total of such reductions shall be reallotted among the remaining States by proportionately increasing the amounts allotted to them under section 4 for such year.

According, if a poorer State finds itself incapable of raising by legislative enactment enough for maintaining its school system, plus a sum sufficient to meet the "State school effort index" prescribed by this bill, it will in effect be paying taxes to support a program from which it cannot profit.

The bill, by implication, looks to future extensions, for it makes provision for this option:

In lieu of making grants of State funds required under subsection (a), any State which wishes to pay the principal and interest annually becoming due on bonds or other obligations issued to finance school facilities projects may elect to have its allotment (or a designated portion thereof) for any fiscal year made available to it in the form of Federal commitments to pay all of the principal and interest annually becoming due on an equivalent amount of such bonds or other obligations.

Obviously a billion dollar appropriation, spread over 3 years, as contemplated by H.R. 10128, would not be adequate to assist States with bond issues within the life of the bill.

Though H.R. 10128 relates only to Federal aid for school construction, as already indicated, we should not overlook the fact that S. 8, which also includes aid for teachers' salaries, has already passed the Senate and is now pending before the House Committee on Education and Labor. Enactment of H.R. 10128, which is not needed, would be only a prelude to enactment in this session and forever hereafter of vast appropriations not only for school construction purposes but teachers' salaries and other educational purposes. For that reason, the question of Federal aid for teachers' salaries should also be discussed as a component of the general subject.

The matter of teachers' salaries and teacher shortage seems to deserve the thoughtful attention of every right-minded citizen. I should like to say here that all of my adult life with the exception of 4 years spent in military service during World War II was devoted to the field of education, until I came to Congress in 1953. I was a high school teacher, a high school principal, and I held an administrative office in a university for a total service of 21 years in the cause of education. My home is Gainesville, Fla., the home of the great University of Florida. Some of my closest and dearest friends and associates are engaged in the field of education.

I am well aware of the acute need of better teacher salaries. I know from experience the sacrifice entailed in trying to maintain minimum decent standards of living for one's self and one's family on a teacher's salary. I am aware of the fact that participation in the adventures and uncertainties of the new space age will require greater numbers of technically and scientifically trained personnel. I am aware of the present rapid increases and predicted future increases in the public school enrollments.

Because of my personal interest in the subject of teachers' salaries, I have been pleased to observe the increased and deserved attention given this matter in recent years. Florida enacted a minimum foundation law several years ago which has brought substantial relief by way of increased salaries to our teachers. Although salaries for competent teachers are not yet so adequate as they ought to be, I call attention to the relative increased earnings of teachers as a group, compared with Federal Government employees and other persons working for wages or salaries during the period 1929 to 1958:

Earnings of teachers and other groups 1929 and 1958

	Teachers	All persons working for wages or salaries	Civilian employees of Federal Government
1929 (actual dollars)	$1,400	$1,405	$1,933
1929 (in 1958 dollars)	2,358	2,366	3,255
1958 (actual dollars)	4,792	4,324	5,514
Percent increase in constant dollars	+103	+83	+69

Since the turn of the century there has been a gradual downward trend in the ratio of pupils to teachers in our public schools. During a 60-year period student enrollment increased 132 percent, instructional staff increased 234 percent, and the ratio of pupils to teacher declined by 30 percent, indicating that a sufficiently large number of persons have been attracted to the teaching profession to bring about a constant lowering of pupil-teacher ratios.

During the past decade there has been a substantial increase in the number of college students whose professional choice is directed toward the field of education. Should this favorable trend continue for another decade beginning with 1960, the output of teachers will be doubled, while the annual increase in school enrollment should be only about half as much as it was in the last half of the decade just ending.

The same question raised in conjunction with the question of Federal assistance for school construction may be asked here: If the Government through a Federal assistance program makes grants to States for teachers' salaries, would the magnificent effort made at the State and local level for insuring more remunerative teachers' salaries be maintained? Would there not be a lessening of local effort when confronted with the reality of Federal aid?

I come now to the crucial point of conflict in the controversial issue of Federal aid for education, and that is Federal control. The fear engendered by the threat of a Federal-controlled system of education is genuine. Aside from the questionable constitutionality of Federal aid for education, the chief obstacle to enactment of such legislation in the past has been an overriding fear of the consequences of Federal control of our educational system. Woodrow Wilson once said that:

The history of liberty is the history of the limitation of governmental power, not the increase of it.

I need not remind this Congress that it was the educational control of Germany—of German youth—under the Nazi regime, after Hitler came to power, and the control of all educational media in the Soviet Union after the 1917 Revolution which first conditioned Germany to precipitate a catastrophic world war, and secondly, enabled Russia to threaten increasingly and unceasingly the peace of the world since the end of that war.

Speaking as the father of three children, I fear possible Federal control over the schools of this Nation as much as I do the menace of communism itself. If and when our educational system passes to the Federal Government, the Constitution of these United States, with all of its matchless guarantees of freedom, will be rendered obsolete.

All of the recent bills introduced, relating to the subject under discussion, have tried to allay the underlying fear of Federal control by including a section to this effect:

In the administration of this act, no department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States shall exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the policy, determination, personnel, curriculum, program of instruction, or the administration or operation of any school or school system.

Let me say emphatically that I believe this particular clause, although representing the sincere sentiments of those who formulated it, is no more than a pious platitude. Whenever you have the type of overall educational support for school construction or teachers' salaries on the Federal level, called for in the Federal aid for education bills, you will inevitably have Federal control.

Management of a Federal aid program, if enacted, would be vested in the Commissioner of Education of the U.S. Office of Education. Two former U.S. Commissioners of Education unequivocally have declared that Federal

aid without Federal control is an illusion. Dr. Jno. J. Tigert, former U.S. Commissioner of Education and president emeritus of the University of Florida—my alma mater—has said:

If we embark upon a program of turning over Federal money to schools without any strings attached, it is only a question of time until the waste, extravagance, and misuse of these funds will result in a reaction or a change. The alternative is Federal control.

Dr. Samuel M. Brownell, another U.S. Commissioner of Education, stated:

On the one hand, we have presented to us arguments that there will be no Federal control accompanying Federal aid. Alongside, we find evidence showing the inadequacy and inequality of education in States able to support a good educational program, and evidence of inefficient or inadequate efforts by these States to eradicate inequality and inefficiency within their borders. If there is to be little or no Federal control accompanying Federal aid, what right have we to expect a major improvement of the education within States under the same leadership that they now have? Thus, if Federal aid is to bring about better schools, it seems apparent that there must be some Federal control.

I realize that times are different and great changes have taken place in our political and economic thinking since these gentlemen spoke out a number of years ago. This fact is dramatically borne out by the following:

When the national defense education bill came up for consideration before the Congress during the close of the 85th Congress in 1958, it was represented as a temporary emergency need specifically related to our defense effort. It was our partial answer to the sputnik launching. But, I fear it was motivated by a more far-reaching objective—eventual Federal support for American education on a large scale. The fears engendered by Russian scientific progress had excellent propaganda value in gaining an entering wedge for such a change in traditional policy, which theretofore had been barred under the impact of sound public opinion. I call attention to remarks of the present U.S. Commissioner of Education, Mr. Lawrence G. Derthick, made on November 24, 1958:

The National Defense Education Act represents a major breakthrough in the area of Federal concern for education. Its impact will be felt for many years to come. Congress has taken a significant step forward in the field of education.

This act was hailed by professional and nonprofessional educators as one of the most important legislative measures of the Congress. But this act is already under severe criticism by many who report "scents of Federal control." According to press reports, widespread dissatisfaction with the act has been expressed by some of the Nation's school administrators. The act has been described as having "Federal control written into it" in spite of honest congressional efforts to the contrary.

The lack of restrictions imposed by the Federal loan funds have, I understand, often set aside well established and smoothly working State programs, and the latter have been replaced by undesirable aspects of Federal control which proponents of Federal aid are always insisting will never come to pass.

It is the consensus of opinion among some of the outstanding deans of graduate schools that there is grave danger in the method of awarding fellowships under the act. I fear if the U.S. Office of Education should be given enough money to control 25 percent of the fellowship awards in our universities, and if methods already initiated are continued, our system of graduate education would be forcefully directed and almost exclusively directed from Washington, D.C. Few institutions would care to institute programs which the U.S. Office of Education would fail to support, while meritorious programs would wither from lack of strong students and the competitive incentives which Federal aid provides. Emphasis has been placed by those administering the act on new and expanded graduate programs, leading, it is feared to Federal support of programs of questionable quality in untried situations and in second-rate institutions which presently are unable to provide even the basic support needed for already-established programs.

Speaking at a nationwide convention of the American Association of School Administrators, Dr. Degar Fuller, executive secretary of the Council of Chief State School Officers, in outlining experiences that have alerted school men to flaws in what they otherwise considered a welcome act, said:

It has Federal control in it, because there is a Bureau of the Budget, a Bureau which is manned with people who feel their duty is to follow every dollar down to the end. When this situation obtains, there is bound to be Federal control, there is no way to prevent Federal bureaus from following every Federal dollar to the end.

As I have stated before, in my opinion, every American citizen has an obligation to do all in his power to insure an adequate school system for the students of today and tomorrow. In spite of the magnificent progress that we have made, there is a continuing need to do better, to provide more and better facilities, a greater number of better trained teachers, and more adequate compensation for dedicated teachers. Men of good will in this Congress and out are divided on the best ways to meet the challenge which an adequate educational system for America poses. We are beset with statistics from the National Education Association, the U.S. Office of Education, the Rockefeller Brothers, and other sources reiterating limiting factors in our educational system. A sort of national inferiority complex has developed because of reported educational advances made in the Soviet Union in recent years. Much of the pressure now on Congress stems, I fear, from the propaganda value which long-time proponents of Federal aid have derived from visitors' reports on Russian education. I do not believe we should be pressured by fear into actions that may have a disastrous effect on our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, the amendment about which I talked at the beginning of my remarks is not altogether new in concept. A similar amendment has been introduced in previous years. My amendment, in brief, would provide that 1 percent of all income taxes collected on individual and corporate income under Federal statutes be returned to the States and territories within which it is collected for use for educational purposes only, without any Federal direction, control, or interference.

The amendment I propose would meet, I sincerely believe, the many and significant objections that have been raised to Federal aid for education bills that have been introduced in successive congressional sessions. It would provide substantial additional assistance for school purposes in the simplest sort of way. While it might not initially provide the resources envisioned by some of the bills that have been introduced, it is conceivable that, with any attenuation in the defense or military needs of the Nation, the amounts returned to the States would more than take care of their increasing educational needs. I could wish, too, that my bill, if enacted, might establish a precedent whereby, in the future, there would be a return of additional tax funds to the States with an accompanying return of programs which rightfully are the responsibility of the States.

My amendment, if enacted, would first of all provide a large measure of aid for education without additional taxation. Any increase of Federal taxes or in the Federal debt, which would be necessary to finance other proposals now before the Congress, would be prevented.

Second. It would definitely not contribute to the socialization of our educational system.

Third. It would require no additional Federal agency, nor extension of any existing Federal bureaucracy to handle the remittances to the various States.

Fourth. The distribution would be fair and just, because a State would receive funds in proportion to Federal income tax collections within it. By making this specific money available at a time of need, State efforts to meet the demands of their own educational programs might be encouraged while the avenues of Federal control, as already pointed out, would be eliminated.

Fifth. There is a precedent for earmarking certain Federal tax collections. Congress has for several years directed that funds equal to revenues from certain taxes shall be made available to the States for designated purposes, that is to say, proceeds of excise taxes on firearms, shells, and cartridges are used for wildlife restoration, and excise taxes on fishing rods, and so forth, for fish restoration and management projects; and certain Federal tax collections in Puerto Rico, Virgin Islands, Guam, and American Samoa are now made available for the exclusive use of such possessions.

Sixth. One of the greatest arguments that proponents of a gigantic aid program for education have is that the Federal Government has appropriated to itself all of the so-called attractive tax raising sources such as the income tax. What I propose would take some of that

income tax and give it back to the States to use exactly as they want to use it in the field of education.

Mr. Speaker, my amendment, if enacted into law, would give us a saner approach to the fiscal problems of this Nation. It would make us realize that money does not grow on trees and, if we appropriate money in Washington, we are going to have to raise the money from the people of the respective States. I sincerely believe that my amendment would meet with general approval for if it were enacted it would effectively stay the hand of reckless spending and the inevitable Federal control that would come as a result of other measures now before the Congress.

I am sure that I speak for a vast number of our citizens when I say that we should keep our hands completely off a vast new program of Federal aid for education. With increased local citizen interest in education, and accelerated State efforts on behalf of the schools, we shall find each citizen doing his own part in support of education. In this manner current demands will be met and foundations for the future soundly laid. The success of the public school system of America depends, after all, upon the participation, interest, and support of all citizens in every community of the Nation. The work of the State and local governments in education has, in the past, given us an educational system unequalled in the world. These same efforts can yet best serve us if we but allow them to do so.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to include at this point in the RECORD the amounts of tax money to be returned to the States for educational purposes, in the event my amendment is passed. The statistics are for 1958; the amounts for 1960 would, of course, be much greater. I earnestly appeal to each of you to vote for this amendment and to avoid the evils of Federal control of education and the useless pyramiding of our Federal debt:

State or region	Income tax collections, fiscal 1958 [1]	1 percent of tax collected
Alaska	$41, 531, 000	$415, 310
Alabama	473, 419, 000	4, 734, 190
Arizona	224, 899, 000	2, 248, 990
Arkansas	174, 185, 000	1, 741, 850
California	5, 891, 243, 000	58, 912, 430
Colorado	824, 622, 000	8, 246, 220
Connecticut	1, 240, 454, 000	12, 404, 540
Delaware	771, 539, 000	7, 715, 390
Florida	991, 644, 000	9, 916, 440
Georgia	743, 900, 000	7, 439, 000
Idaho	129, 181, 000	1, 291, 810
Illinois	5, 647, 218, 000	56, 472, 180
Indiana	1, 456, 282, 000	14, 562, 820
Iowa	585, 562, 000	5, 855, 620
Kansas	489, 738, 000	4, 897, 380
Kentucky	535, 661, 000	5, 356, 610
Louisiana	609, 711, 000	6, 097, 110
Maine	180, 880, 000	1, 808, 800
Maryland and District of Columbia	1, 580, 683, 000	15, 806, 830
Massachusetts	1, 987, 301, 000	19, 873, 010
Michigan	4, 610, 879, 000	46, 108, 790
Minnesota	1, 124, 961, 000	11, 249, 610
Mississippi	163, 489, 000	1, 634, 890
Missouri	1, 644, 189, 000	16, 441, 890
Montana	130, 512, 000	1, 305, 120
Nebraska	386, 909, 000	3, 869, 090
Nevada	92, 574, 000	925, 740
New Hampshire	142, 487, 000	1, 424, 870
New Jersey	2, 109, 289, 000	$21, 092, 890
New Mexico	149, 509, 000	1, 495, 090
New York	13, 519, 459, 000	135, 194, 590
North Carolina	823, 112, 000	8, 231, 120
North Dakota	85, 104, 000	851, 040
Ohio	4, 728, 546, 000	47, 285, 460
Oklahoma	607, 327, 000	6, 073, 270
Oregon	446, 569, 000	4, 465, 690
Pennsylvania	4, 985, 558, 000	49, 855, 580
Rhode Island	289, 145, 000	2, 891, 450
South Carolina	274, 185, 000	2, 741, 850
South Dakota	84, 108, 000	841, 080
Tennessee	577, 334, 000	5, 773, 340
Texas	2, 411, 953, 000	24, 119, 530
Utah	181, 184, 000	1, 811, 840
Vermont	70, 540, 000	705, 400
Virginia	851, 945, 000	8, 519, 450
Washington	847, 471, 000	8, 474, 710
West Virginia	314, 080, 000	3, 140, 800
Wisconsin	1, 290, 021, 000	12, 900, 210
Wyoming	64, 075, 000	640, 750
Hawaii	157, 330, 000	1, 573, 300
Puerto Rico	20, 013, 000	200, 130
Total	67, 763, 510, 000	677, 635, 100

[1] Figure used for the total tax collected was obtained by combining figures reported for State income and employment taxes and State corporation income and profit taxes (including tax on business income of exempt organizations).

Source: U.S. Treasury Department. Combined statements of receipts, expenditures and balances of the U.S. Government for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1958, pp. 116-117.

KINZUA DAM PROJECT

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a statement.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, last Friday the Subcommittee on Public Works reported out the appropriation bill for 1961. In spite of a rising tide of public concern over the so-called Kinzua Dam project, $4.53 million is being appropriated for this project in fiscal 1961. The Kinzua Dam will require the flooding of 9,077 acres in the Allegheny Reservation of the Seneca Nation of Indians, cutting the heart out of what is left of Seneca land. It is the general belief that the Kinzua project will ultimately destroy the Seneca Nation by separating them from their beloved lands. For the past 3 years a swelling controversy has raged around the possibility of alternate projects accomplishing as much or more than the Kinzua, without hurting the Seneca Indians. Dr. Arthur Morgan, a former chief engineer for the TVA and a renowned expert in hydraulic engineering, has prepared a thorough comparison of the Kinzua Dam and the alternate Conewango Dam projects. Under unanimous consent, I include Dr. Morgan's analysis in the RECORD at this point for the benefit of all Members:

A COMPARISON OF THE KINZUA PLAN AND THE CONEWANGO PLAN FOR CONTROL OF THE UPPER ALLEGHENY RIVER

(Statement presented to the Subcommittee on Public Works of the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations by Arthur E. Morgan, May 5 and 6, 1959)

There are two proposed methods for controlling the Upper Allegheny River for flood control, and for increasing the low-water flow downstream.

DESCRIPTION OF THE TWO PROJECTS

The Kinzua plan provides for a dam across the Allegheny River a few miles above Warren, Pa. It would store water during floods, and let it out as soon as possible afterward, so as to be ready for the next flood. Also, it would store a limited amount of water, claimed by the Corps of Engineers to be 550,000-acre feet, for increasing the low-water flow.

The Conewango plan would divert the flow of the Allegheny River through a 6-mile channel into a large glacial depression, where it would be stored for flood control and for increasing the low-water flow. The regulated low-water flow would pass partly down the Allegheny and partly down the channel of Conewango Creek. In case of a flood too large to be held in the Conewango Reservoir, the excess would be passed through an outlet channel and through control gates to Cattaraugus Creek, and so to Lake Erie.

The Conewango-Cattaraugus site is a rare occurrence in nature. Being out of the ordinary and unexpected, it is not surprising that the possibility was overlooked. Before the last glacial period the Allegheny River flowed north into Lake Erie. The ice of the glacial period dug a big hole, in the same way that it dug the Finger Lakes in New York State, and pushed the earth and rock ahead of it, making a dike which turned the Allegheny River away from Lake Erie and to the Ohio River. If we cut through this dike, and use this glacial hole to store water, we have a reservoir with about three times the capacity of Kinzua. The old Allegheny River channel and South Cattaraugus Creek provide a rock gorge, for much of its distance hundreds of feet deep, to carry away the excess floodwater to Lake Erie. A diversion channel about 5 miles long would carry floodwater from the Conewango Reservoir to this deep-rock gorge, and just before it enters the gorge there would be control works to regulate the flow.

Where the Conewango Creek flows out of this Conewango Reservoir site there would be a relatively small dam, which would control the flow. Here the part of the regulated low-water flow which did not pass directly down the Allegheny River would pass down Conewango Creek, entering the Allegheny at Warren, Pa. Conewango Reservoir would completely protect Warren, Jamestown, and the area between from floods from the upper Conewango Creek. Kinzua would give no protection from floods on the lower Conewango.

Just below where a channel would divert the Allegheny River into Conewango Reservoir there would be a relatively small dam across the Allegheny to prevent any flood water from flowing down the Allegheny. Thus, all floodflows from above that point would be entirely removed from the Allegheny and Ohio Rivers. Most of that floodwater could be stored in Conewango Reservoir for use during low water. In case of unusually large floods the excess would pass down the very large preglacial channel of the Allegheny (Cattaraugus Creek) to Lake Erie. A limited amount of regulated low-water flow should be passed down that channel to take care of a very bad pollution condition on the Cattaraugus Creek.

Most of the Conewango Reservoir site is a great marsh, much of it useless. The margins are used for pasture. Almost no one lives on the marsh, but there are dairy farms and several villages around the edges. There are almost no industries in the locality. It is an economically depressed area. The parts of the villages which would be flooded could be moved up the hill for a fraction of a mile without destroying or disrupting the communities. A permanent lake of at least 28 square miles would be created, with all its recreational and economic advantages.

I shall have time here to present only a summary of our findings with reference to the Kinzua and Conewango projects. The evidence and the details which support these findings are given in a longer statement which I shall supply to the Committee. I have dealt with this situation from

the background of more than 50 years of almost uninterrupted experience with water control projects. Incidentally, several of my most striking successes have resulted from a persistent policy of overall exploration of situations in search of unexpected possibilities which conventional or routine engineering had overlooked. At this late date I would not risk my professional reputation on an irresponsible venture. I am thoroughly convinced that my conclusions are sound.

AN ENGINEERING OVERSIGHT

There was an engineering oversight more than 30 years ago when the Kinzua plan was, in fact, selected. Unless that oversight is corrected, Pittsburgh, Warren, and other cities will have less flood protection from the upper Allegheny that they need, and far less than is readily available by the use of Conewango. Unless corrected, that oversight will cost the country much more than $100 million, and probably three or four times as much, in added cost or loss of values. This is not an irresponsible guess, but the result of applying the methods used by the Corps of Engineers in estimating benefits for requesting appropriations; or in one case, determination of costs or loss by the rules established by the American Association of Highway Officials.

In the years since the original oversight, much officework and some fieldwork has been done on the details of Kinzua, and massive reports on those details have been made by the corps, but no general exploration and study have been made either by the corps, or by engineers employed by the corps, to review the original decision of more than 30 years ago, as to what alternative possibilities existed. The best of those alternative possibilities remained undiscovered and unrecognized. This statement applies to the recent work of the Tippetts firm, which was employed by the corps, as well as the work of the corps itself.

I am not here to criticize or blame. The issue far transcends personalities. If we are correct, and we believe that we are, the country will gain greatly by adoption of the Conewango plan. Fortunately, as rarely occurs, the opportunity exists to correct an oversight of 30 years standing.

KINZUA IS INADEQUATE

The trouble with Kinzua is that it does not have enough storage capacity, and that it cannot be enlarged. The approximate location of the Kinzua Dam site is fixed by natural conditions, and cannot be changed. The city of Salamanca, located in the valley bottom, upstream from the dam, sets the limit of how far upstream the water can be stored. Kinzua has capacity for just so much storage, and no more. No amount of engineering calculations can change those hard facts.

Kinzua storage is not enough. All the Corps of Engineers can do with Kinzua is to whittle down their estimates of requirements until they are as small as the absolutely limited capacity of Kinzua, and then to call those quantities enough. This whittling down has been of serious proportions.

To begin with, the corps decided that Pittsburgh needs to be protected against only half of the maximum probable flood, as determined by the U.S. Weather Bureau, at the request of the corps. The great flood catastrophes of the short history of our country have mostly come from rare, unusual, so-called unprecedented storms. I believe that, in view of the concentration of people and property at Pittsburgh, and the extreme vulnerability of that city to floods, it would be good policy to provide a greater degree of protection. With Kinzua such increase is impossible.

In contrast, Conewango, at a cost of $25 million less than the Army estimate for Kinzua, and $50 million less than the real cost of Kinzua, would fully and completely protect Pittsburgh and Warren from the most extreme flood, up to 2½ or 3 times what Kinzua would fully protect against, and would provide as much storage as is claimed for Kinzua for increasing low waterflow.

If the capacity of Conewango should be increased to the point where it would cost $105 million, or $8 million less than the Army Engineers estimate for Kinzua, and I recommend that course, Conewango would not only protect against the most extreme maximum flood, but in addition would have capacity to store three times as much water as is claimed for Kinzua for increasing the low waterflow. The findings summarized here are on the basis of that larger capacity. Such storage would enable Conewango to store for low-water increase the entire year's flow during low-water years, and in addition to hold over much of the flow of wet years for use in dry years.

Now, in order to consider some of the whittling down that must be done for Kinzua to make it appear large enough to give full protection from even half the maximum flood, let us assume for the moment that Pittsburgh needs to be protected from a flood only half as great as the probable maximum, as estimated by the Weather Bureau.

To begin with, the flood storage provided for Kinzua in the Army plans is not 50 percent of their own estimate of the maximum flood, but for only 43.2 percent. The deficiency is 117,000 acre-feet.

A further deficiency arises from the fact that, whereas the Army plans presume to store 745,000 acre-feet for flood storage, and 573,000 acre-feet for increasing low waterflow and for dead storage, yet the total storage capacity of the reservoir falls short of this amount by 138,000 acre-feet. The reasons why, in case of Kinzua, the same storage space cannot be used both for flood control and for low water storage are given in our longer statement.

Again, the Army plans for Kinzua have inadequate provisions for snow on the ground at the time of the flood storm. Here is a deficiency which may amount to 200,000 acre-feet or more.

The Army plans assume that two-thirds of the storm rainfall would run off, including snowmelt, if any. We have dependable record, for a similar area on flatter land—the Dayton flood of 1913—with similar rainfall conditions, with no snow on the ground, where the runoff was more than 90 percent of the rainfall. If we assume even 80 percent of runoff, instead of 66 percent, this deficit is 158,000 acre-feet.

