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Now the invitation has been withdrawn.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.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

RESOLUTIONS OF GENERAL COURT OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague, the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], and myself, I present, for appropriate reference, resolutions of the General Court of Massachusetts memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to increase the compensation for postal employees.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION MEMORIALIZING THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES TO ENACT LEGISLATION INCREASING THE COMPENSATION OF POSTAL EMPLOYEES

Whereas there is now pending before the Congress of the United States legislation, including H.R. 9883 and H.R. 9977, which would increase the compensation of postal employees; and

Whereas the Post Office Department requires adequate means for attracting and retaining efficient and well-qualified personnel in order to maintain the operations at a high level of service: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to enact legislation that will increase the compensation of all postal employees; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the Presiding Officer of each branch of the Congress, and to each Member thereof from this Commonwealth.

Adopted by the Senate, April 25, 1960.

IRVING N. HAYDEN,
Clerk.

Adopted by the house of representatives in concurrence, April 27, 1960.

LAWRENCE R. GROVE,
Clerk.

Attest:

JOSEPH D. WARD,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

AREA REDEVELOPMENT—RESOLUTION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisors of Schenectady County, N.Y., urging the President to sign the distressed areas bill.

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

RESOLUTION 84

Resolution in support of Federal aid to distressed areas

Whereas Schenectady County is one of the areas in the Nation still suffering from chronic unemployment with all the attendant influences on the economic life, stability and future growth of our community: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Schenectady County Board of Supervisors urge the President of the United States to sign the $251 million aid to distressed areas bill approved by the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, Senators KENNETH B. KEATING and JACOB K. JAVITS, and Congressman SAMUEL S. STRATTON.

HAWK MOUNTAIN DAM—RESOLUTION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisors of Delaware County, Delhi, N.Y., protesting against the construction of the Hawk Mountain Dam in the east branch of the Delaware River, at the town of Hancock.

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

RESOLUTION 38

Resolution on Hawk Mountain Dam

Whereas the Town Board of the Town of Hancock has presented to the Delaware County Board of Supervisors a resolution passed by said town board opposing the proposed dam at Hawk Mountain, in the east branch of the Delaware River, town of Hancock; and

Whereas said town board opposes said dam because their supervisor, Fred R. Dix, was informed on the 4th day of May 1960, at a public hearing held at Port Jervis, N.Y., that the proposed dam area would not be taxable; and

Whereas the town of Hancock and the county of Delaware would lose the tax on approximately 25 percent of the assessed valuation of the town of Hancock; and

Whereas there now exists two dams in the county of Delaware built by the city of New York, namely; one at Downsville which floods 5,700 acres of land, and one now being built at Stilesville which will flood approximately 4,900 acres of land. The proposed dam at Hawk Mountain would flood approximately 8,100 acres of land: Now be it

Resolved, That the Board of Supervisors of Delaware County go on record as opposing the proposed Hawk Mountain Dam, first because of the loss of tax on approximately 25 percent of the assessed valuation in the town of Hancock, and secondly, because of the loss of livable, beautiful land wherein our people and those wishing to come into our county may find suitable locations where they may dwell in peace and quiet and enjoy rural life to the fullest in the natural scenery which God has given us; and be it also

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent the U.S. Army Engineer Corps office, 2635 Abbottsford Avenue, Philadelphia, Pa.: Hon. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C., and Hon. JACOB K. JAVITS, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C., and Senator KENNETH KEATING, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

W. J. STORIE,
Clerk of Board.

REPEAL OF TELEPHONE EXCISE TAX—RESOLUTION AND LETTER

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, stockholders of the New Ulm, Minn., Rural Telephone Co., at their annual meeting adopted a resolution asking repeal of the telephone excise tax. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution and letter transmitting it to me be printed in the RECORD, and referred to the appropriate committee.

There being no objection, the resolution and letter were referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas toll telephone services are now subject to a Federal excise tax; and

Whereas this tax was considered to be a World War II revenue measure and also a measure to curtail the use and construction of new telephone facilities; and

Whereas it has been many years since the end of World War II; and

Whereas said tax is discriminatory toward the telephone interests: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the stockholders of the New Ulm Rural Telephone Co., an independent telephone company with headquarters in New Ulm, Brown County, Minn., respectfully ask that said tax on toll telephone services be repealed as it is no longer necessary and has served the purpose for which it was originally placed on all toll telephone services; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the U.S. Senators for the State of Minnesota and to the various Congressmen from the State of Minnesota.

JOHN G. HOLLAND,
Manager.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR PLANT QUARANTINE AT PORTS OF ENTRY—RESOLUTION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, as a Senator from one of the great Midwest States bordering the St. Lawrence Seaway, I would like to express my gratification that the Department of Agriculture asked for, and has been allowed, additional funds that will strengthen the quarantine inspection services needed to protect the United States from the entry of foreign diseases and pests. With the opening of the seaway, deep water cargo vessels are enabled to move far into the midst of our valuable agricultural areas. Expert and unceasing care is needed to guard against new plant and animal diseases which, if undiscovered, could lead to untold millions of dollars of loss.

Many organizations and business people of Minnesota, sensitive to this threat and their responsibility, have asked that Congress take the steps necessary to avoid this hazard. Many organizations have passed formal resolutions asserting their interest. Typical is one received yesterday by the Senator from Minnesota, passed by Union Local No. 63 of the Public School Employees. I ask unanimous consent that this resolution appear at this point in the RECORD.

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

RESOLUTION ON QUARANTINE AND GRAIN INSPECTION

Whereas agriculture is one of the Nation's most important industries and the harbor of Duluth-Superior is well on the way to becoming the greatest lake port for the export of agricultural products and the import of other goods; and

Whereas it is of utmost importance to safeguard the agricultural heartland of the United States and Canada from infestation by foreign plant and animal diseases and insect pests which may be introduced through the port of Duluth-Superior in ships or cargoes originating abroad; and

Whereas millions of dollars worth of crops and animals and thousands of hours of manpower are in jeopardy if destructive pests infest port facilities, elevators or warehouses necessitating fumigation or causing quarantines which might result in embargoes being placed on any shipments in and out of the port of Duluth-Superior by domestic or foreign buyers; and

Whereas there are several State and Federal inspections involved before ships can dock, unload or load whereby uncoordinated inspection operations could lead to duplication, loss of time and money by labor, management and shipping: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this body urge the Federal and State administrators having jurisdiction over the various types of ship and cargo inspections, both incoming and outgoing, to provide enough inspectors to permit adequate, prompt inspections and avoid delays of shipping; and be it further

Resolved, That coordination of the various types of inspection be worked out by those in authority to avoid duplication of effort, loss of time for labor and delay of shipping operations.

ADOLPH ROLEK,
Recording Secretary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. BYRD of Virginia, from the Committee on Finance, without amendment:

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 (Rept. No. 1416).

By Mr. MURRAY, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments:

S. 1889. A bill to authorize the transfer of three units of the Fort Belknap Indian irrigation project to the landowners within the project (Rept. No. 1417).

By Mr. ANDERSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments:

H.R. 8295. An act to authorize the transfer to the Navajo Tribe of irrigation project works on the Navajo Reservation, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1418).

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with an amendment:

S. 2634. A bill to amend the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949, as amended, relative to the return of certain alien property interests (Rept. No. 1419).

By Mr. SPARKMAN, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, with an amendment:

S. 3226. A bill to amend section 809 of the National Housing Act (Rept. No. 1420).

AMENDMENT OF MERCHANT MARINE ACT OF 1936, TO REMOVE CERTAIN LIMITATIONS ON CONSTRUCTION DIFFERENTIAL SUBSIDY — INDIVIDUAL VIEWS (S. REPT. 1415)

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I report favorably, with amendments, the bill (S. 2584) to amend title V of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, in order to remove certain limitations on the construction differential subsidy under such title, and I submit a report thereon.

I ask unanimous consent that the report may be printed, together with the individual views of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. 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 Washington.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. BYRD of Virginia, from the Committee on Finance:

Arnold Raum, of Massachusetts, to be a judge of the Tax Court of the United States;

Allin H. Pierce, of Illinois, to be a judge of the Tax Court of the United States;

Graydon G. Withey, of Michigan, to be a judge of the Tax Court of the United States; and

Irene F. Scott, of Alabama, to be a judge of the Tax Court of the United States.

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. BEALL:

S. 3585. A bill for the relief of Dr. Benigno R. Lazaro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT (for himself and Mr. SPARKMAN):

S. 3586. A bill to authorize additional funds for public facility loans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

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

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 3587. A bill for the relief of Hamish Scott MacKay; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. DODD:

S. 3588. A bill to amend the act of September 2, 1957, relating to the settlement of certain inequitable losses in pay suffered by commissioned officers under emergency economy legislation; to the Committee on Finance

S. 3589. A bill for the relief of George Michael Barakos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself and Mr. O'MAHONEY) (by request):

S. 3590. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act to strengthen independent competitive enterprise by providing for fair competitive acts, practices, and methods of competition, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

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

By Mr. BEALL (for himself and Mr. HICKENLOOPER):

S.J. Res. 197. Joint resolution to give recognition to the two American scientists who discovered the great radiation belt surrounding the earth; to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

(See the remarks of Mr. BEALL when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

PRINTING OF CERTAIN PUBLICATIONS

Mr. DODD submitted a concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 107) authorizing the printing of certain publications for the use of the Subcommittee on Internal Security of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring) That there shall be printed, for the use of the Subcommittee on Internal Security of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, the numbers of copies specified of the following publications:

(1) The Effect of Red China Communes on the United States (hearing before the Subcommittee to Investigate the Administration of the Internal Security Act and Other Internal Security Laws of the Committee on the Judiciary, United States Senate, March 24, 1959), five thousand copies;

(2) Statement by J. Edgar Hoover (S. Doc. 80, Eighty-sixth Congress, second session), ten thousand copies;

(3) The Revival of the Communist International and Its Significance for the United States (committee print, Eighty-sixth Congress, first session), five thousand copies;

(4) Contradictions of Communism (committee print, Eighty-sixth Congress, first session), twenty thousand copies;

(5) Report of the Subcommittee To Investigate the Administration of the Internal Security Act and Other Internal Security Laws to the Committee on the Judiciary, United States Senate, for the Year 1958 (committee print, Eighty-sixth Congress, first session), ten thousand copies; and

(6) The Communist Party of the United States of America—A Handbook for Americans (S. Doc. 117, Eighty-fourth Congress, second session), twenty thousand copies.

RESOLUTION

UNITED STATES AGAINST WILLIAM PRESSER—ATTENDANCE OF CERTAIN WITNESSES

Mr. McCLELLAN submitted a resolution (S. Res. 326) requesting the production of certain Senate committee records for the trial of William Presser in the U.S. District Court, Cleveland, Ohio, and authorizing Senator JOHN L. McCLELLAN and Walter J. Sheridan to testify in said trial, which was considered and agreed to.

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

AUTHORIZATION FOR ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR PUBLIC FACILITY LOANS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to increase the public facilities loan authorization by $100 million.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3586) to authorize additional funds for public facility loans, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. FULBRIGHT (for himself and Mr. SPARKMAN), 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 203(a) of the Housing Amendments of 1955 is amended by striking out "$100,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$200,000,000."

SEC. 2. Section 203(b) of the Housing Amendments of 1955 is amended by inserting "be" immediately after "may".

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the public facilities loan program is for the purpose of purchasing obligations of, or making loans to, State and local governments for building or improving essential public works where financing is not otherwise available on reasonable terms and conditions. Priority is given to loans to smaller communities for such essential public works as storage, treatment, purification or distribution of water; sewage, sewage treatment, and sewer facilities, and gas distribution systems.

The Housing and Home Finance Administrator, acting through the Community Facilities Administration, is authorized to purchase the obligations of and make loans: first, to States; second, municipalities and other political subdivisions of States; third, to public agencies and instrumentalities of one or more States, municipalities, and political subdivisions of States; and fourth, to public corporations, boards, and commissions established under State law to finance specific public projects under State or municipal law.

By law, applications for public facility loans which are received from communities of less than 10,000 population having an urgent and vital need are given priority consideration. The maximum loan term is 40 years. The interest rate is established from time to time, taking into account the current average rate on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States of comparable maturities. The interest rate paid by the community varies according to the type of obligation issued to secure the loan. On general obligation bonds, the current rate is 4⅝ percent, and on revenue bonds the rate is 4⅞ percent.

The public facilities loan program is by no means a new or recent program. For 21 years, the Public Agency Division of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation assisted municipalities in financing public facility improvements, such as sewage and water distribution systems. During that period, the program, aggregating more than $1.5 billion, was operated without loss to the Federal Government. Upon dissolution of the RFC, the authority for this program was specifically retained, to be operated by an agency to be designated by the President. When such agency was not so designated, the Congress approved legislation in 1954 directing the Housing and Home Finance Agency to administer the program. Since very little was accomplished toward assisting communities needing vital public works during the year following this congressional action, legislation was enacted in 1955 to revive the program and place it on an operating basis. One of the provisions contained in the 1955 legislation established a revolving loan fund of $100 million.

Since 1955, some 257 communities have had applications approved for approximately $80 million of loans to assist them in the construction of needed public works projects, practically all of which have been water and sewer projects. This leaves a balance of $20 million in the fund. According to the Community Facilities Administration, applications on hand as of the end of April of this year amounted to $22.8 million; thus, applications exceed the balance on hand by approximately $1 million.

The President's budget message called for an additional $100 million of funds for this program. In requesting this amount, the President stated that this was necessary because the present funds would be exhausted by early 1961. It is obvious from the number of applications on hand that, for practical purposes, the fund is exhausted now.

I would like to include in the RECORD at the end of my remarks a table showing the communities in my own State and those in the State of Alabama which have participated in this beneficial program.

Mr. President, although I am introducing this bill—and supporting it—to provide for a continuing public facilities program, I would prefer to reconstitute and liberalize the program as proposed by S. 1955, the Community Facilities Act of 1959, which I and several other Senators sponsored during the 1st session of the 86th Congress. But I must face reality and be practical. The present administration is opposed to S. 1955, and it appears hopeless to assume that such a measure could be enacted into law during the few remaining weeks of this session of the Congress.

On January 3, 1961, a new Congress will convene. On January 20, 1961, a new Executive will take office. I am very hopeful that the outlook then for a more general community facilities loan program will be more favorable than it has been throughout the present administration. In the meantime, the bill I am introducing can provide for the continuation of a program which is still useful, even though it is unduly restricted, and carries unnecessarily high interest rates, under the present administration.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that tables bearing on this subject be also printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

Community Facilities Administration, public facility loans program

LOANS APPROVED IN STATE OF ALABAMA (FROM INCEPTION THROUGH MAY 15, 1960)

Applicant and location	Type of facility	Amount	Applicant and location	Type of facility	Amount
Town of Akron, Hale County	Water	$66,000	Town of Loxley, Baldwin County	Water	$122,000
City of Bridgeport, Jackson County	Gas	250,000	Town of New Hope, Madison County	do	130,000
Town of Brookside, Jefferson County	do	240,000	Town of Ohatchee, Calhoun County	do	38,000
Town of Double Springs, Winston County	Water	68,000	Town of Orrville, Dallas County	do	87,000
Town of Fort Deposit, Waterworks and Sewer Board, Lowndes County.	Water and sewer	140,000	Town of Phil Campbell, Franklin County	Gas	150,000
Greene-Hale Counties Gas District	Gas	900,000	Town of Vincent, Gas Board, Shelby County	do	420,000
Town of Hobson City, Calhoun County	Sewer	44,000	Town of Wilton, Shelby County	do	50,000
Town of Killen, Lauderdale County	Water	124,000	Total		3,509,000
Lamar County Gas District	Gas	680,000			

LOAN APPLICATIONS PENDING IN STATE OF ALABAMA (AS OF MAY 15, 1960)

Applicant community	Type of facility	Amount of loan requested	Applicant community	Type of facility	Amount of loan requested
Adamsville	Water	$646,000	Scottsboro	Gas	$1,300,000
Beatrice	do	95,000	Total		2,342,000
Littleville	do	105,000			
Loxley	Gas	196,000			

Community Facilities Administration, public facility loans program—Continued

LOANS APPROVED IN STATE OF ARKANSAS (FROM INCEPTION THROUGH MAY 15, 1960)

Applicant and location	Type of facility	Amount
City of Altus, Franklin County	Water	$112,000
City of Amity, Clark County	do	85,000
City of Bald Knob, White County	do	320,000
City of Blevins, Hempstead County	do	38,500
City of Bradford, White County	Water and sewer	118,500
City of Buckner, Lafayette County	Water	50,000
City of Chidester, Ouachita County	do	67,500
Crossett:		
Natural Gas Improvement District No. 2 of of Ashley County.	Gas	188,000
Water and Fire Protection District No. 1 of Ashley County.	Water	419,000
City of Danville, Yell County	do	114,000
City of Delight, Pike County	do	101,000
City of Dierks, Howard County	do	102,000
City of Elaine, Phillips County	Water and sewer	126,000
City of Emmet, Nevada County	Water	82,000
City of Hackett, Sebastian County	do	52,000
Water Improvement District No. 1 of Hackett	do	24,000
Town of Huttig, Union County	Water and sewer	100,000
Town of Imboden, Lawrence County	Water	63,000
Water Improvement District No. 1 of Imoden	do	80,000
City of Lavaca, Sebastian County	do	89,000
City of Lamar, Johnson County	do	73,000
Water Improvement District No. 1 of Lamar	do	53,000
City of Leslie, Searcy County	Water	$85,000
City of McRae, White County	do	90,000
City of Ola, Yell County	do	125,000
City of Pangborn, White County	Water and sewer	121,000
City of Perryville, Perry County	Water	160,000
City of Plainview, Yell County	do	70,000
Water Improvement District No. 1 of Plainview	do	27,000
City of Plummerville, Conway County	do	97,000
City of Ratcliff, Logan County	do	72,000
City of Salem, Fulton County	do	66,000
City of Salem, Fulton County	do	53,000
City of Sparkman, Dallas County	Water and sewer	144,000
City of St. Francis, Clay County	Water	62,000
State Highway Commission, in Phillips County	Bridge	[1] 8,000,000
City of Swifton, Jackson County	Water	113,000
City of Thornton, Calhoun County	do	108,000
City of Washington, Hempstead County	do	45,000
City of Watson, Desha County	do	55,000
City of Weiner, Poinsett County	Water and sewer	[2] 200,000
City of West Fork, Washington County	do	60,000
Waterworks District No. 1 of West Fork	do	60,000
Total		12,270,500

LOAN APPLICATIONS PENDING IN STATE OF ARKANSAS (AS OF MAY 15, 1960)

Applicant community	Type of facility	Amount of loan requested
Caraway	Sewer	$146,500
Carthage	Water	97,000
Coal Hill	do	125,000
Crawfordsville	Sewer	94,000
Dover	Water	92,000
Water Improvement District No. 1	do	48,000
Dyer	do	65,000
Humphrey	Water and sewer	123,000
Magazine	Water	70,000
Water Improvement District No. 1	do	70,000
Melbourne	Sewer	$48,000
Sewer Improvement District No. 1	do	47,000
Mineral Springs	Water and sewer	110,000
McCrory	do	55,000
Water Improvement District of the City of Pangborn.	Water	58,000
Scranton	do	56,000
Water Improvement District No. 1	do	20,000
Turrell	Water and sewer	138,500
Total		1,463,000

[1] Loan reduced to $7,000,000 due to reduction in costs.
[2] $65,000 sold to others, and loan reduced to $135,000.

HAMISH SCOTT MACKAY

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill for the relief of Hamish Scott MacKay.

This bill is designed to authorize the Attorney General to discontinue deportation proceedings against MacKay. The facts of this case are comparable to those of another Oregonian who has been subjected to deportation proceedings—Willia Niukkanen, also known as William Albert Mackie—on whose behalf I introduced the bill, S. 3543 on May 13.