These items, amounting to more than 600,000 acre-feet, indicate a very large deficiency below a factor of safety which would be desirable, even on the basis of protecting against only half the maximum flood. That deficiency is more than the entire storage assumed to be provided for low water control.

Against such possibilities and uncertainties, reasonably conservative engineering judgment will seek for a margin of safety, especially as some of these possibilities tend to be cumulative—that is, they tend to accentuate each other, and to occur at the same time. It is the good fortune of the Upper Allegheny situation that all this factor of safety, and much more, can be secured by the Conewango plan at less than the cost of Kinzua. And, because of the smaller and simpler structures required, the Conewango construction would require 2 years less time.

If we consider that protection against two-thirds of the maximum storm would be desirable, rather than against a storm half the maximum, the deficiency would be increased by about 290,000 acre-feet, making a total deficiency for Kinzua of more than the whole flood control storage planned for Kinzua.

THE ECONOMIC AND HUMAN LOSS OF KINZUA

Additional storage capacity, to provide a reasonable margin of safety against even half the probable maximum flood at the Army estimate of the cost per acre-foot of storage in Kinzua, would be worth $57 million.

The storage of three times as much water for increase of low waterflow, estimated by methods adopted by the U.S. Public Health Service and the Corps of Engineers, would have an additional value of $9 million to $30 million.

The Army plans for Kinzua require that after a flood the flood-control portions of the reservoir shall be emptied as soon as possible, at the rate of 25,000 cubic feet per second, so as to have storage space for the next flood. That water must go down the Allegheny past Warren, to Pittsburgh and into the Ohio River. To empty the Kinzua Reservoir at this rate after a standard design flood would take about 3 weeks. In at least three quarters of the cases this release would be during the flood season, just the time of year when the Ohio and Mississippi are most likely to be in flood.

Moreover, a decision would have to be made at the time of every moderate flood whether to recognize the possibility of a subsequent great storm and to keep storage space for it by letting the early part of the flood go down to Pittsburgh, with moderate damages of from $3 million to $30 million, or to hold the water behind the Kinzua Dam and save Pittsburgh the moderate damages, but to take the chance of having used up the storage, and so of having exhausted that much storage capacity when the catastrophic flood comes. Usually the guess that the flood will be moderate would be right. Only in case of great floods would it be wrong. In every one of the more than 25 cases where the Corps of Engineers has estimated the benefits which would have accrued to Pittsburgh if Kinzua had been built, they assumed that only a moderate flood would occur. The operation of the Kinzua Dam, as the Corps of Engineers announce they would operate it, would be on the assumption that there would be no storm greater than 43.2 percent of the probable maximum, and that none of the possibilities and exigencies I have mentioned would occur. Kinzua would protect Pittsburgh from moderate flood losses only at the risk of increasing damage from a very large flood. With Conewango, no such issue arises, since the storage capacity plus discharge capacity to Lake Erie is more than ample for all purposes.

As another element in the situation, the National Government is spending hundreds of millions of dollars to control floods throughout the Ohio and Mississippi River Valleys. This commonly is by storage reservoirs, which can hold the flood back for a limited time. The Conewango plan would take the part of this unwanted water which could not be stored in Conewango for increase of the low water supply, and would remove it entirely from the Ohio-Mississippi River system, discharging it into Lake Erie. Taking the value of removing such excess of floodwater as it is variously estimated by the Army Engineers, we have an estimated value of somewhere between $60 million to $200 million.

There is another serious disadvantage of Kinzua. The Kinzua Reservoir would destroy the only water level highway through the mountains in that region, one of the finest highway locations in Pennsylvania, and would replace it with a steep, crooked two-lane highway along the precipitous mountainside, with grades of 10 percent at sharp curves. This would then be one of the

poorest through highways in Pennsylvania—far below the minimum standards for American highways. Using the basis of estimate established by the American Society of Highway Officials, we estimate the loss and damage of this change, which is a proper element of cost of Kinzua, to be $25 million. Conewango does not have any similar item.

The Allegheny Valley from Warren to Salamanca is one of the finest recreation, fishing, and hunting areas in Eastern America, as is indicated in the report of the Army Engineers. The valley bottom provides almost the only winter forage for the deer and wild turkey in the State parks adjoining it, and is essential to the maintenance of the good hunting. All this would be destroyed by Kinzua Dam, whereas Conewango would not only preserve this resource and give it a good nearly uniform flow of water the year round, but in addition, would create another recreation area far greater than the lake at Kinzua. The loss of public value due to the destruction of the Allegheny Valley recreation area would run into millions of dollars.

The Kinzua project would require the removal of the Pennsylvania Railroad from a long stretch of the Allegheny Valley. In view of its use as a heavy coal-carrying route and of actively pending industrial developments along the valley, especially in papermaking, this is a matter of consequence.

In the entire Ohio-Mississippi River system there is no other point where a given amount of storage for increasing low water flow would be so valuable. Conewango would double the minimum flow of the Ohio at Pittsburgh, and for some distance below, and would increase the minimum flow through the entire length of the Ohio and lower Mississippi Rivers. Because of salt beds, cheap coal, and abundant labor, this area promises to be the chemical industry center for America, the chief limiting factor being the water supply. Conewango would conserve that to the utmost. Kinzua would waste the greater part of it.

ADVANTAGES OF CONEWANGO

The advantages of Conewango over Kinzua to which we have applied financial estimates, using the minimum figures in all cases, amount to more than $100 million, and if less than the maximum figures are used, to about $400 million.

It is almost embarrassing to mention such large figures in speaking of the advantages of Conewango over Kinzua, when a fraction of that difference should be conclusive. The fact is that in the Conewango setting and the natural enormous outlet channel to Lake Erie we have a most unusual situation. In probably not one reservoir building job in a thousand would one find such a combination of favorable conditions. But there it is, and these surprising values naturally follow from it. Why throw them away for the sake of not admitting an error of 30 years ago?

It may be argued that if Kinzua is built now, in a few years when the air is cleared, Conewango can then be built. But this would mean a great loss. The irreplaceable water-level highway along the Allegheny would have been destroyed. The exceptionally fine recreation area along the Allegheny would have been wiped out. And since both reservoirs are not needed, most of the cost of building Kinzua would have been wasted.

THE COST OF CONEWANGO

Now as to cost estimates for constructing Conewango. Our estimate is $60 million less than that of the Tippetts firm for the same degree of protection they planned. About half that difference is due to the fact that the Tippetts firm overlooked the best of the possibilities, that is, the outlet to Lake Erie by Cattaraugus Creek. When they started their study I told them that I had only begun to look into the many possibilities of Conewango and that further exploration might disclose great opportunities for economies. I urged them to make those further studies. They did not do that, but only looked into the specific suggestions I was able to make at the time they began. I continued my inquiry, and turned up other possibilities so much superior as to make my earlier suggestions obsolete. When I asked the Tippetts engineers to look into other possibilities I had found, they replied that they did not have time to do so. They never made a general study of the situation, and never qualified themselves to pass on all the major alternatives.

Diversion down the Cattaraugus, which the Tippetts engineers did not study, reduces the cost by $20 million under the plan for diversion down Silver Creek, which they did study. A proper treatment of the Pennsylvania Railroad, which they overlooked, further reduces the cost by about $9 million. These two corrections alone would reduce the Tippetts estimate of cost for Conewango to where it is no higher than Kinzua. But there are other large errors in the Tippetts estimate, to the extent of another $30 million.

Construction conditions for Conewango are strikingly different from those for Kinzua. For instance, excavation for Kinzua highways is on precipitous mountainsides, and a large part of it is in solid rock. In contrast to this, the principal earthmoving for Conewango highways is on level bottom land, where there is no rock, but only sand, gravel, and clay. There are millions of yards of this exceptionally favorable work, which would actually cost only about a third as much per cubic yard as would the earth and solid rock on the precipitous mountainside in Kinzua. The Army Engineers estimated $1 a cubic yard for this difficult mountainside earth and rock excavation. The Tippetts engineers took that price per yard and applied it throughout for highway and railroad earthmoving for Conewango, where the real cost would be about a third as much per cubic yard.

The Tippetts engineers took the same course concerning timber clearing. For the Kinzua job, the timber clearing is mostly on steep, rocky mountainsides, or along riverbanks where the trees lean toward the water, and fall into it when they are cut, making it necessary to haul each one out by cable. There are more than a hundred miles of such riverbanks on the Kinzua project. For the Kinzua job this clearing was estimated at $500 an acre. On the Conewango project the timber clearing is in large tracts of flatland, where modern clearing equipment is at its best, and where the actual cost per acre of clearing would be about a third as much for Kinzua. Yet here the Tippetts firm used the same price, $500 per acre, for the broad flatlands in Conewango as was used for the steep mountainsides and miles of riverbank clearing on Kinzua.

This same careless process of transferring unit costs on one job to very different conditions on another job was used in relation to earth dam construction. That is not responsible engineering.

Also, the Tippetts engineers, in estimating highway changes for Conewango, ignored the published and accepted standards of the U.S. Bureau of Public Roads and the New York Department of Public Works, which provide that such an improvement is responsible only for meeting the extra expense made necessary by the improvement. The Tippetts engineers planned farflung highway changes, with standards of construction far more expensive than anything now existing or (with the single exception of U.S. Route 17) beyond anything even remotely planned in that area, and charged the whole cost to the Conewango project, thus improperly adding millions of dollars to their estimate.

In order that there should be the least possible reason for differences of opinion about cost estimates, we used the Tippetts estimates unchanged except where we had clear reason and data for changing them. For a large part of the Tippetts estimates they give almost no data from which their estimates can be checked. We took their estimates without change in such cases, not because we think they are right, but because they gave almost no information for checking them. We believe they are too high by a further $5 to $10 million more of improper cost.

With the corrections in unit costs which I have mentioned, and with the change of outlet and treatment of the Pennsylvania Railroad, our estimate for Conewango to fully protect Pittsburgh and Warren from three times as large a flood as would Kinzua, and to store the same amount of water for low water increase, is somewhat less than $85 million. If the project should be enlarged to cost $105 million, which still is $8 million less than the Army engineers estimate for Kinzua, then in addition to all these values it would also store three times as much water as Kinzua for increasing the low water flow.

THE BASIS OF THE DECISION OF THE CORPS OF ENGINEERS AGAINST CONEWANGO

The Tippetts engineers, in their letter presenting their report to the Corps of Engineers, made just three points against the Conewango plan. They were:

First, that the plan would cost more;

Second, that more people would be displaced; and

Third, that more land would be taken.

The charge that Conewango would cost more is inaccurate.

As to persons displaced, the six villages in the Kinzua Reservoir would be completely buried under water, and according to the explicit statement of the Army Engineers, 90 percent of the population in the Kinzua Reservoir would have to be removed to entirely new locations at a considerable distance.

In the Conewango area, on the contrary, at least 75 percent of the persons affected live in six villages around the margins of the marsh. The parts of these villages which might be flooded would be moved up hill a fraction of a mile without interrupting the community life. These are extremely quiet places in an economically depressed area. In one of these village only one new house—a 4-room cottage—has been built in the past hundred years. These old villages would be changed to live communities in one of the best recreation areas in the region.

The Tippetts report improperly included the entire population of these villages among the persons displaced by the Conewango improvement. If these villages are omitted from the count, the displacement is far greater for Kinzua than for Conewango. Therefore, that criticism is misleading and inappropriate. Moreover, the Tippetts report failed to count approximately 400 of the 835 Indians who would be displaced by the Kinzua project.

As to land taken, it is not acres which count, but values. The Conewango Marsh has little value. Omitting the villages mentioned, the market value of the land, as estimated by the Corps of Engineers and by the Tippetts engineers, and including the State park land, is greater for Kinzua than for Conewango. That criticism of Conewango has no validity.

These three reasons are the only ones given by the Corps of Engineers to the public and to the Congress in announcing the decision rejecting the Conewango plan.

An engineering oversight of more than 30 years ago never has been competently reviewed during the years since, either by the

Corps of Engineers or by engineers employed by them. If not corrected, it will cause the loss of hundreds of millions of dollars in cost and values. If I should be able to contribute in some degree to preventing that loss, and to avoid the breaking of the oldest living treaty of our country, I should feel that I had at least justified my food and lodging for my lifetime.

Respectfully,

ARTHUR E. MORGAN.

APPENDIX

HOW THE CORPS OF ENGINEERS CHECKED ESTIMATES FOR THE DIVERSION PROJECT TO LAKE ERIE

When I testified before the Senate subcommittee in April 1957, my testimony and that of Barton M. Jones was given by Senator ELLENDER of the Senate subcommittee to the Corps of Engineers with a request that our estimates be appraised. Senator ELLENDER, chairman of the subcommittee, said:

"At this point I wish to state that I am going to ask Mr. Tofani to bring the suggestion of Mr. Morgan to the attention of the Army Engineers, and when I recall them in the next 2 weeks that they are prepared and give us an estimate of the costs and advisability of such a method to control the waters of the Allegheny.

"I wish to give you assurance that before this committee acts we shall go into the details of your views. * * * And I hope that the engineers give you the same treatment that you give to them. * * * I have been dealing with them, the Army Engineers, 20 years now. I haven't found them wanting." (Public Works Appropriation, 1958, pp. 2464, 2471, and 2473.)

Without doubt the action of Congress has been in part based on the assurances given them by the Corps of Engineers.

The reply of the corps to the Senate committee was characterized by a lack of understanding and an inaccuracy which we can scarcely imagine coming from a great public agency. The Conewango setting makes possible several different types of design. One of these, as described by Barton Jones in his testimony, calls for a very large channel, with 160 million yards of excavation, to carry all flood water quickly to Lake Erie below ground level, with almost no reservoir storage, and therefore requiring the taking of relatively little land—in this case 8,000 acres. It would, in fact, drain and reclaim several thousand acres of the Conewango marsh. Another type of design called for large storage capacity in that same marsh, requiring the taking of 32,000 acres of land, but calling for the excavation of 60 million cubic yards of earth—100 million cubic yards less.

In estimating the cost for the Senate committee, the corps took the big estimate of 160 million cubic yards of excavation from one type of plan, and the big estimate of 32,000 acres of land from another very different design, and included the cost of both as though they were part of one design. It would be physically impossible for these two major elements to be parts of the same plan.

The land to be taken by the large channel would be mostly in the lowest part of the Conewango marsh. The actual sales prices for the lowland which would be occupied by this channel, were recorded by the Tippetts engineers, runs from $6 to $30 per acre. The estimate presented by General Person is $567 an acre. Thus, General Person's estimate of the cost of land required is more than 75 times what it should be.

It is clear that whoever made this estimate was ignorant of the fundamental conditions of the plans for which he was making an estimate, and similarly uninformed as to the nature of the land taken and as to its going value. Of course, this resulted in a totally false and inaccurate estimate of cost.

This impossible combination of elements from strikingly different plants was accompanied by an excessive estimate of unit cost and the mistaken classification of material. The Corps of Engineers estimated that the work proposed in Mr. Jones' testimony would cost $200 million as against Mr. Jones' estimate of $80 million. The largest single item in the estimate of the corps, as estimated by General Person, was for construction of a section of large channel calling for the excavation of 77 million cubic yards of glacial sand, clay, and gravel.

Now the Tippetts engineers, who made their study a few months later, in the employ of the Corps, had a large item for substantially identical material, to be excavated under less favorable circumstances.[1] In that largest item in the project, their estimated cost, for identical material under less favorable conditions, was considerably less than half as much per cubic yard as in the estimate presented by General Person for the Corps of Engineers.

The work involved in this very large item is standard, large scale excavation, with no complications, and the cost can be estimated within quite narrow limits. On such work a difference of 25 percent either way from the mean would represent a very wide range for competent bidders who are financially and otherwise equipped to do the work to advantage. The variation of more than 100 percent in the estimates for such work is beyond all reason. It does not represent responsible estimating.

For another large item of 25 million cubic yards of identical material, that in the diversion channel, the estimated cost per cubic yard given to Senator ELLENDER by General Person for the corps is more than twice as high per cubic yard as that estimated by the Tippetts engineers for that identical material a few months later.

In addition the estimate which General Person presented to the Senate committee improperly classified more than 20 million cubic yards of excavation, and estimated it at more than five times the cost per cubic yard estimated by the Tippetts firm for substantially identical material. On these three earth moving items alone the estimate of the Corps of Engineers, as given to the Senate committee, is about $50 million higher than it would be at the Tippetts estimate of unit cost for the same material.

The very careful and detailed analysis we had made of this cost indicated that the Tippetts estimates are somewhat high. Our estimates were made by a man whose work for 25 years has been to make detailed working estimates by which large contractors make their bids on large earth moving contracts. The estimates he made for this work were in the same careful detail with which he makes estimates for contractors' bids.

The estimate made by General Person for the Senate committee might be excused on the ground that in the short space of 2 weeks no adequate estimate could be made, and that mistakes were probable. Yet when General Person presented this estimate to the Senate committee, he testified:

"We feel the studies have been completed, and that further studies would not affect our conclusion."

[1] The chief differences were that the length and size of the channel in the Person item was larger, and that therefore the cost of equipment per cubic yard would be less in the item estimated by the Corps of Engineers than in the item estimated by Tippetts; and that the larger dimensions of the Person item would be more favorable to the method of excavation proposed (by Tippetts), the use of suction dredge. The actual unit cost for the Person item would be about 15 percent or 20 percent less than for the Tippetts item.

That has been the position of the corps all along.

Is it not a serious matter that when a Senate committee specifically calls for the judgment of a great national agency as to the adequacy of an estimate it is considering, that this agency should present a statement prepared without even a rudimentary understanding of the work under consideration, and that its estimates of cost should be more than double those made by responsible engineers? Under such circumstances, what chance is there for a fair hearing to be had? This, I regret to say, is somewhat typical of the publicity which has issued from the Pittsburgh office of the corps.

LETTER TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KOWALSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a letter to the President.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. KOWALSKI. Mr. Speaker, a letter asking a series of questions on the U-2 incident and the summit meeting has been sent to the President of the United States by a large group of Members of the House.

The letter was sent to the White House Friday afternoon. Since then additional Members of the House have expressed a desire to sign their names to the letter.

A report listing additional signatures will be made to the House.

Mr. Speaker, following is the text of our letter to the President:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., May 20, 1960.

President DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am authorized by the undersigned Members of the House of Representatives to send you this letter.

We are distressed over the collapse of the summit meeting and the damage to our prestige and leadership in the world. The cause of world peace has been endangered. We believe that Congress and the people must ask the following questions. We believe it is the administration's responsibility to answer these questions:

1. Why was the U-2 flight over the Soviet Union ordered just prior to the summit meeting?

2. When the U-2 incident became public, why were a series of contradictory and false statements issued by administration officials—and who was responsible?

3. Why did the administration order a worldwide military alert from Paris on the eve of the summit?

4. Why did the administration first indicate that as a matter of national policy it would continue manned flights over Russia, and then reverse itself and say that it had ordered them discontinued?

5. Was it necessary to compromise the announced peaceful role of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) by using it as a cover for an espionage operation?

6. Why was there no coordination between the agency responsible for the U-2 flight and the agency responsible for our diplomatic functions?

7. Why did the President announce in advance that as our Chief of State he might return to Washington before the conference ended?

8. Has the traditional American policy of civilian supremacy over the military been impaired?

Cordially,

FRANK KOWALSKI, Member of Congress, Connecticut; CHET HOLIFIELD, 19th District, California; LEE METCALF, 1st District, Montana; STEWART L. UDALL, 2d District, Arizona; ROY W. WIER, 3d District, Minnesota; GERALD T. FLYNN, 1st District, Wisconsin; JAMES ROOSEVELT, 26th District, California; JEFFERY COHELAN, 7th District, California; THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ, 1st District, Michigan; WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD, 28th District, Pennsylvania; HENRY S. REUSS, 5th District, Wisconsin; ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER, 2d District, Wisconsin; FRANK THOMPSON, JR., 4th District, New Jersey; JOSEPH E. KARTH, 4th District, Minnesota; DON MAGNUSON, 7th District, Washington; LEONARD G. WOLF, 2d District, Iowa; B. F. SISK, 12th District, California; MERWIN COAD, 6th District, Iowa; DOMINICK V. DANIELS, 14th District, New Jersey; JOHN A. BLATNIK, 8th District, Minnesota; CLEMENT W. MILLER, 1st District, California; BYRON L. JOHNSON, 2d District, Colorado; J. EDWARD ROUSH, 5th District, Indiana; HARRIS B. MCDOWELL, JR., At Large, Delaware; JOHN F. SHELLEY, 5th District, California; EDITH GREEN, 3d District, Oregon; AL ULLMAN, 2d District, Oregon; CHARLES O. PORTER, 4th District, Oregon; JOHN BRADEMAS, 3d District, Indiana; LEROY H. ANDERSON, 2d District, Montana; JOHN D. DINGELL, 15th District, Michigan; JAMES C. OLIVER, 1st District, Maine; HUGH J. ADDONIZIO, 11th District, New Jersey; PETER W. RODINO, JR., 10th District, New Jersey; SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL, 7th District, Maryland; THOMAS L. ASHLEY, 9th District, Ohio; CHESTER BOWLES, 2d District, Connecticut; ELMER J. HOLLAND, 30th District, Pennsylvania.

Additional signers to letter to President on U–2 and summit:

THADDEUS J. DULSKI, 41st District, New York.

GEORGE P. MILLER, Eighth District, California.

KENNETH J. GRAY, 25th District, Illinois.

CECIL R. KING, 17th District, California.

CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR., 13th District, Michigan.

JOHN R. FOLEY, Sixth District, Maryland.

WINFIELD K. DENTON, Eighth District, Indiana.

VICTOR L. ANFUSO, Eighth District, New York.

EDNA F. KELLY, 10th District, New York.

DAN ROSTENKOWSKI, Eighth District, Illinois.

GEORGE A. KASEM, 25th District, California.

JAMES M. QUIGLEY, 19th District, Pennsylvania.

More names to be added to the list of signers for the letter to the President on the U–2 flight and summit:

LEONARD FARBSTEIN, 19th District, New York.

HERMAN TOLL, Sixth District, Pennsylvania.

WILLIAM H. MEYER, at large, Vermont.

EMANUEL CELLER, 11th District, New York.

JOHN H. DENT, 21st District, Pennsylvania.

EARL HOGAN, Ninth District, Indiana.

EMPLOYMENT DISCRIMINATION BECAUSE OF AGE

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, years ago this country recognized its responsibility to its children, and the first child labor laws were enacted. By the enactment of these laws, the Congress of the United States said that it believed there should be a minimum age established when a child could work.

The bill I introduce today will recognize another responsibility which I feel has become the responsibility of this Congress. That is to insure that men and women who desire to work, who are physically able, and who have proper technical skills and employment experience for the positions for which they apply, are permitted to work without regard to age.

Recent congressional hearings and studies reveal the fact that discrimination because of age can begin to haunt an individual as early as age 45 or even before. As our economy experiences more and more automation we find that workers in the 45 to 65 age group find it increasingly difficult to secure new employment.

To be unemployed because of age is a deep humiliation to a worker in the age group just mentioned, and jeopardizes the livelihood of themselves and their families. At the same time our Nation is deprived of one of our most valuable resources, the skill and experience of the mature person.

The American Legion and the Fraternal Order of Eagles, in both of which I am a member, have been concerned about this problem for some time, and I want to commend them for the educational campaign which they have carried forward to acquaint employers with the advantages of hiring workers in the 45 to 65 age bracket.

My bill would make discrimination because of age an unfair labor practice. It would amend the National Labor Relations Act by making it unlawful for an employer or a labor organization "to refuse to hire, to discharge, or otherwise discriminate against any individual with respect to his terms, conditions, or privileges of employment, otherwise lawful, because of such individual's age, when the reasonable demands of the position do not require such an age distinction."

Mr. Speaker, the reasons usually given for refusing to hire older workers is that they have "slowed down" or are "irregular in reporting on the job."

This assertion, Mr. Speaker, is not borne out by the facts which are included in the reports from the McNamara Subcommittee on the Aged and Aging in the United States, and a study conducted by the Department of Labor in 1956. These studies showed that older job seekers are more highly skilled and more stable in terms of job changes and job tenure than younger workers. Also, these studies showed that there were no significant differences in absenteeism and safety records between young and older workers.

The hearings of the McNamara subcommittee make it clear that little progress has been made through voluntary or State action, and that it must now become a national legislative issue to overcome discriminatory employment practices.

My bill will make it plain that national policy is strongly opposed to such a waste of human resources and manpower, and that we are determined to do something about it.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. BOWLES] be permitted to extend his remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and include extraneous matter, notwithstanding the fact that it is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $243; and that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] notwithstanding an estimated cost of $384.75, may have the same permission.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, can the gentleman tell us what is the total cost where these extensions exceed the authorized cost?

Mr. McCORMACK. On the two cases I have just referred to?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. One was in the sum of $384.75 and the other $243.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Both Democratic requests?

Mr. McCORMACK. I think that is an unnecessary observation.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Undoubtedly it is unnecessary, but——

Mr. McCORMACK. If we go into that, it will apply both ways.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill H.R. 12176.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

CASCADE, IOWA, MEDICAL CENTER EXAMPLE OF RURAL AMERICA IN SUCCESSFUL SELF-HELP PROGRAM

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. WOLF] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, America's increasing population and higher living standards have created the need for more and better hospital and medical facilities. The Federal Government has

already recognized this need, and its responsibility in this field by helping communities, through their State agencies, to construct those hospital and medical facilities which are necessary to meet their needs. It has done this through the well-known Hill-Burton hospital program.