A résumé of the facts in Mr. MacKay's case is contained in a letter dated April 28 addressed to me by Mr. Nels Peterson, a Portland, Oreg., attorney. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Peterson's letter be included in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

APRIL 28, 1960.

Re deportation of Hamish Scott MacKay.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: The Supreme Court of the United States denied certiorari for the above named on Monday, April 18, 1960.

Herewith follows a summary of the life of Hamish Scott MacKay and the course of the deportation proceedings instituted against him.

Hamish Scott MacKay was born near Calgary, Alberta, Canada, in 1905. His father was born in Scotland and immigrated to the United States, and in 1900 was living in North Dakota and there obtained American citizenship by naturalization. In 1903 the father of Hamish Scott MacKay was married to Hamish Scott MacKay's mother who was a native born American citizen, one of whose ancestors signed the Declaration of Independence. Immediately after their marriage, they moved to the wilderness of Canada. In 1905 Hamish Scott MacKay's father became naturalized, but having resided there less than the requisite 3 years to become entitled to be naturalized. The relationship between Canada and the United States was governed by a treaty dated May 13, 1870 (16 Stat. 775), which provides that citizens of either country naturalized as citizens or subjects of the other should be treated as citizens of such country by the country of origin. The treaty further provided that in case citizens of one country naturalized in another, wished to renew their residence in the country of origin, they could be restored to the privileges of citizenship "on such conditions as the government may think fit to impose." The foregoing is only background information as explanation of our later contention that Hamish Scott MacKay was an American citizen by derivation of a naturalized citizen of the United States, his father, and by a native born citizen of the United States, his mother. We contended upon the petition for writ of certiorari, as we did in the lower courts, that the intention of the treaty between Great Britain and the United States was to prevent statelessness and that Hamish Scott MacKay acquired derivative citizenship under this treaty. Hamish Scott MacKay came into the United States for permanent residence with his father and mother in 1924. His father (James Scott MacKay) attended a chiropractors' school in Davenport, Iowa, went to the State of Colorado and practiced chiropractics for approximately 2 years. His father returned to Canada in the fall of 1927 and died on February 9, 1928. Hamish Scott MacKay returned to Canada for a short time and reentered the United States for permanent residence on November 28, 1928, at North Portal, N. Dak.

Hamish Scott MacKay settled in Portland, Oreg., in the early thirties after having served in the National Guard in the State of Illinois. Hamish Scott MacKay was a carpenter by trade and was married in Portland, Oreg., to a native born citizen of the United States. Two sons were born as issue of the marriage. During World War II the wife of Hamish Scott MacKay abandoned her husband and the children and he obtained a decree of divorce from her and was awarded the custody of his two sons, whom he thereafter substantially reared alone until his marriage in 1949 to his second wife, a native born American citizen.

On May 25, 1949, a warrant of arrest was issued for the arrest of Hamish Scott MacKay on the ground that he was an alien subject to deportation, in that after entry into the United States he was alleged to have been a member of an organization, association, society or group that advises, advocates or teaches the overthrown by force and violence of the Government of the United States, pursuant to the act of October 16, 1918 (40 Stat. 1012, as amended). Hearings began July 24, 1950, and continued from time to time thereafter. During the course of the hearings, an additional charge was lodged against MacKay that he was deportable for being a member of the Communist Party after entry into the United

States, pursuant to the Internal Security Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 987) enacted September 22, 1950. At the original hearing, a witness, one Paul Crouch (now deceased) allegedly then living in Florida, testified as to the aims and purposes of the Communist Party. His testimony was hardly credulous (e.g., he testified he was able to read newspapers at the age of 6 years) and he testified that the Communist Party, during his membership in the thirties, advocated the overthrow of the Government by force and violence. This witness, Paul Crouch, had been court-martialed in Hawaii but by some mysterious circumstance had been released. (Incidentally, after the passage of the Internal Security Act of 1950, proof that the Communist Party of the United States advocated the overthrow of the Government by force and violence no longer became necessary, hence the lodging of the additional charge against Hamish Scott MacKay of membership in the Communist Party.)

Following the hearings, he was ordered deported, which order was affirmed by the Board of Immigration Appeals. In October, 1955, MacKay filed with the Board of Immigration Appeals a motion to reopen the hearing for the purpose of filing an application for suspension of deportation. On October 31 MacKay filed a petition in the U.S. District Court for a writ of habeas corpus and for injunctive relief. The trial judge denied the writ and the injunction, but the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit issued a restraining order and allowed his release upon bail. In June, 1956, a hearing on his application for suspension of deportation was held and the relief requested denied, although the Government admitted that hardship was shown. The appeal to the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals, by stipulation, was dismissed and the matter referred back to the U.S. District Court where an amended petition for injunctive relief and for a writ of habeas corpus was filed on March 5, 1958.

The amended petition challenged the constitutionality of the Internal Security Act of 1950 and we contended that the case of *Rowoldt* v. *Perfetto* (355 U.S. 115, decided Dec. 7, 1957) was controlling, and that the Government had failed to prove "meaningful association" with the Communist Party. Our contentions were based upon the evidence presented by the Government by the witness Lee Arthur Knipe and by the testimony of the divorced wife of Hamish Scott MacKay. We also contended that MacKay had not been afforded a fair hearing on his application for suspension of deportation because the "special inquiry officer" at the hearings was one and the same person who served as a hearing officer upon his deportation hearings.

At this moment, Hamish Scott MacKay is buying a modest home in Portland, is married and has a 17-year-old son in high school. His older son has served honorably in the U.S. Army after graduation from high school in Portland, Oreg. His older son is married and has a child. He is married to a native-born American citizen, Annabelle MacKay. Hamish Scott MacKay has been active in the Boy Scouts, has belonged to various unions, and the only testimony against him related to activities of the unemployed for bread and butter and relief in the depression of the thirties. The evidence, vague in nature, covered the years 1936 to approximately 1941.

Hamish Scott MacKay has been active in the Oregon State Grange, in school activities for his sons and other community activities. He has never been convicted of any crime and denies that he was ever a member of the Communist Party.

All of the reasons, except a shorter period of residence in the United States of America, apply to Hamish Scott MacKay as apply to William Albert Mackie.

I believe that my review of the legal aspects in Mackie's deportation apply equally to Hamish Scott MacKay.

We respectfully urge that appropriate special legislation be introduced to permanently stay his deportation and permit his continued residence as a person of good moral character, with deep family and property involvements, here in the city, State and country of his choice.

Yours sincerely,

NELS PETERSON.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a point that I cannot stress too much in these deportation cases is the fact that individuals such as Hamish MacKay, under existing law, are being subjected to the loss of a very precious privilege—that of residence in the United States—without trials by juries of their peers. In these cases the basic facts are determined by a special inquiry officer. I am strongly of the opinion that, when such a privilege is at stake and the possibility of banishment to foreign soil is involved, the basic facts should be determined by American jurors. There can be no substitute for the decision of jurors who, by the very nature of their citizenship rights, understand the importance not only of national security but of the humanitarian interests involved.

I urge early consideration of this case by the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, and it is my hope that the committee will report on this bill well in advance of the end of the current session. It would be better to keep MacKay in the United States under surveillance, if deemed necessary, rather than send him to Canada. My bill proposes the humane, Christian approach to these unfortunate cases. Here is a man who has lived most of his adult life in the United States. He claims he was never a Communist. If he was caught in the tentacles of the Communist net in the United States, it was before the end of World War II. His record for years has been one of loyal patriotism to the United States. He is an uneducated man, a hard-working man, a family man, a man who should be allowed to continue to live in this country on condition of continued patriotic good behavior.

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3587) for the relief of Hamish Scott MacKay, introduced by Mr. MORSE, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, 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 the Attorney General is authorized and directed to discontinue any deportation proceedings and to cancel any outstanding order and warrant of deportation, warrant of arrest, and bond, which may have been issued in the case of Hamish Scott MacKay. From and after the date of enactment of this Act, the said Hamish Scott MacKay shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which such deportation proceedings were commenced or any such warrants and order have issued.

SETTLEMENT OF INEQUITABLE LOSSES IN PAY SUFFERED BY CERTAIN COMMISSIONED OFFICERS

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the act of September 2, 1957, relating to the settlement of certain inequitable losses in pay suffered by commissioned officers under emergency economy legislation.

Under the act of September 2, 1957, Public Law 85–255, commissioned officers of the uniformed services finally received, after 25 years or more, the increased pay to which they were entitled when advanced in rank during the period 1932–34.

Notwithstanding the pay was earned over 25 years ago, the Treasury Department required the Comptroller General to deduct 18 percent withholding tax in the case of every living officer. In a Treasury Department ruling published as Revised Rule 58–443, the Internal Revenue Service admitted that the money paid under Public Law 255 "qualifies as back pay" as remuneration received by a Federal employee.

The bill which I introduce today, would simply make effective as a practical matter the Treasury Department ruling. For example, in the case of Rear Adm. R. E. Bakenhaus, he was admittedly due back pay in the total sum of $3,450.46. When he applied for payment under Public Law 255, all he actually received was $2,850.45. The Comptroller General deducted $590.01 as withholding tax. If he had been paid in 1932–34 he would have been liable for little or no income tax whatever.

Had this situation been realized and foreseeable, of course, Congress would have prevented it when Public Law 255 was enacted by including language similar to this bill.

There should be no objection to this correctional bill. It would not apply to widows of officers as the Comptroller General did not deduct a withholding tax in their cases when payments were finally made under Public Law 255.

It is estimated that since 2,381 officers were compensated under Public Law 255, and that at least 20 percent are now deceased, this bill would allow the remaining living officers, about 1,900 in number, to receive the tax withheld from them. This bill would at last end the injustice which arose more than 25 years ago.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3588) to amend the act of September 2, 1957, relating to the settlement of certain inequitable losses in pay suffered by commissioned officers under emergency economy legislation, introduced by Mr. DODD, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION ACT TO STRENGTHEN INDEPENDENT COMPETITIVE ENTERPRISE

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, by request, I am introducing on behalf of myself and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] a bill to prohibit certain loss leader sales. I offer this bill in order that the appropriate Senate committee may have an opportunity to study the subject and to conduct hearings on the proposed legislation.

Many small businessmen and associations of small businessmen feel that this legislation is necessary to the survival of our traditional economic system. Among the associations strongly endorsing the bill are the National Association of Tobacco Dealers and the National Independent Dairies Association.

Similar legislation has been introduced by the chairman of the House Small Business Committee and by several of his colleagues.

Mr. President, I hope that the introduction of this proposal may provoke study, discussion, and constructive criticism.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3590) to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act to strengthen independent competitive enterprise by providing for fair competitive acts, practices, and methods of competition, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself and Mr. O'MAHONEY), by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

RECOGNITION TO AMERICAN SPACE SCIENTISTS

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, on my own behalf and on behalf of the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution to give recognition to the two American scientists who discovered the great radiation belt surrounding the earth. The two scientists are Prof. S. F. Singer, of Maryland, and Prof. J. A. van Allen, of Iowa, who have worked together in many cooperative space undertakings.

Prof. Van Allen made the discovery of the radiation belt through the use of the U.S. Explorer satellites launched by the Army Ballistic Missile Agency in Alabama in cooperation with the Jet Propulsion Laboratory in California.

The theoretical existence of the Van Allen Belt was advanced earlier by Prof. S. F. Singer, of Maryland.

The world scientific community has recognized the great value of this discovery. The discovery has changed the concept of the radiation environment of the earth, has illuminated the origin of important geophysical phenomena, and also has important implications for manned space flights.

The Russians, following their custom of claiming credit for all of history's great scientific discoveries, have recently credited themselves with this discovery by our own American scientists. On April 21 last, the Soviets announced that four Russian physicists had been awarded the Lenin Prize for 1960 for discovering the external radiation belt around the earth. Such a claim is completely without justification; the radiation belt was discovered by our own professors Van Allen and Singer 2 years ago, and that distinction should not be denied them by Russia's false claim.

Since long before Russia's Sputnik I, American scientists have been carrying out research projects which have greatly contributed to the knowledge of space and the powers operating in it. These scientists have come from universities and research institutions of every section of the United States. Their accomplishments portray the working of the American system, in which Government and non-Government scientists work side by side, in which public and private resources are combined for the public good. Our space scientists, unlike their Soviet counterparts, are free agents, contributing their work to the national space effort of this free Nation.

I think it is appropriate that the Government of this country undertake in the future to give official recognition to important accomplishments in scientific fields.

I hope that the joint resolution which I am introducing will act to express to the two scientists connected with the discovery of the great radiation belt some of the appreciation that the people of this country feel for their important work.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 197) to give recognition to the two American scientists who discovered the great radiation belt surrounding the earth, introduced by Mr. BEALL (for himself and Mr. HICKENLOOPER), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

UNITED STATES AGAINST WILLIAM PRESSER—ATTENDANCE OF CERTAIN WITNESSES

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I submit a resolution, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Whereas the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Senate Committee on Government Operations has in its possession certain records pertaining to an investigation dealing with William Presser, President of the Ohio Conference of Teamsters and President of Joint Council 41, and the International Brotherhood of Teamsters and its Locals and other affiliate organizations; which investigation was conducted in 1958 by the Senate Select Committee on Improper Activities in the Labor or Management Field; and

Whereas the Senate referred to the Department of Justice the transcript of the records on a citation of contempt of the Senate, which transcript contained allegations of the mutilation and destruction by said William Presser of certain records under subpena by the Select Committee; and

Whereas the matter of United States against William Presser, now pending trial in the U.S. District Court, Cleveland, Ohio, charges said William Presser with obstruction of justice; and

Whereas the Department of Justice has requested the production of the records in this matter and has requested that Senator JOHN L. McCLELLAN, former chairman of the Senate Select Committee on Improper Activities in the Labor or Management Field and present chairman of the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Senate Committee on Government Operations, and, further, requested that Walter J. Sheridan, formerly an investigator for the Senate Select Committee on Improper Activities in the Labor or Management Field and presently an investigator for the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Senate Committee on Government Operations, to appear and testify in the above proceedings; and

Whereas by the privileges of the Senate no Member or Senate employee is authorized to appear or testify or to produce Senate documents but by order of the Senate: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Senate Committee on Government Operations is granted leave to permit the copying and presentation of certain records for examination in connection with the aforementioned court case, the records thereupon to be returned to the possession of the Subcommittee on Investigations; and be it further

Resolved, That Honorable JOHN L. McCLELLAN, a Member of this body, and Walter J. Sheridan, an investigator employed by the Senate, are authorized to appear and testify in the above-mentioned proceedings.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, the resolution is self-explanatory.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request for the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 326) was agreed to.

ADMISSION OF CERTAIN VESSELS TO AMERICAN REGISTRY—AMENDMENT

Mr. JAVITS (for himself and Mr. KEATING) submitted an amendment, in the nature of a substitute, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (S. 3516) to admit the vessels *Fort Town*, *Maple City*, and *Windmill Point* to American registry and to permit their use in the coastwise trade, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered to be printed.

ADVANCEMENT OF MARINE SCIENCES—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] be added as a cosponsor of the bill—S. 2692—to advance the

marine sciences, to establish a comprehensive 10-year program of oceanographic research and surveys; to promote commerce and navigation, to secure the national defense; to expand ocean resources; to authorize the construction of research and survey ships and facilities; to assure systematic studies of effects of radioactive materials in marine environments; to enhance the general welfare, and for other purposes, introduced by me on September 11, 1959.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

OFFICE OF INTERNATIONAL TRAVEL AND TOURISM AND TRAVEL ADVISORY BOARD—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] be added as a cosponsor of the bill—S. 3102—to strengthen the domestic and foreign commerce of the United States by providing for the establishment of an Office of International Travel and Tourism and a Travel Advisory Board, introduced by me on February 25, 1960.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TO PRINT AS A SENATE DOCUMENT A STUDY BY DR. HERMAN KAHN ENTITLED "THE NATURE AND FEASIBILITY OF WAR AND DETERRENCE" (S. DOC. NO. 101)

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed as a Senate document a study by Dr. Herman Kahn entitled "The Nature and Feasibility of War and Deterrence," along with a short foreword which I have prepared.

This paper summarizes some of the points in a forthcoming book by Dr. Kahn, which is to be published by the Princeton University Press later this year. I want to indicate my appreciation to Dr. Kahn for his granting me permission to present this provocative study to the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON CERTAIN BILLS BY SUBCOMMITTEE ON DONABLE PROPERTY OF COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I wish to give notice that the Subcommittee on Donable Property of the Senate Committee on Government Operations will hold public hearings on (a) S. 2725, S. 2732, S. 3154; (b) S. 3489; (c) S. 3493; and (d) S. 2605 and S. 2388, beginning on Wednesday, June 1, 1960, at 10 a.m., room 3302, New Senate Office Building. Those desiring to testify should so inform Mr. Glenn Shriver of the committee's staff.

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. RUSSELL:

Address delivered by Senator SMATHERS, of Florida, before the Atlanta Bar Association.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

Address delivered by him at Bethany College, Bethany, Va., on May 5, 1960, relating to disarmament.

Address delivered by him, entitled "The War That Can Be Won," at Wheeling College, Wheeling, W. Va., on May 5, 1960.

INQUIRY, RESPONSIBILITY, AND SOLIDARITY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, we are in a situation which demands the utmost in calmness and coolness from all of our people. This is definitely a time for all good Americans to be responsible.

The concept of responsibility and the concept of solidarity call for some forbearance from all participants, and demand that we keep foremost in our minds the basic objective of our Union, which in this case is to preserve our freedoms and our way of life from the maneuverings and the tactical moves of communism.

When I was a very young boy, my father taught me that no man's judgment on any given question is any better than the information that man has on that question. What we in this country need now is information that will shed light, instead of partisanship which will generate heat.

We have two Senate committees which have distinguished themselves by their responsibility and by the objectivity with which they have gathered information. I refer to the Foreign Relations Committee, headed by the very able and distinguished Rhodes scholar, the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], and to the Government Operations Subcommitee on National Policy Machinery, headed by the very able junior Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], who for more than a year have been studying questions pertinent to this subject. Both of these committees have discussed with the appropriate officials the wisdom of receiving briefings, pursuing studies, eliciting the truth, and gathering the facts, in order not only that the Congress will be fully and adequately informed but also that all the information in the national interest can be given to the American people.

In addition, other committees which have jurisdiction in this field, such as the Armed Services Committee and the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, may conceivably gather some information.

Mr. President, this is not the time to anticipate the work of those committees by coming to conclusions on the basis of alleged newspaper interviews which may well have been garbled in translation or which, through improper emphasis, may have changed a thought. What we need is information about what happened, not suspicions about each other.

Mr. President, in this case there is no individual who is in particular trouble. It is our country about which we must be concerned. I have said, and said repeatedly, that unity does not require sweeping the facts under the rug, no matter how unpleasant those facts could or might be. I do not think there is any disposition to do that; but the situation does require treatment of the facts candidly, calmly, coolly, in an objective vein and in a nonpartisan vein. I think the Nation will be well served if we proceed in that manner.

I know of no reason why all the pertinent information available to the Executive cannot be given without transgressing security, to the people of this country. I am informed that that is the policy of the President, following international conferences, and that that practice will be adhered to, as announced, on Wednesday evening.

It is also the policy of the Congress, following conferences with other nations, to have the Secretary of State and other appropriate officials report to the Congress or to the appropriate committees on the developments at those conferences.

Last week, following the return of the distinguished Secretary of State and the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, I discussed at some length with the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, Mr. FULBRIGHT, the wisdom of having his committee meet with the Secretry of State and with the appropriate officials to receive full and adequate briefing and elicit all the information possible in order better to serve the national interest.

I have also conferred with other committee chairman who may have jurisdiction in connection with some of the subjects discussed. From time to time, I am sure they, in cooperation with the executive branch, will sit down and will reason together, not for the purpose of finding a scapegoat, but for the purpose of building a strong policy that will better serve America in the days ahead.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I think I can concur in nearly everything the majority leader has said. Certainly I shall not replow old ground.

With reference to the item about the possibility of a garbled newspaper dispatch or inverview, of course I let that speak for itself. I thought the record was pretty well documented.

Yesterday, I referred to the refreshing viewpoint expressed by the majority leader. I expressed my consternation of spirit that my fellow compatriot from Illinois, the former Governor, saw fit to use the language he did employ in his address in Chicago, and to give it such a very definite partisan cast. Beyond that, I need not go.

We shall watch the enfoldments as time goes on. If and when comment is called for, obviously that comment will be made.

Mr. KEATING subsequently said: Mr. President, I desire to say just a word in commendation of the distinguished ma-

jority leader for the remarks which he has just made. He has spoken, as he usually does, as an American, and not as a partisan. This is one very important reason for his effectiveness in this body.

It is, of course, the desire and aim of all of us to look to the future, rather than to the past. If mistakes have been made, they can and must be used in building a better and more hopeful future. That is what the American people want and that is what they deserve.

The Congress, of course, has a perfect right to inquire into these matters. It has a perfect right to obtain all information available which is consistent with the security requirements of the Nation.

If these committees will approach their studies in this vein and in consonance with the convictions expressed by the majority leader, our country will be the stronger for these actions.

Certainly, the approach of the distinguished majority leader to this problem is worthy of merit. It is one which as I have said, I hope will be followed by many others in the forthcoming inquiries which are to be made into the U-2 incident and its surrounding circumstances.

ANNIVERSARY OF DEATH OF SECRETARY OF STATE JOHN FOSTER DULLES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, 1 year ago, our late Senate colleague and Secretary of State John Foster Dulles passed to his reward.

This morning, at the Department of State, his successor, Mr. Christian Herter, and colleagues in the Department commemorated the day. It is interesting to note that on Tuesday next, representatives of the SEATO powers will convene in Washington to discuss matters of mutual interest. SEATO was the brainchild of Secretary Dulles, and I was privileged, along with him and Senator J. Alexander Smith, to be one of the three signatories for the United States.

Mr. Dulles was a lifelong student of diplomacy and statecraft. He was a man of determination and will power. He could always see the other side of the coin, in connection with any matter brought to his attention.

He was a devoted public servant, a man of devout religious conviction, and one who always carried the interests of our country in his heart and in his head.

This statesman of brilliant intellect and keen insight has left his mark. We shall continue to miss him, and we shall always remember him with affection and respect.

We are happy that he has been succeeded by his former associate in the Department of State; and Secretary Dulles himself would be proud of the man who has taken his place in the State Department—Christian Herter, of Massachusetts.

I note this anniversary because of the many services Secretary Dulles rendered to our country. He was a good man, a good Senator, and an outstanding Secretary of State.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I am glad that the junior Senator from Montana has taken this occasion to recognize the anniversary of the death of the late Secretary of State.

A year ago John Foster Dulles died. We remember him today, as he will be remembered by future generations, for his devotion to the United States and to freedom throughout the world. In every capacity in which he served he brought honor to our country.

NOW IS THE TIME TO GO ALL OUT FOR PEACE—STARTING WITH ENFORCIBLE ATOM TEST BAN

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, with all the tumult and the shouting about appeasement, there is the danger that all of us in the Senate will lose sight of the fact that the prime purpose of a U.S. Senator is still to work for peace with freedom. Of course, freedom is absolutely essential. I am sure there is not a U.S. Senator who would not prefer to die for freedom than to have this country submit to Moscow as the price of peace. Personally, I think it is a terrible waste of time for us to stir up the country's emotions by pretending there are any Americans of any influence in either party who do not share this determination.

At the same time, Mr. President, while we insist on freedom, the junior Senator from Wisconsin believes we should go all out to achieve peace, especially now, when every American citizen who can read a newspaper knows how tragically the prospects for peace have dimmed in recent days.

This is a time when the world is rocketing on to one cataclysmic triumph after another in the art of destroying life on earth. A few years ago it was the H-bomb, now mass produced, a few hundred of which could wipe out life in this Nation. A few thousand could destroy life on earth. The H-bomb is said to have its fallout drawbacks to the aggressor as well as the victim. Today we have developed missiles capable of delivering H-bomb warheads literally thousands of miles precisely on target in a matter of minutes. Tomorrow we will develop the neutron bomb, the death-ray bomb, that can kill without danger to the aggressor. What will come next?

Mr. President, can anyone read the history of mankind, with its steady, rhythmic pulsation of a war every generation, without recognizing it is not enough to hope that, in Churchillian phrase, "Safety will be the twin brother of annihilation, survival the child of terror?"

With all the dangers we confront, we must act, we must risk, we must work for peace—or we know in our hearts we are doomed.

Mr. President, this is why even now—I should say especially now—there must be voices raised in this government pleading that one of the last great hopes for peace—that great first step towards armament control—the conference on suspending nuclear tests, will not fail.

With this in mind, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an excellent letter by Prof. Herbert Jehle, a professor of physics at George Washington University, to the Washington Post, setting forth the practical prospects and promise of the test-ban negotiations, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

PERSPECTIVES ON DETECTION

There has been a lot of misunderstanding about the hearings of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy on the detection of nuclear explosions. Last week, a critical evaluation of the congressional hearings on that topic was given by the eminent nuclear physicist, Dr. H. A. Bethe, professor of physics at Cornell University, former member of the President's Science Advisory Committee, who was a member of the technical team at the Geneva test-ban negotiations.

What follows is a summary of Dr. Bethe's remarks.

The test-ban negotiations are the only negotiations between East and West which got somewhere. A great many articles have been agreed upon, though the more sticky articles are still to be negotiated.

East and West have a different way of approaching the issue. The Russians started these negotiations from the political point of view; no controls, no detection, no inspection. We moved a long way from this point. The West started from the position that nuclear test cessation agreements must have safeguards.

And because the U.S.S.R. is sensitive to the presence of visitors, we will make the safeguards as technical as possible. We will ask for 20 control stations in Russia, and 180 altogether in the world.

It is easy to detect nuclear explosions which occur in the atmosphere.

But now we have the underground tests. They were first made in 1957 in the series known as Operation Plowshare, or experiments in the peaceful uses of atomic energy. These are quite difficult to detect, but we can be proud of the achievements in the field of test detection. We can detect the major underground explosions.

The technical situation is fully taken into account by the President's proposal of February 11 which covered ban on tests in the air, in water, in near space; and underground insofar as explosions stronger than 20,000 ton TNT equivalent, i.e., 4.75 earthquake magnitudes are concerned. This means that we want the test ban to be enforcible, or limited to those explosions that we can detect with present techniques.

What the Holifield hearings in April established was that the basis of this proposal was technically sound. In all essential points this proposal was accepted by the Russians.

Since the question is being asked, where does our detection capability stand? With the 1958 Geneva network of stations we can detect underground tests of magnitude 20 kilotons or larger ones in Nevada type geological conditions. There are about 130 earthquakes above magnitude 4.75 (20 kilotons equivalent) annually in Russia; 50 percent of them would be identifiable as earthquakes—not explosions—by the first motion of the seismographic recordings. This would leave about 60 events per year unidentified.

With a slight extension of the net from 20 to 30 stations inside Russia as suggested by Dr. Richard Latter, one can improve the detectability of 20 or more kiloton events, leaving only 10 unidentified events per year. This makes it possible to reveal clandestine nuclear tests by on-the-spot inspection.

The idea of concealing large nuclear explosions in cavities can't be taken quite seriously. Natural cavities (which are usually too small), and big artificial salt domes, constructed for the purpose, are the proposed means of achieving decoupling. Though such an Albert Latter hole is technically possible, it usually cannot be dug secretly, even if we disregard information leaking through defectors from behind the curtain.

We are, however, by no means powerless against muffled bomb tests in cavities, and it is in this context in which I proposed a network spacing of 125 miles instead of the 1958 Geneva network spacing of 600 miles. In such a net we would detect even the muffled explosions of 20 kilotons, decoupled to 70 tons. This would mean some 600 stations if we put them evenly all over Russia.

But it would only be necessary to put the stations this close in the seismic regions, that is, in regions in which there are many earthquakes and in regions where there are possibly salt domes. If you spread them this close in those regions only, you would need about 200 stations inside Russia.

The extra stations would be of the small unmanned type which are relatively inexpensive, costing only about $100,000 apiece. I am confident that, given 2 years' time, unmanned stations can be developed which are tamperproof in the sense that it is possible to know if they have been tampered with.

After we have been forced to discuss technical details about concealment for over a year, the next round, on the technical level, should now go to the improvement of detection systems. Several proposals have been made for improved detection schemes in the well-known Berkner report of March 1959.

But it is a great mistake to inject a demand for hundreds of stations in Russia into the negotiations at this point. This is a position to fall back on in a couple of years if there is no improvement in our techniques of detection. And that is not at all hopeless. The really important issues are not these technical details. It makes no sense at all to go for 100 percent security in this field while depending entirely on the good will of the Russians in much more important fields.

HERBERT JEHLE.

HIGH COST OF MEDICAL CARE CRUEL BURDEN TO AGED

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the sincere and unsolicited letters we all receive on the question of medical care for our senior citizens go to the heart of the issue and, properly, to the hearts of us all.

I have here a letter that contains a simple but compelling lesson in arithmetic that cannot be denied and a plea that must be heeded. A couple receiving $96 a month on social security can not well afford $11.50 for health insurance. Millions of aged, of course, receive far less than this. What are they to do? I ask unanimous consent to have it printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

MY DEAR SENATOR: With the tabling of the Forand bill it looks as though nothing will be done this session for aid to older people. This is a pity. There is no place where the need is greater. Let me give you an example:

A couple we know have a total social security check of $96. They have carried Blue Cross health insurance for more than 20 years. This week they were notified that the monthly costs have now risen to $11.50.

Also they cannot carry any other similar coverage without forfeiting their Blue Cross protection.

In addition a change has been made in their policy requiring them to pay 20 percent of the first $300. This is for 70 days hospitalization, unless 90 days have intervened.

$11.50 out of $96. just for health insurance is prohibitive. And of course it will go higher, as it does every year.

With our President and many other high-salaried members of Government beneficiaries of nonprivate systems it seems hardly fair that they should be indifferent to the tragic needs of millions of aged. There is nothing the aged fear more than what can happen in case of extended illness.

I am hoping you will exert your influence so that the present Congress will do something in this direction.

Sincerely,

_____.

EXPANDED AIR POLLUTION RESEARCH AND CONTROL EFFORTS NEEDED

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I call attention today to an editorial which appeared in yesterday's New York Times comparing the air pollution control programs of Los Angeles and New York City, and calling for greater efforts, at all levels of government, to curb and control the amount of harmful substances in the air above our Nation's major metropolitan areas.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial from the New York Times be printed at this point in my remarks.

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

[From the New York Times, May 24, 1960]

SMOKE PROGRESS—ELSEWHERE

Officials of New York City's Department of Air Pollution Control have been advised that the new budget of the Los Angeles County Air Pollution Control District in California is $3,640,000, compared with the $674,380 budget for the New York department. Los Angeles has a staff of 458, and some private help in addition; the New York department's staff numbers 111.

Yet Los Angeles officials are not satisfied and are looking around for ways to improve matters. The county engineer's office out there has reported that in recent years air pollution control "has only maintained the status quo on smog, since State legislation to control the auto exhaust, the major contributor, has only recently been enacted."

Accordingly, the county engineer summed up, humbly and modestly we think: "In view of the small inroads thus far in actually reducing smog, our officials seek all information available on legislation and other control actions by the many jurisdictions that have attacked the air pollution control problem." We commend the Los Angeles diligence to our own city government, and point out that the effectiveness of New York City's antismoke efforts must be directly related to the availability of funds and facilities.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the subject of air pollution control has increased markedly in importance over the past several years.

There is often a tendency to limit the discussion of air pollution problems to certain west coast metropolitan areas in which this matter is especially serious. My colleagues in Congress from the State of California have devoted a considerable amount of energy to the control and alleviation of smog conditions in the Los Angeles area and in other west coast communities.

I want to make it clear, Mr. President, that the consideration of this subject must not be limited to Los Angeles and the west coast. We need to analyze and deal with it in all of the areas in which smog conditions exist or in which there is even a potential danger that this problem will become serious in the future.

In my own State of New York, New York City, as evidenced by the above editorial, has an active air pollution control program. Buffalo is becoming increasingly concerned about smog conditions. Other large cities, such as Cleveland and Houston, are in the same position. Both Pittsburgh and St. Louis have launched intensive and highly successful programs to reduce air pollution.

In all, 250 American communities have some form of local or State air pollution control programs. New York's Air Pollution Act was enacted in 1957. It establishes a State Air Pollution Control Board, which has been devoting considerable effort to problems in this field.

Under the Air Pollution Control Act passed in 1955, the Federal Government, through the Public Health Service, has spent some $20 million for research on the causes and possible methods of curbing air pollution conditions harmful to the health and safety of the citizens of our Nation.

Mr. President, I was extremely pleased that the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee last week approved H.R. 8238, an act passed by the House on August 17 of last year, which provides for a study of the effect of motor vehicle exhaust fumes. The House bill calls for a 2-year investigation by the Surgeon General as a public health matter.

I am hopeful that this bill will be enacted and that the Surgeon General's research reports will indicate what, if any, type of governmental controls are necessary in this area and, if necessary, at which level of government they should be imposed. Basically, I believe that, whenever we can, it is desirable to deal with air pollution control matters relative to such factors as automobile exhaust fumes through voluntary action on the part of private groups. At the same time, I have personally looked into various legislative approaches to this problem, should it be found that such approaches are necessary.

Mr. President, on the matter of automobile exhaust fumes, I noted with interest that Secretary Flemming of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, in testifying on February 24 before the Subcommittee on Health and Safety of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, commented on the extent to which automobile exhaust fumes contribute to metropolitan air pollution conditions. This was in connection with the renewal of the Air Pollution Control Act, which is

presently pending before the relevant committees of Congress. Although Secretary Flemming does not feel that Federal action is presently needed in this field, he placed considerable stress on his opinion that automobile air pollution problems must be dealt with on a national basis.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted at this point in the RECORD extracts from the testimony.

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

Emission of pollutants from automobile operations is a common phenomenon throughout the country. These are of concern in various areas because of irritative characteristics, their possible adverse effects on health, damage to vegetation, and interference with visibility. It does not appear feasible that this type of problem be approached on an individual community basis. The national character of automobile manufacture and distribution is such that consensus as to desirable actions should be obtained on a broader geographic basis.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I am not prepared to discuss the more technical aspects of the various devices for reducing the amount of hydrocarbons in the air from automobile fumes in the air. I do, however, call attention today to an excellent and thoughtful article on this subject printed initially in Fortune magazine and reprinted in abbreviated form in the April issue of the Reader's Digest. I ask unanimous consent that the Reader's Digest article to which I just referred be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

AUTO FUMES—AND THE AIR YOU BREATHE

(By George A. W. Boehm)

A malodorous nuisance in many cities, these exhaust fumes can become a positive menace if they remain uncontrolled. There are practical solutions to the problem—California and the auto industry are edging toward them.

The automobile is now the only major source of air pollution in American cities that is not under some degree of control. Through the switch from soft coal to oil and gas in industry, and through the use of filters and precipitators on industrial chimney stacks, smoke and soot are now kept within bounds. But comparatively little has been done to reduce automobile fumes.

These are a growing nuisance, if not menace, in almost every big city. They are malodorous. In some cities they are the chief cause of haze and smog. Health experts suspect they may be partly responsible for the alarming urban rise in lung cancer.

The trouble comes from a small but potent fraction of gas vented through the crankcase or tailpipe. The modern internal-combustion engine is not 100-percent efficient. The gasoline it burns the way it is supposed to emerges from the cylinders as water and carbon dioxide—the harmless products of complete combustion. But even a perfectly tuned engine wastes a little fuel, about 2 percent on the average. This waste, unburned or partially burned, carries the hydrocarbons that worry pollution-control experts.

We need not banish automobiles to end the trouble. Since 1953, the auto industry has spent $6 million on air-pollution research and now has half a dozen feasible ways of reducing fumes. Engineers know that for perhaps $10 per car they can eliminate 50 percent of the hydrocarbons; for perhaps $300 they can do an almost complete job. What we need now is to decide officially that something must be done, and how much.

The smog in Los Angeles is notorious. Now other cities—Cleveland, Buffalo, and Houston among them—are beginning to complain about smog chiefly in downtown areas. To date, only California has been moved to act. At the legislature's order the State board of health set standards for exhaust purity to be considered as the basis for laws requiring control devices on California automobiles. Under the proposed program, every car manufactured after January 1, 1961, for sale in California must be equipped with an approved exhaust-control device. Any solution that proves acceptable in California may be applicable in other areas where auto exhaust is a serious problem.

Where air pollution is only a marginal problem, simple and cheap methods of reducing hydrocarbons may prove adequate. The simplest is a gadget that recycles gases from the crankcase vent back into the carburetor. Getting these gases burned in the engine can eliminate roughly 40 to 50 percent of the total hydrocarbon emission.

Another simple method of reducing hydrocarbons is to give a car regular maintenance. (How much hydrocarbon comes out the tailpipe depends largely on the condition of the engine. One fouled spark plug can double the emission of hydrocarbons.) Last year a group of Chrysler engineers compared the fumes from their engineering department's fleet of 40 service cars, which had had a tune-up every 5,000 miles, with the fumes from a sampling of privately owned automobiles in Los Angeles. The comparison was eye-opening. The carefully tended company cars gave off 60 percent less hydrocarbon and carbon monoxide than the average Los Angeles car.

But such halfway measures as crankcase recycling and regular maintenance don't satisfy California air-pollution officials. Smith Griswold, director of the Los Angeles County Air Pollution Control District, estimates that at least 90 percent of the tailpipe emissions will have to be eliminated if smog is to be rolled back to the level of 1940, when there was occasional haze but no eye irritation.

How?

After 6 years of work, Ford, General Motors, and Chrysler have each come up with a practical device which, doubling as a muffler, burns up the hydrocarbons on their way out the exhaust pipe. The Chrysler device does this by concentrating the normal heat of the exhaust and using it to heat the hydrocarbons to 1,600°, at which temperature they burn readily. The Ford and General Motors devices pass the exhaust gases over pellets of a ceramic-like catalyst which makes the gases burn at relatively low temperatures—as low as 700° in one Ford model.

The devices vary in effectivenes. They burn from 60 to 90 percent of the hydrocarbons, cost from $100 to $300, and require maintenance or replacement after anywhere from 8,000 to 25,000 miles.

Although the Big Three's burners are still only in the advanced development stage, any one of them can be made ready for production within less than a year. It makes little difference to the manufacturers which burner is chosen. All the companies—Studebaker-Packard and American Motors as well as the Big Three—are bound by a cross-licensing agreement to share patents and designs free of charge.

A more radical and direct proposal for eliminating hydrocarbons has come from Ralph M. Heintz of Los Gatos, Calif. Heintz, now retired, was the cofounder and engineering ace of Jack & Heintz, the Cleveland firm that makes aircraft and missile parts. He insists that the only really satisfactory solution to the exhaust problem is to burn the fuel completely in the engine. Installing afterburners to consume wasted gasoline, he holds, is "like inventing rubber gloves because your fountain pen leaks."

Heintz has modified automobile engines so that they emit about 70 percent less hydrocarbon than the conventional engine. Working with Prof. Alexander L. London of Stanford University and E. Finley Carter and Dale Hutchison of Stanford Research Institute, he has replaced the carburetor with auxiliary combustion chambers, one for each cylinder. From these chambers just enough burning fuel is fed into a large excess of air in the cylinder to satisfy the immediate power demand of the engine. The result is inherently more efficient combustion.