This program has been a great help. The needs of all communities, however, cannot be accommodated as only those areas which State agencies determine have the greatest needs or priorities have been able to construct hospital and medical facilities with Hill-Burton matching funds.

There is located in my district in northeastern Iowa a community which provides an excellent example of the action which a community can follow when it finds that it must construct modern medical facilities, without Federal aid, in order to attract and keep a local doctor. The community to which I refer is Cascade, Iowa. It has a population of 1,500.

I would like to point out the tremendously vital service which the local newspaper performed in informing the citizens of the area of possible courses of action and in creating enthusiasm for the project. The efforts of the Cascade Pioneer-Advertiser contributed a great deal to the successful culmination of the community's efforts. The work of this newspaper, in stimulating local interest and cooperation, can serve as an example to other newspapers in communities with similar problems.

On June 4, 1959, the local newspaper, the Cascade Pioneer-Advertiser, carried an editorial pointing out the need for resident doctors and a hospital. The editorial stated:

CASCADE NEEDS RESIDENT DOCTORS; HOSPITAL HERE DEEMED NECESSARY

What is one of the major problems facing small town Americans? That might be cataloged under one heading, adequate medical service. Hundreds of small towns, all over the United States, have that vexing problem, among them Cascade. What is the true picture regarding medical doctors locating in small towns? If you, as a citizen, interested in your community, in its growth and well being were to ask that question of one or all three of the committee appointed within recent months by the Commercial Club to look into the local doctor situation, you would be greatly concerned and shocked.

The day of the old family physician is passé. Gone is the day when the old family doctor, answered your summons, day or night, in fair weather or foul. Probably one of the last of that kind, Dr. M. I. Nederhiser, is just now returning to office practice, following an illness of several months, brought on by overwork. In their place has come the specialist.

Today's doctors demand and get something more than just an office in which to practice. Yes, the doctor of today wants and must have hospital facilities. If those facilities are not available the doctor goes elsewhere.

It doesn't take a seer or someone versed in business projection to reach that conclusion. All it requires is a visit with one or all three local men acting as a doctor committee, or by your own personal contacts, both inside and out of the medical profession.

As one young doctor who recently visited Cascade put it, "Our class has it made. We can practically dictate our own ticket. This is a business proposition with us just as it is with anyone else about to engage in business. There must be adequate facilities available. What do you have to offer?"

Cascade as it is presently constituted is similar to other small towns needing additional medical service. It has plenty of work, too much for one doctor to handle. True hospital facilities are as near as 8 miles in one direction and 25 in another direction but evidently that does not suffice. They must be here.

One of Iowa's small towns which can boast to top medical service is Buffalo Center, population 1,200. It has three medical doctors, all under 40 years of age. How did they secure three such doctors? First and foremost the town has hospital facilities. Originally started by a Dr. Dromlage, the hospital with a recent new addition is 100 by 40 feet of brick design, modern in every way. It has 14 rooms containing 20 beds. Twenty-three people are on its payroll including nurses, nurses' aids, cooks, and so forth.

A basic requirement for any community, if it is long to remain in the sun, is to be constantly alert toward improving itself. One of those basic requirements is adequate medical service. What then must we do as citizens of this community to insure the health of not only ourselves but our neighbors, as well. We must meet those challenges which face the small town and make every attempt to solve them. First, by being a booster for community betterment and second, whenever and wherever possible to assist in a monetary manner.

On June 18, 1959, the Cascade Pioneer-Advertiser explained to its readers the Buffalo Center, Iowa, Hospital and Clinic project as follows:

BUFFALO CENTER HOSPITAL AND CLINIC

The town of Buffalo Center, population 1,200, has the above fine hospital available for use by the residents of the area. The hospital has 20 rooms and last year admitted 936 patients. Services available include: obstetrical, surgical, X-ray, complete lab, physical therapy, and general medical. Three young doctors are on the staff of the Buffalo Center Hospital, which was founded by a fourth doctor, Dr. George Francis Dolmage. Considerable effort is now being expended by interested persons trying to build a hospital in Cascade.

WHAT'S YOUR IDEA?

An editorial in this column 2 weeks ago on the possibilities of building a hospital here and through such a hospital alleviate our medical doctor shortage, drew much favorable comment. Everyone agreed a hospital or clinic should be built. Not only was the local comment favorable, but it was well received in other localities. The editorial pointed up the fact that Buffalo Center, a town of 1,200 people, which is about 300 smaller than Cascade, has its own hospital the 3 young medical doctors. That hospital is self-sustaining. The editorial was read over quite a wide area, as the writer has been told of a number of other towns who now have hospitals or realize they must provide better health facilities for residents of their communities. Three towns who are presently building hospitals or will get them underway shortly are Guttenberg, Cresco, and Decorah. Each of those three towns now have hospitals but within recent months those hospitals failed to meet State requirements. In each instance it was a case of either building a new hospital, completely revamping their present one, or just quitting. As can be imagined not one chose the last. On the contrary each decided to provide their people with the best facilities possible. Under such community momentum, new hospitals will be built, assisted by the Hill-Burton Federal plan which provides that the Federal Government furnish 33⅓ percent of the cost. Location of each of the towns mentioned bears out the fact they are within easy driving distance of other towns having hospital facilities. Buffalo Center is close to Clear Lake, Mason City, Lake Mills, and Forest City. Decorah is only 1 hour removed from the Mayo Clinic at Rochester. Guttenberg is the same distance or approximately so as is Cascade from Dubuque. Will we as a community unite and give the hospital or clinic our fullest consideration or shall we just forget the whole proposition?

On July 2, 1959, the Cascade Pioneer-Advertiser in citing the Guttenberg, Iowa, Hospital as an example, stated:

ANOTHER TOWN LOOKS FORWARD

Guttenberg, Iowa, a town of 1,900, 38 miles north of Cascade, with only 400 larger population, has broken ground for a beautiful new 30-bed hospital. It can in reality accommodate 40 beds. When complete it will be ultramodern and compare favorably with any Dubuque hospital, only on a smaller scale.

The present hospital at Guttenberg was condemned in recent months by the State board of health. It therefore became necessary to do one of three things, remodel the present structure, build a new one, or fold up, so to speak, insofar as home hospital facilities were concerned. Having had the many benefits, over a long number of years, that a hospital can and does bring, there was only one thought uppermost in the minds of the majority of the people of that community, and that was of course to build.

Originally it was planned to start on a small scale, around $50,000 to $100,000, a unit for the handling of minor surgery, confinements, etc. When the fund drive actually got under way there was so much enthusiasm generated it immediately became apparent they could do much better.

Application for a Federal grant brought the information that the area actually needed a 30-bed hospital, and on that premise, money would be available. To fulfill that requirement it was necessary for the community to project its thinking: $300,000 was raised by contributions, a $100,000 bond issue passed with the Government furnishing the $200,000.

Cascade does not need a $600,000 hospital or one of anywhere near that amount. The above does show, however, what another Iowa town, in our population bracket is doing to cement its community. What Cascade probably does need is what Guttenberg originally started out to get, a $50,000 to $100,000 hospital where minor surgery, confinements, etc., may be taken care of. We either move forward or slip backward. There is no middle ground insofar as community life is concerned. In your measured judgment which of the two has Cascade done in the past 3 years?

On July 16, 1959, the new medical clinic in Elizabeth, Ill., was cited by the Pioneer-Advertiser:

ANOTHER SMALL TOWN LOOKS FORWARD

Elizabeth, Ill., on U.S. Highway 20, is about 25 miles east of Dubuque and has a population of 800. It has recently completed a medical clinic at a cost of $28,000. Information provided by Mr. John H. Gerkman, owner of an appliance center bearing his name, furnishes the Pioneer-Adviser with the following data relative to that clinic:

The building is 44 by 36 and was built in accordance with the Sears-Roebuck Foundation plan. The Sears Foundation furnished the building plans free. Mr. Gerkman said it was not necessary for the Sears Foundation to help them further but that help was available. "The building is very modern," Mr. Gerkman wrote. "It is brick veneer, has two examination rooms, two treatment rooms, consultation room, nurse and reception room, large waiting room, emergency room, X-ray room, utility room, two washrooms. The building is air conditioned, gas heated."

Mr. Gerkman also writes they had been trying to secure a doctor for more than a year but none were approachable because of the lack of modern facilities.

An organization, known as the Elizabeth Development Association, numbering 14, was set up. Each member subscribed for $2,000 in shares, total $28,000. A board of directors and building committee were elected. This board took office in December of last year. Today, Mr. Gerkman writes, "We have a young doctor who likes the setup very much."

Mr. Gerkman invites people from this area who might be interested in the clinic to drive to Elizabeth and see it close up.

Having shown the residents of the area what other towns of comparable size had accomplished in providing adequate medical and hospital facilities for their people, the Pioneer-Advertiser on August 13, 1959, announced a community-wide hospital survey in Cascade under the direction of the Sears Foundation of Chicago, Ill., to ascertain the community needs in the way of increased hospital and medical services. The text of this announcement follows:

SURVEY TO DETERMINE MEDICAL STATUS

Going forward this week is an impartial random, communitywide sample survey to ascertain what this community needs in the way of increased medical services.

This survey is being made under the supervision and direction of Sears Foundation, Chicago, Ill. Assisting in the work are two separate groups, Cascade Woman's Club and members of a committee from American Legion and business circles which has been meeting regularly Monday evenings to try and seek an answer to more adequate medical service for this area.

NEED NEW INSTRUMENTS

Cascade is not the only small community which finds itself in the position of having curtailed medical service. Other small communities are likewise handicapped when competing with larger towns and cities for the services of doctors. The reason: doctors today need laboratories, X-rays, modern instruments—all the facilities of modern medicine to verify their diagnosis and speed patients' recovery.

MUST HAVE FACILITIES

Doctors now locate in cities where they have the facilities they need, at the local hospital. But if they settle in small communities they usually must either buy the equipment or do without.

Consequently, as doctors die or move away, few younger doctors take up their practice. The people in such communities are then forced to go to larger towns or cities for their medical care. And even when some doctors remain, who have inadequate facilities, the people rely on them mainly for emergencies and first aid. Their more serious ailments are treated by larger towns and city doctors.

NEED MODERNIZATION

To combat that, small communities like Cascade must provide themselves with modern medical facilities. Only then will competent young doctors be induced to settle in small communities, like ours. And only then will people of this area receive the quality of medical care they need.

WILL SHOW NEED?

The community survey which is now being conducted will show whether a definite need exists for a doctor or doctors in this community. This preliminary survey provides a factual evaluation of the medical needs of this area—and if such do exist the community has something of definite value with which to interest the doctor or doctors.

PROFESSIONAL ARCHITECT

Sears Foundation has retained a professional architect who specializes in medical architecture. Plans are available through them for a one- and two-doctor unit that is adaptable to local conditions, modern in design, and contains many built-in features. Complete plans and specifications are given to cooperating communities.

The community that provides modern medical facilities increases also its competitive position with larger communities in obtaining a physician. Sears, Roebuck Foundation has a close working relationship with the American Medical Association and the State medical societies. The foundation will also assist the doctor or doctors in setting up forms, accounting procedures and policies. It will also assist as an expert in medical business practice.

Sears, Roebuck Foundation is a nonprofit corporation and endowed by Sears, Roebuck & Co. to aid in the economic and social improvement of the American community.

In summing up what the committee has been doing and is still doing, with the help of the local woman's club, if the survey returns are favorable and a definite need is established for more adequate medical services, we must become more self-reliant and adopt also a do-it-ourselves plan, fashioned somewhat after the lines of those appearing in the Sunday daily newspapers. We either move forward or backward. There is no standing still.

A report on the medical economic survey was published in the Pioneer-Advertiser on September 10, 1959, as follows:

MEDICAL ECONOMIC SURVEY OF CASCADE, IOWA, BY THE SEARS, ROEBUCK FOUNDATION

It is the purpose of this survey to evaluate the community and its trade area as to its medical habits, economic potential, and ability to support a doctor. The foundation has been conducting such surveys for over 2 years and in those communities surveyed that have secured doctors, the doctors' actual experience shows, in every case, the economic potential as stated in the survey, to be conservative.

POPULATION COMPOSITION

Cascade, Iowa, is a town of 1,423 population, located 25 miles west of Dubuque. The population is mainly German and Irish, consisting of 42.7 percent adult, 57.3 percent children. Main industry is beef raising and farming.

HOSPITALIZATION

During the last 12 months, it is estimated 16.5 percent of the population was hospitalized. They went to:

Town:	*Distance (miles)*	*Percent*
Monticello, Iowa	10	48.3
Dubuque, Iowa	25	38.0
Iowa City, Iowa	60	12.6
Cedar Rapids, Iowa	45	1.1

The causes were:

	Percent
Medical	52.8
Surgical	26.4
Obstetrics	20.8

SICKNESS IN THE AREA

During the last 12 months there was an estimated 4,477, separate illnesses necessitating 8,155 individual visits to the doctor. This averages 27 patients a day visiting doctors. The breakdown shows these patients are visiting doctors in the following communities:

Town:	*Distance (miles)*	*Percent*
Monticello	10	61.5
Dubuque	25	20.8
Cascade	--	11.2
Dyersville	16	4.5
Other towns	--	2.0

DISTANCE TRAVELED

In order to visit doctors, the people of the Cascade area, in the last 12 months, traveled 228,580 miles. This averages 790 miles per day, round trip or roughly the distance from Cascade to Birmingham, Ala.

Economic potential

Estimated expenditure for medical care based on office calls and inoculations only	$22,675
Estimated expenditure for medicines (bought in towns other than Cascade)	17,000
Estimated annual expenditure for gas and oil driving to and from doctors offices	4,070
Total	43,745

In addition, these persons, when visiting doctors in neighboring towns purchase household supplies (other than medicines) estimated to total $72,530.

INSURANCE

Fifty-four percent carry hospital insurance.

Forty-three and three-tenths percent carry health insurance.

AN INVITATION

You and your family are urged to attend a meeting of utmost importance to the future of this entire community, a medical center, bringing with it increased medical coverage. This meeting will be held at 8 p.m., Monday, September 14 at Legion Pavilion, Cascade.

Speaker will be Mr. Norman H. Davis, from Sears Foundation, Chicago, Ill., who will tell us how we, as a community, may secure increased medical coverage.

Slides of other medical centers will be shown.

COMMITTEE ON EXPANSION FOR MEDICAL SERVICE.

A communitywide meeting was held on September 14, and the results of that meeting were reported by this local paper on September 17 as follows:

[From the Cascade (Iowa) Pioneer-Advertiser, Sept. 17, 1950]

OVERWHELMING MARGIN FAVORS CENTER PROJECT

By an overwhelming margin of 231 to 6, those persons attending Monday evening's public meeting voted to work with the Sears Roebuck Foundation to secure increased medical facilities for Cascade and community. The written vote was taken following a 2-hour meeting in Legion Pavilion.

Norman H. Davis, director of the foundation's medical program, gave a talk on the community medical assistance plan and showed slides of one- and two-doctor units the foundation has helped communities build.

The next step will be organizational. A nonprofit corporation will be formed and an executive committee appointed. This committee will then form solicitation teams for the fund raising which will be in the form of pledges of loans to the corporation. The pledges will be called in at a later date. Retirement of these loans (they are not donations) is determined by the executive committee and will be done as the corporation is financially able to do so. Income for the loans comes from rent of the doctors. The stockholders may decide at a later date if they wish to sell the building to the doctors, should they want to buy it.

Davis pointed out that no less than a 2-doctor unit should be considered for Cascade. The cost of such a medical center can be guaranteed by the foundation not to exceeed $35,000. That cost would be for a building 48 x 44 and would include everything but the doctors' equipment, which

they will purchase themselves. Davis pointed out that the Sears-Roebuck Foundation has nothing to sell, but is only interested in giving its services to those communities needing them.

SECURE DOCTORS

Another service that will be performed by the foundation will be to use its contacts with the placement service of the American Medical Association, the State medical society and the efforts of its own medical advisory board in interesting physicians to come to Cascade. Davis pointed out that when a community accepts the program offered by the Sears-Roebuck Foundation and raises money to build the medical center, then the foundation feels obligated to work toward securing doctors until they are successful. He said the foundation takes the responsibility of getting doctors because of working with the community on the problem.

The following eight excerpts from the Cascade Pioneer-Advertiser depict the fund-raising drive, the election of temporary officers, the selection of a hospital site, the start and progress of construction:

[From the Cascade (Iowa) Pioneer-Advertiser, Oct. 1, 1959]

MEDICAL CENTER FUNDRAISING DRIVE TO BEGIN NEXT WEEK

The fundraising drive to build the medical center for Cascade and area will start early next week. Campaign materials have been received from the Sears, Roebuck Foundation and precampaign planning is now being taken care of.

A recent survey made in Cascade by the foundation shows that an average of 23 patients a day travel to surrounding communities for medical care. This results in a cash loss of medical fees of $22,675 and $17,000 for medicines. It requires $4,070 for gas and oil to visit these communities. In addition, these persons, when visiting doctors in neighboring towns purchase household supplies (other than medicines) estimated to total $72,530. This brings the total economic loss to Cascade to $116,275.

The Community Medical Assistance Plan of the Sears, Roebuck Foundation offers Cascade an opportunity to stop this economic loss as well as make our area a trade center for this rural area.

[From the Cascade (Iowa) Pioneer-Advertiser, Oct. 8, 1960]

ONE-THOUSAND-DOLLAR LOAN TO MEDICAL CENTER

The American Legion Auxiliary of Cascade at its Monday meeting voted to loan $1,000 to the fund for the construction of the Cascade Medical Center, Inc. Mrs. R. P. Neiers, auxiliary president, presented the check Tuesday morning to R. L. Tucker and Adrian Kurt, committee members. The fund drive was officially opened Tuesday evening when over 40 captains met to receive their instructions and pledge cards. Every person in the area will be contacted to help reach the goal of $50,000.

[From the Cascade (Iowa) Pioneer-Advertiser, Oct. 15, 1959]

PROGRESS NOTED—MEDICAL CENTER CAMPAIGN TARGET DATE IS SATURDAY

Target date for completion of the fundraising drive for the Cascade Medical Center, Inc., has been set for Saturday, October 17. This was the date set at the meeting of the captains on October 6.

The captains should turn in their checks and completed pledges at the Cascade State Bank before 4 p.m. Saturday. A special account has been opened at the bank to handle the fund.

Workers have been busy all week making their calls to help reach the goal of $50,000. To insure the drive's success, it will be necessary for everyone to lend as much as possible. Anyone not contacted by Saturday who desires to make a loan to the center may do so at the bank or by calling one of the captains listed in last week's paper.

Additional captains named since last week's paper include Robert Curoe, Ray and Duane Recker, Walter Callahan, and Ralph McCarthy.

All captains are asked to meet Saturday night in the auxiliary room of the Memorial Building at 8 p.m.

[From the Cascade (Iowa) Pioneer-Advertiser, Oct. 2, 1959]

GETTING CLOSE—MEDICAL CENTER FUND PLEDGED $44,000

The fundraising drive to build the Cascade Medical Center, Inc., is nearing completion thanks to the generous support accorded it by approximately 480 individuals, clubs, and organizations. As of this date the fund has reached the total of $44,937.

A few area captains have yet to make their reports so it now appears that the goal of $50,000 will be reached. No doubt some persons wishing to make loans to the Center were missed in the solicitation. The committee would appreciate those persons stopping at the Cascade State Bank or contacting one of the committee members who will fill out a pledge card for them. Those persons can help immensely in reaching the final goal.

MEETING SATURDAY

Any captain who has not made a report as yet is urgently requested to do so on or before Saturday. Cash and pledges can be turned in at the Cascade State Bank or may be turned in at a meeting set for the captains Saturday night at 8 p.m. in the auxiliary room. Saturday night will be the final report so all captains are urged to attend.

Monday's Commercial Club meeting produced another $500 loan when the club members voted to lend that amount.

ARCHITECT HERE

The committee has been informed by the Sears-Roebuck Foundation that its architect, Mr. Don F. Putney, of the Technical Service, Burlington, will be in Cascade Tuesday of next week to look at possible building sites for the Center. He will make a recommendation as to the best site available.

Final results of the drive will be announced in next week's paper.

[From the Cascade (Iowa) Pioneer-Advertiser, Oct. 29, 1959]

MEDICAL CENTER—TEMPORARY OFFICERS, DIRECTORS ARE NAMED

A temporary slate of officers and directors has been named for the Cascade Medical Center, Inc. The group will hold office until the first annual meeting of stockholders.

R. L. Tucker has been named president; Edward Kremer, vice president; and W. T. McDermott, secretary-treasurer. Named as directors were Adrian Kurt, Ray Noonan, Dr. E. J. Bisenius, Mrs. R. L. Tucker, Richard Devaney, Mrs. Charles Schneiter, Mrs. Roy Ganfield, and Leo Sullivan.

Don S. Putney, R.A., medical facilities planning consultant, Burlington, was here Monday to look at possible building sites. E. C. Whiting, medical structures consultant, Iowa City, creator of modular coordinated medical practice facilities, was here Monday evening to meet with the committee to discuss the building and construction procedure. He will return Monday evening to again meet with the board.

GOAL ALMOST REACHED

With almost all captains having reported in, the financial goal has been almost reached. It is hoped all captains will be finished with their calls by Saturday night.

[From the Cascade (Iowa) Pioneer-Advertiser, Nov. 5, 1959]

ENTER CONTRACTS—SELECT EAST SIDE LOTS FOR MEDICAL CENTER

E. C. Whiting, of Iowa City, consultant for Modular Coordinated Medical Practice Buildings, met Monday evening with the Cascade Medical Center Committee. Following a long discussion, second in 2 weeks, the committee entered into contracts with Mr. Whiting and Lyle Rogers, of Warsaw, Ill., who will act as general contractor, to erect a Modular Medical Building here. Mr. Rogers will work under the supervision of Mr. Whiting.

Two building sites were given careful study. The committee acting upon advice from both Mr. Whiting and Don S. Putney, engineer consultant, of Burlington, selected what is known as the Legion lots in East Cascade.

Mr. Whiting has been consultant to about 60 of these buildings this year. Mr. Rogers has three or four of those buildings in various stages of completion at this time.

Bids will be offered local concerns on lighting, heating, plumbing, air conditioning, and floor coverings.

Because work is starting almost immediately and at an accelerated pace, it will be necessary for stockholders to move up the date of their pledges. It is hoped that other public-spirited citizens will join in this community-wide project. Stock purchases are available through members of the committee or at Cascade State Bank.

[From the Cascade (Iowa) Pioneer-Advertiser, Nov. 19, 1959]

MEDICAL CENTER BUILDING STARTED

Construction started last week on the Cascade Medical Center, Inc. The footings were dug Friday, and Monday the cement was poured. A picture shows the building-site after the footings were dug. The picture was taken with American Legion Post 528's park in the background. Steel for the 44-foot-5½-inch by 49-foot 5½-inch building will be shipped from Elizabeth, Ill., on November 28. Pledge reminder letters are now being mailed to stockholders so that building expenses can be met as they arise. Payments on the pledges can be returned in the return envelopes enclosed with the pledge reminders, paid at the bank, or paid to one of the center officers.

[From the Cascade (Iowa) Pioneer-Advertiser, Dec. 10, 1959]

MEDICAL CENTER PROGRESSING

Work on the Cascade Medical Center is rapidly progressing. Work was just starting on the steel bar joists and steel fabricated trusses Tuesday when a picture was taken. Workmen finished the steel installation yesterday (Wednesday) and now have started on the roof. A photo also shows the exterior prefab wall panels. Lyle Rogers, Warsaw, Ill., the general contractor, has been supervising the construction. Art Dehner is the subcontractor. Completion date is tentatively set for mid-January.

Mr. Speaker, the dedication ceremonies of this new medical center were held on April 3, 1960. As the newspaper said:

It was through the combined efforts of everyone that a dream became a reality.

Perhaps this is why on a cold, damp, raw day, almost a thousand people came to the ceremonies and viewed the medical center with shining eyes and pride in their own personal accomplishment.

The Pioneer-Advertiser on April 7, 1960, reported as follows:

This community's new medical center was dedicated with appropriate ceremonies Sunday. The weather was not 100 percent cooperative but the number of people at both the program and open house following was nothing short of tremendous. Had good weather prevailed, it is doubtful if the crowds could have been handled. It is estimated 500 people attended dedication ceremonies in Legion pavilion and no fewer than 800 viewed the center during the afternoon.

Program speakers were lavish in their praise of the medical center, as well they might be. Its exterior beauty is eye-catching. Its interior, circular in design, is novel at the same time labor-saving for the doctor. Sears-Roebuck Foundation is to be highly complimented for the features incorporated into this building. One speaker at Sunday's dedication said it compared favorably with any to be found in Chicago, New York or San Francisco. Another voiced the opinion it was comparable to any in the Nation. In both instances they were right. This entire community may take pardonable pride in this medical center. It was through the combined efforts of everyone that a dream became a reality. This medical center should prove conclusively that small communities are far from gasping for their last breath. Each community is just as good as its residents wish to make it.

Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to speak at the dedication ceremonies, and the report on my remarks follows:

"If this town is dying, then I would like to be a part of it." So spoke Representative LEN WOLF at the dedication program Sunday of the Cascade Medical Center. WOLF's words were in reply to recent articles in a neighboring newspaper which implied that rural America (the small towns) was dying and would become a thing of the past.