After 2 years of experimentation, Heintz has a sound engine which can probably be improved further. It clatters a little, like a diesel, and it cannot yet match the power of conventional carburetor-fed engines. On the other hand, it gets several extra miles to the gallon.

Since the proposed California legislation primarily affects new cars, there won't be much reduction in California smog for several years. (Turnover of cars is approximately 50 percent in 6 years, 85 percent in 12 years.) And the program will be costly. At, say, $150 per car, and at the present rate of turnover, Los Angeles alone will become a $40 million per year market for burners.

There will have to be inspection stations. To inspect each car twice a year, Los Angeles will need about 1,000 stations. An inspection instrument which may prove suitable has recently been put on the market at $1,475. This cost, multiplied by 1,000 stations, plus the pay of 1,000 technicians, amounts to a sizable sum.

But the nuisance of smog is sizable, too. Los Angeles and other American cities will have to weigh the intangible cost of that, as well as the possibility—still to be determined—that smog may play a deadly role in promoting lung cancer.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I am very much concerned about the hazard to the health of our Nation created by harmful substances in the air. This problem cannot be tossed off lightly. The air we breathe must not become America's wastebasket.

WIRETAPPING LEGISLATION

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, it was necessary for me to be absent from the Chamber yesterday when the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] urged that we take action at this session to make it clear that wiretapping by State law-enforcement officials, under court order, did not run afoul of Federal law. I have since had an opportunity to read his statement and I want to commend him for his excellent analysis of the problem.

There is no doubt that the present law is seriously hampering law enforcement, is placing State district attorneys in jeopardy of Federal prosecution, and is establishing the telephone as a privileged instrument for criminal operations. The whole problem of eavesdropping, of which wiretapping is only one aspect, needs to be explored by Congress, and I have introduced a comprehensive measure for this purpose.

The immediate and urgent necessity, however, is to prevent the suppression of

evidence obtained against organized crime under State court orders. Enactment of S. 3340, which is modeled after a bill introduced by Senator McCLELLAN in the last Congress, would accomplish this limited but essential objective. Certainly, where State statutes require court orders before wiretapping can be done, the evidence thus obtained should be admissible in evidence and should not be held to violate any Federal law.

I am very grateful to the Senator from Arkansas for the very strong support which he gave to this point of view, and I am confident that his powerful influence will be helpful in advancing such legislation.

SUMMIT CONFERENCE WHICH WAS NEVER HELD

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, last Friday at 2 o'clock many thousands of Government workers were given a holiday for the remainder of the week and told to greet President Eisenhower. Some schoolchildren were dismissed. Units of the Armed Forces including bands, were ordered to the National Airport and to places along the route selected for President Eisenhower's return to Washington. Newspapers editorially urged a grand welcome for President Eisenhower—in fact, even included printed maps showing the route, thus catering to the well-known American habit of loving a parade.

Mr. President, the cruel fact is that President Eisenhower should not have been greeted as a conquering hero. What did he conquer? What great accomplishment was his at the summit conference?

Were not American citizens and leaders of friendly nations shocked in the first instance over false statements issued by a panic-stricken administration official who should have remained silent? Heads of state of friendly nations may well have been shocked by the ineptness of officials in the Eisenhower administration in the varying statements following the time the U-2 was downed some 1,300 miles within the borders of the Soviet Union.

These officials suffered humiliation, along with the citizens of our Nation, over the mistakes made by officials in NASA and the State Department. They could well reason that if appointive administration officials failed in this emergency, how likely it is that they would likewise fail if even a greater emergency were suddenly thrust upon us by Soviet action or aggression.

President Eisenhower, and the entire country with him, sustained a humiliating rebuff. Due to this failure and to ineptness and mistakes, the summit conference never took place. Whatever hope there was among leaders of the nations of the free world that some good result might come from a conference at the summit, was destroyed.

Our appointed officials let the President down. They utterly failed to do anything other than to furnish Khrushchev with grounds for bombast, bluster, and uncontrolled vituperation.

Officials guilty of authoring the shockingly false and then conflicting statements and flagrantly failing, at a critical time, in the performance of their duties, should be downgraded or dismissed from the public service. Better yet, they should have been seated in an automobile directly following that of the President after his arrival at the National Airport. It would have been appropriate to have draped that automobile in mourning over the hopes that were dashed partly as a result of their failures. It is unfortunate that the one principally responsible was not installed as a dummy in that Soviet satellite now in orbit.

It is true that our President conducted himself—in the face of charges from Khrushchev and the disappointments of the heads of State of our allies—in a dignified manner. He showed he could take all the abuse Khrushchev was capable of giving. I wish he had retaliated with some sharp language. But it is unfortunate his own officials—by clumsy and confused mishandling—distorted facts, permitted officials of NASA to publicly state that our aerial observation plane was on an innocent mission gathering information on weather, and then followed this with State Department officials denying that the pilot of the plane was spying.

This is an incredible performance.

Khrushchev disclosed the evidence, and then these same officials who should have said "we are investigating the incident," or remained silent, issued the provocative statement that those whose responsibility it is to defend this Nation would be failures if they did not do everything necessary, including spying, to "overcome the danger of a surprise attack" from the Soviet Union. This language clearly applied to the future.

A State Department official, very unfortunately for us, said: "Well, I will leave it to your interpretation." Then, apparently without notifying Vice President NIXON—who publicly defended aerial reconnaissance spying as necessary to penetrate the Iron Curtain and secure for our Armed Forces and for our allies information as to missiles on launching pads and aggressive preparations behind the Iron Curtain, and asserting that it was necessary to continue these defensive actions—this same appointive official pulled the rug from under him and handed Khrushchev an additional propaganda weapon for his bluster and bombast. Our President announced discontinuance of such aerial flights, which had, a couple of days before, been declared so necessary. Both President Eisenhower and Vice President NIXON were let down by administration officials who proved inadequate to cope with an unexpected misfortune.

It is time for Americans to hold a postmortem. Their hopes died in a welter of contradictory statements which should never have been made and which led to insult of the leader of our Armed Forces and national humiliation.

It is due to our own failures that Khrushchev was given opportunities which he eagerly grasped, to stifle a conference which promised some hope to peace-loving peoples the world over. He did this, in a lusty manner, before it even commenced.

Then, to compound confusion, Secretary of Defense Gates, from Paris, called for an Armed Forces alert for Sunday, May 15. We rattled our sabers; Khrushchev menaced with his missiles.

The prestige of the United States has been lowered due to clumsy, embarrassed, contradictory, and frequently false statements and conflicting explanations. In truth and fact, Communist Russia has had its spies in America constantly during the past years.

There was no excuse for inept and inadequate failure of CIA and other officials to cope with an unexpected mischance. We, unfortunately, were placed on the defensive, where we should not be. Our President was insulted. Officials of his administration were at fault and caused his discomfiture and frustration.

The truth is that there is little indication—in fact, no indication—of any accelerated war threat, but the tension of the cold war has become more evident.

Our citizens have not, as yet, fully recovered from the shock to our pride and confidence. When we do, we should take to heart the lesson that in this 20th century, we must have in the White House a full-time President who does not delegate responsibility and leadership. In this grim period, the times demand that; and we should have confidence that following the coming election, we shall once again have a strong leader as President and Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces.

It is the irony of fate perhaps that President Eisenhower, following a period of years when Dame Fortune had smiled upon him, now finds the law of averages catching up. He sought a relaxation of warlike tensions. Increased warlike tensions resulted. He hoped, in the final months of his administration, his would be a constructive achievement in face-to-face conferences with a dictator, to stem the tide of aggression and promote permanent peace.

Our high hopes for that success were denied—not so much by Khrushchev as from the Eisenhower lack of leadership and failure of our own officials in high places of authority.

Now it is for us to tear aside this false facade presented in the carefully planned Presidential parade from the National Airport, and for us to rebuild—as painful and gradual as it may be—toward further face-to-face conferences, seeking, as a powerful nation, to end the armaments race but maintaining adequate safeguards.

To accomplish this we must have great and strong leadership, a President with vigor and industry, who devotes full time to his job.

PUBLICATION ENTITLED "DESIGN OF SMALL DAMS"

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the Senate, I desire to call attention to a new publication being issued by the Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior, entitled "Design of Small Dams."

This publication, it seems to me, is a substantial contribution to western water development. In fact, it should be of nationwide interest since the design of small dams concerns areas throughout the country. I desire to commend the Bureau of Reclamation for its foresight and ingenuity in this field.

Of course, much of the work on this publication was done under previous administrations like that of former Secretary Oscar L. Chapman and former Commissioner of Reclamation, Michael W. Straus, as well as the former chief engineer of the Bureau, Leslie N. McClellan.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks a copy of a letter to me under date of May 20 from Hon. Floyd E. Dominy, Commissioner of Reclamation, and an advance copy of a news release from the Information Service of the Department of the Interior.

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

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
BUREAU OF RECLAMATION,
Washington, D.C., May 20, 1960.

Hon. JAMES E. MURRAY,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MURRAY: Knowing of your deep concern over the need for nationwide conservation of natural resources and your familiarity with the Bureau of Reclamation's work toward this end, including our engineering structures in the Western States, we believe you will be interested in the new publication Design of Small Dams.

We believe the technical assistance offered in this publication will be of great value in the furtherance of the development of the water resources in this country. It should be of particular assistance in the development of small water resource projects in the West, where many small dams remain to be constructed, in that it will make available to private engineers and engineering firms that would perform the engineering services for such projects, the specialized technical knowledge and experience of the Bureau of Reclamation as applied to low dams. The demand for such assistance was so great that an earlier publication had been exhausted, and the technique of design and construction so advanced in 22 years that it would be a disservice to simply reprint the old book, which was sponsored by the Water Resources Committee of the National Resources Committee.

It is our belief that the store of knowledge and 50 years' experience of a Government agency in this field should be available to the public. It can be readily appreciated that passing on this technical knowledge to the public will benefit not only those directly associated with the Bureau of Reclamation program, but the thousands of conservation districts, engineers, and planners interested in water conservation and utilization. We believe it will provide a guide to the information and data needed for the hydrological and structural design of small dams, provide specialized technical knowledge in readily usable form for engineers who are new in the field of dam design, and greatly simplify the design procedures for low dams. From this should come economy in engineering and design costs.

No doubt this publication will be of interest to you and your committee. Should additional copies be desired for your use, do not hesitate to let us know.

Your interest in and continued support of the reclamation program are most appreciated.

Sincerely yours,
FLOYD E. DOMINY,
Commissioner.

NEW RECLAMATION BOOK PRESENTS DATA FOR USE IN DESIGN OF SMALL DAMS

A new technical book, "Design of Small Dams," has been published by the Bureau of Reclamation as a guide to small water resource organizations, public agencies, and private engineers engaged in the design and the construction of small dams and retention reservoirs, the Department of the Interior announced today.

In announcing the release of the new publication, Commissioner of Reclamation Floyd E. Dominy said that because of the Bureau's international reputation in the field of dam design there was a wide, continuing demand by the public for technical assistance by the Bureau's staff in the planning for and design of small dams. He said this demand was becoming more acute since an earlier Government publication, "Low Dams," published in 1938, had been out of print for several years during the current worldwide boom in water resource development.

Mr. Dominy explained that the public is entitled to the knowledge and experience amassed by the Bureau in a half century of dam building. "We believe," he said, "that making this information public is not only a substantial technical contribution to the water conservation program, but also that it will help bring about full upper-basin water development, with correlative benefits to large downstream storage reservoirs. Furthermore, by stimulating private and local initiative to construct the smaller dams, it will be contributing to the overall Federal policy of encouraging private capital and non-Federal agencies to assume a large and challenging public resource development task without turning to the Federal Government."

In the preface of the 611-page volume, Commissioner Dominy pointed out that the new book is intended to serve primarily as a guide to safe and economical practices for those concerned with the design of small dams in public works programs in the United States. "The book will serve this purpose in three ways," he said. "(1) It will provide engineers with information and data necessary for the proper design of small dams. (2) It will provide specialized and highly technical knowledge concerning the design of small dams in a form that can be used readily by engineers who do not specialize in this field. (3) It will simplify design procedures for small earthfill dams."

Only the more common types of small dams now being constructed are discussed. These include concrete gravity, earthfill (rolled type) and rockfill dams. Emphasis is placed on the design of the common, rolled earthfill type. Small dams are defined as earthfill and rockfill structures with heights less than 50 feet above streambed, and concrete dams on previous foundations whose "head" from headwater to tailwater does not exceed 20 feet.

In addition to discussions of the design of dams, spillways, and outlet works, the book contains chapters on project planning, flood studies, foundations and construction materials, diversion during construction, and maintenance and operation. Appendixes are provided on hydraulic computation, construction of embankment, concrete in construction, sample specifications, and other supplementary features. A total of 331 illustrations and engineering plates is included.

The book was prepared by Bureau personnel at the Commissioner's office in Denver, Colo., under the direction of Grant Bloodgood, Assistant Commissioner and Chief Engineer, and L. G. Puls, Chief Designing Engineer. More than 30 engineers and many technicians participated in the preparation of the book and in its critical review. Special recognition was given to O. L. Rice, Chief of the Dams Branch; H. G. Arthur, Supervisor, Design Unit, Earth Dams Section; and E. H. Larson, Head of the Manuals and Technical Records Section, all of the Denver engineering staff, and to other Federal agencies which provided technical material.

"We believe that 'Design of Small Dams' not only will provide guidance in the most common type of water storage development, but that it also will furnish a technical reference reflecting the knowledge and experience the Bureau of Reclamation has gained through extensive operations in this field during the past half century," Commissioner Dominy said.

Copies of the new publication may be obtained from the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., or the Bureau of Reclamation, Denver Federal Center, Denver, Colo., Attention 841. The price is $6.50, postpaid.

AERIAL RECONNAISSANCE

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an article entitled "The Business of Aerial Reconnaissance," written by Holmes Alexander, of the McNaught Syndicate.

The article is significant and helpful both because of its timing and its content, with particular reference to the events of recent days on the Eurasian land mass and in Paris.

Mr. Alexander discusses the Tactical Air Command's aerial reconnaissance function. He emphasizes the vital importance of TAC's photographic reconnaissance mission as distinct from similar strategic operations, and calls attention to certain technical limitations which we might largely remove by making available for this mission up-to-date processes and developments already in use in private industry.

The crucial role of this TAC function in our national defense, particularly as we enter a new phase of the cold war, and the ease with which we may be able to effect needed improvements make this article and its proposals important reading for all Senators.

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

THE BUSINESS OF AERIAL RECONNAISSANCE

(By Holmes Alexander)

SHAW AIR FORCE BASE, S.C.—Unbeknownst to most Americans, something like 3,000 personnel and 288 aircraft of the Tactical Air Command are very much in the business of learning and practicing frontline, up-to-the-minute aerial reconnaissance.

This work should be distinguished from "spying" and from the gathering of "strategic" information about enemy capabilities. Our Tactical Air Command (TAC) deals with winning the battle, while Strategic Air Command (SAC) deals with winning the war. But by the very nature of midcentury facts of life, the first battle could be of more importance than ever before in history. Moreover, the potential of nuclear knockout punches on both sides means that dispersion of troops, concealment of weapons and especially the mobility of the new missiles take on a crucial significance. The ever expanding and ever refining science of airborne photography gives our side a chance to know not what the enemy can do, or

plans to do, but what the enemy has actually moved into a warlike position to do just a few minutes previously.

Between the time this piece is written and published, the Sino-Russian Communists may have cocked a fist for a surprise assault in the Far East against South Korea or Formosa, or in West Europe by intercepting our land or air access into Berlin; but it is most unlikely that the enemy could move so much as one missile launcher or one flight of planes without being caught in the act by TAC cameras.

There is a TAC reconnaissance unit officially located at Misawa Air Base, Japan, but it is roaming at will throughout the Far East commands. There are four squadrons of daylight reconnaissance planes, designated RF-101's, at Laon, France. There are two more such squadrons at Phalsbourg, France. In addition, there are four squadrons of night reconnaissance planes, designated RB-66's, based at Schulethorpe, England.

Apart from these oversea units, there are reconnaissance wings operating from three home base air forces—the 9th near Sumter, S.C., the 12th at Waco, Tex., and the 19th at Seymour-Johnson Air Base, N.C. These Zone of Interior TAC wings are, in fact, ready for duty anywhere in the world. Two summers ago they turned up in Lebanon and Formosa with less than 3 days' notice. On top of the regular units, there are four National Guard reconnaissance wings—operating out of 22 fields in 12 separate States.

These data are given in some detail because it may well be that the United States of America has passed into the cold war phase where tactical, frontline, instantaneous intelligence is more significant than any other kind. Today, the galaxy of Russian satellites in the sky, and the long-range plans of world communism to subvert and invade Latin America and Southeast Asia may not be nearly so vital as the enemy's intention to move troops or weapons down a highway, into a forest, or to shift a flight of aircraft from inland bases to the coasts and borders.

If the enemy does these things, we will have photographic proof—dropped by parachute for fast development—in a matter of minutes and hours. And we will have the chance—if we dare—to strike, rather than wait and be struck.

One of the prime purposes of your reporter on this trip was to learn what our tactical reconnaissance air units need to press their work toward a greater degree of perfection. I am told that the following methods exist in our photographic industry, but are not today as available as they should be for operational and training units:

1. A simple device within the navigational equipment to mark the exact geographical location of aerial pictures. At present, headquarters must rely largely on the memory of pilots who may be wounded or exhausted.

2. Infrared developments to improve night photography and bad weather reconnaissance.

3. Dry film processing.

4. High-resolution radar equipment of a more advanced stage than presently available.

5. The development and assignment of an airplane for day-night reconnaissance. At present, the RF-101 works at supersonic speeds by day and the RB-66 works at subsonic speeds by night.

Most of these improvements can and should be had almost immediately. We need to know—what's the enemy up to now?

DAVID E. LILIENTHAL ON POST-SUMMIT U.S.A.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article by David E. Lilienthal, first Chairman of the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, and before that Chairman of the Tennesese Valley Authority. In an eloquent way Mr. Lilienthal has recognized the firm challenge facing our Nation for a long time and now, upon the dawn of what must be a new postsummit era of American consciousness of the world's situation, calls for action—action of which only freemen are capable because it results from their most profound personal convictions.

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

[From the New York Mirror, May 17, 1960]

LILIENTHAL POINTS A WAY TO SURVIVAL

May 1960, may be remembered as the month when we Americans returned to the harsh reality of the world as it is. Once again our feet are on the rough and long and painful road to survival. Two years of wishful thinking and fantasy about the approach of an era of peaceful coexistence and nuclear disarmament are about to come to a close.

Three recent events can be thanked for this awakening:

First, the demonstration of how little substance there is—in terms of survival—to all the fanfare over summit meetings outside the United Nations, and the essential hollowness of ceremonial visits of heads of state and lesser lights.

Second, the collapse of the technical, and therefore the political basis for an agreed ban on the testing of nuclear weapons.

Third, the furor over an American reconnaissance flight into Russia.

The barrenness of trying to slow up or halt the nuclear arms race by an inspection agreement on an issue so collateral and essentially remote from disarmament as a ban on the testing of nuclear weapons and the impending debacle of the summit conference are events that the free world may view as a turning point of historic proportions. Something graphic was needed to awaken the people of America and Britain to the facts of life.

The major significance of the crackup of one of our reconnaissance planes within Russia, it seems to me, is that this episode dramatizes for the average citizen what has, quite unwisely I think, been hidden from him by the words of many of the world's political and intellectual leaders, West and East—namely, that the not-so-cold war has not and cannot in fact be abated by wishful thinking or a verbal escape from the evidence of the Soviet's determination to dominate the world, and the free world's equal resolution to remain free of such domination, come what may.

Once again we may begin to live in the world of reality, which is a world of constant danger. It may continue to be just that for a generation or more.

To face up, as now I believe even the most optimistic must, to the realities of how wide is the chasm between the Soviet world and our own is, I think, the only hope for the avoidance of war, and for building a solid foundation upon which two basically opposite concepts of life can manage to live side by side.

The sure road to war is to live in a fantasy, in a world that does not exist. Neville Chamberlain at Munich demonstrated how tragic this kind of escape from reality can be. World War II was direct product of that kind of wishful thinking. The French confidence that the impregnable Maginot line made an attack by Germany impossible is the older equivalent of the current doctrine that nuclear weapons possessed by both antagonists have produced a stalemate that frees the world from the danger of a nuclear war.

It is through such a dream world that the West has been passing. During this incredible period, however, the hard-bitten, realistic, and aggressive Communists were softening up our American resolution—their prime target.

They flooded us with horror stories of mutual suicide by atomic warfare and alluring but empty offers of peaceful coexistence, total disarmament, and an end to nuclear weapons.

They realized that if by threats and promises our will to resist was eroded, freedom might perish without a single shot being fired. I think we must admit that their campaign was partly successful.

Now we are ready, I hope, to put aside the superficial hopes engendered by the spirit of Camp David, or the notion that visits of Russians to this country, and Americans to Russia, highly desirable and beneficial as they are in themselves, have any basic relation to survival. We are now ready, I hope, to recognize that these are only sideshows that to many have obscured the real and basic obstacles to getting along with the Soviet system.

We are, I hope, ready to put aside, too, the wishful thought that the Russian political leadership desperately wants disarmament because they must keep their people happy with consumer goods, and cannot do so unless their huge costs of armament are dismissed.

Perhaps now we can come to grips with the central problem. That is to return to our efforts, exhausting but essential, to learn, step by cautious step, case by case, the process of negotiation with political leaders whose concept of life is almost as far from ours as if they were being on another planet.

It is in the American temperament to be sanguine, to believe the best of others. It is also in the American temperament to face up to whatever must be faced, but only when some dramatic fact forces us to. The story of Pearl Harbor is a classic in this category.

There is a wealth of impressive evidence that the American people can face hard, cruel, and disappointing facts, and can act with vigor, toughness, tenacity, and firmness. Here, I think, is the hopeful side, and the saving grace of the rather sudden disillusionment of the past weeks.

It was American firmness and readiness to face up to facts that helped get the Red Army out of Iran, that rebuilt our Armed Forces and thereby kept the Chinese out of South Korea, that saved Greece and Turkey, that helped produce a peace treaty for Austria, that saved Berlin by the amazing airlift. On almost any of these acts of resolution, the Soviets might have gone to war. They didn't.

We are dealing with a revolutionary and highly successful enemy. We must be at least as realistic as the Russians have shown themselves to be. We do not want to compete with them by imitating their closed society, their lying to their own citizens. We need above all to be ourselves, Americans at our best. And at our best we do not flinch from facts, we do not insist that our public servants feed us only good and pleasant words, but that they tell us the truth, however distasteful.

Let us hope that the debacle of the summit and the maneuvers of the nuclear test ban negotiations will mark the beginning of a period of realism in our dealing with the Soviet.

A peace that is no peace, a "thaw" that is no warming up except in the most superficial ceremonial sense, a consequent lulling and deterioration of American resolve and will to stand firm for what we believe—this is not the road to peace. On the contrary, it is the road to disaster.

Stockpiled atomic and other weapons are inert machines. They have no deterrent

value whatever, unless there abides the will to use those weapons rather than surrender freedom.

There is as yet no evidence that facing up to reality in dealing with the Soviet adds to the risks that already exist.

My own opinion is that the greatest risk of all would be to continue to nurse the illusion that international tension is relaxed because we ourselves have been relaxing.

ANOTHER SUMMIT—LABOR-MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the past week has seen the complete collapse of a summit conference on the international scene and the failure of another summit conference on the domestic scene. The urgency of the threat to free institutions throughout the world was made clear by Chairman Khrushchev when he scuttled the meeting of the leaders of the free and Communist worlds. Let us not have any failure of a U.S. labor and management summit meeting now. This is the danger faced by and the pitfalls so far in the way of the President's labor-management summit meeting. See the attached affidavit from the New York Times of May 23, 1960.

It may be fruitful, too, it seems to me, to give an underpinning to a labor-management summit and to place the work of forging mutual confidence and labor-management cooperation into the hands of those on the plant and community level whose immediate interest resides in such confidence and whose daily efforts must make such cooperation a reality. Mr. President, last February I introduced S. 3121, to promote increased productivity, and foster peaceful labor-management relations through the establishment in the executive branch of a bureau of productivity councils. This Bureau, jointly administered by the Secretaries of Commerce and Labor, would stimulate and encourage the establishment of productivity councils on the community level through regional advisory committees, pilot projects in various communities, and the distribution of information and publicity. I believe that this approach contains much hope for practical results because the spirit engendered by face to face discussion of mutual problems among men whose daily work depends for its success on the solution of these problems removes many of the obstacles standing in the way of agreement at summit conferences which take place in the spotlight. After the bases for cooperation have been put down at the working level, summit conferences have a chance for success.

The urgent need for labor-management cooperation to increase the productive power of the United States has been highlighted by the darkening international scene. The decade of the 1960's will see a greatly intensified economic struggle between the free world and the Communist bloc. In this struggle, the United States cannot afford to repeat the loss experienced during the 1950's of 340 million man-days of work and more than $15 billion worth of production—all as the result of labor-management disputes. In terms of the economic struggle, this figure represents almost as much as the United States spent for economic aid to the underdeveloped nations and as much as the entire cost of our missile program, excluding research expenditures, during the 1950's.

Mr. President, labor-management cooperation is a matter entirely in the hands of the American people. In this matter, we are not at the mercy of foreign powers and inimical interests. Only we could answer for any failure to act in our own self-interest. I do not think that the American people will accept such failure.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD an editorial in the New York Times of May 23, which represents an expression of profound concern on this subject.

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

[From the New York Times, May 23, 1960]

AN EMPLOYER-LABOR SUMMIT?

The first meeting of the union-management summit conference has not given as much promise as the soundness and urgency of its objectives deserve. The mere fact that it has taken about 6 months even to get the first meeting and to complete the conference personnel suggests a lack of enthusiasm on at least one side. This impression is reinforced by the postponement of another meeting for 6 weeks or 2 months on account of other commitments of the members—which presumably seem to them more important.

Then the proposed makeup of the two groups has already disclosed disturbing differences of views. AFL-CIO President Meany has appointed the top officials of two of the most important unions to serve with him—men with nationwide experience in labor-management negotiations. Mr. Meany doesn't feel that the management representatives chosen by President Bannow of the National Association of Manufacturers are of equal stature, with one a president of a company that has had a strike by the union headed by a Meany appointee. Regardless of the obvious general competence of Mr. Bannow's designees, Mr. Meany's reservations are not good omens for summit success. But Mr. Bannow has promised to add some others.

As for the agenda, it looks as if the conference hasn't got that far. But surely there must be genuine agreement in advance of a meeting schedule of what is to be discussed and how—with an emphasis on a better mutual understanding by each group of the other's point of view rather than agreement on specific policies. Anyway, we wish the undertaking well in spite of the difficulties and dangers that seem to lie ahead.

"TROJAN HORSE" RECOMMENDATION BY CHICAGO CONGRESSMEN THAT DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE UNDERTAKE POLLUTION STUDY IN LAKE MICHIGAN

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, as my colleagues may recall, there is a bill, H.R. 1, pending before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. The measure would propose to divert large volumes of water—dangerously large volumes, I believe—from the Great Lakes Waterway system, for sanitation purposes at Chicago, draining into the Illinois Waterway.

As of now, the effort to enact such legislation, contrary to Great Lakes interests, has been consistently either defeated in Congress, or vetoed by the President. Now, however, the pushers of this ill-advised legislation are trying for an "end run" under the guise of a proposal offered by Congressmen O'BRIEN and YATES, of Illinois, which would provide that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare appropriate $12 million for a study of pollution in the Great Lakes area. The proposal would also authorize the Chicago Metropolitan Sanitary District to divert an additional 1,000 cubic feet per second of water from Lake Michigan as part of this study.

The sudden interest of the Chicago Congressmen in a pollution study was merely an excuse to enable Chicago to carry out unauthorized diversion of water from Lake Michigan, contrary to the wishes and welfare of all the other Lake States.

The issue of further water diversion from the Great Lakes is now properly before the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate and the Supreme Court of the United States. It is, therefore, unfortunate that a new effort is being made to bypass the regular responsible consideration of this issue by the appropriate legislative and judicial agencies.

Now, I want to say this: I am fully in favor of carrying out necessary and effective antipollution studies needed in the Great Lakes. However, let us not be fooled by this ruse for attempting to increase diversion of water from the Great Lakes.

Believing that the proposed amendment to the HEW funds before the Appropriations Subcommittee is a "Trojan horse" operation, I have contacted Senator LISTER HILL, chairman of the subcommittee on this matter.

To give my colleagues in the Senate the benefit of the subterfuge, which I believe is contained in the proposal, I ask unanimous consent to have a recent letter I submitted to Chairman HILL, printed in the RECORD.

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

DEAR SENATOR HILL: I am writing to you in connection with the testimony presented before your subcommittee on May 5 by Congressmen O'BRIEN and YATES urging a special appropriation for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in order to conduct a pollution study in the Great Lakes area. As I shall proceed to show, this request for a study of pollution in the Chicago area is intended to serve as a Trojan horse. The request for a study of pollution is merely a guise to enable Chicago to carry out further diversion of water from Lake Michigan—contrary to the wishes and welfare of all other riparian owners.

I believe it was unfortunate that Representatives O'BRIEN and YATES came before your subcommittee in an effort to bypass the regular responsible consideration of the issue of further water diversion from the Great Lakes by the appropriate legislative and judicial agencies. The subject of the Chicago diversion of waters from Lake Michigan is now appropriately before the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate and the Supreme Court of the United States.

The subject of water diversion from Lake Michigan by the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago has been a subject of continuing controversy between Chicago, the State of Illinois, and the other States adjoining the Great Lakes for many years. As far back as 1928 the Supreme Court of

the United States was brought into the conflict in order to determine the equities involved. At that time the Court approved a temporary diversion of 3,300 cubic feet per second. In recent years there has been continuous effort on the part of the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago to divert additional quantities of water from the Great Lakes.

During this session of Congress, as in many previous ones, a bill was introduced by Representative O'BRIEN (H.R. 1) authorizing an additional diversion of 1,000 c.f.s. from Lake Michigan. A companion bill, S. 3, was considered by the Committee on Public Works, which, after long hearings, reported it to the Senate. There was much discussion on the merits of this legislation on the floor of the Senate—with particular emphasis on the Canadian opposition to such diversion. The bill was finally referred to the Foreign Relations Committee for its consideration. At the request of the Foreign Relations Committee, the Department of State has contacted the Canadian Government in order to ascertain the Canadian position on this matter.

Simultaneously, the Supreme Court of the United States, which assumed jurisdiction over this subject in 1928, again proceeded to look into the problem, and on June 29, 1959, appointed a special master to hear the evidence in connection with this controversy. The master, U.S. Senior Court Judge Albert Maris of Philadelphia, has been holding hearings on this subject in Chicago and in other places since August 4, 1959, and has not yet completed his study.

Primarily, the issue relates to the diversion of additional water from Lake Michigan for the benefit of the Chicago Sanitary District. The controversy arose from the fact that between the years 1892 and 1900 the city of Chicago and its suburbs carried out a plan to dispose of the sewage of the Chicago metropolitan area by cutting a canal across the low continental divide about 10 miles west of Lake Michigan and discharging the sewage of the entire metropolitan area into the Mississippi watershed.

Ultimately the States of the Great Lakes Basin, all the way from New York to Minnesota, brought action in the U.S. Supreme Court to enjoin Chicago from the continued abstraction of waters from the basin. After extensive hearings the Supreme Court, in 1930, issued a decree based upon the findings of Special Master Hughes, later Chief Justice, ordering the reduction of the diversion of water to its present level. It was the view of the Supreme Court that such diversion would be sufficient to maintain the navigation levels of the Chicago Canal and the Illinois River, and would be adequate to provide water circulation for sanitary purposes.

But in recent years, the Chicago Sanitary District has undertaken a tremendous program of expansion. From some 508 square miles in 1954, the District, through annexation grew to more than 920 square miles in 1958. Unable to cope with its sewage problem through sewage disposal, Chicago again desires additional water in order to flush its sewage down into the Mississippi watershed. To obtain authority for such additional diversion, Chicago has sought all possible excuses and has dragged the matter from one agency to another in a fashion somewhat reminiscent of the man who not being satisfied with one judge's determination, sets out on a shopping expedition to find a judge that would agree with him.

H.R. 1, which was introduced last year, sought to authorize additional diversion under the guise of navigational needs in the Chicago area. The amendment that Congressmen O'BRIEN and YATES are now seeking to the Health, Education, and Welfare budget would authorize diversion under the guise of a pollution study. But all these measures are designed to do the same thing: To provide Chicago with water for flushing down its sewage; and this contrary to the original Supreme Court directive to the sanitary district to treat such sewage in another fashion, through the establishment of sewage disposal plants and facilities.

Now that this matter is pending both before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the Supreme Court, I find it rather surprising that the two Representatives from Illinois have undertaken to bypass these responsible agencies. The other States adjoining the Great Lakes continue in their opposition to further diversion. Recent communications from the Canadian Government indicate that the Government stands by its earlier position that further unilateral diversions would be in violation of the 1909 Boundary Waters Treaty between the United States and Canada.

I believe that this difficult question is now properly dealt with by the Special Master appointed by the U.S. Supreme Court and the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate. We must certainly await their judgment before further action in this matter could be undertaken. It would certainly be inappropriate for your committee, or any other committee, to bypass the careful and responsible consideration and decision of these other Government authorities which have jurisdiction in this matter.

Sincerely yours,

ALEXANDER WILEY.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GORE in the chair). Is there further morning business?

SETTING OF FIRST COLUMN FOR EXTENDED EAST CENTRAL FRONT OF THE CAPITOL

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I have been asked by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, in his capacity as Chairman of the Commission for Extension of the U.S. Capitol, to invite the Members, officers, and employees of the Senate to witness the setting in place of the first large marble column in the portico of the extended east central front of the Capitol, at 9:30 a.m., Thursday, May 26, 1960.

This is a historic occasion in which I feel each Senator will be deeply interested. All are invited to enter the construction area at the door to the fenced enclosure just south of the entrance to the Senate Wing, from where they will be directed to a safe and appropriate vantage point.

The old records indicate that the original sandstone columns were erected in 1824 and that the stonecutters at the Capitol participated in a procession and exhibit celebrating July 4, 1824.

The new columns are duplicates of the originals except that they are of Georgia white marble instead of sandstone. They are monolithic, weigh about 18 tons each, are 24 in number, and are 24 feet 9 inches high. The columns are of the Corinthian order and taper uniformly from a diameter of 3 feet at the base to 2 feet 6 inches at the top.

The original columns were designed by Charles Bulfinch in carrying out the overall plan for the east portico prepared by his predecessor, Benjamin H. Latrobe. Mr. Latrobe and Mr. Bulfinch were the second and third architects of the Capitol, respectively.

The column to be set on Thursday, May 26, will be the one located immediately to the southeast of the main entrance leading to the rotunda.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to query the majority leader about the program for the latter part of this week, inasmuch as next weekend will be Memorial Day weekend.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I have checked with the Parliamentarian. I am informed that in recent years it has been the policy of the Senate not to meet on Memorial Day, so I am in the position to definitely inform the Senate there will be no session on Memorial Day.

Judging from the bills which have been reported to the Senate and which are available for discussion, I do not anticipate there will be a necessity for a session on Saturday. Therefore, I think we will go over from Friday until Tuesday.

As to whether we shall have any yea-and-nay votes on Friday, I shall have to wait until we see what progress we make on proposed legislation which is to be considered this week. We have before us the question of overriding the President's veto on the depressed areas legislation. We shall have a yea-and-nay vote on the Agriculture Department appropriation bill.

We shall have a meeting of the Policy committee for the purpose of considering the scheduling of the wheat bill, S. 2759, Calendar No. 1339.

The bill which relates to the disclaimer affidavit in the National Defense Education Act, S. 2929, Calendar No. 1411, may be considered. The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] has indicated a desire to have that bill considered this week. If it meets with the convenience of the other members of the committee and if it is agreeable to the policy committee, the bill will be scheduled for consideration as early as possible.

We hope to consider also the bill relating to the shrimp convention between the United States and Cuba, Calendar 1412, Senate bill 2867; the International Development Association bill, Calendar 1414, Senate bill 3074; and the bill enacting certain provisions of the Reorganization Act of 1959, Calendar 1417, House bill 7681.

In addition, there are a number of bills from the Finance Committee and the Labor and Public Welfare Committee on the calendar. Among the bills from the Labor Committee are those relating to nurse training, the extension of the Library Services Act, and special teachers for the deaf, Calendar Nos. 1473, 1474, and 1476.

None of those measures have been cleared for consideration, but I anticipate that all of them will be scheduled at an early date, and as soon as the committee has acted upon them, I will promptly make that announcement to the Senate.

Senators may expect the Senate to be out of session from Saturday through Monday, Memorial Day. Later in the

week I will announce whether any legislation which will require rollcalls on Friday is to be anticipated.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thank the majority leader.

KEYNOTE ADDRESS BY HON. HOWARD W. SMITH AT DEMOCRATIC CONVENTION AT VIRGINIA BEACH, VA.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks an outstanding address made by the Honorable HOWARD W. SMITH, chairman of the Rules Committee of the House of Representatives, as the keynote speaker at the State Democratic convention held at Virginia Beach, Va., on May 21, 1960.

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

KEYNOTE ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE HOWARD W. SMITH AT THE STATE DEMOCRATIC CONVENTION, VIRGINIA BEACH

My fellow Democrats, you are assembled here today as the chosen representatives of the Democrats of Virginia, the home State of Jefferson, the founder of the Democratic Party. The party that has survived the vicissitudes of political warfare throughout a century and a half. The party that could only survive because of the basic principles of government upon which it was founded.

Broadly speaking, those principles are that the best governed peoples are the least governed, that the closer the local self-government is to the people, the better. That the centralization of power in the Federal Government is an evil that will eventually strangle the sovereignty of the States and destroy the carefully preserved concept of free, sovereign, and independent States. Sovereign States with every right, duty, and power save only those specifically granted to the Central Government by the Constitution.

This was the universally accepted concept on which the Constitution was ratified by the States. Without that concept written into the Constitution and reemphasized in the Bill of Rights, the compact would never have been ratified by the States.

In other words, under the Constitution as written and adopted, the Federal Government has no power whatsoever outside of those specifically granted by the Constitution. All other powers of government are specifically reserved to the States, and when we speak of States rights it embraces every right of the sovereign government, with the exception of the limited powers granted to the Federal Government. The complaint so persistently and loudly voiced by those of us who believe in a strict interpretation of the limitations imposed by the Constitution which every Federal officer (legislative, executive, and judicial) is solemnly sworn to uphold.

Perhaps we have drifted away so far from the moorings that bound us to our forefathers' conception of our system of government that it is too late to return. Perhaps we have drifted so far into that conception of socialistic government that presently infests the whole world that we can never return. There are, however, those of us who will maintain until we die that the course we are now pursuing will lead this Nation, the greatest the world has ever known, into pitfalls of disintegration, deterioration, and ultimate disaster. We see in Washington today in the Congress a reckless disregard of fiscal responsibility and extravagant expenditures on almost every fanciful, do-good scheme that the mind of man can conceive to drain from the people of the States the taxes to feed the hungry maws of Federal expenditures. While, in spite of this unbearable burden of taxation, Congress passes—and the President approves—expenditures which over the past 20 years, have resulted in unbalanced budgets that have required annual and continuous increases in the Federal debt to meet deficiencies in Federal revenues. In these transgressions against financial responsibility, there is little difference between the Democratic and Republican National Parties.