Over 500 persons attended the dedication program and an estimated 800 visited the center during the open house which followed.

RURAL AMERICA ON THE GO

Representative WOLF, in his dedication address, referred to the completion of the medical center as, "Rural America in action; rural America on the go." He praised the area for its adjustment to changing times and its ability to get things done by the action of its own people.

"It's easy to write to Congressmen in Washington," WOLF said, "and say we need help, but first you must prove that you can help yourself. This has been done here in Cascade and community."

Speaking on "Community Relations and Medical Care" WOLF concluded his address with, "God bless you for the work you've done, I'm proud to be a part of you today."

TUCKER MASTER OF CEREMONIES

R. L. Tucker, president of the board of directors of the medical center, turned in an excellent job as master of ceremonies at the formal program.

The Reverend Thomas Bisenius, chaplain of Post 528 and assistant pastor at St. Lucas, offered the invocation.

Several distinguished guests were introduced including Mayor Leo Hirtz, Bernard; Mayor William Mausser, Epworth; Mayor Cliff Knippel, Dyersville; Mayor Leo Dolphin, Cascade; and E. C. Whiting, consultant for the center project.

Dr. Robert Myers, president of the Jones County Medical Society, was present representing the society. He congratulated the Cascade area on the completion of its fine center and extended best wishes to Dr. Mehrl as he started practice in Cascade. "From my own experiences," Dr. Myers said, "You couldn't have picked a better town."

DAVIS SPOKE

Norman Davis, director of medical programs for the Sears-Roebuck Foundation, extended his congratulations for the rapid completion of one of the best medical centers in the United States. "This medical facility could be put in any size city in the country and would rank at the very top," Davis told his audience. He presented a plaque to the center from the foundation in recognition of the project's completion.

Aslam Zafar, in this country from Pakistan to study Democratic policies and agricultural practices, accompanied WOLF from Washington and spoke briefly. Zafar has been assigned to WOLF because of the latters interest in agriculture.

Dr. William J. Mehrl, who started practices in the center Monday, expressed his gratitude for the help and kindnesses that had been extended to him and his family since they moved to Cascade the previous Thursday. Dr. Mehrl said they are looking forward to living in Cascade and becoming a part of the community. He also announced that Elizabeth Carr, R.N., would be the nurse at the center. Later, he officiated at the ribbon-cutting ceremony at the center.

LEGION COLOR GUARD

Personnel from Cascade American Legion Post 528 comprised the color guard. Making up the guard were Jerry Green, Pat Kean, Dave Dolphin, Herb Green, and Dick Sullivan.

The Dubuque American Legion Drum and Bugle Corps provided the days musical entertainment.

The Cascade Women's Club served coffee and cookies during the open house at the center.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that this presentation of Cascade's accomplishments will show other communities which are faced with similar difficulties that they can cause miracles to happen through their own concerted efforts.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. CHIPERFIELD (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), for May 23 and 24, on account of attending United Nations sessions in New York City.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. WOLF (at the request of Mr. McCORMACK), for 20 minutes today, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. CONTE (at the request of Mr. QUIE), for 30 minutes, on Wednesday, May 25.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DULSKI in two instances and to include an editorial.

Mr. SISK and to include a speech by Mr. WOLF.

Mrs. KEE.

Mr. BOSCH.

Mr. ALGER.

(At the request of Mr. McCORMACK, and to include extraneous matter, the following:)

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska.

Mr. FOGARTY in three instances.

(At the request of Mr. QUIE, and to include extraneous matter, the following:)

Mr. BROOMFIELD.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 4029. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to eliminate the proration of the occupational tax on persons dealing in machineguns and certain other firearms, to reduce occupational and transfer taxes on certain weapons, to make the transferor and transferee jointly liable for the transfer tax on firearms, and to make certain changes in the definition of a firearm;

H.R. 6482. An act relating to the credits against the unemployment tax in the case of certain successor employers;

H.R. 6779. An act to amend section 170 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to the unlimited deduction for charitable contributions for certain individuals); and

H.R. 9308. An act to extend until June 30, 1963, the suspension of duty on imports of crude chicory and the reduction in duty on ground chicory.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 44. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct the San Luis unit of the Central Valley project, California, to enter into an agreement with the State of California with respect to the construction and operation of such unit, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 54 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 24, 1960, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2171. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Defense, transmitting 36 reports covering 49 violations of section 3679, Revised Statutes, and Department of Defense Directive 7200.1, entitled, "Administrative Control of Appropriations Within the Department of Defense," pursuant to section 3679(i)(2), Revised Statutes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

2172. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to change the method of promotion of Reserve officers of the Air Force to Reserve general officer grades"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2173. A letter from the Director of Research and Development, Department of the Army, transmitting a report on Department of the Army research and development contracts for $50,000 or more which were awarded during the period July 1 through December 31, 1959, pursuant to Public Law 557, 82d Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2174. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the 51st quarterly report, covering the 1st quarter 1960, pursuant to the Export Control Act of 1949; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2175. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Defense, transmitting the anual report of the American National Red Cross for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, pursuant to the act of Congress approved January 5, 1905 (33 Stat. 599), and as amended by the act approved July 17, 1953 (67 Stat. 173); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2176. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting the initial report on the review of the administrative management of the ballistic missile program of the Department of the Air Force; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2177. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of the automatic data-processing (ADP) installation, New Orleans commodity office, Commodity Stabilization Service, Department of Agriculture, October 1959; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2178. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting the report of the Archivist of the United States on records proposed for disposal under the law; to the Committee on House Administration.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, pursuant to the order of the House of May 19, 1960, the following bills were reported on May 20, 1960:

Mr. CANNON: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 12326. A bill making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and certain study commissions, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1634). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 12261. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, with respect to market adjustment and price support programs for wheat and feed grains, to provide a high-protein food distribution program, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1635). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[Submitted May 23, 1960]

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MORRISON: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H.R. 9883. A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1636). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Government Operations. Sixteenth report of the Committee on Government Operations; (Rept. No. 1637). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Government Operations. H.R. 9996. A bill to amend section 402 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, to prescribe procedures to insure that foreign excess property which is disposed of overseas will not be imported into the United States to the injury of the economy of this country; with amendment (Rept. No. 1638). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 9866. A bill to establish Federal agricultural services to Guam, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1639). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 11615. A bill to amend section 4 of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act; with amendment (Rept. No. 1640). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 12176. A bill to amend title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1642). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DELANEY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 536. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 10128, a bill to authorize Federal financial assistance to the States to be used for constructing school facilities; without amendment (Rept. No. 1643). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 11854. A bill to clarify the ownership of certain church properties located in the Virgin Islands; without amendment (Rept. No. 1641). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, pursuant to the order of the House of May 19, 1960, the following bill was introduced May 20, 1960:

By Mr. CANNON:

H.R. 12326. A bill making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Tennessee Valley Authority and certain study commissions, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes.

[Introduced and referred May 23, 1960]

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H.R. 12327. A bill to provide for the erection of Freedom Monument symbolizing the ideals of democracy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BARDEN:

H.R. 12328. A bill to extend and improve the special education and rehabilitation services provided by the Federal Government; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BETTS:

H.R. 12329. A bill relating to the gift and estate tax treatment of the relinquishments of certain powers in the case of reciprocal and other trusts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BREEDING:

H.R. 12330. A bill to authorize an appropriation for the special milk program for children for the fiscal years 1962 and 1963; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 12331. A bill for recovery by the United States of costs and expenses to it arising out of the negligent or wrongful acts of third persons; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GEORGE:

H.R. 12332. A bill to establish an Arms Control Research Institute; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Maryland:

H.R. 12333. A bill to extend to nonprofit sport fishing or fishing fair or contest organizations and associations the third-class mail rates applicable to certain categories of nonprofit organizations or associations; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. JONES of Missouri:

H.R. 12334. A bill to decelerate depreciation of income of cotton producers; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MURRAY:

H.R. 12335. A bill to amend the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 12336. A bill to amend section 507 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, with respect to the preservation of basic compensation in downgrading actions; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 12337. A bill to provide for allotment and advancement of pay with respect to civilian employees of the United States in cases of emergency evacuations from certain areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 12338. A bill to amend certain laws of the United States in order to abolish the death penalty, and to substitute in lieu thereof life imprisonment; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H.R. 12339. A bill to amend the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 12340. A bill to provide for allotment and advancement of pay with respect to civilian employees of the United States in cases of emergency evacuations from certain areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SAUND:

H.R. 12341. A bill to amend section 8e of the Agricultural Adjustment Act (of 1933), as amended, and as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, so as to provide for the extension of the restrictions on imported commodities imposed by such section to imported shelled walnuts, dates with pits, dates with pits removed, and products made principally of dates; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.R. 12342. A bill to provide for the erection of Freedom Monument symbolizing the ideals of democracy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SCHWENGEL:

H.R. 12343. A bill to strengthen the enforcement provisions of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act and extend the duration of the authorization of grants for State water pollution control programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SMITH of Iowa:

H.R. 12344. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 with respect to the procurement of

property and services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 12345. A bill to require the use of competitive bidding to the maximum practicable extent in the procurement of property and services by the Armed Forces through the establishment of specific standards governing the use of negotiated contracts for such procurement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SPENCE:

H.R. 12346. A bill to amend section 14(b) of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, to extend for 2 years the authority of Federal Reserve banks to purchase U.S. obligations directly from the Treasury; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. VINSON:

H.R. 12347. A bill to establish a Judge Advocate General's Corps in the Navy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WOLF:

H.R. 12348. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act to make it an unfair labor practice for an employer or a labor organization to discriminate unjustifiably on account of age; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H.R. 12349. A bill to authorize Federal financial assistance to the States to be used for constructing school facilities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CORBETT:

H.J. Res. 711. Joint resolution designating the red and white carnation and the blue cornflower as the national floral emblem of the United States; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.J. Res. 712. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to abolish the death penalty under the laws of the United States, any State, or any other place subject to the jurisdiction of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SPENCE:

H.J. Res. 713. Joint resolution to authorize the use of surplus grain by the States for emergency use in the feeding of resident game birds and other wildlife, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CORBETT:

H. Con. Res. 692. Concurrent resolution to create a Joint Committee on a National Fuels Policy; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DAWSON:

H. Con. Res. 693. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of House Document No. 198 of the 84th Congress, entitled "The Commission on Intergovernmental Relations"; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. DENT:

H. Con. Res. 694. Concurrent resolution to create a Joint Committee on a National Fuels Policy; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. Res. 537. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 9883, a bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H.R. 12350. A bill for the relief of Marion John Nagurski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOWNING:

H.R. 12351. A bill for the relief of Charles B. Forrest; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 12352. A bill for the relief of Marta Manelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H.R. 12353. A bill for the relief of Edgar Allen Gallegos and Ana Gloria Gallegos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H.R. 12354. A bill relating to the effective date of the qualification of Plumbers Union Local No. 12 pension fund as a qualified trust under section 401(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RIVERS of Alaska:

H.R. 12355. A bill to validate the homestead entries of Leo F. Reeves; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. YOUNGER:

H.R. 12356. A bill for the relief of Masaki and Yaeko Ouchi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRADEMAS:

H.J. Res. 714. Joint resolution to authorize the President of the United States to confer a medal on Dr. Thomas Anthony Dooley III; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. LANE:

H. Res. 538. Resolution providing for sending the bill H.R. 4426, with accompanying papers, to the Court of Claims; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

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

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nevada, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to establish a system of payments by the Federal Government to the State of Nevada or its local governments, which payments will be made in lieu of property taxes on federally owned property in this State, which property is immune from State or local taxation; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nevada, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to propose constitutional amendment abolishing income, estate, and gift taxes and prohibiting the Federal Government from engaging in any business, professional, commercial, financial, or industrial enterprise except as provided in the Federal Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nevada, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to oppose passage of H.R. 1884, which if enacted will prohibit the States from imposing a length-of-residence requirement as a condition to receiving welfare benefits under the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

470. By Mr. HARMON: Petition of Harold J. Crowley, Shelbyville, Ind., and 16 others, opposing the enactment of H.R. 10033; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

471. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Charles Fluhrer, president, Machine, Tool & Die Local 155, United Electrical, Radio & Machine Workers of America, Philadelphia, Pa., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to supporting and requesting enactment of the Forand bill, H.R. 4700; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 23, 1960

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of May 21, 1960:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas, May 21, 1960)

Future historical analysis of the summit may record that President Eisenhower's conduct scored a great victory for the free world. Meanwhile, we can all be "Monday morning quarterbacks." We all can expect, also, the bitterest, least-temperate appraisals to come from politically motivated office-seekers. At the moment, the nicely staged show of bipartisan support represented by the Democrat leadership's message to Ike at the summit has been rudely shattered by presidential-aspirant Stevenson's sharp attack on Eisenhower's administration. A spirit of constructive criticism would be more apparent if Mr. Stevenson had not alleged that it will take a Democrat administration and himself to do the job. Of course, we all know each person's evaluation of himself is high. That's human. But it's another thing to suggest against the background of the Yalta, Potsdam and Teheran Conferences that a Democrat administration can better handle or solve foreign problems.

Health care for the aged continues as the focal point of the social security bill being prepared for House debate. A move to hold hearings to get further information was defeated. To me it is inconceivable that a right solution can come from ignorance of the facts. We still have no comprehensive knowledge of medical services available or of medical needs and how they are being met, since we lack information on State and local programs. All we have, as data, is Health, Education, and Welfare Department information on Federal programs, which are only a part and not the major part at that. In my view, this is not responsible conduct, neither to other Members of Congress who look to the Ways and Means Committee for guidance in this field nor to the people of the Nation, including the aged and all taxpayers. Fortunately, the final page of this story has yet to be written. I hope politics will not dictate it.

The Small Business Investment Act of 1960 expands the Federal effort to make equity type capital and long-term credit more readily available for small business concerns. We thus add to the Federal bureaucracy and

the tax load, so that we can turn around and lend businessmen money to replace that taken from them in taxes. Tax relief, I believe, would be the greatest and soundest aid that businessmen or anyone else could ask of the Federal Government.

Debt reduction: Can debt be reduced by borrowing money to pay on it? To me, that's hardly more sensible than setting up a savings account by getting a loan at the bank. Yet there is periodic and favorable mention of a bill which would force Federal debt reduction without compelling a balanced budget or limiting the power to borrow further, which would leave us in exactly that situation. A better solution, it seems to me, would be enactment of a constitutional limitation on the Government's power to tax, spend, and borrow and which would require a yearly balanced budget.

H.R. 5, the Foreign Investment Incentive Act, passed narrowly 195 to 192. Earlier this year it was left hanging in midair after partial floor debate. Though aimed basically at according U.S. firms doing business abroad the same tax treatment given foreign-based subsidiaries of U.S. companies, the 61-page bill was complicated and technical. It was not understood by many, I am sure, among both the proponents and opponents. Originally a move to simplify and equalize tax treatment, the bill soon became one of concern to the State Department (to help develop officially designated underdeveloped countries); Labor Department (that wage levels and working conditions in these industries must not be substandard according to each country's standard); Commerce Department (only 10 percent of goods manufactured by U.S. industries located abroad can be shipped back into the United States); and so on. Thus a tax bill became the vehicle for a lot of social proposals in no way related to taxes.

Construction of a Federal Center Building in Dallas may have been delayed indefinitely by a strictly partisan move among Democrats on the Public Works Committee. The vote, I'm told, was 18 to 7 with all Republicans voting for approval of the project and all Democrats (including 10 proxies) against.

Controversial issues lie ahead in the short time left before adjournment and political conventions: (1) Federal aid to education; (2) Federal aid to depressed areas; (3) Federal aid to the housing industry; (4) interest rate ceiling. These are some that will provoke bitter partisan arguments. This does not assure a proper solution for the problems, of course.

Random notes: The television series will continue on WFAA-TV Sundays at 10:30 a.m. * * * A preliminary tabulation of the questionnaire returns is complete, and I hope to finish a survey of this year's answers by June 1. Any who mean to reply to the current questionnaire and have not yet done so should send it to me this month.

Award to Dr. J. Fred Rippy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 23, 1960

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is with pleasure that I announce to the House the 1960 William Volker Distinguished Service Award for outstanding achievements as a scholar and teacher to Dr. J. Fred Rippy, history professor emeritus of the University of Chicago. A stipend of $15,000 goes with the award.

Dr. Rippy was a member of the University of Chicago faculty for 31 years until his retirement in 1958. He was internationally recognized as America's foremost authority on Latin America. He now resides in Durham, N.C.

It will interest my colleagues to know that this distinguished scholar for years has been a regular reader of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. No matter how busy his schedule, he has found time to read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as part of his daily must.

Hon. Leonard G. Wolf Discusses Role of Congress in Space Age

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. F. SISK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 23, 1960

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, my good friend and able colleague from Iowa, the Honorable LEONARD G. WOLF, of Iowa, was selected as the guest speaker at the National Aeronautical Electronics Conference at Dayton, Ohio. Congressman WOLF is a distinguished member of the Committee on Science and Astronautics, upon which I also have the honor of serving. I have had an opportunity to observe his fine work on the committee, and I think every Member will want to study Congressman WOLF's description of the work of the committee and his pertinent comments on America's position in the space age, which formed the theme of his speech at the Conference on May 3.

The text of Congressman WOLF's address follows:

I am indeed flattered to have this opportunity to speak to you tonight. It is always a stimulating experience to address an audience of well-informed and highly professional people such as you. By the way, I stand here, as a one-time Navy electrician, World War II vintage and I know the difference between an ohm and a watt, or a resistor and a condenser, and especially the difference between a hot line and a ground. I find this very inadequate after today's experiences at Wright Patterson.

But I think that if I were now pursuing a career in the field of electronics I would be greatly excited and stimulated by the great events that are taking place in the programs of rocket research and space exploration currently being pursued by the Department of Defense and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. These events have a significance to developments in electronics research that stretches out into the future far beyond our ability to envision. The implications in the single fact of being able to communicate with and receive information from a space vehicle—Pioneer V—out to 50 million miles or more are to me simply staggering. We are only now approaching the threshold of achieving manned flight through space to the moon and to the planets, which could not be possibly accomplished without the unceasing drive toward progressive development that has been demonstrated over the past years not only by you and your colleagues, but also by our great national industrial complex that has made possible the comparatively recent growth of the electronics industry. Today I met a man who is still working, yet worked with the Wright brothers just a few short years ago.

Now, let me go into the role of Congress in the development of our space programs, and in a much larger sense, its interest in all aspects of scientific research and development.

For many years, perhaps more positively since World War II, there has been a growing awareness in Congress, particularly in the House of Representatives, of the increasing importance of scientific research and development in the everyday life of our people and, equally important, as a very important part of our defense and national resources.

If we reflect upon the historical significance of our great economic and social advances that followed World War I, of the roaring twenties, of the depression, of the thirties, and of another great industrial and economic upsurge coming out of World War II, we can then perceive more clearly the recent emergence into early maturity of a vigorous approach, nationally, to scientific research and development as the root-source of future security and economic prosperity. Congress and the executive branch, including the military departments, have been keenly aware of this fact, and nowhere has this awareness been more pointedly expressed than by the Department of Defense in its requests for steadily increasing appropriations to pursue military research and development programs submitted to Congress every year.

For instance, the budget for research, development, and engineering submitted by the DOD for the coming fiscal year is almost $6 billion. And the National Aeronautics and Space Administration has almost doubled its budget in its 2 years of existence from $500 million to more than $900 million. Congress has expressed its awareness of the importance of R. & D., by appropriating almost all the funds requested.

Of course, we have had outstanding scientific organizations within the many Departments of the Government for many years. I need only point to the National Bureau of Standards and the National Science Foundation, as examples. But, in comparison to the DOD, the funds required by these organizations have been very small indeed.

My committee, the Committee on Science and Astronautics as well as the Senate Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, is the latest and perhaps the most significant expression of Congress of its awareness that productive research and development, both basic and applied, has become a factor of major importance to our national community. Incidentally, my committee is the first standing committee that has been created by the House of Representatives since 1900. During the 2d session of the 85th Congress, the Select (that means temporary) Committee on Astronautics and Space Exploration, working with great energy and drive, created the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and dedicated it to the peaceful exploration of space for the benefit of mankind everywhere.

My committee is the direct descendant of that select committee and has functioned with even greater vigor and action. My committee has a record of having held more hearings in its first year than any committee in the history of Congress. To give you an idea of the extent of our interests and jurisdiction, aside from our legislative responsibilities, we have held definitive hearings on the international control of outer space, ground-cushion phenomena, satellites for world communication, missile development and space science, space propulsion,

nuclear explosions in space, to name only a few. Yes, and in earth sciences, oceanography, social sciences, too.

But, you may ask why does a congressional committee take the time and expend the energy to make such detailed investigations? Why doesn't it just concern itself with enacting legislation and acting as a watchdog over the executive branch? The answers to such seemingly innocuous questions are really quite complex.

Ladies and gentlemen, it has been my continuing mission since being elected to Congress, to point out as emphatically and as often as I can, that within our country there is no longer existing a clear division between civilian and military. We no longer live during times of peace and of war.

We are, and have been for many years, continually and unceasingly at war—with only the shooting suspended and not always is this true. Now, no one doubts that Western civilization is faced, in the form of the Communist philosophy, with its most deadly threat since Genghis Khan stormed out of Mongolia with his "golden horde" and brought Europe almost to the brink of complete political and social disintegration in the 12th century. To quote Gen. John B. Medaris, who appeared before our committee on February 18 of this year, "Fundamentally [the United States-Soviet competition] is a clash between different philosophies as to the position of the individual in society. The field of conflict is so broad, so profound, that it encompasses every element of international power—military, economic, diplomatic, political, psychological, and spiritual."

Coupling my first premise that scientific research and development is assuming a paramount importance to the lives of all our people, with the realization and acceptance of the fact that we are engaged in a universal conflict, which can result only in unconditional surrender either by the West or the East, Khrushchev's "We will bury you" was no figure of speech, then it should become clear that each and every one of you, and your colleagues in the other scientific disciplines, hold presently, to a major degree, the responsibility for our continued existence as free people. It therefore becomes the objective of Congress and my committee to support and foster, as a principal national resource, the scientific mission in every field of endeavor.

In this connection, let us consider the education of our young people. We have held considerable hearings on this subject and received testimony from many outstanding educators and educational administrators. And I am sure that many of you have a deep interest in this field. In this very basic, fundamental area, we are, right now, seeing the Soviet Union turning out scientists and engineers at a rate far surpassing our own. The Red bosses recognized years ago that the success of their mission to communize the world would depend upon excelling all other nations, particularly the United States, in science and technology. Such success would depend totally on the quality and quantity of trained scientists that would be available to their research and engineering programs, and ultimately making world dominion possible. We must come to grips with the great needs in the field of education and quit arguing over who has the responsibility to do it and get the education program going.

You can see why we in Congress and in my committee are concerned with the education of scientists in our country, and also for the material well-being of much of the world.

Let me speak now about the interest of our committee in the space program.

During the International Geophysical Year recently terminated, the United States assumed the responsibility for placing a satellite in orbit around the earth to explore the regions beyond our atmosphere. The Navy, and the Naval Research Laboratory was assigned the Vanguard mission and proceeded with the necessary design, engineering and tests, despite the fact that the Army's Ballistic Missile Agency at Huntsville, Ala., by slightly modifying the existing Redstone missile, was ready to place a satellite in orbit almost a year before the scheduled Vanguard. Then, as we all know, came the great awakening; inaugurated by Sputnik I. Our complacency had been jolted. False illusions regarding the Soviet Union's technological capabilities were thoroughly dissipated. And we stood before the world, figuratively, with our scientific halo down around our ears. We learned there was no longer room for complacency. I left Russia just a few days before Sputnik I, when, in my first speeches, I suggested Russia had some scientific surprises for us my audiences laughed with pompous self-esteem. And then sputnik—then my audiences would say, "Now how come? What happened to American leadership?"

Between Sputnik I and now has evolved gradually, grimly, and often painfully, the comprehensive space research program now underway in NASA. And there is no question that in the last few years, our satellite and deep probe projects have paid off handsomely. It is an established fact that our space vehicles have contributed data to the scientific communities of the world that quantitatively and qualitatively exceeds that of the Soviet Union by several orders of magnitude.

I'd like to read two significant comments from Mr. Baldwin of the New York Times.

Baldwin says the reason for this is that we Americans have not recognized sufficiently the psychological and political aspects of the space race. "The nation's space program," he writes, "has been too much under the authority of the mathematical scientists—the 'pure' researchers to whom scientific facts and findings are ends in themselves—and the budget planners, economists and cost accountants."

However, in awareness of the political and psychological importance of space achievements Moscow has been far more perceptive than Washington. Our greater proficiency in the accumulation of scientific data has been more than offset in world opinion by the Russian "firsts"; first sputnik; first deep-space probe; first picture of the "dark side" of the moon; first rocket to hit the moon. Moreover, the Soviet space program excels our own in the greatly superior thrust of the Soviet booster rockets.

And a comment of Dr. Eberhardt Rechtin, the Chief of the Telecommunications Division, states this in the following manner: "At the present time, one of the most remarkable features of the U.S. position is the almost complete lack of urgency in the space program. Our space program costs less than $10 per year per U.S. adult or roughly, one evening's entertainment per year."