As a result, the American dollar, which for decades had been looked upon as the soundest currency in the world, has been reduced to the purchasing value of 48 cents. The national debt has climbed to around $290 billion. World financial centers have been shaken in their faith in the soundness of our currency until the Treasury has found it impossible to float American long-term securities at the interest rates allowable by law. The astounding result is that American taxpayers are called upon to pay interest on the national debt of $9 billion a year, which is more than the entire budget for 1930 which was $4,665,236,678.04.

I selected the year 1930 because it was the year that I was first elected to Congress. At that time and in that year, the total expenses of the Federal Government including interest, debt retirement and operating expenses was a little over $4½ billion, while this year in interest alone we will pay $9 billion, twice as much as the whole expense of the Federal Government in 1930. With an annual budget now of around $80 billion a year and a public debt grown to $290 billion, is it any wonder that the public cries out for a return to fiscal sanity and a reduction in Federal expenditures. And in the face of that cry, a Democratic Congress and a Republican administration continue to find and promote, and pass and pay for, new and untried schemes of social welfare that you and I and the rest of the American taxpayers are called upon to pay.

From the time of the adoption of the Constitution to the year 1946, the total expense of the Federal Government was a little over $233 billion for the whole period of 152 years.

In 7 years of the Truman administration, from 1946 to 1953, the total expenditure in those 7 years was $335 billion—far more than the whole expense of the Government in the preceding 152 years.

In the 7 years of Republican administration, from 1953 to 1960, the Republican administration expended the enormous sum of $528 billion, more than twice as much as was spent in the 152 years preceding the Truman administration.

The platforms and the leaders of both great national parties have fastened upon the taxpayers of our country what is apparently a permanent expenditure of around $4 billion a year for foreign aid to other nations, who have more and more come to look upon this bonanza as the answer to their economic and financial difficulties. All in the name of world peace—and while we cry peace, peace—there is no peace. In a futile and timid attempt to buy the friendship of foreign nations, we have extended our socialistic, giveaway program to nearly every nation on earth. Our welfare programs at home have been extended to carry on the backs of our burdened taxpayers the woes and economic problems of nearly all the nations on the face of the globe.

While we meet here today the Congress is considering new schemes, new bills, new plans, for the new and additional extravagance that will further burden the American taxpayer and further increase the national debt, further increase the interest rates, and further burden the American taxpayer, and further reduce the value of the dollar.

If the things which I here decry lie outside of the proper and constitutional functions of the Federal Government, both of the great national parties are equally guilty.

Aside from our misguided fiscal policies, there are those well meaning individuals and organizations in our midst who believe that all the evils of the present world situation can be cured by a so-called world government.

The first step in this movement shows itself in the present agitation to repeal the so-called Connally amendment to the treaty of the World Court. That treaty sets up an international court with power to make determinations as to certain international disputes, but provides that each sovereign country reserves the right to determine everything relating to its domestic problems. The Connally amendment further provides that each country shall determine what are its domestic problems; the country itself to decide what is, or is not, a domestic problem. The repeal of the Connally amendment would leave it to the World Court to decide this vital question.

Thus, there would be placed in the hands of a foreign court in which we would have minority representation to determine whether our immigration policy, our tariff policy, and numerous other policies could be dictated by foreign countries against our will. It would be a fatal step in the altruistic dream of a world government. This proposal has the endorsement of important public officials in both the Democratic and Republican Parties.

Fundamentally, all of the things of which I speak arise from a disregard for the limitations of power placed upon the Federal Government under the Constitution. Nor can we confine these transgressions to any one of the three divisions of Government created by the Constitution. The executive department, the legislative department, and the judicial department all have contributed to the grasp for powers that they do not rightly possess under our system. All from time to time have sought to deprive the States of the Union of their sovereign rights guaranteed us by our charter of government devised by our forefathers out of bitter years of experience with misrule and oppression, and imitated throughout the world by peoples seeking new freedom.

We have seen the Chief Executive invade a sovereign State with the Armed Forces to impose the will of the Central Government on the people of that State in open and flagrant violation of the specific prohibition contained in the Constitution, unless done at the request of the legislature or the Governor of such State.

We have seen the legislative department of the Federal Government, the Congress, recklessly assume power to govern, control and rule in the exercise of the local functions of the government reserved to the people of the sovereign States.

Saddest of all have been the decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court, that vital and final bulwark against the encroachment of the Federal Government on the rights of the sovereign States and the individual liberties of our people.

Time permits only the mention of a few instances where that Court, guided by its own sociological ideals, has reversed previous decisions of that Court that have stood as the law of the land for generations.

By its decision in the school segregation case it changed the constitutional rights of the States to operate their public school systems and reversed decisions of the former courts that had stood the test of time and had been the law of the land for a hundred years. Basing its decision, not upon the law of the land, but upon the writings of a socialist Swedish author.

In the Girard College case where Stephen Girard a hundred years ago had established a fund of his own money in trust to the city of Philadelphia for the education of poor white children, and though it had been operated for a century under the conditions laid down by the donor, the Supreme Court substituted its own will for the will of Stephen Girard and held that Negro children must also be permitted to share the bounty of this benefactor against his will.

In the case where the Health Department of the State of Alabama under State law undertook to inspect unwholesome foods, the Supreme Court by its decision deprived the State of Alabama of its inherent right to protect the health of its citizens against impure food because of the mere fact that Congress had enacted a pure food law.

In New Mexico where State law prohibits license to practice law except to persons of good character, authorities of the State of New Mexico decided that a person with a record of subversive and treasonable activities was not of the good character that the State desired to license, the Supreme Court substituted its judgment of good character for the judgment of the sovereign State of New Mexico in dealing with a purely local problem.

In the city of New York where the State legislature, in enacting a city charter, provided that any schoolteacher who in any procedure took advantage of the fifth amendment automatically severed his employment with the city, and where the city authorities discharged a schoolteacher for violation of its charter provision as being a person not desirable as a teacher of the youth of that community, the Supreme Court substituted its judgment as to whom New York should hire for the education of their youth, for the judgment of the State legislature of that State.

In the famous Steve Nelson case where a known and active working Communist seeking to overthrow the Government by force was convicted under the law of Pennsylvania, the Supreme Court denied to the sovereign State of Pennsylvania, and all other States having similar laws, the inherent right to protect itself against subversive criminals seeking to overthrow the Government by force.

What we do here today, what we say here today, may be, I fear, an exercise in futility. A call for return to constitutional government as designed by the framers of this government; a call for a fiscal policy to restore the solvency of the government and relieve our people of the burden of taxation for improvident expenditures; a call to restore to the States their just rights of local self-government; a call for a Supreme Court that would confine its present exercise of unlimited powers to the functions prescribed in the Constitution; these calls may be a voice calling in the wilderness at the National Convention of the Democratic Party which will shortly assemble in Los Angeles. Such a call would be equally futile if addressed to the Republican Convention.

But we can at least voice to our friends and fellow Democrats who will assemble and assume to speak for the Democratic Party, our hopes, our desires, and our pleas for a moderate and sympathetic consideration of the hopes and aspirations of that great body of loyal and conservative Democrats throughout the Nation who view with the gravest apprehension the political motivations that have brought about the division in the great party of Jefferson. The Democratic Party that for a century and a half has carried the banner in battle after battle for good government, unselfish government, local self-government, and government in the best interests of the masses of the people, but never unmindful of the constitutional basis upon which foundation rests the success or failure of our efforts.

There are those among us who feel that we should divorce ourselves from the National Democratic Party. There are others of equal patriotism and equal apprehension as to the course of the party who feel we can be more effective in our efforts by remaining within the party. Certainly the National Republican Party offers no haven of refuge for unhappy Democrats. Southern Democrats should not forget that it was the Republican leader in the Senate who proposed in the recent civil rights legislation he introduced, to approve as the law of the land the infamous decision of the Supreme Court in the school desegregation case and was defeated only by the dogged and persistent opposition of those 18 Senators from the Southland, with the timely aid of the Democratic majority leader in the Senate.

It was the Republican civil rights bill, written and masterminded by the Republican Attorney General, that was finally passed and signed by the Republican President. No, my friends, there is no haven of refuge in the Republican Party for the beleaguered southern Democrats.

On the other hand, we have under Virginia law the power to reconvene this convention after the national convention if the Butlers, the Hoffas, and the Reuthers, and others fix upon us a situation that is intolerable.

It is my hope that this convention may proceed to its work in harmony and friendly understanding. Certainly the objectives of all gathered here are in accord. It is my hope that we endorse to the national convention a candidate of demonstrated ability and fundamental belief of our system of constitutional government, and with the courage to lead us in turning the tide of socialism back into the quiet channels of responsible constitutional government and fiscal sanity.

THE U-2 PLANE INCIDENT—EDITORIALS IN AVIATION WEEK

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, two penetrating editorials have appeared in Aviation Week, both on the U-2 situation, and both written by Robert Hotz, editor.

The first, entitled "Lockheed U-2 Over Sverdlovsk: A Study in Fabrication," appeared May 16.

The second, entitled "Fallout From the U-2," appeared May 23.

Both of these editorials merit the thoughtful reading of Members of the Senate.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these editorials be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From Aviation Week, May 16, 1960]

LOCKHEED U-2 OVER SVERDLOVSK: A STUDY IN FABRICATION

(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. It may never emerge from the welter of official lies pouring from Moscow and Washington.

Nevertheless, there are some points that have already emerged from this adventure that are worth examining. Let us start with the fabrications that have been bullroared from the rostrum of the Supreme Soviet by Nikita Khrushchev because they reveal much about his fears and problems over the current state of the world.

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 spectacle of Soviet air defense system futility for the last 4 years in trying to stop these penetrations must provide a chilling counterpoint for Soviet citizens to the bellicose blustering of their leader over the aggressive strength of his military power.

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 by the Red Army missilemen to whom Mr. Khrushchev awarded medals.

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.

Mr. Khrushchev has good reason to worry about the ability of the U-2 and other aircraft to skim over his huge air defense system. For it must come as a real shocker to Soviet citizens, fed a steady diet of propaganda on the superiority of Soviet military might, to hear the admissions from Mr. Khrushchev and Andrei Gromyko that these U-2 flights have been going on successfully for at least 4 years. The Soviet citizens must wonder, if this is true, how much credence they can place in the assurances they receive from Mr. Khrushchev that manned bombers are obsolete and cannot penetrate the Soviet air defense system. Even if his claim of a missile hit at Sverdlovsk was true, how does Mr. Khrushchev explain a 1,400-mile penetration from the Pakistan border to the Urals?

It is obvious that Mr. Khrushchev does not really believe his own claims about the difficulty of manned bomber penetration into the U.S.S.R. because he has been pushing a gigantic expansion of his air defense system for the past several years. This includes new improved surveillance, and ground control intercept radar, passive detection systems, new interceptors and a tremendous program of new antiaircraft missile installations around key military and industrial areas. If Mr. Khrushchev really believed the Strategic Air Command B-47, B-52, and B-58 fleet of manned bombers were as ineffective as he publicly blusters, he would hardly waste the vast resources that he has and is still putting into his air defense system.

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. It is developing

new supersonic bombers and a nuclear-powered bomber and it is exercising its current operational jet bomber fleet at an accelerated rate in long distance Arctic missions. Mr. Khrushchev would like us to believe his lies on the future of the bomber in the Soviet arsenal. This belief would encourage the trend, already started, toward cutting back our own air defense system.

Mr. Khrushchev is also ignoring some pertinent facts when he stresses the "provocative" nature of the U-2 flights. The Soviet espionage system in this country has been exposed in many aspects of its hydraheaded operation. The record from the atomic secret snitching of Klaus Fuchs to the cozy Brooklyn espionage nest operated by the Soviet Colonel Abel has offered ample provocation for anything this country cares to make of it.

The Soviets are fighting the reconnaissance war with every method at their disposal all around the periphery of the Iron Curtain, cutting transatlantic cables off Newfoundland, grappling for Caesar antisubmarine warfare stations, fishing for nose cones off Ascension Island, monitoring the Atlantic Missile Range communications, shadowing Polaris submarines and conducting electronic reconnaissance on our frontiers by trawler, submarine and aircraft. The Soviets do not require deep penetration of the United States for photo reconnaissance because of the availability of this information from public sources and their espionage system. Their prime need is for electronic intelligence and this they are gathering with every means at their disposal.

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 gives us a queasy 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. They saw no reason to sniff suspiciously at an offer of a free research program for high altitude weather and gust loading research from the military. This bailment of military aircraft to NACA was traditional, since NACA had no budget of its own for this purpose. NACA wrote the test program requirements, sporadically got back data from missions executed according to its specifications and apparently never did much analytical research into the geographic locations of the U-2's or the isolation of the agency from any contact with their personnel. NACA and later NASA, dutifully published three technical reports in 4 years on this work and worked happily in the traditional role of the piano player in a bagnio who was never told what was going on upstairs.

This coupling of CIA (which Washington wags are now saying stands for "caught in the act") with NASA in an international espionage venture will badly damage, if not altogether destroy, the fine foundation NASA was organizing for international cooperation in the scientific exploration of space. NASA can hardly blame foreign nations already solicited in this program for inquiring as to how much of a tracking station, launching site, or payload instrumentation is earmarked for CIA missions. Nor can they be blamed for politely declining to take a chance with an agency that apparently doesn't know all it should about its own activities.

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.

Second is the spectacle of the State Department turning a complete slow-motion somersault from the flat lie that "there was no deliberate attempt to violate the Soviet airspace and there never has been," to a mousy admission that there might have been such flights but that they "were not authorized by Washington," to a final complete admission that the U-2 penetrations were in fact an integral part of U.S. national policy. What the State Department can command as a credibility factor in future roles as a U.S. spokesman will be interesting to see.

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.

This policy, which is unprecedented in the history of nations, leaves our allies in an untenable position and forces the Soviets to carry this matter much further than they may have originally intended. It appears to be another one of those hasty, poorly thought out, improvised policies aimed at a quick fix with not much thought for future consequences or other implications.

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 requirements.

The need for a congressional or some other "watchdog" operation over CIA was never more apparent.

Finally the most important aspect of the U-2 episode is the illumination it must shed for most Americans on the simple salient fact that we are in fact fighting a war against the forces of communism. It is a far different war than we have ever fought before and it is being fought with weapons that we are not accustomed to using. The bungling, naivete and innocence our various Government agencies have displayed in the U-2 episode show clearly that we are not yet organized for this type of conflict nor do we yet really understand its scope and strategy.

Although too few Americans realize it, we are already deep into this struggle to determine whether the Soviet system or our own will prevail. If we hope to preserve the basic elements of this civilization we cherish, we must dedicate ourselves more thoroughly to this task and organize our national resources and policies more effectively to achieve this goal.

[From Aviation Week, May 23, 1960]

FALLOUT FROM THE U-2

(By Robert Hotz)

Last week we warned that the extraordinary statements of Secretary of State Herter and President Eisenhower making aerial espionage and violation of foreign airspace with the Lockheed U-2 an official U.S. policy would produce serious repercussions in the future. The presses printing these words had hardly stopped rolling when the first diplomatic fallout from these incredible statements began raining down. At this writing it is still continuing with no prospect of early abatement.

One of the extremely harmful effects of these statements has been the embarrassing position in which we have placed our allies on the edge of the Iron Curtain. By those statements this country formally implicated them in an official espionage effort against the Soviet Union and provided the Communists with more potent ammunition against the NATO countries than they themselves have been able to generate in a decade. The gravity of this allied position is indicated in the formal diplomatic protests already lodged with the United States by Norway and Pakistan and the cannonade of Soviet threats to rocket-blast these allied bases if any further U-2 operations are conducted from them. Denmark finds it necessary to make an official statement barring its airfields for unauthorized flights over countries not members of NATO. It is hard for people in this country to realize the courage required by our allies on the edge of the Iron Curtain to stand fast behind our cause in the face of the constantly growing Soviet military threat, economic and cultural exploitation and diplomatic pressure. Norway and Denmark by their very presence in the NATO organization provide proof positive of the free world's determination to resist Soviet aggression. Both these countries saw their neutrality shattered by Nazi Germany in World War II, lived under a despot's occupation and resisted it with every means at their disposal. They have learned that there can be no compromise with brutal aggression no matter what political label it bears. Norway has a common frontier with the U.S.S.R. Denmark sits on the shores of the Baltic, now practically a Communist lake, and is flanked by Communist Germany to the landward. Both have stood firm in the face of earlier Soviet bluster against their NATO role.

Both of these countries have made vital contributions not only to NATO's strength but to the over-all U.S. military position in the Western World. Norway's underground airfields carved from its rocky northern coast are practically impervious to destruction even by nuclear weapons. The giant radar on the North Cape looks down into the beehive of Soviet air activity on the Kola Peninsula and covers an Arctic flank. The Danish radar on Bornholm Island in the Baltic does a similar job on the Communist periphery from Lithuania to East Germany. The use of key air bases in Greenland along with the BMEWS site is another vital Danish contribution. Both Norway and Denmark maintain small but modern jet and missile forces at considerable expense to their modest national economies to back their determination to remain free and fly their own flags.

Now we have rewarded this loyalty and courage by ineptly pulling the rug from under their exposed position and providing the Soviets with the only valid evidence for diplomatic protest in a decade of searching. Turkey, which has a historic antipathy to the surge of Russian imperialism toward warm water and has never lacked the courage to fight invaders when they threaten, has made similarly important contributions to NATO and is now left in a similarly embarrassing position.

The next chapter in this unnecessary humiliation of ourselves and our allies will be staged in the great world sounding board of the United Nations. It is difficult to see at this time how a successful public defense can be made for our right to unilaterally penetrate other nations' airspace for the purposes of espionage. No matter how anybody feels privately about this matter it will be difficult, if not impossible, for any nation to

formally support such a position in an international forum.

But even worse than the position in which some of our firm allies find themselves because of our handling of the U-2 situation is the casual and thoughtless manner in which our top official spokesmen pulled the rug from under their carefully constructed and stoutly defended international position in relation to the Soviet Union. We cannot hope to retain the leadership of the free world unless we exercise it with considerably more intelligence, skill and effectiveness than has been displayed in the U-2 incident.

The belated anouncement by President Eisenhower that he had suspended U-2 flights for the duration of his administration came too late to do much good at the summit and if continued will leave this country in a position of losing its sharpest eyes inside the Soviet Union at a time when we need them most. For there is little doubt that the temperature of the cold war is rising. And the knowledge that no prying U-2 cameras will be roaming the Soviet airspace certainly makes the prospect for surprise military action more tempting than ever to Soviet leaders.

As predicted, President Eisenhower's assumption of responsibility for the U-2 flights closed the door on the exit provided for him in Khrushchev's original discussion of the incident and left the Soviet leader no further room for maneuver. It obviously stirred him to magnify the U-2 episode into a far larger issue than originally intended, if only to pacify a rising tide of domestic criticism.

Collapse of the summit was based on unresolved issues far deeper than the U-2 flights although the official U.S. handling of this episode provided Khrushchev with an unusually convenient escape hatch and an unusually fine opportunity to bellow equally well for both international and Russian consumption.

Perhaps the real value to this country of the sorry summit spectacle is that the artificial mask of friendliness slipped from Soviet leadership, revealing its true nature and the fact that its goals have not changed one iota since the days of Stalin's cold war. Mr. Khrushchev's brutal threat to the West of "peaceful coexistence or war" and his post-summit behavior should make it abundantly clear that by peaceful coexistence the Soviet leadership means peace on their terms with the naked threat of war to force compliance.

The spectacle of the summit should convince the American people that the basic problem of opposing Soviet imperialism has not changed one whit during the recent "palsy-walsy" era when this country's official policy was to pursue peace without defining the price we were being asked to pay.

It is worth while now to recall that there are many American leaders who warned against altering U.S. policy on the basis of this false front of Soviet smiles and who stoutly maintained that our best position for any negotiations would be a position of unchallenged military strength. In the historic light of the summit collapse and the policies that "summitry" stood for, the American people must think seriously on which type of leadership they should look to for future guidance.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNG of Ohio in the chair). Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

Without objection, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

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. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION AUTHORIZATION ACT, FISCAL YEAR 1961—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 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. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

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

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of May 19, 1960, p. 10828, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I understand that this is a unanimous report.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator is correct.

Mr. President, there were only two amendments in controversy, involving certain positions of the Senate, with respect to which, after conferring with the chairman of the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, the Senate conferees agreed to the House position, with the understanding that that met with the approval of the distinguished chairman of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

The other position of the Senate was that $55 million should be added to the amount of money requested by the President, for two purposes: First, primarily to take care of any increase in cost that had developed since the President's budget estimate was submitted; second, to take care of any breakthroughs that had not been anticipated, or any developments that were not known at the time the budget was submitted.

It must be borne in mind that this is merely an authorization. The conferees unanimously agreed to the position of the Senate that the $915 million should be increased by an additional $55 million authorization. So in the event that, either by reason of cost increases or breakthroughs, a larger amount should be needed, the administration would not find it necessary to ask for an additional authorization, but could submit a request for a supplemental appropriation.

I believe that both of these positions are in the national interest. They are unanimously agreed to by Mr. OVERTON BROOKS, Mr. JOHN MCCORMACK, Mr. GEORGE MILLER, Mr. OLIN TEAGUE, Mr. JOSEPH MARTIN, JR., Mr. JAMES FULTON, and Mr. GORDON MCDONOUGH, on the part of the House, and the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN], on behalf of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. 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. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

THE AREA REDEVELOPMENT ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 11 o'clock has arrived; and, under the order entered on yesterday, the Chair lays before the Senate the enrolled bill, S. 722, the Area Redevelopment Act, returned to the Senate by the President without his approval.

The question is, Shall the bill pass, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding?

Debate for 3 hours, to be equally divided, is permitted under the order entered on yesterday.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield myself such time as I may require.

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE VETO

Mr. President, for the second time in two successive Congresses—namely, the 85th and the 86th—the administration has dealt a cruel blow to the people in the labor-surplus areas of high unemployment in our country and in the low-income rural areas of underemployment.

For the second time, these people in industrial areas of high and persistent unemployment, spread throughout 28 of our States, and representing a labor force of approximately 1¾ million people, together with millions more in 500 struggling rural counties in 20 different States, have been led down the path of hope, lured by administration promises and expressions of interest in their problems, further encouraged by widespread congressional interest and positive legislative action, only to be finally rudely awakened in the most irresponsible manner by another shocking Presidential veto of the area development bill.

Senate bill 722 can, if passed over the President's veto, provide an effective approach to the solution of the economic problems of areas of chronic unemploy-

ment and underemployment in the midst of generally prosperous business activity in the United States. These areas, in the opinion of a majority of Congress, are entitled to a domestic point 4 program. The President has asked us for—and, indeed, has demanded from us—appropriations for all types of economic assistance abroad; yet he will not countenance a small—but effective—fraction of such aid for our own people here at home.

I repeat, this veto was a cruel blow to an important part of our society, men and women who want nothing more than a chance to help themselves and their communities by sound economic development, under private enterprise, of the areas in which they live.

This legislation is one of the most important domestic issues facing both Congress and the country. It will be a gage of the promises and performance of both political parties. It tests not only our concern for pressing human needs, but also our capacity to utilize the great idle resources of manpower, and thus add to the Nation's goods and services and productive facilities.

Sometimes we forget that perhaps the greatest waste in our society is the waste of human labor, of laborers who want to work, and are competent to work, but who cannot find employment. If means are found, through private enterprise, but with Government loans to provide these men with capital and industries to give them employment, this will add greatly to the productive wealth of the Nation, and can do so without inflation, because there will be increased production to match the increased investment in plants and equipment.

The vote which very shortly will be taken in the Senate will be an acid test of political responsibility.

Senate bill 722 and its predecessors have been before us since 1956, the first year in which an area redevelopment bill was presented to Congress. Since 1956, Congress has twice answered this challenge by passing constructive measures, only to be met, first, by the pocket veto, in 1958, of Senate bill 3683, and now by the present veto of Senate bill 722. Unless there is repentance by a sufficient number of the administration's supporters to override this veto, I believe this whole history will conclusively demonstrate the need for action at the polls in November. If my memory serves me correctly, the 1958 elections have already revealed the views of many people on this matter. The veto, the present debate, and the ensuing vote of this body will be important, and in some cases decisive, factors in the choices which the voters will make in November. This may be an issue which ultimately will be determined at the grassroots and the closed factory gates of our country if we have not the wisdom and the will to decide it here.

HISTORY OF CONGRESSIONAL ACTION AND OF PARTY LINEUPS

In order that the responsibility for what is done may be clear, let me briefly recount the history of Congress' action on this problem.

In the spring of 1955, I introduced the first comprehensive bill on this subject, and in 1956 it passed the Senate with a 2-to-1 majority. It was killed in the House, however, during the last days of the session. It was killed because of the efforts of the Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Weeks, and the Republican Members of the House and the Republican administration. This was hard to understand, for the President from the summer White House in Denver had called for a "bold" program to help chronically depressed areas and for congressional action. At the end of the session, during a press conference, the President was asked why his Secretary of Commerce had been opposed to the bill. The President said that he was not aware of that fact, and that he was sorry. That was in 1956.

The unsympathetic attitude of the administration toward this legislation, however, was further demonstrated at this time during the House consideration of the measure. I am advised that a last desperate effort to secure action was made by the House leaders working for the bill, who got in touch with the then Assistant Secretary of Commerce, Frederick H. Mueller—now the Secretary of Commerce—and made an offer even to accept the watered down administration bill in order to have some basic legislation. It was late in the session. Adjournment was imminent. The messengers reported that Assistant Secretary Mueller requested 24 hours to consider the offer. And what did he do? I am informed that he advised the House leaders that the administration did not want any bill—not even the one which ostensibly was its own.

In the meantime, the President in each of his economic messages to Congress in the 3 years 1956, 1957, and 1958 called for legislation to help solve this problem. And recently he referred to this Congress as a "do nothing Congress." These are reasons why it is so difficult to understand how and why he again vetoed this year's bill.

In 1958, the area redevelopment bill, which I had introduced—of which we made Senator Payne, of Maine, a coauthor—again passed the Senate. The vote was 46 to 36. Of the votes in favor of the bill, 29 came from Democrats—71 percent of the Democrats who voted, and 17 votes from Republicans—41 percent of those voting. Of those who opposed the bill, there were 12 Democrats—or 29 percent—and 24 Republicans—or 59 percent.

Although there was no yea-and-nay vote on the question of final passage in the House, the key vote was on the motion to recommit the bill. That motion, if adopted would have killed the bill. But the motion to kill the bill was defeated by a vote of 188 to 170. The party breakdown of the vote was as follows:

Motion to recommit (kill) the Douglas bill, 1958

Opposed to killing the bill, 188:	
Democrats (72 percent)	139
Republicans (30 percent)	49
For killing the bill, 170:	
Democrats (28 percent)	54
Republicans (70 percent)	116

In other words, the Democratic Senators voted 2½ to 1 for the bill; the Republican Senators voted 2⅓ to 1 against the bill. That was the bill which was given a pocket veto by the President.

On January 27, 1959, I introduced another area redevelopment bill (S. 722), with 38 cosponsors, from both sides of the aisle; and we made the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], the joint authors of the bill, in an effort to get bipartisan cooperation. It is this third bill, with House amendments, which most recently was passed by the Congress, and which the President has vetoed, and which is before this body today.

After further lengthy hearings and full debate, the vote on S. 722 was as follows: The Senate first passed the bill by a margin of 49 to 46. On that yea-and-nay vote, 45 Democratic Senators and only 4 Republican Senators voted "yea," although we had made every effort to obtain Republican cooperation; and 30 Republicans and 16 Democrats voted against it.

In other words, we Democrats voted approximately 3 to 1 for the bill, and the Republicans voted 7½ to 1 against the bill.

Subsequently, the House passed the amended bill by a vote of 202 to 184. Those voting for the bill consisted of 179 Democrats, joined by 23 Republicans, while 115 Republicans and 69 Democrats opposed the measure.

The Democrats on the House side voted almost 3 to 1 for the bill. The Republicans on the House side voted precisely 5 to 1 against it.

On the final vote in the Senate a short time ago to accept the House-passed bill, which was 45 to 32, 40 Democrats and only 5 Republicans supported the bill, while 21 Republicans and 11 Democrats voted against the bill.

In other words, the Democrats voted approximately 4 to 1 for it; the Republicans voted approximately 4 to 1 against it.

The record of the votes in Congress on an effective area redevelopment bill thus makes it clear, by the action of the President, and by the actions of the Republicans, that this has become a party issue, despite all the efforts which we have made to make it a nonpartisan issue. It has become a party issue not by our actions but by those of the Republican Party.

The repeated acts of the President in using his veto power to deny to Congress the type of legislation which a majority believe should be enacted, range the Republican Party leadership clearly on the side of opposition to any effective measure to deal with this problem. If they wish to redeem themselves on this issue, there is still time for them to vote to override. They have one more chance to take this out of political controversy.

A final opportunity is now presented to this body to demonstrate to the Nation that the legislative branch of the Government accepts its responsibility to study and pass legislation according to its wisdom and the dictates of its conscience, and that, notwithstanding the unwillingness of the executive branch to permit this legislation to be enacted with its approval, and, indeed, notwithstanding the determination of the executive

branch to prevent this legislation by its veto, the Congress can nevertheless overcome these obstructions by voting to override that veto by a two-thirds vote.

I plead for the cooperation of the gentlemen on the other side of the aisle, and those on this side of the aisle who in the past have opposed this measure, to join with us in asserting the independence of the legislative branch of the Government in helping to promote the welfare of the people of the United States. There is a chance for redemption at the last minute for all of these men, and those who enter into the gate at the last hour will be as welcome as those who have borne the heat and the burden of the day during the long, hard struggle.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an analysis which I have made of Senate bill 722 be inserted in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

ANALYSIS OF S. 722, A CONSTRUCTIVE PROGRAM

The program set forth in S. 722 will go a long way toward effecting a permanent solution to the national problem of chronic unemployment and underemployment. It establishes a program which will put wasted manpower and undeveloped resources to work not only to meet the pressing immediate needs of our unemployed, but also as an aid to developing an expanding economy.

WHAT THE BILL DOES

Section 1. The short title of the act is the Area Economic Redevelopment Act.

Section 2. Finding of facts: The purpose of the act is to help areas needing redevelopment to expand their economic activities so as to alleviate substantial unemployment and underemployment that prevails within such areas. This would be accomplished by assisting communities, industries, enterprises, and individuals in providing new employment opportunities and by expanding existing facilities and resources without reducing employment in other areas of the United States.

Section 3. Area Redevelopment Administration: An Area Redevelopment Administration would be established under the direction and control of an Administrator who is to be appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate. The salary of the Administrator is to be $20,000 a year.

Section 4. Advisory Committees: The bill provides for the establishment of two advisory committees. Subsection (a) creates a Government Advisory Committee on Area Redevelopment. In addition to the Administrator, 11 heads of Federal departments or Federal independent agencies are designated as members of this committee. The committee is required to meet twice annually and is to make recommendations to the Administrator with regard to carrying out his duties.

Subsection (b) creates a National Public Advisory Committee to be appointed by the Administrator to consist of 12 members representing labor, management, agriculture, and the public in general. This committee is to make recommendations to the Administrator in carrying out his duties.

Subsection (c) authorizes the Administrator to call ad hoc industry committees representing the parties in interest when employment has dropped substantially over a number of years in such industry resulting in high levels of unemployment in various areas designated by the Administrator as redevelopment areas. The industry committees are to recommend plans and programs to the Administrator with reference to such industry.

Section 5. Redevelopment areas: The bill recognizes two types of redevelopment areas—industrial and rural—which are eligible to receive Federal assistance under this bill.

Under subsection (a) an area may be designated an industrial redevelopment area in either of the following two ways: (1) the Administrator may, at his discretion, determine that a given area has been subject to substantial and persistent unemployment for an extended period of time and designate the area an industrial redevelopment area; or (2) an industrial area must be classified an industrial redevelopment area if it meets any one of the following four tests and has 6 percent unemployment at time of application: (a) not less than 12 percent of the total labor force in the area has been unemployed for a period of 12 months immediately preceding the date on which an application for assistance is made; (b) not less than 9 percent of the labor force in the area has been unemployed for a period of 15 months out of the last 18 months prior to such date; or (c) not less than 6 percent of the labor force was unemployed during at least 18 months in the 2 years immediately preceding such date; or (d) not less than 15 percent of the labor force in the area has been unemployed for a period of 6 months immediately preceding such date.

Subsection (b) sets forth the criteria for designating a rural area as a rural redevelopment area. The Administrator is directed to designate as rural redevelopment areas those rural areas in which he determines that there exists the largest number and percentage of low-income farm families and a condition of substantial and persistent underemployment. In making these designations, the Administrator is required to consider, among other relevant factors, the number of low-income farm families in the various rural areas in the United States, the proportion such low-income families are to the total farm families of each of such areas, the relationship of the income levels of farm families of each such area to the general levels of income in the same area, the current and prospective employment opportunities in each such area, and the availability of farm manpower in each such area for supplemental employment. The Administrator shall designate the 500 counties in the United States ranked lowest in level of living of farm-operator families, or which have the highest percentage of commercial farms producing less than $2,500 worth of products for sale annually.

Subsection (c) provides that in making determinations concerning redevelopment areas, the Administrator is to be guided—but not conclusively governed—by the available information published by the various Federal agencies, State and local governments, universities and private organizations.

The Administrator may also request from the Secretary of Labor, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Director of the Bureau of the Census special studies and such information and data as he deems necessary to enable him to make the determinations provided for in this section. The Administrator is required to reimburse these agencies for expenditures which they incur in connection with filling his requests.

Subsection (e) defines the term "redevelopment area" to mean any area within the United States which has been designated by the Administrator as an industrial redevelopment or a rural redevelopment area.

Section 6. Loans for industrial and rural projects: Section 6 of the bill provides two $75 million revolving funds, one for industrial projects in industrial redevelopment areas, the other for rural redevelopment areas. These revolving funds for loans were provided because witness after witness testified that in these urban and rural areas where unemployment and underemployment have been substantial and persistent, the communities own resources are not sufficient to make it possible for industrial development to proceed. These loans are intended to help provide for plant, equipment and machinery, but not for working capital or the purchase of raw material and payment of labor. These loans are to be for no longer than 30 years. Government participation is never to exceed 65 percent but may be less. Local and State authorities must put up at least 10 percent and at least 5 percent must be from nongovernment sources.

Section 6 expressly provides that loans made under it for industrial projects must not be granted to assist establishments relocating from one area to another when such assistance will result in an increase in unemployment in the area of original location. This provision reflects the declaration of purpose of the act, to create new employment opportunities by developing and expanding facilities and resources without substantially reducing employment in other areas of the United States.

Sec. 7. Loans for public facilities: The bill provides a revolving fund of $50 million for loans to States, Indian tribes, or organizations representing redevelopment areas to help in financing the purchase of development of land for public facility usage, and construction or alteration of public facilities, if the project will tend to improve the opportunities in the area for the establishment or expansion of industrial or commercial plants or facilities. These loans may run for a period up to 40 years.

A depressed area may have many of the assets sought by industry—buildings, labor, community facilities and the like—but it may lack one public facility without which all the others are useless, for example, adequate water for industrial use, adequate sewage facilities, or access to a navigable river or a railroad.

Interest rates: The bill authorizes appropriations of $251 million for the program. The Administrator is to pay interest on these loans at a rate determined by the Secretary of Treasury, but such rate shall not be greater than the current average yields on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States of comparable maturities as of the last day of the month preceding the issuance of such notes or other obligations.

Loans made to industrial projects must pay interest to the administrator at this same rate plus one-half of 1 percent. Of this, one-quarter of 1 percent is allocated to a sinking fund for payment of losses.

The interest rate in the case of public facility loans is a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, but which shall be not greater than the average annual interest rate on all interest-bearing obligations of the United States then forming a part of the public debt as computed at the end of the fiscal year next preceding the year in which the loan is made and adjusted to the nearest one-eighth of 1 percent, plus one-quarter of 1 percent per annum.

Section 8. Grants for public facilities: The bill authorizes appropriations of $35 million for grants to States or their subdivisions, Indian tribes, or public or private organizations representing redevelopment areas for land acquisition or development for public facilities usage, or construction or alteration of public facilities in the area, if the project will improve the opportunities in the area for the establishment or expansion of industrial or commercial plants or facilities. Financial participation by the applicant is required to the extent financial ability will permit.

Some redevelopment areas have inadequate economic resources, either because of chronic unemployment or underemployment or a

generally low level of economic development, to borrow money to develop public facilities which would make the areas attractive to new industry. For this reason, the bill provides for grants to improve public facilities in these localities.

Sections 9 and 10. Information and technical assistance: The Administrator is directed to provide assistance, technical information, market research, and other forms of advice available from the Federal Government which would be useful in alleviating unemployment and underemployment in the areas. In addition, the Administrator is authorized to provide technical assistance to the areas including studies evaluating the needs of and developing potentials for economic growth for such areas. This may be done either through the Administrator's staff or by employing individuals, firms, or institutions. Appropriations up to $4.5 million annually are authorized for this program.

Section 11. Powers of Administrator: Usual corporate powers.

Section 12. Termination of eligibility: When unemployment ceases to meet the criteria set forth, the area is no longer eligible. Contracts, however, continue in force.

Sections 13 and 14. Urban renewal: The bill makes available to economically depressed areas the benefits of the Federal urban renewal program. Under this section, urban renewal assistance may be provided to a municipality designated as "an industrial redevelopment area" if there is a reasonable probability that with such assistance the area will be able to achieve more than a temporary improvement in its economic development. Such an area need not comply with the predominantly residential test and thus areas which are predominantly commercial or industrial and which will be redeveloped as commercial or industrial areas are eligible.

Sections 15 and 16. Vocational training and subsistence retraining payments: The bill provides that the Secretary of Labor shall determine the needs of the area for vocational training to meet the employment opportunities created by the bill and shall cooperate with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and existing State and local agencies to make these services available to the area. Authorization for an appropriation of $1.5 million annually is provided for vocational training.

In order to enable unemployed persons to get the benefits of this training, the bill also provides that the Secretary of Labor may make weekly retraining payments through State agencies to unemployed persons in the redevelopment areas of 13 weeks at the average weekly unemployment compensation rate in that State, but limited to those not receiving unemployment compensation. A ceiling of $10 million is placed upon this program.

THE ESSENCE OF S. 722

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I may say that fundamentally what this bill aims to do is to provide loans at low rates of interest to help establish new industries in areas of high and persistent unemployment; to require local participation; to require participation by private parties, but to provide seed capital to help put the unemployed to work turning out goods which are needed by society under the private enterprise system. This would take men and women off relief, and help to prevent the progressive drying up of afflicted communities, and, in general, to raise the national product.

As I have again and again pointed out, this method is used by the Tory Government of Great Britain and by the conservative government of West Germany, and yet it is regarded as too radical by the Republican administration of this country.

This problem is far more serious than the administration believes. I have had a map of the United States prepared, which is in the back part of this Chamber. The areas designated with the red pins represent both the larger and smaller labor market surplus areas of the United States, those that would meet the qualifications laid down in Senate bill 722.

There are 40 of these major, large labor market areas, and 122 of the smaller.