Yes, insofar as booster thrust and weight lifting capabilities are concerned our rocket development is still several years behind that of the U.S.S.R., whose Sputnik III exceeded in weight, the total sum of the payload of every satellite and space probe we have sent up, to date.

However, in many long hours of hearings our committee has heard from Dr. T. Keith Glennan, Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and his associates, regarding the progress of current NASA satellite launching programs, the development of large and superlarge boosters, and the plans for a continuously productive program leading to an ever-growing space capability. And I can assure you tonight that our future in space looks very promising indeed, particularly with regard to the development of large boosters such as the Saturn and the Nova. However, I cannot equate our relationship with Russian progress. They are not standing still. But despite our successes so far the history of the management process that have characterized our missile and space programs has left much to be desired. To put it bluntly, they were delayed by an almost pathological inability to choose our objectives and to make management decisions on the top level, to organize Government resources for the job needed to be done.

And I say this despite the brilliant success of our Armed Forces in bringing their ballistic missiles to operational status in record time. To quote Dr. Simon Ramo, outstanding scientist and industrial organizer of our day, who appeared before our committee: "We have become bogged down again with the real bottleneck—not the limited technical and physical resources available in this Nation, but instead, the slow process of decisionmaking, organization, and arrangementmaking.

"Today, years after complete demonstrations of our technical capability and years after the unprecedented simultaneous implementation of all of the production tools and facilities and operational military planning for the full utilization of these technical accomplishments, we still seem to be involved in major debates as to how many should be the numbers of missiles that we provide to insure inevitable retaliation—this, even though a substantial part of America's capacity for competitive hardware production stands unused." I might say at this point, that most of the rivalry and friction between the services has been caused by this decisionmaking problem at the top. The individual chiefs have had to fight to maintain their programs. And they hoped that the rival chiefs would do the same. But all of this should have been unnecessary, had proper decisions been made and on time at the summit.

This is where Congress and my committee has made the largest contribution—the continuous insistence and polite prodding that all the responsible Government agencies develop, by every means available, the most efficient organizations possible, obtain the best scientific talent available, and provide leadership to American industry which, in the final analysis, is the only instrumentality by which our national scientific objectives can be achieved.

I have tried in these few brief moments to give you an idea of the depth and breadth of my committee's responsibilities and areas of action. We Americans are living in a period of fateful decisions made by men who are motivated either by a belief in moral law and the inherent dignity of man, or in the supremacy of the state. These decisions will inevitably and permanently effect our lives as free people, surrounded by an incredible plentitude that has been the product of our science, our technology, our industires and hard work, a plentitude that is experienced nowhere else in the world. We are richer far beyond what our fathers ever envisioned we could be. And our material wealth is the envy of all peoples. Our danger lies in the complacency bred by plenty.

I have had an opportunity to travel extensively in the world, only recently returning from southeast Asia and the Orient. There I saw human degradation of a fantastic order that beggars description. I have seen people who are struggling to survive without even the basic human needs of food, clothing and shelter, living in the midst of squalor that makes our worst city slums look like the hanging gardens of Babylon. I have been in places where a cupful of rancid, spoiled food is worth more than a human life. And yet, these people live in hope, striving as best they may for a better future for their children. And they have before them two avenues that they could travel toward that future—one posted with

the hypocrisy and blandishments of communism, the other with the promise and truth of democracy. I say to you that we are competing with the Soviet Union, not for space, not for the marketplace, but for the minds and trust of uncommitted peoples all over the world.

How is American science, research, technology a part of this competition? We have made it irrefutably evident that the products of hard work, the exploitation of our natural gifts and the unceasing development of our scientific and technical aptitudes have been combined to give America what it has today. And this, the most important point of all, has been done within a society of free men and women in less than 200 years. And, the same is possible for all peoples. This is the message we must bring to those struggling people. This is the bright hope we must give them. Material and spiritual progress is possible without destroying the basic freedoms.

I think, ladies and gentlemen, that perhaps our greatest virtue is not solely in our abilities to produce, but rather too, in our willingness to give. I think that most of us believe that we are our brother's keeper, and have acted that way over the years. I do not mean to imply that in helping to feed the hungry, clothe the naked, and shelter the homeless of the world that each one of us were self-conscious in doing so. Nor do I believe we have sent our bounty overseas like the ostentatious philanthropist.

No. Because I have seen in these countries American shovels, tractors, combines, looms, all types of machinery along with American scientists, technicians, engineers, doctors—there to teach and instruct those people how to help themselves, and to have pride in their own accomplishments. We must increase this area even more. We must lead in this area, not as a military power, but as a free nation whose only desire is to help raise up mankind.

I need only point to our enormous contributions to the rebuilding of war-devastated nations, particularly Japan, now a thriving, vigorous commercial country 15 years after almost complete economic disaster.

These are the things that American science has made possible. And thus through our technology have we affirmed our principles of morality and humanity. We must be sure that those countries which have not as yet finally chosen the road down which they will march toward the future, have an opportunity to respond to those same eternal principles and hopefully create a better life for their people through the democratic process.

Therefore, you and I, as participants in this great outpouring of scientific discovery, energy, and accomplishment, in our own humble way, strive for the common goal so earnestly desired by everyone. You, more directly than I, can be part of translating concept into reality.

The goal of my committee, as the instrument of the greatest form of human government the world has ever known, guides and attempts to give to our national research and development programs a positive and constructive emphasis. It is the firm belief of my colleagues that the results achieved through our national and scientific efforts should benefit all mankind. As an instrument of the Government that stands as a symbol of intellectual fredeom for everyone, the Committee on Science and Astronautics has the incomparable opportunity to play a major role in assuring to ourselves and the free world the security and tranquility that is sought and dreamed of by so many. And with God's help, that opportunity will lead man ever closer to realizing the promise that was given to him 2,000 years ago in Bethelhem, "Peace on earth, to men of good will."

Graphic Arts Awards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 23, 1960

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, each year the Buffalo Newspaper Guild, Local 26, in Buffalo, N.Y., sponsors a competition whereby staff members enter their respective work which was published in their newspaper during the year.

More than 300 entries were submitted by staff members of four Niagara Frontier daily newspapers. The winners were selected by newsmen in Detroit, Pittsburgh, and Toronto.

Buffalo Evening News staff members won all five awards in the graphic arts—three in photography, and one each for cartooning and illustration. Its reporters and editors took both sports writing prizes and also scored in the editorial writing, individual reporting, woman's page and headline writing categories.

The Buffalo Evening News winners were:

Millard H. Browne, chief editorial writer of the News, who won the prize for the best editorial with an inspiring observation directed toward the "Class of 1959."

Pulitzer Prize winning cartoonist, Bruce Shanks, scored again with a cartoon that asked what Premier Khrushchev had in his other hand on the occasion of his American visit last year.

For his analysis and description of the uproar attending the Buffalo reassessment job, Ernie Gross, a News city hall reporter, carried off the prize for the best individual reporting.

A heading on a story about the button industry's woe—"Buttons All at Loose Ends as Zippers Pull to the Top"—gained the best headline awards for Elwood M. Wardlow, assistant copy desk chief.

Jean Reeves Allan won the prize for the best woman's page writing, with three interviews with home economists at a convention.

A stunning story about people who drive in the classic 500-mile Memorial Day race at Indianapolis won Jack Horrigan, sportswriter, the accolade for the top sports feature.

Dick Johnston's piece about a preseason clash between the world champion Montreal Canadiens hockey team and the Buffalo Bisons won the sports news story award.

A warm pen-and-ink sketch of St. Bonaventure University's late Reverend Thomas Plassman to accompany a feature story about the famous "Father Tom" won John A. Sunley this year's illustrator's award.

The Buffalo Courier-Express had three winners—one in feature writing, one in spot news category, and the other in interpretive writing. They are:

Richard Hirsch, who won his award in feature writing for his weekly column "Offhand," which has appeared in the Sunday Courier-Express for more than 2 years. This is the second award he has won for his column. He also won another award last year for a series, and a fourth award as well as the Walter O. Bingham plaque in 1956 for journalistic achievement.

George Wyatt won his award in the spot news category for an interview of a Massachusetts resident who was kidnaped in his car and threatened with death until he escaped in Amherst. He was cited for presenting the interview in "an interesting and dramatic manner."

William Folger, a previous winner in 1956, won his award in interpretative writing for his weekly column on the church page. His column also won him a Freedom Foundation award earlier this year.

Three photography awards went to the following News staffers:

Robert L. Smith's shadowy dramatic picture of physicians at Our Lady of Victory Hospital trying to revive an asphyxiation victim won the spot news picture award.

Merrill D. Matthews scored in the feature picture category with a Thanksgiving picture showing a small boy trying to hold down a large turkey.

Two speeding girls racing to the finish wire in the Erie County Junior Olympics gave William Dyviniak the honors in the sports picture department.

One winner will be selected from all these categories for the 1959 Walter A. Bingham Memorial Award, a prize honoring a late Buffalo Evening News photographer.

Steuben Society of America Banquet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT H. BOSCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 23, 1960

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday evening, May 21, 1960, the Steuben Society of America held its 41st anniversary banquet in New York City. This society which bears the name of Baron Friedrich Wilhelm von Steuben of Revolutionary War fame lists under its policy and program:

1. This society aims to loyally support the Constitution of the United States of America, advocates the proper application of its provisions, and endeavors to inculcate the principles underlying government by a federal republic with limited, delegated powers.

2. This society is dedicated to maintaining the independence and sovereignty of the United States of America and its freedom from all foreign influence.

The society was very fortunate in having for its speaker at the 41st anniversary banquet the Honorable KENNETH B. KEATING, U.S. Senator from the State of New York. The Senator delivered a very timely and stirring address of tremendous interest to his audience and which I believe should be read by every citizen of the United States.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the text of the address to which I have referred:

STEUBEN SOCIETY, MAY 21, 1960

Mr. Chairman, members of the Steuben Society of America, it is a profound source of pleasure to me to have the opportunity to be with you here tonight. Your famous Steuben Society is more than an assemblage of outstanding and loyal American citizens. It is a part of the America that we love and cherish—a symbol of the great stream of culture, of talent, of patriotism that has flown into our Nation from the great source of the German peoples, to strengthen and to ennoble this land we are proud to call our own.

Baron von Steuben can never be a mere name to Americans. He remains forever a part of our history, a part of our greatness, a part of our pride as a nation.

This is a time to be proud to be an American. This is a moment in history when the spirit that has made us great—the spirit of free men in a free society—is facing a challenge unique in the annals of our Nation.

And that challenge is being met—therein should lie our pride—by a massive and intense dedication to the principle that man is a creature of God, a creature of dignity—and that nothing we can strive for, nothing we can fight for represents a greater or more compelling cause.

We have known the face of danger here in America. It has surged before our eyes, cold and menacing, from the years of our history.

It was the ugly face that Americans braved with men like Baron von Steuben at their sides and in their vanguard.

It was the pitiless face we have seen on land and sea and in the air through all the wars of our birth, our growth and our maturity. A familiar face—but a foredoomed face—because the valor of American hearts, the strength of American arms crushed it to earth.

Now danger stalks the world again. It is not the danger dressed in uniform, the one we know only too well. It is rather the danger dressed in a garb of philosophy that is not only anti-God, but also anti-man. I here speak of man as a spirit, not as an animal, as an individual, not as a number. I speak of the mass operation to dehumanize man, to brutalize him, to legislate out of existence his soul, his conscience, his personality.

This is a new and ominous visage of danger. And it is not distant. It is not isolated in some remote land. It is pervasive. It is present. It is glaring at us on all sides. And you can read its identity card. It says, "communism."

Geography is no longer a lesson for children. It is a lesson for us all. The map of the world represents a study that should command far more attention than it does. For its blood-red areas are vast and growing.

The red stain has spread—is spreading—and as it seeps across new frontiers, as it trickles into new areas, the homeland of freedom undergoes a concurrent shrinkage, loses ground, loses strength, loses prestige.

This is the silent battleground upon which we fight this day. This is the threat to our way of life. This is the face of danger.

It is so often a well-masked face that we are prone to ignore its presence. As a nation we have been accustomed to fight conventional battles with conventional weapons.

Today the enemy may put on the very disguise of freedom in order better to fight freedom. In the name of liberation he practices enslavement. In the name of the people he oppresses the people. In the name of peace he would destroy peace.

This is a new pattern of conquest in the history of our world, new and ominous and deadly. As a symbol of its technique we have only to consider the ill-fated summit conference.

It is apparent, grimly apparent, that Khrushchev went to Paris to obstruct, to confuse, to attempt to divide, rather than in the spirit of peace seeking or peace making.

And the pretext he has used to promote failure is in itself an affirmation of the Soviet code of expediency, of total disregard for concepts of right and wrong.

Here we have the supreme irony of perhaps the greatest spymaster in history demanding an apology because his nation has been spied upon. Moral indignation is a mask that fits him poorly, yet he flaunts it before the world like an angel of innocence. Meanwhile, his espionage agents, scattered like termite colonies throughout the world, are eating away at the foundations of freedom wherever they are to be found.

And while those agents walk through our open doors, a great black expanse of secrecy marks the Communist areas on the strategic map of the world. It is a world hermetically sealed—in the military sense. Historically, our American cry of vigilance has been "on the ramparts we watch." And watch we must, so long as the shadow of an upraised fist falls across the sunlight of our freedom.

The resolve of the United States to live up to its role and responsibility as the leading Nation of the free world has been made unmistakably apparent to the Kremlin.

And if we must choose a symbol of this resolve it is to be found in Germany—in our unqualified support of the magnificent citadel of freedom that West Germany and West Berlin represent to this divided world.

Standing literally on the battleline of two opposing global forces, free Germany is an eloquent testimonial to human courage, to the spiritual quest for freedom, for self-determination, no matter what the risks, no matter what the sacrifices.

It is one thing to be brave behind a wall of security; it is another and higher courage to face up boldly to danger, head high, heart high, firm in the sense and assurance that one is in the right, that there can be no compromise with principle, no dilution of the basic freedom that means more than life itself. Our support, our identification with the cause of free Germany is, to be sure, a great bulwark in their struggle. But we did not invent the raw courage of the German people.

We did not put the fire of patriotism, of dedication in the hearts of Chancellor Adenauer, of Mayor Willy Brandt, of all the millions of free Germans who stand solidly, steadfastly, and unafraid on the very rim of danger.

In this regard, may I say a word or two about the matter of Khrushchev's threat to conclude a separate peace treaty with East Germany and turn over access to West Berlin to the Communist regime. It is seriously to be questioned whether the facts of life—facts growing out of the very German character he has attempted to subjugate—will make such a move politically practicable.

By this I mean that the strong signs of instability in Germany—which is another way of saying the presence of the free spirit of Germany—may well make a peace pact with East Germany fraught with danger for the Kremlin. For it implies an Ulbrecht regime that will be on its own both in foreign affairs and in domestic state security, and such an eventuality may create more problems than it solves, so far as the Communist grand design is concerned.

It is especially appropriate, in these days when the fate of freedom is at stake in the world, that I should have the opportunity to speak before the Steuben Society. For in your charter, in your reason for existence, is typified not only the spirit of a free America but the vigilance to keep it free.

Our strength, as a nation, must be measured by people, not by armaments. Our true strength is not in our military muscles, but in our citizens' hearts—in the spiritual dedication of people like yourself to the living honor of our great country, to the love it inspires in Americans, to the respect it inspires in all corners of the world.

Particularly is this spirit of dedication called for in an age of tremendous counterforces that press hard against our house of freedom, that chip away at its foundations, that would engulf it in the new, dehumanized society that communism seeks to create.

What is imperatively called for in this hour is an awareness of the presence of danger—and it is in this field that the mission of the Steuben Society becomes of paramount importance.

It is my feeling that too many Americans are prone to confuse their material well-being with a sense of security—to confuse their inalienable rights with permanent, impregnable liberty, to assume that labor-saving devices and freedom-preserving devices come in the same packages. The Steuben Society serves this Nation well when it raises its voice to remind us all that freedom is something that we can lose as well as win—and that to keep it in our possession, cherished for the God-given attribute it is, we must have the eyes to keep watch on it, and the heart to fight for it in its hour of danger.

We live in a new and dangerous world, and we need Paul Reveres like yourselves to alert the country to the perils of indifference, of apathy, of the assumption that freedom is a birthmark that no power can remove—when it is actually an inheritance that can be lost by default.

Above all, the struggle we are engaged in must be seen in the true perspective of our sense of survival as a nation, not in the false and twisted perspective of irrationality and blurred values. In this regard, let me say that I have been appalled at the number of letters I have received openly condemning our Nation for conducting spy flights over Russia. In the eyes of these citizens—yes clouded by a woeful misunderstanding of the facts of political life—we had no right to try to protect America and all free men from the sudden fist that strikes out of the dark to smash our freedom, to smash all that we have fought and died to create, before and since the founding of the Republic.

These are honest, well-meaning citizens. Happily, they are a small minority. Yet it is symptomatic of the confused values of our time that such people are prone to plead the cause of the enemy of liberty by seeking to apologize for one manifestation of the very acts of intelligence-gathering which are employed against us unceasingly, night and day, year by year.

If we were the victims of a nuclear Pearl Harbor—and heaven grant that terrible visitation may never come—these same citizens would assail our Government for failure to have secured the intelligence that would have rendered such an attack impossible.

Patriotism, like charity begins at home. And that, too, is where vigilance begins—where security begins—in the minds and in the hearts of the American people.

We must be an aware people—an informed people—if we are to preserve intact and undiminished the precious gift of freedom that was handed down to us—that remains our sacred trust for so long as we live.

That is why I would wish to see the influence of your wonderful Steuben Society radiated throughout our land—why I would wish to see it galvanize to action a love of country, a devotion to country that too often slumbers in the soft featherbed of apathy, of indifference, of sheer unawareness of the tremendously meaningful hours and days we are living, in this world of hostility, of challenge, and of change.

In closing, may I leave with you this one observation. It has significance, I feel, in the light of what has been said here tonight. History has recorded for us the many ways in which human freedom has died—gloriously, cravenly, forlornly—but the saddest, most ignominious death of all is when freedom dies in its sleep.

Juvenile Delinquency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 23, 1960

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include an address which I delivered at the AFL-CIO Joint Council Meeting on Juvenile Delinquency, New York, N.Y., on May 12, 1960.

RESPONSIBILITY IN JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

It is a pleasure to be here with you today, and I welcome this opportunity to share with you my thoughts on juvenile delinquency.

As a Member of your Congress and chairman of the Appropriations Committee for health, education, and welfare funds, I have been fighting for new programs and legislation to help reduce juvenile delinquency. I know you are just as concerned with this as I am. And so, what I have to say to you will be a reminder of our shared responsibility for meeting and dealing with this serious problem.

Moreover, I shall point out some of the ways by which we can more strongly attack and deal with the growing menace of juvenile delinquency. The situation is not hopeless. Far from it. But there are things we need to do that we are not doing—and the time for action is now. So, what I shall say will show the gloomy side—the staggering statistics of juvenile delinquency. But it will also reveal the hopeful side—the opportunities for positive programs and action.

Juvenile delinquency is reaching epidemic proportion in our society. It is causing grave concern not only to you and to me, but to every American concerned about the present and future welfare of our country.

The statistics are shocking. The number of delinquency cases disposed of by juvenile courts in the United States nearly tripled between 1948 and 1958. During this period the child population of delinquency age increased by about a third, while the delinquency rate per thousand children in this age group doubled. Cause for further alarm is the fact that acts of violence against persons are increasing more rapidly than almost any other form of juvenile delinquency. The cost of delinquency in dollars and cents is also staggering. FBI estimates indicate that juvenile delinquency currently represents a drain on our national economy of $4 billion each year.

But the problem is even more serious than the surface facts make it appear. It is reliably estimated that one boy in five in this country now has a delinquency record by the time he is 18 years old. Though it is true that many of the offenses that are counted in establishing this figure are relatively minor, it is also true that the statistics on delinquency are limited to cases known to law enforcement agencies and courts. For every child who becomes a juvenile court statistic there are two or three who are dealt with informally by the police, even though they may have committed similar offenses. About half of all arrests for burglary and larceny and almost two-thirds of the arrests for auto theft involve persons under 18 years of age. Yet in these three categories, slightly less than one offense in four results in an arrest.

It is obvious then that the figures on delinquency represent only the surface portion of a menacing iceberg—an iceberg in which we should include all of the thousands of youngsters with delinquent behavior patterns. These young people must also be seen as people, not merely as statistics. They are the citizens, the workers, the parents of the next generation. They are individuals with productive potential—and many of them have the basic abilities to make important creative contributions to our society. We simply cannot afford this kind of waste of our productive youth. No country, not even ours, is rich enough or ever will be rich enough to afford it.

The child population of delinquency age will increase by about 50 percent in the next two decades. On top of this, in the next 2 decades many more of our people will be living in or near big cities. At present, the big city delinquency rates are three to four times the rural and small town rates, and adult crime rates also increase with the size of the city. It seems very likely, therefore, that as we become a more urban nation our delinquency and adult crime rates will continue to rise, with more delinquents in the juvenile age bracket and more and more of them moving into adult crime as they grow older.

For the last 13 of my 19 years in the Congress, I have been active—either as a ranking member or chairman—on the House committee responsible for levels of programs that include the field of delinquency. The subcommittee which I head has become increasingly alarmed at the national juvenile delinquency problem. Accordingly, last year our committee asked the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to coordinate a special effort and give leadership to persuade more of our scientists to turn their attention to study in the behavioral sciences. Such studies, we felt, should include inquiry into the psychological, emotional, and environmental factors leading to deviant behavior in youth.

From such knowledge we could hope to find a way of preventing juvenile delinquency. Let me quote from our report:

"In the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare we have the Children's Bureau and the National Institute of Mental Health, both with interest, experience, and resources in the fields of child behavior, child welfare, and child psychology. It would seem that a collaborative effort by these two agencies, one oriented to research in behavioral, psychological, and psychiatric sciences, and the other oriented to research in sociological science with emphasis on child welfare, could lead to methods for helping reduce the tragic social burden that juvenile delinquency represents."

We asked the National Institute of Mental Health and the Children's Bureau to undertake a most careful and thoughtful study of what can and should be done in future years in the field of juvenile delinquency prevention.

The joint report of the National Institute of Mental Health and the Children's Bureau has now been received. Its contents indicate that, though we do not now have any final answers regarding the nature of delinquency and the most effective ways of treating different types of delinquents, we do have a good deal of useful knowledge resulting from scientific studies and from the experience of people working in the field of delinquency.

We are not completely ignorant and helpless before this crisis. We can identify the problem, we can plot its course, at least crudely, and we can take preventive measures. It is not enough to be against delinquency—it is our responsibility to develop a major national blueprint for the control of this epidemic. Fortunately, it is not too late for prevention and control if we are willing to take bold, expensive, and large-scale action, to conduct field experiments and demonstrations, to train needed personnel, and to do more research.

Our committee is recommending such action and is also recommending an appropriation of $1 million to the National Institute of Mental Health and $60,000 to the Children's Bureau in the coming fiscal year to inaugurate the first steps for such a program. We recognized, of course, that substantially larger sums will be needed in the succeeding years as demonstration, research, and training projects get under way, and as State and local governments begin to apply the findings from these projects.

But while Federal leadership and help are needed in attacking the problem, it must be clearly recognized that this effort requires the active teamwork of responsible private organizations such as the community service organizations of AFL-CIO, social and health agencies, schools, churches, and many other civic and community organizations. Such teamwork of public and private resources is required not only because the problem is reaching epidemic proportions but also because delinquency is so deeply interwoven into the fabric of our society.

Since it is obviously impossible to completely remake our society, it is appropriate to concentrate on a few strategic factors which people who have worked extensively with delinquents consider to be crucial.

There are numerous families with inadequate incomes in the deteriorated areas of our big cities. Many such families are unable to do an adequate job of child-rearing because of physical health and mental health problems, and because of lack of meaningful ties with religious, social, educational, and health agencies in the community. Health, counseling, remedial education, recreation, welfare, and voactional guidance services must be provided to these families, where needed, on an individual basis. Also, the basic structure of health, education, and welfare services for the entire community must be strengthened to prevent the spread of delinquency and other social contagion from these malfunctioning families. By focusing on such families and the services which they and their neighbors need, it is possible to launch an attack on delinquency now, even though we cannot deal with all the myriad factors associated with delinquency at once. The rationale for such an approach is derived from an examination of certain dominant trends in the American way of life today.

In our huge, complex, industrialized and mechanized urban society, we no longer have the informal social controls that characterized the rural way of life in America during the 19th century. For those who would achieve a rewarding position in legitimate society, a long educational preparation is required. Besides, there are widespread pressures which prevent youth from holding jobs or even learning jobs before they are 18 or older. At the same time, our society becomes increasingly complex and keeps changing so rapidly that it is more and more difficult for youth to establish a meaningful way of life and select a suitable career.

The child of today, unlike his counterpart 100 years ago, or even 50 years ago, does not have a sense of belonging, of never questioning his place in the community, in the economy, and in the world at large. In our medium-sized and larger cities there are many children in the low-income areas who are faced with the fact that neither they, their parents, their neighbors nor their

friends feel that they belong to the community or have a responsible role to fulfill. Particularly if they are part of a minority group, they constantly feel rejected or at least ignored by the bulk of the population. When the urban low-income child starts school he is likely to find that his previous life experiences have not prepared him for this setting, and that school represents preparation for a way of life that appears to have no place for him except in the most menial and lowest paid occupations.

Unless an understanding parent, teacher, neighbor, clergyman, or social worker can help him, through a continuing relationship, to understand this educated world better and see a meaningful role in it for himself, he is unlikely to develop the feeling that he belongs to this complex education-ridden society. This process of alienation from productive society can start very early indeed in the case of a child whose home is extremely deprived in human relationships and material needs.

Unfortunately, the major social trends of our time that accompany urbanization tend to create more and more of these rootless, alienated, and finally rebellious children. These trends include industrialization, increasing technology, larger and larger organizations, and the overall continuing expansion of our economy.

It is apparent that there are not going to be any easy answers to the problem of delinquency. It is equally apparent, also, that we cannot expect to make any real inroads against delinquency unless we simultaneously launch a broad campaign in the whole field of child welfare.

We need more and better professional services for children and families before problems arise. And in our programs designed to treat the juvenile delinquent, we need more emphasis on coordinating and strengthening all of the basic local social services for children. Such a program is impossible without broad citizen support at every level.

As chairman of the committee in Congress that has supported research programs to a very great degree of success in the medical and biological sciences, I believe it is possible to attack the juvenile delinquency problem through similar programs. I believe the Federal Government must support research, demonstrations, and training to provide the necessary scientific knowledge and personnel. The State and local governments do not have the resources for all that is needed of this kind of activity. On the other hand, the actual services to children and their families must be provided in the individual community, with the help of the State and local governments.

This will be done, but only if people everywhere want it strongly enough. Citizens and citizen groups, including such outstanding leadership groups as the AFL–CIO Community Services program, must indicate that they are willing to support Federal and State tax levels sufficient to maintain adequate child welfare research, training, and service programs. They must take the initiative in insisting that local governments, agencies, and civic groups mobilize to improve social services—and that careful and thoughtful planning is done before any action is initiated.

A careful blueprint is also needed in order to attack delinquency adequately. The Federal Government has a substantial role in this program and has already begun to take action through some of its agencies. For example, the National Institute of Mental Health is now conducting a substantial program of research focused on basic processes involved in social problems, development of effective preventive and treatment methods, and methods of training personnel to do work connected with these social problems. The Institute is attempting to acquire more scientific knowledge about the many processes involved in producing delinquents.

The major effort, however, is concentrated on effective application of current knowledge and skills. The consensus of experienced professionals in the field is that serious delinquency usually involves a long-term social and psychological process. In many delinquents the first symptoms appear in early childhood, with onset varying between ages 2 and 10. There is evidence that the process can be reversed or at least arrested, but early intervention and continuing attention are required. In this respect delinquency roughly resembles diabetes, which physicians are able to control if they spot the illness early enough and provide continuing care for an indefinite period. With delinquency, however, such control methods are less reliable, though promising.

Preventive care needs to continue at least through the adolescent years, perhaps beyond. In mild cases, such care may involve no more than an initial diagnostic study, followed by periodic contact with a trained probation officer or other experienced person, plus occasional provision of necessary health, counseling, remedial education, recreational, and vocational guidance services. In more serious cases, a continuing and intensive rehabilitative process is required, involving a concentration of coordinated services.

An essential counterpart to such individual and family care is an attempt to modify the spirit of the community in high-delinquency areas so that adults in these areas will show a more accepting, helping, and nurturing attitude toward all children in the area, including delinquents, and will participate in mobilizing and improving all community services for youth.

Since many experienced delinquency workers feel that they could do a much better job if they had adequate resources, the Institute of Mental Health is supporting three research and service groups who are testing out special delinquency control approaches. In order to provide these and similar groups with more effective tools to carry out control programs, support is also being provided for projects focused on early identification of delinquents and predelinquents, special methods of treating such children and their families, and methods of evaluating the effectiveness of preventive and treatment programs.

One of the three special projects at the University of Michigan is being carried out in a city of about 200,000 population. Thus far it has involved an intensive study of the social and psychological characteristics of delinquents in the community as compared with children whose behavior is exemplary and outstanding. There has also been extensive study of community services and of social and institutional factors involved in delinquency.

The next phase will be to transmit results of the study in appropriate form to a group of leaders in community services for youth, as well as to the community at large. This feedback process should mobilize a groundswell of community interest and concern which will insure total community support for a carefully planned delinquency control program. If community resources are insufficient to provide services needed in such an all-out control program, they will be supplemented in order to carry out the program at an effetcive level for an adequate demonstration period.

Another special project, set up in a middle-sized city in Massachusetts, is attempting to devise methods for classifying a sample of all delinquents coming to the court so that they can be referred for appropriate treatment. This effort is based on the observation that most communities lack resources and techniques needed for adequate diagnosis and disposition of delinquents. These diagnostic instruments have now been developed and are being applied to a sample of all delinquents coming to the court. The next phase will include a tryout of the recommended dispositions or treatments, with local services for this purpose being augmented as needed.

The largest project undertaken thus far is that of mobilization for youth, on the Lower East Side of New York City. This project, still in its formative stages, is expected to include both preventive and treatment services for predelinquents, delinquents, and their families, plus a broad program aimed at modifying community attitudes toward youth and at reorganizing and augmenting services designed to help youth move into productive adult lives.

Mr. James McCarthy, who is here today, can tell you more about this project, since he is the director of its action program. All three of the special projects being supported by the National Institute of Mental Health are of the type that need extensive participation by community service programs such as your own.

Aside from general support for such programs, there are a number of special ways in which organizations concerned with community health and welfare, and in particular your organization, can help attack the problem of juvenile delinquency. Let us first consider the problem of youth employment.

Early in this century child labor laws were introduced to prevent the exploitation of children and youth in unhealthful work situations. At the same time public education was expanded on a compulsory basis so as to permit all children to complete high school. We are now finding that many children have such serious difficulties with education that they are ready to leave school by the time they reach their teens. Many of them now do leave school by age 14 on a formal basis, or informally by very frequent truanting and by being inattentive and disruptive in class.

The great bulk of delinquents are recruited from this group. Over half of all delinquents are educationally retarded and a large proportion of school dropouts become involved in delinquent acts. However, automation and the shorter work week have made it extremely difficult to bring younger teenagers into the labor force, and organized labor has legitimately been concerned about attempts to lower the working age.

Yet some means must be developed for gradually preparing the school-rejected and school-rejecting teenagers for a useful work career. In some European countries such youth serve as apprentices in a wide variety of occupations and are thus gradually introduced into the adult labor force. I offer no solutions to you at this time, but would suggest that this is a problem which merits the special concern of your organizations.

The advent of the shorter workweek brings increased concern for constructive use of leisure time. It is within their leisure time that many of our teenagers get into difficulty. Certainly the opportunities for constructive use of leisure time are extremely limited in some of the deteriorated areas of our large cities. There is a great need for hobby programs, recreation programs of all kinds, and for the help of a large number of responsible citizens in developing such programs. These programs must be adequately planned and supervised.

Here in New York City there are a variety of such programs. For example, some schools are open all day and also during the evening, providing supervised hobby and recreation programs as well as programs throughout the summer months. Other agencies, including schools, are carrying on activities which help new migrants from Puerto Rico or from rural

areas of the South to become acquainted with the customs, services, and opportunities of the big city.

Experienced workers in the field of delinquency recognize the importance of citizen and voluntary organization participation in carrying out prevention and treatment programs. The actual or potential delinquent and his family in a low-income area may require a variety of remedial education, health, counseling, recreation, and vocational guidance services. If such services are to be provided in a way that meets local needs in a coordinated fashion, a large number of responsible local citizens must serve on boards, in planning agencies, and as volunteers. Such support is needed not only for agencies serving delinquents but for all agencies concerned with the welfare of the child and his family.

Although public interest in a problem like delinquency is aroused when an epidemic of vandalism, theft, or violence occurs, such interest is apt to subside as other pressing problems arise. Besides, delinquents have no lobby, as do, for example, the physically handicapped and mentally retarded children. Parents of delinquents do not organize as do the parents of these other handicapped children.

Therefore there must be continuing support from responsible organizations like yours for constructive legislation and for community efforts in the field.

Finally, and perhaps most important of all, much help is needed in spreading community concern for every child of the community, in setting standards, and in sharing these standards with parents of children in our most deprived areas. Because we are living in what has been called an affluent society, we are too apt to assume that prosperity has filtered around all of the corners in our economy. We are too apt to assume that significant portions of our society who do not share the comforts and opportunities on which middle-class values are predicated will nevertheless owe full allegiance to such values.

Delinquency is a growing, threatening epidemic in our national life, and only a portion of it is visible. National leadership and help is required to cope with this problem. And a larger part of that leadership must come from the teamwork of many public-spirited orgnizations, one of the more important of which is the community services program of the AFL–CIO.

Inactivation of 449th Fighter-Interceptor Squadron, at Ladd Field

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH J. RIVERS

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 23, 1960

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I consider it my duty to call to the attention of my colleagues in the House an alarming development with regard to our national defense. I refer to the incredible decision of the Air Force, recently announced, that it will inactivate and phase out the 449th Fighter-Interceptor Squadron at Ladd Field, near Fairbanks, Alaska, in August 1960. This unit, which is the only one of its kind in Alaska north of the Brooks Range—the only other fighter-inceptor squadron in Alaska being at Elmendorf Air Force Field near Anchorage, Alaska—has for many years been regarded by the highest military authorities as an indispensable shield against potential aggression by the Russians. Ladd Field, only 600 miles from Siberia, is a part of our northwest bastion of defense; a vital link in our perimeter of national defense, which includes Alaska as the corridor between Asia and North America, being an area once characterized by the late great Army officer, William "Billy" Mitchell, as "the most important strategic place in the world."

As recently as last March the Air Force programed replacement of its 25 F–89 aircraft at Ladd AFB for F–101Bs, in line with strengthening the defensive power of the 449th Fighter-Interceptor Squadron. This occurred at a time when international tensions appeared to be relaxing. Now in the midst of a worsened world situation stemming from our U–2 observation flights over Russia, we are confronted with the Air Force's sudden plan to withdraw from Ladd Field, soundly established on American soil in the shadow of the Iron Curtain, as contrasted with many of our foreign airbases which are built on political quicksand.

On July 4th last, at Auburn, N.Y., I had the privilege of speaking at a ceremony honoring our 49th State, in which I extolled the foresight and wisdom of former Secretary of State, William Henry Seward, in effectuating the purchase of Alaska from Russia, and noted the disadvantage the rest of North America would now be suffering if Alaska were yet in the hands of the Russians. Both the audience and I visualized the idea of Russian bombers and missiles being located in Alaska pointed toward the great industrial centers of the older States and Canada, and we did not like what we saw, which lent enhanced meaning to the memory of William Henry Seward.

Now we are told by Gen. Curtis LeMay, who requested the construction of Eielson AFB a decade ago as a launching ground for SAC bombers just 26 miles from Fairbanks, that Alaska is now of subordinate strategic importance and that for economy reasons the risk of phasing out the 449th Fighter Interceptor Squadron may be taken. This, in the face of the fact that said squadron has been on the alert for years to defend not only Ladd Field and environs against the possibility of a Russian paratrooper attack or destructive bombing mission, but to likewise defend the great SAC installation and runway at Eielson AFB with resultant protection of our whole country.

Since long-range missiles presently under development are presumably not yet operational, the Russian airpower according to Gen. Thomas D. White, Chief of Staff of the Air Force, is still Russia's most dangerous weapon. To my mind this makes the problem elementary and the answer apparent—this is no time to inactivate any part of our manned fighter-interceptor forces. Comes the day when East and West will have each other thoroughly pinpointed with adequate arrays of ICBM's, there may be no further use for Air Force bases as we know them today, but the time is not now, any more than it is time to phase out the Air Force itself.

I realize that the Air Force is hurting because of the recent congressional appropriation cutback on Bomarc widely regarded as an extravagant fifth wheel in our overall missile program, but do not think this justifies the economy reaction displayed in the plan to chop down our manned fighter strength. This reaction is equivalent to saying to the Congress, "You want economy so we will give it to you—where it hurts." Instead, the money saved on Bomarc should be made available to strengthen our manned fighter defenses. Such approach would be consistent with the fact that the top stratum of the Air Force has turned down the request of Lt. Gen. Frank A. Armstrong, Jr., Commanding General of the Alaskan Command, for intermediate range missile installations in Alaska to offset the 27 Russian missile installations in Siberia across the Bering Strait. If Alaska is not an area usable for exchanging missile blows with the Russians, it must be regarded as an area vulnerable to attack and attempted occupancy by the Russians for use against the rest of our country as a nearby launching platform.

An excellent and more complete treatment of this whole subject is found in the remarks of Senators BARTLETT and GRUENING of Alaska set forth in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 17, 1960, beginning on page 10407 with the speech of Senator GRUENING. I invite all of you to read the able presentations of the two Senators, for the vital interest of all the people of the United States is at stake.

Keenotes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELIZABETH KEE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 23, 1960

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD I include a copy of my newsletter released today:

WASHINGTON, MAY 23, 1960.

KEENOTES BY REPRESENTATIVE ELIZABETH KEE

The collapse of the summit conference raises many grave problems for the United States and the rest of the free world. One thing appears to be certain—the cold war will be resumed with all of its dangerous implications.

The country is united behind the President. In view of Premier Khrushchev's violent and bitter attacks on Mr. Eisenhower, there is nothing else the country can do. A show of weakness at this point on our part or that of our allies could be fatal.

The failure of the summit negotiations to produce results is not surprising. But what is surprising is the violent manner in which Khrushchev chose to prevent them from even getting under way. The shooting down of the U–2 plane was the excuse he used. Obviously, he had made up his mind before coming to Paris to block any meaningful talks.

The important thing now is to present a united front to the world to meet an expected series of crises in the coming months. An inquiry into an unfortunate series of events preceding the Paris meeting can wait until a more appropriate time.

VETO BY PRESIDENT UNFORTUNATE

The veto by President Eisenhower of legislation to help in the economic rehabilitation of distressed areas is unfortunate. Twice Congress has passed this bill and each time the President has seen fit to kill it by veto.

In my opinion, the need for this legislation has been clearly established. There are thousands of people in various parts of the Nation who are at present leading hopeless lives. Their jobs are gone and the prospects of finding gainful employment are dim.

This legislation would have launched a cooperative program to rebuild these areas and create jobs for the unemployed. The President's six reasons for vetoing the bill did not seem to be very convincing to me.

Eventually, a program of this kind must be put into operation. The President's two vetoes have cost us valuable time in attacking a serious national economic problem.

WATERSHED PROTECTION PROGRAM STRENGTHENED

The House has voted an additional $4.9 million for the watershed protection program.

The idea behind the program is this: By building dams and other water checking facilities on small streams, the danger of downstream flooding on larger streams is lessened without the need for large, expensive dams. Also, the damage to productive farm land is kept to a minimum.

This program has been a success. In West Virginia and other States, some projects are actually under construction and others have been completed. There have been so many requests by local interests for inclusion in the program that additional planning funds were essential.

Protection of soil is one of the major problems facing the Nation. Soil is one of our most precious assets. We must not squander it.

I also strongly support the soil conservation program under which locally managed districts are formed to install soil conserving practices on a broad scale. Millions of acres are now included in soil conservation districts which are practicing the latest methods of conserving and preserving the soil.

This is a fine program which enjoys almost unanimous support in Congress.

Prices Charged by Hospitals for Drugs Administered to Patients

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 23, 1960

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, since medical plans for the aged have been advanced, many problems have come to light. A study made 2 years ago revealed that 40 percent of our retired people have some form of health insurance. Even this is often inadequate, and it is expensive in view of the limited resources of the greater majority of our senior citizens. In the meantime, medical costs continue to rise.

I return to my district every weekend and meet with many constituents, some of whom have had the misfortune of illnesses that have run into exorbitant costs.

In recent months public attention has been glaringly focused upon the high drug prices in our country, and emphasis has been properly placed on the wide disparity between the manufacturing cost of certain drugs and their retail selling price. I have followed the hearings conducted by the Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee, of which Senator ESTES KEFAUVER is chairman, and I have noted one aspect of this problem which has not yet been explored. This is the price charged by hospitals for drugs administered to patients. Since the patient in a hospital is a captive customer with respect to the drugs that are administered to him, I feel that this should also be an area for investigation by the subcommittee.

In reviewing the many complaints that I have received from constituents, I find that many of the statements rendered by hospitals, for the drugs administered to the patient, are not itemized. Also, in every case, it was felt that the charge for drugs was excessive.

I shall include a copy of a bill which one of my constituents received from a hospital, covering 1 week's expenses last October for one of his relatives. I was astounded when I saw the charge for drugs—$676.25. This was over half the cost of the entire hospital bill:

The following is a duplicate of this bill:

Board and room (7 days, at $21.50)	$150.50
Cardiogram	15.00
X-ray	20.00
Oxygen	78.00
Glucose	11.00
Laboratory examinations	207.00
Surgical dressings	9.08
Special medicines	676.25
Total	1,166.83

Under "Special medicines," or drugs, we find the following items:

Aqueous penicillin (190,000,000 units)	$380.00
Molar NA Lactate I.V.	21.00
Chymar	5.00
Cediland I.V	4.00
Hydrocortisone	24.00
Solu Cortel	15.00
Vitamin B_{12}	10.00
Digalon	2.00
Streptomycin	8.00
Saline	.75
ASA suppositories	7.50
Chloromycitin	102.00
Levaphed	3.00
Sulfadiazene	12.00
Glucose	75.00
Rontine	7.00
Total	676.25

It is my earnest hope that the Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee will delve into this aspect of drug prices since it is evident that a great quantity of drugs is dispensed through the medium of our hospitals. In view of the lack of competition in this area, corrective legislation may be necessary as determined by the facts after careful exploration by this subcommittee.

Washington, D.C., International Race

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 23, 1960

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, a statement which I have prepared on the Washington, D.C., International Race, the "Olympic of Racing," held on Veterans Day at the Laurel, Md., racetrack.

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

WASHINGTON, D.C., INTERNATIONAL RACE—THE OLYMPIC OF RACING

On November 11, Veterans Day in the United States, the unique Washington, D.C., International Horserace will be presented to the sporting people of the world for the ninth time. As each year becomes history, global interest shows a decided increase, not only among the peoples of the world who breed, own, and race thoroughbreds, but also by racing's millions who thoroughly enjoy keen competition anywhere.

By its very nature, the Washington, D.C., International is an "Olympic of Racing." By adding a sound sporting idea to modern air transportation, the Laurel Racecourse has developed an international spectacle already ranked the equal, if not surpassing, other worldwide contests featuring representatives of various countries in a struggle for global supremacy.

The Washington, D.C., International, with its Olympic overtones, is especially significant this year, a year in which the United States engages the nations of the world in athletic prowess.

Horseracing is not included on the official Olympic agenda at Rome, but what could be more fitting than for this great Maryland racing classic to serve as an Olympic vehicle? Understandably, it would be unofficial. But it isn't too far-fetched to see this sporting equine test, involving all the skill, speed, and stamina connected with the ancient Olympics, as a part of the games every 4 years, albeit not counted officially.

The race, begun in 1952 by Laurel President John D. Schapiro, was planned with this very idea in mind, that the best horses in each country, meeting on grass, the natural footing for a thoroughbred, and at the classic distance of a mile and a half, should have the opportunity of competing for the world championship of racing, in the same manner the various nations battle for supremacy in other sports. This certainly parallels the Olympic pattern.

Present-day air travel, with its speed and up-to-date equipment, has been largely responsible for this new era of international racing, but it remained for Laurel to do the pioneering and earn the success. It has meant work—hard work—and a lot of time, but the sporting people of the world now have a race of worldwide importance, a race in which the various champions of each nation can meet on equal footing in a battle for the bluest of all blue ribbons—a world championship.

It is especially fitting that this "Olympic of Racing" is held on Maryland soil. A small State in size and population, Maryland is nevertheless one of the Nation's leading producers of the thoroughbred horse. Over 55,000 acres are devoted to this industry, and farms range from the 2,500-acre Holly Beach farm near Annapolis to the

half-acre lot near Timonium where the fabulous Maryland-bred horse, Yes You Will, was raised.

The area comprising Baltimore, Howard, Harford, Prince Georges, and Montgomery Counties, produces 13 percent of all the thoroughbreds foaled yearly in the United States. And yet, with all this production, all but a small minority of breeders retain their produce for racing purposes, as compared to the commercial breeding establishments of Kentucky and Virginia.

So it is with a great deal of pride that I am able to point out that Maryland is the scene of the Washington, D.C., International. Despite the name of the race, it is Maryland's own, being staged by Marylanders on Maryland soil. It carries the name of Maryland all over the world, something no other sporting event in the State does, because racing, unlike other American sports, is known far and wide. And the Washington, D.C., International, by its very name, is of prime importance to the vast amount of people all over the globe who have a strong affinity for the sport of horseracing.

Repeal the Two-Term Limit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 23, 1960

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, just a few years ago, the 22d amendment to the Constitution was adopted, limiting the number of years a President could serve as Chief Executive of our Nation.

Since this amendment became a part of the supreme law of our land, there have been many criticisms of this provision.

There have been charges that it would seriously cripple the power of a President in his dealings with Congress. It has been said that this amendment even affects his role as titular head of his own political party and makes it extremely difficult to win support for his own programs among Members of Congress.

All these are valid criticisms, and we have seen the truth of these accusations during the past few years here in Washington.

But now we are faced with a much more serious effect of this amendment upon our Nation. We are faced with the very survival of civilization, with our existence as a nation.

The fact is that Premier Khrushchev has used our own Constitution against us. He has taken advantage of the 22d amendment to try to force his will upon us, to insult our President and the people of our Nation.

Mr. Khrushchev has said that he will not go to the summit for another conference until such time as President Eisenhower is out of office and a new President is elected.

We, as Americans, are prevented from returning President Eisenhower to office by a decisive margin to rebuke Premier Khrushchev, to show him that we oppose any such meddling in our internal affairs, particularly by one who has shown such a great disregard for truth, for honesty, for freedom and humanity.

What if Premier Khrushchev had not had the 22d amendment to lean on during his Paris outburst? Could he have successfully insulted our President and our people?

I do not believe so. The reason is that we, as Americans, would have had a means of showing up Premier Khrushchev in very short order.

We could have demonstrated to the world that we stand behind our President, and that we do not want to be pushed around by anyone. We could have returned President Eisenhower to the White House for a third term.

Under such circumstances, I doubt very seriously if there would ever have been a walkout by Khrushchev at the Paris conference. I believe he would have had to tone down his remarks and his accusations about the U-2 flights. I believe he would have considered what a resounding vote of confidence by the American people in their President would do to his threats and insults.

Quite likely, there would have been no Paris walkout. There would have been no period of renewed tensions and a dashing of hopes for peace.

The dangers in Russian prestige would have been too great. The odds would have been against Khrushchev.

President Eisenhower is the first President who has served under the terms of the 22d amendment. Already, this amendment has done great harm to our people, has caused serious damage to efforts to secure world peace, to end tensions and permit the world to live in some sense of security.

The weakness of this amendment has made itself readily apparent, and we should see to it that a President of the United States never again finds himself in this predicament.

Therefore, I urge repeal of the 22d amendment in the best interests of our people and our future.

I am well aware of the fact that some members of my own political party were the strongest advocates of this amendment. However, it was not foreseen—it could not be foreseen—that this amendment would be turned against us.

If we are to give our President the responsibility for our foreign policy, for maintaining world peace, then we must give him the authority to cope with these problems.

It is asking too much of any man to take on a dangerous and deadly foe with one hand tied behind his back, and that is exactly what we have asked our President to do.

A recent editorial in the Daily Tribune of Royal Oak, Mich., points out the dangers very clearly, and at this point I would like to have this article inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

[From the Daily Tribune, May 18, 1960]

REPEAL TWO-TERM LIMIT

When the Premier of Soviet Russia calls the President of the United States a "lame-duck President, it is time we reconsider the 22d amendment.

This amendment was adopted in spite. It limits the terms of the President to two. It was urged by those whose sole intellectual gift was hindsight; men with little real understanding of the legitimate use of governmental power but with a vast greed for it—if it is held by someone else.

By telling President Eisenhower that perhaps the Soviet Union will extend a new invitation for a Presidential visit—"in 6 or 8 months"—Premier Khrushchev automatically made the summit conference a 1960 campaign issue. It is bald interference in our internal affairs.

The choice of paths to peace is, of course, a legitimate campaign issue. But an issue for Americans. We may disagree among ourselves as to which is the wisest course to pursue, and vote accordingly. But the point is that the discussion and decision will take place within a general agreement, as Americans, that our primary concern is with the security and future of the United States of America.

The danger in Mr. Khrushchev's gambit, for us as well as for the Soviet Union, is that he may misread the election returns as either for or against the Soviet Union—as he already has chosen to misunderstand the meaning of the U-2 flight.

Mr. Eisenhower, the first President to hold office under the 22d amendment, already has felt the effect of limitation on Presidential power in his relations with Congress.

It was well understood before the adoption of the 22d amendment, that a President in a position to succeed himself was in a more effective position to secure carrying out the decisions our Constitution requires him to make. Now Khrushchev has pointed up an even more dangerous limitation on the power to represent the United States effectively in foreign affairs.

Economics, Ethics, and Mental Illness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 23, 1960

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include an address which I delivered at the 11th Mental Hospital Institute, Buffalo, N.Y., on October 20, 1959:

ECONOMICS, ETHICS, AND MENTAL ILLNESS

(Address of the Honorable JOHN E. FOGARTY, Member of Congress, Second District, Rhode Island, at the 11th Mental Hospital Institute, at the Hotel Statler in Buffalo, N.Y., on October 20, 1959)

Distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, I am greatly honored by your invitation to present the academic lecture at this 11th Annual Mental Hospital Institute. I have a sense of some temerity, however, in addressing a group such as this on the subject of ethics and mental illness. All of you have, in the most practically real and effective way, dedicated yourselves to improving the condition of the mentally ill. The staffs of the outstanding hospitals that have received the Mental Hospital Service Achievement Awards here tonight are in the front echelons of an army of many thousands who work against tremendous odds. These people, despite the magnitude and seeming hopelessness of the task, have made substantial gains in the campaign to improve care and treatment for the mentally ill, to help them recover more rapidly and more fully. As a layman, I can

add to your great effort only my indirect help, my understanding, and my support for your work.

I have been closely concerned for a long time, as many of you may know, with the problems of mental and emotional disorders. The prevalence of these illnesses, and the regularity with which they afflict a large proportion of our people in every class and condition of society put them in a critical category all by themselves. If mental illness were acutely contagious instead of causing chronic invalidism and disability, our country and all the countries of the civilized world would long ago have declared a state of emergency against this epidemic.

As a nation, we are painfully aware of the economic costs of mental illness; we have deep sympathy for the misery of those who suffer from mental illness and the hardships endured by their families; we want to do as much as we can to alleviate this suffering—but we are not sure how much we can afford to do; what limits we should set to our efforts in the light to what we know at present; in what directions we should exert our efforts most vigorously.

The dilemma was posed most succinctly in the recent report on the economics of mental illness. This report is the second in a series being issued by the Joint Commission on Mental Illness and Health as part of a national mental health survey initiated by Congress. The purpose of the survey is to bring together a comprehensive body of findings and recommendations that will serve as the basis for planning a stepped up, comprehensive national mental health program.

Dr. Rashi Fein, the economist who worked out methods for estimating the direct and indirect costs of mental illness in the United States, estimates them conservatively at a minimum of $3 billion each year. This figure obviously does not represent the full cost of mental illness. It includes direct costs of caring for the mentally ill expended by public and private agencies, by the patients and their families, by public institutions and private foundations. It includes estimates of such indirect costs as loss of production and loss of earnings. It does not include the costs of private care outside the hospital, of public assistance to the mentally ill or the handling of the mentally ill by police, court, penal, social welfare and other public institutions. Nor does it include the costs of related problems such as drug addiction, alcoholism, juvenile delinquency, and mental retardation.

The $3 billion figure includes $100 million as an estimated minimum direct cost of care provided by psychiatrists in full-time practice. It does not include the cost of payments to psychiatrists in part-time practice, to general practitioners, or to internists for the care of the mentally ill. I am sure that you who work in the field are well aware of the difficulty of gathering accurate statistics on this subject. It has been estimated that perhaps 50 percent of the patients consulting general practitioners are suffering from complaints of an emotional origin. If this cost were included, we would have to add another $1 billion to our $3 billion annual total.

We all are, of course, painfully aware that even though we pay out $3 billion annually, we are not providing our mentally ill with anything like the best care presently possible. The average expenditure per patient in a public mental hospital is just a little better than $4 a day. This compares with a daily cost of approximately $25 in a general hospital. The staff of the Joint Commission raise some very provocative questions in their preface to Dr. Fein's report. They ask: "How much would it cost to provide the highest possible standard of care for the mentally ill? Can we afford these costs? More exactly, which can we better afford—the cost in human misery caused by mental illness or the cost in dollars to provide the best care we know how to give?"

As a people, we Americans are committed morally and ethically to the proposition that each man and woman is entitled to the opportunity to realize his best capabilities. This includes the opportunity to receive proper medical care, regardless of income, social class, or the nature of the illness. We subscribe to the statement in the constitution of the World Health Organization that "the enjoyment of the highest attainable standard of health is one of the fundamental rights of every human being without distinction of race, religion, political belief, economic or social condition." However, we are a practical people. We also want to know whether large increases in the money spent to treat mental illness would be justified from an economic as well as a humanitarian viewpoint. Will increased expenditures tend to reduce the extent of the problem in the future? Where will the money come from? Should available increased funds be spent to step up research that hopefully will reduce the problem drastically at some future date—and, in the meantime, limp along with inadequate care for those who now are mentally ill or who become mentally ill in the near future?

From an ethical point of view, I do not believe that we have any choice. We cannot abandon one iota of the available potential for uncovering useful new knowledge through research. Equally, we cannot abandon the mentally ill. We are morally obliged to strive, to the limit of our abilities and resources, to improve the lot of the mentally ill, to make treatment more effective, to increase our efforts at cure and rehabilitation. Certainly people suffering from this illness are entitled to the same consideration as those with physical illness. As you know any person with acute appendicitis can obtain a good surgeon to remove it regardless of his ability to pay. We do not provide similar services for the mentally ill.

But because our resources are far from unlimited, we must make choices. What kinds of expanded services for the mentally ill are likely to be the most profitable? Where will our efforts be apt to bring the greatest payoff in terms of patient recovery?

Until fairly recently these were questions which could be answered almost solely on empirical evidence. And as a glance back over history will remind you, the answers that were accepted and applied in treatment were colored more often by the intellectual attitudes of the times than by detached analysis. Thus, little of constructive value was done to help the mentally ill in Western Europe until the age of enlightenment at the end of the 18th century. Paradoxically, the period of the Renaissance, during which new emphasis was placed on the dignity and worth of the individual, was characterized by cruel and repressive treatment for the mentally ill.

As you know, it was not until the 1800's that a systematic approach to mental illness was predicated on the belief that the mentally ill are entitled to the humane treatment that is the inalienable right of all human beings. This era of moral treatment, based on principles advocated by Pinel and Tuke, stressed the importance of attempting to influence the mentally ill by appealing to them with kindness and understanding rather than by regimenting them. Although it was believed that mental illness was caused by some unknown pathological process in the brain, the advocates of this type of treatment felt that their approach would do much to help their patients.

In that era, there were so few mental hospitals in the United States that only a small fraction of the people who needed hospital care would be admitted, but the hospitals that did exist were operated along excellent principles. They were small. The superintendents were highly intelligent and well motivated. The atmosphere was friendly, comfortable, hopeful, and the superintendent was able to talk to each patient daily. Despite the paucity of treatment methods, the number of discharges and recoveries in these hospitals was substantial.

Further advances in care and treatment were made in the big mental hospitals that were established during the latter half of the 19th century. New discoveries made during the first half of the present century enabled us to conquer the psychoses due to pellagra and general paresis. The use of shock therapy changed the entire picture with respect to involutional melancholia. The various psychotherapies were developed, and much was learned about the anatomy, physiology, and pathology of the nervous system.

In our own day, we have witnessed a period of remarkable progress which began shortly after World War II. Stimulated by the realization that mental and emotional disorders were a dangerous hazard to our safety as a nation, Congress, at that time, initiated our present ongoing program of support for research, training, and service in the field of mental health. In the short span of years since then, this activity has grown manyfold. Equally important, new work in the field of mental illness has been begun and stimulated by State and local government agencies, institutions, private foundations, citizens' organizations, universities and medical schools, training centers, and groups of all types throughout the country.

I have watched this campaign grow and spread, as you all have, and I must say the results have been impressive. New research findings have emerged—the tranquilizers and other psychoactive drugs have come into general use—we have developed new ways of training personnel and using people now available to treat patients—we have set up new kinds of treatment facilities and changed our uses of present facilities. The growth in treatment resources and know-how has been little short of phenomenal. Though we are still far from our goal, we have, I believe, what no previous period had. We have a handle with which to grasp the problem of mental illness. We have some tools that can help us decide, on a scientific basis, where our expanded efforts are most likely to bring results in terms of patient recovery.

Among the more useful tools, it seems to me are the epidemiological studies of mental illness. These studies have provided new knowledge about who becomes ill, how long they remain ill, what happens to the mental patient both in and out of the hospital, and the effects of new therapies and new kinds of domiciliary and outpatient care. This kind of information, obviously, is of first importance in long-range planning and in making critical decisions which will affect the patterns of caring for the mentally ill for decades to come. A great deal of this information has come from the many statistical studies of mental hospital populations sponsored and conducted by the States in the Model Reporting Area for Mental Hospital Statistics, with the guidance, cooperation, and assistance of the National Institute of Mental Health. Experts in this field have charted new ways of analyzing the problems of mental illness.

To me, one of the most significant changes that has taken place in recent years is that communities are assuming more responsibility for the care of the mentally ill. Services and facilities that make it possible to keep people out of mental hospitals and still give them adequate care are being established throughout the Nation.

Of particular importance has been the increase of psychiatric facilities in general hospitals. The numbers of these hospitals accepting psychiatric patients rose from 43 in 1939 to almost 1,000 in 1958.

The increase in the number of outpatient clinics and the extent of their services has been equally phenomenal.

New types of outpatient facilities and day-care and night-care centers have been opened.

Emergency psychiatric services are being developed which hopefully will obviate the need for hospitalization in some instances.

Nursing homes and chronic-disease hospitals are being used more and more for care of such groups as the aged mentally ill.

There has also been an increase in after-care facilities in the community so that patients who have been released are less likely to relapse.

Within the mental hospitals, there have also been significant changes. In fact, from what I have read I would say that there has been a virtual revolution in the way in which the hospital views and handles the mental patient, a revolution that has been reflected in the more hopeful attitude toward mental illness prevalent throughout our society today. The use of total push programs, begun about 10 years ago, have demonstrated that many backward patients—the ones for whom hope had long since been abandoned—could improve to the point where they can be returned to the community.

The open hospital has been another major step forward in the attempt to prevent long-term hospitalization and its associated ill effects. The healthy activity and sense of purpose that characterize the modern mental hospital are a far cry from the atmosphere that surrounded the mental hospital even as recently as 25 years ago. The idea of the open hospital has come to our shores in recent years from England where it has worked out very successfully in a number of hospitals. As yet it is not so generally accepted here as abroad.

A number of commentators have pointed out an apparent difference in the amount of violence among British and American patients and have suggested that something in the British personality or the more uniform culture in Great Britain may make the open hospital more feasible there than here. But the precedent for patient freedom in this country existed long ago. In 1842, Charles Dickens described, in his "American Notes," scenes in the Boston Lunatic Asylum that would do justice to the more enlightened of our present-day institutions. "Every patient in this asylum," Dickens wrote, "sits down to dinner every day with a knife and fork; * * * At every meal, moral influence alone restrains the more violent among them—but the effect of that influence—is found, even as a means of restraint, to say nothing of it as a means of cure, a hundred times more efficacious than all the strait-waiscots, fetters, and handcuffs. * * *"

One might logically conclude, therefore, that the success of the "open door" is dependent upon a real change in attitude toward the mentally ill. Opening locked doors and giving patients the social freedom that is rightfully theirs is not enough. There must be real conviction on the part of the entire hospital staff that the patient can improve. Patients must be given treatment; all the available therapies—chemotherapy, psychotherapy, physical therapies and so on—must be marshalled and organized on an individual basis so that each patient is given the benefit of all that is now known about treating mental illness.

More and more the hospital must take its place as part of a network of mental health services in the community. The treatment and rehabilitation programs of the hospital need to become more closely integrated with community health and social services, so that the patient can receive continuous psychiatric and social assistance that will change as his needs change—and so that he will be able to maintain his links to the community and to his family throughout the course of his illness.

Dr. Robert Felix, Director of the National Institute of Mental Health and president-elect of your American Psychiatric Association, pointed out this need at your meeting 2 years ago when he said: "I would envision the time when we would consider the hospital period not as a separate entity, but as an entity in the total therapeutic program of the individual." The hospital also must share its responsibilities in the total community forces available for fostering preventive programs and positive mental health activities. Dr. Felix has also said: "* * * members of our hospital staffs are going to be much more effective as a total therapeutic instrument in hospital programs if there are devices set up whereby they must spend some of their time in consultation with other agencies in the community."

This means that hospital staff would become involved in a whole array of community activities—such as industrial mental health, school mental health, the mental health aspects of law enforcement programs, and various community mental health activities in cooperation with civic leaders. Although these activities would, of course, burden the already overcrowded schedule of hospital staff, the benefits would far outweigh the difficulties—and the advantages would probably spur renewed and successful efforts at expanding hospital staff. Closer contact with the community would give the hospital physician, nurse, social worker, and psychologist a clearer understanding of the problems confronting the patient when he leaves the hospital. Such contacts would also stimulate professional personnel and other people working and living in the community to provide services within the hospital and help the hospital staff.

Ideally, if we are to make the mental hospital an effective therapeutic instrument, it must be set within a larger community which itself is a healing community—in which the general climate and the available services tend to minimize the unhealthy stresses which contribute to mental illness, and tend to promote mental health in a positive way. Recent research leaves no doubt that an individual's social environment has a tremendous influence on his mental health. In the hospital, a therapeutic environment means a climate in which the entire staff brings help to the patients and the patients help one another—in which there is increased emphasis on patient self-government and the patient is given more responsibility for managing his own affairs—in which treatment and help and rehabilitation are dominant. In the community a situation conducive to mental health means ready and adequate help for families in trouble, before one of their members breaks down—it means helping families recognize the early signs of mental illness and seek the proper kind of help as soon as possible—it means halfway houses, sheltered workshops and social-therapeutic clubs for discharged patients—it means the establishment of mental health centers to serve as screening and referral agencies—it means psychiatric emergency services and foster-home care and other measures to avoid long-term mental hospitalization.

The problem of avoiding long-term mental hospitalization is perhaps most acute with the aging—the group who are the particular focus of this Mental Hospital Institute. The problem represented by the disproportionately large number of persons 65 years and over being admitted to public mental hospitals will become an even more critical one in the years ahead. It is estimated that by 1980 the number of people 65 years and over in the general population will double. If the current trend remains fixed, the increased numbers of older people in our mental hospitals will be tremendous. This will pose additional problems, because older patients require a great deal of physical and medical care and special staff attention.

This emerging problem suggests increased emphasis on research in many directions. For example, we need to know more about the aging process itself, about the cause of mental illness in the aged, and about the cultural and economic factors that determine choice of the hospital for needed care. Not all patients with mental diseases of the senium are cared for in mental hospitals. There are a variety of other facilities available—homes for the aged, nursing homes, chronic disease hospitals. We need more facts before we can decide which facility can furnish the most appropriate care.

Perhaps we should give more thought to foster home care of the aged patient whose condition does not necessitate hospitalization but who does not have a family able or willing to give him the help he needs. In thinking of such foster care, we should not ignore the contributions that might be made by the increasing numbers of healthy and active older people in our population—people for whom the responsibility of providing a foster home for aged patients would mean the difference between aimlessness and a sense of purpose and being needed that are essential to everyone's mental health. Payments for providing such foster care might mean the difference between self-respecting independence for thousands of healthy elderly people and the economic dependency on others that in itself can breed psychological problems for the aged. Perhaps this approach could help the older people to help themselves.

But the question of institutional or community or home care of the aged mentally ill, as of other types of mental patients, is only one aspect of the problem. The choice of treatment and treatment facility will change with constantly changing medical knowledge about prevention, treatment, and rehabilitation. It will change as attitudes of the community toward mental illness keep changing. It will change as we learn more about the complex interactions of biological, psychological, economic, and social forces that influence mental health and mental illness. The mental hospital is in a strategic position to contribute to the accumulation of that knowledge as well as to test it out with patients. It can be a living laboratory for the study of mental illness. The establishment of research activity within the hospital itself would help to strengthen its ties with university and other research centers, and would make the hospital more attractive as a place to work and learn. In thus branching out into other activities, the mental hospital may help to solve the chronic problems of insufficient staff that has tended to keep it ingrown and isolated in the past.

I am aware that most of these thoughts have occurred to all of you, perhaps many times. I am also aware of the numerous practical problems and obstacles that daily frustrate your attempts to move ahead. But, as you carry on your deliberations at this institute, and as you work in your respective hospitals throughout the coming year, you should know that there is broad and generous public support for your efforts. I believe I express the feelings of the vast majority of our people when I say that our country is committed to a full program of activity in the field of mental illness, up to the limit of our economic, and scientific abilities.

The U.S. Merchant Marine and World Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 23, 1960

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address entitled "The U.S. Merchant Marine and World Trade," delivered by the Honorable Frederick H. Mueller, Secretary of Commerce, before the Port of Washington Propeller Club, in celebration of National Maritime Day, at the Statler Hotel, in this city, on May 20, 1960.

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

THE U.S. MERCHANT MARINE AND WORLD TRADE

(Text of address by the Honorable Frederick H. Mueller, Secretary of Commerce, prepared for delivery before the Port of Washington Propeller Club in celebration of National Maritime Day, Statler Hotel, Washington, D.C., Friday, May 20, 1960)

It was just 27 years ago today that the Congress, by joint resolution, established May 22 as National Maritime Day and provided for its annual proclamation by the President. It provides an occasion to commemorate the first transoceanic voyage of any ship powered by steam. For on May 22, 1819, the SS *Savannah* started the voyage which ushered in a new era in merchant shipping.

This year another chapter in maritime history will be written. As President Eisenhower noted in his Maritime Day proclamation, "This year will witness the harnessing of the atom for the benefit of mankind as the world's first nuclear-powered merchant ship, the NS *Savannah*, sails out upon the high seas."

But, as the President also noted, National Maritime Day each year also provides an occasion to honor the U.S. merchant marine and all who help to maintain an industry and service so essential to the economy and security of the free world.

In all of our proper celebrations all over the country, however, it behooves all of us to remember another anniversary—for it points a moral. A century ago last month the famous Pony Express began operating between St. Joseph, Mo., and Sacramento, Calif.

You might be interested in the kinds of ads used to recruit the boys who manned this wild and woolly route to carry messages at the rate of $5 a half ounce—later reduced to a dollar. One was reproduced in the Washington Evening Star for April 9:

"Wanted—young, skinny, wiry fellows not over 18. Must be expert riders willing to risk death daily. Orphans preferred. Wages $25 a week."

In its short life the Pony Express sure had glamor. Buffalo Bill Cody and Wild Bill Hickok were in the select company of riders, and Mark Twain penned their praises. They astonished the world with their record of 7 days and 17 hours carrying Lincoln's first inaugural address.

But the enterprise went broke, for a variety of causes, in about 18 months. It was given the final blow when the first transcontinental telegraph line, building from both coasts, was finally joined and completed at Salt Lake City in October 1861. Technological progress, which within the lifetime of men and women still living has seen the world move from the Pony Express days to jet planes that can cross the entire continent between breakfast and lunch, has been inexorable. However glamorous the good old days, competition in new and improved methods of transportation and communication have sounded their knell.

I say this not to play the specter at the feast on this occasion, but to note another purpose of Maritime Day celebrations. Past accomplishments inspire them—but we must look ahead, reflect upon our problems, and plan a better future for the maritime industry.

I say "we" advisedly. The Department of Commerce, the U.S. Government, in fact the people of the United States and the whole free world, have a vital stake in your economic health and growth. Before getting into some specifics, let me spell that out as a step in enlisting the kind of help we shall need to do what sorely needs to be done.

We have survived two world wars and were able to end the bloody stalemate in Korea, aiding our allies in all of these struggles, in great measure because we could stay in business on the world's sea lanes. Today, with an even greater threat, U.S.-flag ships must be available to deliver U.S. economic and military aid to nations whose strength and growth are vital to our own.

On the strictly commercial side, we need your help. As you know, the President recently intiated a national export expansion program—a partnership by the Federal Government and private industry to sell more American goods abroad. The Departments of State and Commerce are stepping up services to help business to do more business overseas.

We urge the maritime industry to take a fresh look at the trade and tourist picture. I am sure that your great industry will join with other American business enterprises in seeking new markets for American products and new traffic for American shipping.

As our foreign trade expands—and expand it must—we have a job to convince both exporters and importers that they should move a substantial portion of their cargoes on fine American ships.

Now for those specifics. What is plaguing your industry? We don't have all the answers, but we've been learning fast.

Recently, I submitted to the President the report which he requested me to make, as Secretary of Commerce, on Federal transportation policy and program. The problems of the merchant marine were identified in the light of general problems of public policy in transportation. The general recommendations we made were stated in summary form, and require further elaboration in detail.

As the decade opens, the strategic position of the United States has undergone a transformation. In former years we felt as a nation that we faced but a single acute threat to our national security. The response to it was specific and decisive: specific plans for defending the security of the free world.

This specific, decisive policy had all the virtues of a simple issue which could be stated in term easily understood. It had its influence on our merchant marine policy. Since our objective was specific our merchant marine policy could be equally specific; we could say that our defense plans and assumptions required a civilian merchant marine of X number of tons or X number of ships to augment our logistical plans. Merchant marine planners could look to the military authorities for their specific logistical requirements and could attempt to build a merchant marine policy on the assumptions presented to them.

Under today's conditions in international affairs, this simple, black and white way of planning a national merchant marine is no longer possible, let alone desirable. We have a whole economy to think about. What was once a simple issue of military power between the free world and the Soviet bloc has become a problem of more uncertainty and more complexity. We face continuous threat and tension in many areas.

This evolving situation has introduced great uncertainties into military planning, and consequently into the national defense aspects of our merchant marine policy. We can no longer plan merchant marine policy on the basis of a specific set of figures on national defense requirements. While defense plans must recognize that a backlog of merchant ships is of great potential value, this value must be measured against a great variety of other military problems.

Furthermore, our economic policies in this coming decade will have important impacts on our political relationships. Like the world strategic situation, the world economic situation is evolving from the severe simplicity of the past to increasing complexity. Our foreign trade and balance of payments have reflected this changing picture. We know that we must be competitive if our economy is to survive in a world of growing productivity.

The growing competitiveness of world trade has made a profound impact on our shipping industry. Our national merchant marine now carries less than 20 percent of our foreign trade tonnage, a lesser rate than any time since before the First World War. Furthermore, wide cost differentials exist between our maritime industry and those of other countries in the construction and operation of ships.

Historically the Government has sought to meet this particular competitive disadvantage with a variety of subsidies. Construction and operating differential subsidies have been granted, and such subsidy costs have increased. Under cargo preference laws, reserving to privately owned and operated American flag merchant ships at least 50 percent of Government-financed cargoes, the unsubsidized part of our foreign trade fleet is also being aided.

One of the major policy goals recommended in our transportation report is to improve the efficiency of shipbuilding and ship operation to meet foreign competition and reduce the need for Federal subsidy. The research and development programs of the Department of Commerce have been greatly expanded over the past 5 years. The NS *Savannah* is one result, and others—such as the hydrofoil vessel and the automation of ship operations—are on the way.

These measures looking toward industry and Government cooperation toward greater efficiency, obviously require the full cooperation of American labor.

Here I feel we all—and again I say "all" advisedly—have done very little. I refer to the fact that the connection between the worker's job and the safety and security of his home and family has not been emphasized.

On the face of it labor has been a major beneficiary of our merchant marine subsidy policy. And no one would argue with the fact that labor and management in your industry have a common interest in the continued existence of American ships and shipyards. But are the implications of these facts sufficiently known on both sides of the bargaining table?

American labor has learned, in many industries, that mechanization and automation make and keep jobs, and make a higher standard of living possible. American management has learned that labor has a right to a measure of protection and a voice in decisions affecting their livelihood. And great progress has been made.

But it is later than we think. New means of labor-management cooperation must be found to improve the competitive position of our merchant marine. We need new machinery where automation does not apply—human machinery to provide flexibility and rapid change in service to meet the changing demands for service.

The least that the public has a right to demand is that those who are the beneficiaries of subsidies as well as the payments of customers should work together to give value received. I have high hopes that our transportation report, emphasizing competition and deemphasizing subsidies, can gradually permit the Government to concentrate our tax money upon those programs which the Government alone can undertake and carry through.

Maritime management and labor surely have the know-how to do the job. Our foreign trade and domestic commerce are growing, as is our population and the world's population. Subsidies should operate as an incentive to greater initiative and efficiency on the part of the American Merchant Marine. No one knows better than you in the industry that subsidies do not guarantee a profit to the operator.

That happy solution to your difficulties depends, in the final analysis on your ability to secure cargoes at remunerative rates. The Maritime Administrator, implementing section 212 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, has appointed a committee to study and develop ways and means to induce importers and exporters to give preference to vessels under U.S. registry.

It is not unreasonable to shoot for a goal of at least half of our export and import traffic to move in American-flag bottoms. Yet in 1958 only a third of such traffic moving by liner ships over essential foreign trade routes moved in U.S.-flag ships. If bulk cargoes are included, this proportion drops to 16 percent.

All of us can do a better job than that. We can bring home to those controlling selection of carriers that U.S.-flag carriers usually—and subsidized operators must—purchase and use U.S. products except under emergency conditions. Your service—unlike foreign shipping operators who come and go as they please—is stable and regular. Our shipyard workers and seamen benefit from use of American-flag ships and in turn increase purchase of American goods and services.

These are but elements of good salesmanship, and we need the hard sell in your industry as much as we need it to better our whole export position.

Meanwhile we in Government are going ahead with further proposals for merchant marine construction and operation, based upon our evaluation of shipping needs and such strategic assumptions as seem reasonable. But our concentrated attention will increasingly be on means of increasing the competitive quality of our merchant marine to assist in the improvement of the competitive position of your industry in world trade.

This effort will involve hard decisions and the solution of difficult problems. For many it will require a new outlook. Industry and labor must make their own constructive suggestions to the Government on means of improving the value of the merchant marine to American business in foreign trade. And much more emphasis must be given to research and development.

The program I have described, based upon the findings and recommendations in our transportation report, will be a major experiment in industry-labor-government partnership. The stakes are high. They involve our national survival as well as that of your industry. Upon its success rests not merely our own prosperity. The peoples of the world of the 1960's will grow even closer together in time—and we hope in freedom—through progress in science and the exchange of goods made possible by peaceful trade.

The pony express beat the then world's record for carrying messages 2,000 miles at about 250 miles a day a century ago. Yet with all its gallantry it couldn't beat the competition of technological advance.

But the spirit of those young men, whose exploits have enchanted several generations of Americans, is still with us. It is that spirit which will yet carry the message of freemen and free enterprise around the world and perhaps to the unexplored reaches of the universe.

Libraries, Education, and Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 23, 1960

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include an address which I delivered at the Drexel Institute of Technology, Philadelphia, Pa., on May 17, 1960:

LIBRARIES, EDUCATION, AND SOCIETY

(Remarks made by Representative JOHN E. FOGARTY at Drexel Institute of Technology on May 17, 1960, on occasion of his receiving the Distinguished Achievement Award from the Graduate School of Library Science and the Library Alumni Association)

Today I saw for the first time the impressive new quarters of the library school here at Drexel.[1] I am sure they bring to you a deep sense of pride and gratification—much as your Distinguished Achievement Award, and this opportunity to meet with you have given me. It is a fine thing to feel that one's efforts have played some part in strengthening the American heritage.

A library school—or legislation to aid libraries—can do just that: It can enrich society and strengthen the Nation. It does this mainly through the enduring contribution of libraries to education.

America's strength was once felt to lie predominantly in her agricultural and geographic advantages. Since the turn of the century, industry and natural resources have been paramount. Both, of course, remain essential to our country's strength and her leadership among free peoples. But the close of World War II brought sharply into focus another basic resource—education; and recent years have commanded its critical appraisal. It is now clear to many that agriculture and industry, however prolific, cannot insure supremacy or even survival without a stronger fiber of education in the social fabric.

The modern concept of education is a broad one. Besides the schools at all levels, many institutions and media are recognized as educational—partly because of their mounting interest in the role. There are more and more educational uses of films and recordings, radio and television, magazines and newspapers, pamphlets, and books. There is an upward trend in the publication of all factual matter. I believe these changes reflect generally a felt need of people for a broader view of the world about them.

One institution with a growing educational mission is the library. It is axiomatic, of course, that libraries should serve scholarship; but I refer to a more active part in the educational process. Increasingly the progressive library is concerned with information—with collecting, lending, and promoting current reading matter, films, recordings, and other educational materials. Thus the library aligns itself with institutions and forces that are shaping our national destiny.

It is my conviction that this is the way in which libraries of all types can best serve the community in our dynamic times. Libraries are more than storehouses; their broader function is to teach.

For many years I have given my best thought to certain needs and aspirations of our people. This has been basic to my responsibilities as a Representative to Congress from the Second District of Rhode Island, and as chairman of the subcommittee in the House of Representatives which is concerned with appropriations to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. I am pleased to say that many libraries and library groups are closely allied with the Department in several of its programs. They collaborate in activities of the Office of Education and the National Library of Medicine. They share particularly the interests of the Public Health Service in aging, juvenile delinquency, and blindness.

As an interested layman, I should like to express briefly some views on the library's role in these tremendous problems.

One of the great paradoxes of the modern world is the problem of our aging population—the medical and social needs that have risen as a result of our longer life span, which is largely attributable to advances in medicine and public health. Since 1900, people over 50 have increased in our population from 13 percent to more than 22 percent. By 1970, nearly 25 percent of the American people will be over 50, and 10 percent will be over 65. This implies a continued increase in those burdens that weigh so heavily upon the aged—health problems, occupational difficulties, lowered income, unsatisfactory living conditions, loneliness.

In attempting to come to grips with such a problem one naturally turns to institutions and individuals that might be expected to help. A group that has outlined its objectives with regard to the aged is the National Library Association. It has spelled out in congressional testimony[2] how the public library renders direct services to the elderly; supplies middle-age groups with literature on retirement plans, housing and income; coordinates interested civic groups and educational programs; and assists personnel who work with the aging through books, films, and exhibits.

These seem to me excellent, practical objectives that might well be extended to all libraries. In addition, I should like to see library schools expand the training of librarians to work with the elderly. Some studies should be undertaken to settle the question whether cultural and educational interests can actually retard mental decline, and to learn how libraries can help bring out and utilize the older person's best attributes. It would be a great credit to library science, and quite fitting, if some library group were to lead the way toward salvaging the elder population's vast resource of experience and skills.

The library's place in our culture is nuclear: it offers literature, information, and recreation to many groups, the young as

---

[1] The Graduate School of Library Science (third oldest in the United States and among the first five in enrollment) and the Drexel Library are housed together in the Library Center, opened in the fall of 1959, and the latest addition to the physical plant in the current expansion program.

[2] Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, Aug. 4, 1959.

well as the old. I feel that its values to youth have barely been tapped. In many young people, there is a spirit that rebels against education—or rather, against being taught. This finds a terrible and ruinous expression in the juvenile delinquent, whose rebellion may lead to total loss of educational contact. And yet the delinquent or predelinquent does not necessarily resist learning. His indifference or hostility may embrace only the formal aspects of education—the classroom and its implication of discipline and conformity. The same individual may sometimes be reached through an appeal to his curiosity, his need to excel, or his natural love for reading, music, or some related pursuit. Every era has its Bohemian movement, which is essentially rebellious and yet intellectual or artistic.

The difficulty, of course, is to capture and hold interest. The library has strong competition, and I can offer no formula. I only know that the mind of youth is capable of intense application in response to the right appeal. With no coercion whatever, youth can master difficult sports, jazz music, automotive mechanics, radio engineering. And we have all seen young people come to public libraries in underprivileged metropolitan sections, drawn by up-to-date material on invention, the space age, sports and recreation, career opportunities, and interesting lives. I have seen this in districts where crime and violence beckon constantly to every child. In light of these things, I am confident that ways can be found to enhance the appeal and effectiveness of libraries in helping the prospective citizen.

You may be interested in certain resolutions passed at the recent White House Conference on Children and Youth, which included nearly 100 librarians among the delegates.

One resolution called for adequately supported studies to determine the effects of reading books, magazines, and newspapers upon young people. Another recommended that much more extensive use be made of films and other instructional material in both formal and informal education. Several resolutions were aimed at augmenting the opportunities for training and participation in dramatics, theater arts, and film production.

With direct reference to libraries, it was resolved that action should be taken to extend the availability of public library service to every citizen; that libraries be established in schools, colleges and universities, with a view to helping them achieve higher standards; and that reading, training in the selection of literature, and recruitment of personnel trained in reading guidance be vigorously promoted.

One of the forums resolved that young people should be encouraged to study the great ethical, moral and religious truths, and to use these to formulate codes of conduct for their guidance toward good citizenship.

I believe we shall soon see legislation and other efforts to implement these recommendations at local, State, and Federal levels. Meanwhile, library workers will be able to draw on the resolutions in seeking interest and aid.

Another medical and social area in which libraries are making a valuable contribution is blindness. Despite public and private efforts over many years, the number of blind persons in this country is about 350,000 and is steadily increasing. The Public Health Service's National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Blindness is attacking the problem from the medical standpoint. On the social side, I believe there is need for a good study on problems related to blindness and the needs of the blind. One objective would be to help create a national atmosphere more favorable to the blind person and his role in society. This would call for studies of existing conditions, including the problem of providing books and recordings. The best library services now available for the blind should be augmented and extended.

Some of you may not know that the Library of Congress program to provide books for the blind is currently operating under an appropriation of $1.6 million, which is a little more than ever before. To date, the Library has provided about 5,600 titles in Braille and Moon type and 4,000 talking books. Approximately 70,000 of the Library's machines are now in use.

As I have indicated, many grave medical and social problems call strongly on libraries among other key groups. Assistance to libraries themselves has been made available through the Library Services Act. In fiscal year 1960 allotments are based on the maximum authorized appropriation, $7.5 million. In this session of Congress, I have introduced a bill to extend the act for another 5 years beginning July 1.

This Office of Education program has helped to bring library services to 30 million people in rural America. It has provided trained personnel, 200 bookmobiles, and 5 million books and other materials. Fifty-two States and territories are now participating. Since the beginning of the program in 1957, the matching requirements have stimulated local governments to increase their library appropriations by 45 percent. One of the most encouraging results is the development of an effective system of libraries, with strong centers, cooperative processing, and so forth. And throughout the Nation there is a growing awareness of the meaning of libraries in education.

In my own State of Rhode Island, progress under the act has been typical. A special unit, Public Library Services in Rural Areas, was set up in the office of the secretary of state to administer the program. A director, assistant director, clerical staff, and a bookmobile were added and new quarters obtained. A book grant was made to rural libraries, with provisions for emphasis on reference materials. Books are ordered and processed by the State agency. A series of workshops has been held at headquarters, and State consultant and bookmobile services have steadily grown.

Another law that has much significance for libraries is the National Defense Education Act of 1958. This is primarily designed to strengthen, improve, and expand education in the United States at all levels. Libraries are specified as basic to the educational process. I should like to call attention to the fact that projects developed under the act may include books and other materials, and that these are not yet available in adequate quantity and quality. Library materials to aid both teachers and students are needed for a balanced program.

Of the 10 titles in the act, title III offers the most direct opportunities for libraries. This authorizes $70 million a year until July 1962 for improved science, mathematics, and modern foreign language instruction in public schools. Federal funds are available for laboratory and other special equipment. By the language of the act, special equipment includes printed materials (except textbooks) and audiovisual materials and equipment. Minor remodeling and special equipment needed by the library because of its necessary expansion may be included under projects approved by the State educational agency and the U.S. Office of Education.

Other titles also pertain to libraries and librarians. Title II, for example, which provides loans up to $5,000 for college students. Persons training to become librarians are eligible, and 50 percent of the loan will be canceled for those who serve as school or teacher librarians for 5 years. Another example is title IV, which provides graduate fellowships aimed particularly at the preparation of teachers for colleges and universities.

I urge all of you to review the provisions of the National Defense Education Act (Public Law 85-864) and to be sure your students are familiar with the aspects pertaining to libraries. The ALA or the U.S. Office of Education will gladly supply details.

While speaking of Federal aid to libraries, I will make a point that may seem to the older hands here a little obvious. I refer to the fact that a library in the modern sense, adequately stocked and staffed to pull its own weight in an educational program, requires strong support from many quarters—particularly in the form of funds. A school of library science would do well to train its advanced students in the practice of fund raising. You must have support at local, State and National levels. To this end, librarians should take steps to increase public awareness of the library—to make it felt as a part of the community. It is largely through trustees and friends of libraries that the trend toward a more educational role must be advanced.

Such a role is necessarily diversified, and I have mentioned only some aspects. I have merely alluded to the library's part in cultural enrichment. Society depends upon the library for many things, not the least of which is its capacity to deepen appreciation and stimulate interest in the arts and sciences, in our principles and traditions, and in the peoples of other lands. This is an intangible role, but nonetheless a real one. It evokes a vital spirit in every American—the spirit to see our country progress and lead.

In this complex troubled world, the sciences loom in importance. Our prestige among nations depends largely upon our scientific preeminence. No amount of military preparedness could compensate for a lag in scientific knowledge or manpower. Nor can we ignore the value of the health sciences in a military and economic sense, for the cost of disease is the greatest burden any country can bear in war or peace. All this has direct bearing in the library field. You must continue, and I hope expand, your efforts to interest more people in the various sciences—in their support, their progress, and their application. Again the library is a powerful force for motivating, guiding and teaching.

It is a responsibility of libraries to help keep alive the spirit of culture and learning. I know of no better way than to cherish and promote the freedom to read. As a nation we are not given to slogans or glib phrases for expressing our deeper values. It is not easy to tell in a word or two what America stands for. Yet we can say that our country and its Constitution are flatly opposed to censorship—that anyone can go to a public library and read any book fit to print, whether or not the ideas it expresses are generally accepted. This is specific enough, and should be widely proclaimed as a basic fact. It is the librarians who make such freedom possible by seeing that all sides of a social issue are presented, trusting in the American way to speak for itself. Freedom to read is fundamental to true democracy.

I have rambled a good deal, but I believe I can sum up the main theme. The library in modern society is particularly important as an educational institution. To enhance its social value, it must strengthen its educational role. This may be effected through the teaching of librarians, studies in the use of the library as an education instrument, promotion of science, and aid to special groups such as the young at critical ages and the elderly. Progress along these lines will require friends, funds, and a strong voice in the community. Finally, libraries of all types, in preserving the freedom to read, in the broadest sense, both serve and exemplify the American ideal.

Address by Senator Wiley Over Radio Liberty to People of the Soviet Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 23, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in the light of recent events—particularly Mr. Khrushchev's new hard line at the Paris meetings—the free world, I believe, must make a renewed effort to get across the truth about world affairs to the people under Communist domination.

Now, how can this be accomplished?

There are, of course, a number of ways:

We recognize, however, that the construction of the Bamboo and Iron Curtains make it exceedingly difficult to get through to the dominated peoples.

Recently, I was privileged to participate in a broadcast to the people of the Soviet Union over Radio Liberty.

Incidentally, I believe the splendid work carried out by Radio Liberty, Radio Free Europe, Voice of America, and other private and publicly sponsored efforts to get the truth to the people under Communist domination, are indeed most commendable, and deserve the gratitude of the Nation.

The purpose of my broadcast was to provide the people behind the Iron Curtain with a realistic picture of the significance of the summit, of the U-2 flight, of the conduct of Mr. Khrushchev. Too, the talk reiterates the dedication of the free world—despite Mr. Khrushchev's unwillingness to discuss differences at the Paris meeting—to continue, in a resolute, fearless, undaunted effort, to find peaceful ways to resolve the differences between the East and West, and to create a better world.

Despite the resumption of Soviet jamming of radio broadcasts, I am hopeful that this message will get through.

Such broadcasts, I believe, represent the kind of efforts which will need to be broadened, not only through radio and television, but also through other contacts, in the light of the new hardened Soviet policy.

Reflecting further upon this need, I ask unanimous consent to have two items printed at this point in the RECORD:

First, a statement released today, stressing the need for "going over the heads" of the Communist leaders to the people behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains with the truth of world affairs; and, second, excerpts of my address over *Radio* Liberty, scheduled to be broadcast early this week to the people within the Soviet Union.

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

WILEY URGES GREATER EFFORTS TO GO OVER THE HEADS OF COMMUNIST LEADERS TO PEOPLE BEHIND THE IRON AND BAMBOO CURTAINS WITH TRUTH OF WORLD AFFAIRS

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, Republican, of Wisconsin, senior Republican of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, today urged a greater free world effort to go over the heads of the Communist leaders to dominated people with the truth on world affairs.

"Around the world, people of the globe find themselves alternately involved in hot and cold wars, because of Communist activity," Senator WILEY said.

"Today, the hard core of Communists actually comprises only about 4 to 6 percent of the people in the Soviet Union; and about 2 percent in Red China, with additional scatterings of Communists elsewhere in the world—although fortunately a very, very small portion of the population.

"The question, then, arises: How long will the world tolerate the troublemaking of these perpetrators of discord, and advocates of a political-economic system of dictatorship contrary to the yearning, and will for freedom of all mankind? How long will we—as a world—allow such a minuscule minority to keep us on the brink of war?

"We recognize, of course, that the hard-core Communists, particularly in Red China and the Soviet Union, have an iron grip of control on these countries. Insofar as possible, however, I believe that we need a greater effort to go over their heads to reach the almost 1 billion people under domination, with: The truth about world affairs—for example, the real story of Khrushchev's torpedoing the Paris meeting; and the dedicated efforts, outside the Communist orbit, to promote a real peace—based upon justice and order—by the non-Communist people and nations.

"In such efforts, of course, we must be careful not to drive the Communist leaders so tightly into a corner that they push the panic button and touch off a nuclear-missile war.

"Despite this need to tread carefully, however, I believe the United States and the free world can—and should—be far more effective in getting across the story of freedom.

"Last session, I introduced a bill, S. 2188, to provide a Citizens Council to make a reevaluation of our effectiveness—or lack of effectiveness—in getting the truth to the people behind the Iron-Bamboo Curtains. The purpose of the Council would be to: reevaluate the Communist global ideological challenge and reappraise our own efforts in the light of that challenge; increase public awareness of the importance of the battle of men's minds, and our efforts to (a) counter the Soviet offensive, and (b) lay a foundation of free ideas, translated into the language that people of other lands can more easily understand—upon which to build a better world; and, extremely important, to increase the use of ingenious know-how which our free enterprise system has developed for mass media, to a better freedom-spreading program.

"Encouragingly, the idea of the Freedom Council has been endorsed by a number of outstanding individuals—well qualified to evaluate the need in the field, including the following:

"Former President Herbert Hoover: 'Your idea is magnificent.'

"David Sarnoff, chairman of the board, Radio Corporation of America: 'I heartily agree with your view that a greater United States and free world effort is needed to combat the Communist ideological offensive.'

"Howard K. Smith, CBS News: 'It's an excellent idea. One of our chief faults—an odd one for a nation that has produced so many fine speakers—is a recently acquired inability to articulate our case. It is most noticeable in our time when our chief adversary is a natural genius in public relations.

" 'I hope the bill is passed and the Council can become effective as soon as possible.'

"Eric Johnston, president, Motion Picture Association of America: 'I like your idea to establish a Citizens Council for Advocacy of Freedom. It deserves the support of Congress.'

"Dwayne Orton, president, Council for International Progress in Management; also editor of Think, published by International Business Machines Corp.: 'I am very much interested in your bill, S. 2188. This strikes me as a very sensitive and needed stroke on the ideological offensive.'

"Robert F. Hurleigh, president, Mutual Broadcasting System, Inc.: 'I am most grateful to you for contacting me regarding your proposed Citizens Council for Advocacy of Freedom, for the ideas outlined in your pending bill support the very philosophies on which the heavily accented news schedules of the Mutual Broadcasting System are now based. * * *

" 'If there is anything the Mutual Network or I can do to further your Council plans, please do not hesitate to call on us.'

"Julian Goodman, NBC News: 'The purposes of your plan for a Citizens Council for Advocacy of Freedom are highly laudatory, and I certainly endorse them wholeheartedly. Any move we can make in this direction would certainly be useful.'

"The proposal—providing a mechanism for improving our 'salesman's' techniques—should, I believe, be enacted by Congress.

"We can expect, of course, that the Communist leaders—through jamming of Western radio broadcasts and through maintenance of the Iron-Bamboo Curtains—will continue to obstruct our efforts to get through to the dominated people. If we can achieve our objective—and I believe this is possible to a much greater degree than is now occurring—however, it would represent a major step toward reducing the power and threat of international communism and establishing ultimate peace in the world," Senator WILEY concluded.

EXCERPTS OF INTERVIEW WITH SENATOR ALEXANDER WILEY, SENIOR REPUBLICAN, SENATE FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE, FOR BROADCAST OVER RADIO LIBERTY, TO THE PEOPLE OF THE SOVIET UNION

Citizens of the Soviet Union: I welcome the opportunity to send warmest greetings to you from the people of the United States.

Historically, we have enjoyed friendship and mutual respect. Although people of different lands, we seek the same goals: Good homes for our families; freedom to go to the church of our choice; ever-better schools for our boys and girls—to enable them to grow intellectually, morally, and spiritually; jobs for our workers; an ever-higher standard of living; and better and better cities, farms, factories, roads, modes of travel—overall, a better way of living for all our people.

Although there are differences in the world, I do not believe any real difference exists between our people—who seek, and yearn for, a peaceful world in which to build what—to each of us—is the "Good Life."

Now, why can't we accomplish this objective?

As a nation, we are sorry that Mr. Khrushchev could not find it in his heart to sit down at the conference table with Prime Minister Macmillan, President de Gaulle, and our own beloved president, Mr. Eisenhower in Paris to discuss—reasonably and rationally—the issues troubling the world.

His excuse was the U-2 flight. However, he has known for a long time—as we have known of counter activities—of air surveillance and other types of information-seeking activities. Had Mr. Khrushchev been willing to agree to an "open skies" proposal—as recommended by President Eisenhower; or to work in a really constructive way to establish peace, the U-2 flight or, conversely, the spy activities directed by Mr. Khrushchev would not occur at all.

Realistically, there had been no great hopes for finding answers—magiclike—to all questions at the summit. However, we had thought that a pattern might be estab-

lished for frank, open discussions on how to resolve some of the differences between our governments and create a more peaceful atmosphere.

We regret, too, that President Eisenhower will not be able to visit with you next month—as he had been invited to do—by Mr. Khrushchev. We had hoped that he could bring to you, personally, the warm greetings and "handshake of friendship" of the American people. A man devoted to peace, you will recall that he fought with your sons and daughters against a common enemy—nazism—in the Stalingrads of Europe—to free the world from fear of aggression.

If he could have visited you, we felt that across your great country—as throughout the world—would ring out resounding the familiar, warm, hearty greeting: "I like Ike."

Now the invitation has been withdrawn. Why?

Mr. Khrushchev again says it was because of the flight of the U-2 over the Soviet Union. Was it really?

For years, both our Governments—even though Mr. Khrushchev has not as yet willingly admitted this—have tried to find out about each other's activities, particularly as these relate to military power.

Was the U-2 flight, then, really the basic cause of your Premier's refusal to contribute to world peace at the Paris Conference?

No, I don't think so; since it was only one small act, blown up out of proportion, indulged in for purposes of national interest by nearly all countries in the world, including the Soviet Union.

What, then, was the real reason for Mr. Khrushchev's refusal to sit down with the leaders of the Western Powers to try to find a road to peace?

Perhaps you, the people of the Soviet Union, best know the answer.

Any great guilt, however, and yes, condemnation, must be placed upon those who continue to thwart real progress toward peace.

Unfortunately, we have listened much to Mr. Khrushchev "flexing his missiles," threatening us, and others, with military destruction.

We don't like what we hear. We wish it had not been said. But we cannot ignore it.

Like you, the Russian people, we, too, feel we have a great country with proud traditions and real hopes for the future.

The objectives of U.S. policy—and this reflects the will of the people and leaders alike—are not to fight with you, but to be your friends.

In the face of warlike threats, however, we do not feel that we can go to sleep, then possibly be attacked, and one morning wake up to find ourselves slaves of another country.

Instead, we have found it necessary, against our will and traditions, to put more and more money, manpower, and brainpower into an effective, powerful, jet missile, atom space defense; incidentally, a strong, mighty force to be reckoned with carefully by any would-be aggressor.

If we had our way, however, we would like to beat our swords into plowshares, to channel great resources, skill, and human ingenuity of our country and the world into farm machinery, hospitals, homes, schools, roads, food for the hungry, books and teachers for the millions in the world who cannot read or write; more electric and atomic power for factories, homes, and farms, and a million other uses for peaceful purposes.

In America, we are fortunate that most of our population enjoys a great many of these advantages. Yet we know that until the good things of life are brought to all people, at home and abroad, there can be no real peace.

We seek for other countries what we wish for ourselves, the right to create and live under a self-determined form of government. But our philosophy is more than live and let live; instead, we are willing to live and help live.

Unfortunately, this cannot be accomplished in a world of threat and counterthreat by the great powers.

Recognizing the destructive power of modern weapons, we know that in a nuclear-missile war, both attacker and attacked would be largely, if not wholly, destroyed. Consequently, we shall continue to do all we can to establish a world of order, justice, and peace.

Despite the unwillingness of Mr. Khrushchev to negotiate at Paris, we as a nation, and our President, and other leaders are undaunted. We shall go ahead—relentless, fearless, in a dedicated way, to try to find ways and means—to create a more peaceful world.

In our efforts we shall depend also upon you—the people of a great country—to assist us in spirit, and as you can, in fact, to find the right road to a better world and a life of peace.

SENATE

TUESDAY, MAY 24, 1960

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a.m., and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

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

Our Father God, as with a new day another chance for love and service comes from Thy hand, may we be solemnly conscious that wrought deeply in the texture of human life are inexorable laws far beyond the reach of debates or legislative fiats. In the crises of these explosive days, give us to see that one of those fundamental laws, as framed by man's Best Man, is that to selfishly save life is to lose it, and to lose it for humanity's sake is to find it. Thou art making it plain on this rapidly shrinking globe that there are no borders or frontiers to neighborliness and brotherhood.

As we seize this day, may its fleeting hours remind us in solemn tones that life is too short to be little, and that the most potent truth which can guide our actions and fix our goals is that he who does not guard his fellow's security is diligently engaged in the destruction of his own, as the ages confirm.

We ask it in the name of Him who is the way and the truth. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, May 23, 1960, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

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

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

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 the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1157. An act to provide for promotion of economic and social development in the Ryukyu Islands; and

H.R. 8226. An act to add certain lands to Castillo de San Marcos National Monument in the State of Florida.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were each read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H.R. 1157. An act to provide for promotion of economic and social development in the Ryukyu Islands; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 8226. An act to add certain lands to Castillo de San Marcos National Monument in the State of Florida; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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 PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be permitted to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare be permitted to meet during the session of the Senate today.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I have been asked to object to that request.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be permitted to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.