We have just received word from the Department of Labor that there are approximately 1,770,000 unemployed people in those regions, or, on an average, 8.4 percent of the labor force of this area.

In some of these areas, unemployment is vastly greater than the average of 8 percent. In West Virginia there are areas where unemployment runs from 11 percent to 25 percent.

In my own State of Illinois, in the southern portion of the State, which was primarily a coal-mining area, there is unemployment in some areas of 12, 15, and 18 percent.

There is high unemployment in the textile centers of New England, New York, and Pennsylvania.

This is a problem which, as the map shows, and as the table shows, is not sectional. It applies all over the country, although, so far as unemployment is concerned, it is primarily confined to regions where formerly textiles were manufactured, coal-mining regions, areas where timber has been cut over or natural resources have given out.

The colored areas on the map represent the rural low-income areas of the United States. It will be seen that they exist primarily in the South and Southeast. The degree of severity of the rural low-income situation is shown by the colors, the areas with the most depressed rural income being shown in red, the next most depressed in blue, and those depressed, but not as badly as the others, in yellow.

Very frankly, I cannot understand why so many Senators and Representatives from those areas, which would benefit perhaps more than any others from starting new industry to help the low-income families who live there, seem to be opposed to this bill.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am happy to yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I would not want to break the continuity of the presentation of the distinguished Senator from Illinois, except to say that when he asks the question and answers it, that indicates, of course, as one looks at this map, that the reasons are overriding for assistance in area redevelopment legislation.

I desire to supplement the discussion on the current legislative situation by indicating that if we have an economic erosion in any area of the United States, it quite likely will become an erosion to the neighboring sections. So the damage does not stop at a line.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. RANDOLPH. It flows over in its tragic implications to affect people of other sections. Certainly, when there is an economic erosion there comes a lessening of the strength of the people—of all the people, not simply a few of the people—to help themselves.

All we are requesting in the proposed legislation is a strengthening of the total economy. We do not seek handouts from the Federal Government. We seek legitimate and, as provided in the pending bill, moderate assistance to States, to areas within States, and to people who find themselves unemployed throughout these chronically depressed areas of the Nation.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank my good friend from West Virginia, who has been a stalwart supporter of this proposal.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a table prepared by the Department of labor, which sets forth the history of the designation of these areas as labor surplus areas, and a list of counties which would be designated as rural redevelopment areas.

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

Initial dates of labor surplus area classification and subsequent classification experience,[1] July 1951 to present—Urban areas that may qualify for Federal assistance under various legislative proposals [2]

MAJOR AREAS [4]

Area redevelopment bill (S. 722 as passed by Congress) (40 major areas)	Douglas bill (S. 722 as originally passed by the Senate) (17 major areas)	Dates of labor surplus classification	Unemployment	
			Date	Rate [3]
Connecticut:				
Bridgeport		January 1958 to November 1959	March 1960	6.6
New Britain		March 1958 to November 1959	do	6.4
Indiana:				
Evansville	Evansville	May 1954 to January 1956 to May 1955 and present	do	8.7
Terre Haute	Terre Haute	July 1951 to present	do	8.8
Kentucky: Louisville		January 1958 to November 1959	do	7.5
Maine: Portland		March 1955 to July 1955 and March 1958 to July 1959	do	8.2

See footnotes at end of table.

Initial dates of labor surplus area classification and subsequent classification experience,[1] July 1951 to present—Urban areas that may qualify for Federal assistance under various legislative proposals [2]—Continued

MAJOR AREAS [4]

Area redevelopment bill (S. 722 as passed by Congress) (40 major areas)	Douglas bill (S. 722 as originally passed by the Senate) (17 major areas)	Dates of labor surplus classification	Unemployment	
			Date	Rate [3]
Massachusetts:				
Brockton		July 1951 to November 1952, March 1958 to September 1959, and November 1959 to present.	March 1960	8.4
Fall River	Fall River	November 1951 to May 1953, May 1954 to November 1955, and January 1957 to present.	do	9.9
Lawrence	Lawrence	July 1951 to present	do	6.7
Lowell	Lowell	July 1951 to present	do	9.8
New Bedford	New Bedford	March 1952 to March 1953, January 1954 to November 1955, January 1958 to present.	do	9.4
Springfield-Holyoke		March 1958 to present	do	7.4
Worcester		March 1958 to September 1959	do	6.4
Michigan:				
Detroit	Detroit	January 1952 to May 1952, February 1954 to January 1955, May 1956 to January 1957, and July 1957 to present.	do	7.2
Flint		January 1952 to May 1952, May 1956 to November 1956, May 1957 to November 1957, and March 1958 to January 1960.	do	6.2
Minnesota: Duluth-Superior		March 1954 to July 1956, March 1958 to present	do	11.0
New Jersey:				
Atlantic City	Atlantic City	November 1951 to present	do	15.3
Newark		January 1958 to September 1959	do	6.2
Paterson		March 1954 to September 1955 and January 1958 to September 1959.	do	7.2
Trenton		January 1958 to September 1959	do	6.9
New York:				
Albany-Schenectady-Troy		May 1954 to July 1955, May 1958 to November 1959, and March 1960 to present.	do	8.2
Buffalo		May 1954 to May 1955, March 1958 to present	do	8.7
Utica-Rome		March 1952 to May 1953, May 1954 to November 1955, and January 1958 to present.	do	9.5
North Carolina: Durham		May 1952 to present	do	7.1
Pennsylvania:				
Altoona	Altoona	July 1951 to present	do	8.8
Erie	Erie	May 1954 to July 1956 and July 1957 to present	do	10.1
Johnstown	Johnstown	May 1953 to present	do	10.6
Philadelphia		May 1954 to November 1955 and January 1958 to September 1959.	do	6.6
Pittsburgh		May 1954 to November 1955 and January 1959 to present	do	8.0
Scranton	Scranton	July 1951 to present	do	13.3
Wilkes-Barre—Hazleton	Wilkes-Barre—Hazleton	do	do	14.6
York		March 1958 to September 1959	do	6.5
Rhode Island: Providence	Providence	July 1951 to present	do	8.4
Tennessee: Chattanooga		March 1954 to November 1955 and March 1958 to present	do	7.1
Texas:				
Beaumont-Port Arthur		July 1951 to March 1952 and March 1958 to present	do	9.1
Corpus Christi		March 1958 to September 1959	do	7.9
Virginia: Roanoke		May 195› to present	do	7.7
West Virginia:				
Charleston	Charleston	March 1954 to present	do	8.7
Huntington-Ashland	Huntington-Ashland	March 1954 to September 1955 and January 1958 and present	do	13.0
Wheeling	Wheeling	March 1954 to July 1955 and January 1958 to present	do	13.7

SMALLER AREAS [4]

Area redevelopment bill (S. 722 as passed by Congress) (102 smaller areas)	Douglas bill (S. 722 as originally passed by the Senate) (58 smaller areas)	Dates of labor surplus classification [3]	Unemployment	
			Date	Rate [3]
Alabama:				
Florence-Sheffield	Florence-Sheffield	November 1954 to November 1956 and February 1958 to present.	December 1959	7.2
Gadsden		January 1954 to July 1955 and February 1958 to present	January 1960	9.7
Jasper	Jasper	March 1952 to present	April 1960	7.3
Talladega		April 1954 to September 1955 and January 1958 to present	November 1959	7.0
Alaska: Anchorage	Anchorage	March 1958 to present	August 1959	7.8
Connecticut:				
Ansonia		February 1958 to present	December 1959	6.9
Bristol	Bristol	July 1954 to November 1955 and March 1958 to present	do	8.9
Danielson	Danielson	March 1952 to January 1953 and March 1955 to present	October 1959	6.7
Meriden		March 1958 to present	December 1959	5.1
Middletown		do	do	5.4
Norwich		May 1952 to January 1953 and March 1958 to present	do	7.1
Thompsonville		March 1958 to present	do	6.7
Torrington		March 1955 to November 1955 and February 1958 to present	do	5.5
Illinois:				
Centralia	Centralia	May 1958 to present	November 1959	7.3
Harrisburg	Harrisburg	December 1954 to present	March 1960	18.7
Herrin-Murphysboro-West Frankfort.	Herrin-Murphysboro-West Frankfort.	September 1951 to present	February 1960	17.7
Mount Carmel-Olney		February 1955 to present	December 1959	6.5
Mount Vernon	Mount Vernon	April 1954 to present	April 1960	11.3
Indiana:				
Connersville		May 1952 to January 1953, January 1955 to May 1955, and April 1958 to present.	March 1960	6.9
Vincennes	Vincennes	September 1951 to present	February 1960	7.9
Kansas:				
Coffeyville-Independence-Parsons		December 1951 to present	November 1959	7.2
Pittsburg	Pittsburg	May 1954 to present	March 1960	12.3
Kentucky:				
Corbin	Corbin	July 1953 to present	March 1960	11.5
Hazard	Hazard	do	do	12.9
Madisonville	Madisonville	September 1953 to present	do	10.6
Morehead-Grayson	Morehead-Grayson	August 1954 to present	do	16.8
Paintsville-Prestonsburg	Paintsville-Prestonsburg	July 1953 to present	do	15.0
Pikeville-Williamson	Pikeville-Williamson	do	October 1959	20.9
Maine:				
Biddeford-Sanford	Biddeford-Sanford	May 1952 to September 1952, March 1954 to present	February 1960	13.2
Lewiston-Auburn	Lewiston-Auburn	May 1952 to September 1952, March 1958 to September 1959	March 1960	8.2

Initial dates of labor surplus area classification and subsequent classification experience,[1] July 1951 to present—Urban areas that may qualify for Federal assistance under various legislative proposals [2]—Continued

SMALLER AREAS [5]

Area redevelopment bill (S. 722 as passed by Congress) (102 smaller areas)	Douglas bill (S. 722 as originally passed by the Senate) (58 smaller areas)	Dates of labor surplus classification [3]	Unemployment	
			Date	Rate [3]
Maryland:				
Cambridge		September 1959 to present	December 1959	16.6
Cumberland	Cumberland	September 1951 to present	February 1960	10.5
Massachusetts:				
Newburyport		February 1958 to September 1959 and January 1960 to present	December 1959	8.3
North Adams	North Adams	March 1954 to July 1955 and March 1957 to present	February 1960	11.4
Michigan:				
Bay City	Bay City	March 1952 to July 1952, March 1954 to May 1955, and July 1957 to present.	do	8.3
Iron Mountain	Iron Mountain	March 1952 to September 1953, April 1954 to November 1957, and February 1958 to present.	do	10.2
Marquette	Marquette	July 1955 to September 1956 and January 1958 to present	do	7.6
Monroe	Monroe	March 1954 to May 1955 and May 1956 to present	March 1960	9.6
Port Huron	Port Huron	March 1952 to November 1952, March 1954 to July 1955, and March 1956 to present.	February 1960	8.5
Mississippi: Biloxi-Gulfport		March 1959 to present	January 1960	7.5
Missouri:				
Flat River	Flat River	March 1958 to present	December 1959	9.5
Joplin		May 1952 to January 1953, May 1954 to November 1955, and February 1958 to present.	November 1959	6.6
Washington		March 1959 to present	August 1959	6.1
Montana:				
Butte	Butte	April 1958 to present	December 1959	26.8
Kalispell	Kalispell	do	do	11.8
New Jersey:				
Bridgeton	Bridgeton	March 1955 to present	April 1960	9.9
Long Branch		February 1955 to present	March 1960	9.9
New York:				
Amsterdam	Amsterdam	June 1954 to November 1956 and March 1958 to present	April 1960	11.2
Auburn	Auburn	January to September 1955 and April 1958 to present	March 1960	8.9
Elmira		April 1958 to present	February 1960	6.8
Gloversville	Gloversville	March 1952 to November 1955 and April 1958 to present	December 1959	12.9
Jamestown-Dunkirk		May to November 1954 and April 1958 to present	March 1960	9.6
Newburgh-Middletown-Beacon		July 1958 to present	November 1959	8.1
Ogdensburg-Massena-Malone		November 1959 to present	December 1959	13.9
Plattsburgh		March 1959 to present	February 1960	14.7
Wellsville		November 1958 to present	April 1960	8.7
North Carolina:				
Fayetteville	Fayetteville	February 1955 to present	March 1960	10.3
Hendersonville		March 1959 to present	January 1960	7.6
Lumberton		do	February 1960	13.7
Mount Airy		September 1955 to present	December 1959	5.9
Ohio: Portsmouth-Chillicothe	Portsmouth-Chillicothe	May to September 1952 and July 1957 to present	November 1959	7.1
Oklahoma:				
Ardmore		September 1958 to present	February 1960	7.9
McAlester	McAlester	September 1954 to present	January 1960	10.2
Muskogee		September 1954 to November 1955 and September 1959 to present.	February 1960	12.5
Okmulgee-Henryetta		May 1958 to present	March 1960	7.9
Pennsylvania:				
Berwick-Bloomsburg	Berwick-Bloomsburg	May 1954 to present	October 1959	10.0
Butler	Butler	November 1954 to November 1955 and March 1958 to present	March 1960	8.9
Clearfield-Du Bois	Clearfield-Du Bois	May 1952 to present	do	13.3
Indiana		January 1954 to September 1956 and March 1959 to present	January 1960	9.2
Kittanning-Ford City		March 1954 to November 1956 and March 1959 to present	February 1960	12.0
Lewistown		March 1955 to present	November 1959	7.1
Meadville		March 1955 to November 1955 and May 1959 to present	October 1959	9.0
New Castle	New Castle	April 1954 to November 1955 and May 1958 to present	March 1960	9.6
Oil City-Franklin-Titusville		September 1954 to November 1955 and October 1958 to present	do	8.5
Pottsville	Pottsville	September 1951 to present	do	18.7
Sayre-Athens-Towanda		June 1958 to present	do	7.4
St. Marys		July 1955 to November 1955 and March 1959 to present	February 1960	10.3
Sunbury-Shamokin-Mount Carmel	Sunbury-Shamokin-Mount Carmel.	July 1952 to present	March 1960	13.0
Uniontown-Connellsville	Uniontown-Connellsville	September 1951 to present	do	17.8
Williamsport		March 1954 to November 1955 and September 1958 to present	do	8.2
Tennessee: La Follette-Jellico-Tazewell	La Follette-Jellico-Tazewell	January 1954 to present	October 1959	14.1
Texas:				
Laredo		July 1951 to March 1952 and March 1958 to present	March 1960	9.9
Texarkana		January 1954 to present	do	9.5
Virginia:				
Big Stone Gap-Appalachia	Big Stone Gap-Appalachia	September 1953 to present	April 1960	10.7
Richlands-Bluefield		June 1954 to July 1957 and July 1958 to present	November 1959	9.2
Washington:				
Aberdeen	Aberdeen	March 1958 to present	February 1960	7.4
Anacortes	Anacortes	do	do	15.9
Bellingham	Bellingham	do	do	11.5
Bremerton		do	do	7.2
Port Angeles	Port Angeles	do	do	7.8
West Virginia:				
Beckley	Beckley	March 1953 to present	do	25.8
Bluefield	Bluefield	March 1954 to July 1956, and February 1958 to present	December 1959	17.9
Clarksburg	Clarksburg	March 1954 to December 1955, and May 1958 to present	April 1960	11.4
Fairmont	Fairmont	May 1952 to present	do	10.4
Logan	Logan	April 1954 to present	February 1960	16.0
Martinsburg		March 1952 to July 1953, and May 1958 to present	April 1960	9.9
Morgantown	Morgantown	March 1953 to December 1955, and May 1958 to present	do	13.6
Parkersburg		May 1952 to December 1955, and February 1958 to present	December 1959	8.3
Point Pleasant-Gallipolis	Point Pleasant-Gallipolis	July 1952 to present	February 1960	12.1
Ronceverte-White Sulphur Springs	Ronceverte-White Sulphur Springs.	March 1952 to present	do	14.9
Welch	Welch	February 1954 to present	December 1959	25.4
Wisconsin: La Crosse		May to November 1952, February 1954 to September 1955, and February 1958 to present.	January 1960	10.6

[1] Dates areas listed were officially classified by the Department of Labor as "areas of substantial labor surplus."

[2] Listing of eligible areas is preliminary and tentative, and is based largely on bimonthly or semiannual data compiled from area labor market reports prepared in connection with the Bureau of Employment Security's program for the classification of areas according to relative adequacy of labor supply. Data used cover a 2- to 5-year period, generally extending through March 1960. Later data, now becoming available for some areas, could result in several changes in the above listing.

[3] Unemployment rates for major areas are as of March 1960. Data for smaller areas are for latest month available as reported in official area labor market reports prepared by State employment security agencies.

[4] Major areas are the 149 areas included in the Bureau of Employment Security's regular area labor market reporting and classification program. Unemployment and labor force data for these areas are generally available on a bimonthly basis.

[5] Smaller areas: Areas with a labor force of 15,000 or more which are officially classified as "smaller areas of substantial labor surplus" by the Bureau of Employment Security. Data for such areas are generally available on a semiannual basis. Information for smaller areas which are not classified, or for areas with a labor force of less than 15,000, are not available in Washington on a consistent basis.

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Employment Security, Office of Program Review and Analysis, Washington, D.C., May 23, 1960.

APPENDIX B. LIST OF COUNTIES WHICH MUST BE DESIGNATED AS RURAL REDEVELOPMENT AREAS

Alabama: Autauga, Barbour, Bibb, Blount, Bullock, Butler, Chambers, Chilton, Choctaw, Clarke, Clay, Coffee, Conecuh, Coosa, Covington, Crenshaw, Cullman, Dallas, De Kalb, Elmore, Escambia, Etowah, Fayette, Franklin, Geneva, Greene, Hale, Henry, Houston, Jackson, Lamar, Lawrence, Lee, Limestone, Lowndes, Macon, Marengo, Marion, Marshall, Monroe, Montgomery, Morgan, Perry, Pickens, Pike, Randolph, Russell, Sumter, St. Clair, Tallapoosa, Tuscaloosa, Walker, Washington, Wilcox, Winston.

Arkansas: Ashley, Baxter, Boone, Bradley, Calhoun, Chicot, Clark, Clay, Cleburne, Cleveland, Columbia, Conway, Crittenden, Dallas, Desha, Drew, Faulkner, Fulton, Grant, Greene, Hempstead, Howard, Independence, Izard, Jefferson, Johnson, Lafayette, Lawrence, Lee, Lincoln, Little River, Logan, Lonoke, Madison, Marion, Miller, Monroe, Montgomery, Nevada, Newton, Ouachita, Perry, Phillips, Pike, Polk, Pope, Randolph, St. Francis, Scott, Searcy, Sebastian, Sevier, Sharp, Stone, Union, Van Buren, White, Woodruff, Yell.

Florida: Baker, Calhoun, Gilchrist, Hamilton, Holmes, Jackson, Jefferson, Lafayette, Leon, Madison, Okaloosa, Suwannee, Union, Walton, Washington.

Georgia: Appling, Atkinson, Bacon, Baker, Baldwin, Brantley, Brooks, Bryan, Burke, Butts, Carroll, Charlton, Chattooga, Clay, Clayton, Clinch, Coffee, Coweta, Crawford, Dade, Decatur, Dodge, Douglas, Early, Echols, Elbert, Evans, Fannin, Fayette, Glascock, Gilmer, Greene, Hancock, Haralson, Hart, Harris, Heard, Henry, Jasper, Jeff Davis, Johnson, Lamar, Lanier, Liberty, Lincoln, Long, Marion, Meriwether, Montgomery, Murray, Newton, Oglethorpe, Pierce, Quitman, Rabun, Randolph, Rockdale, Screven, Stewart, Taliaferro, Tattnall, Taylor, Telfair, Towns, Treutlen, Twiggs, Union, Walker, Warren, Washington, Wayne, Wheeler, White, Wilcox, Wilkes, Wilkinson.

Illinois: Hardin, Johnson, Pope.

Kentucky: Adair, Allen, Breathitt, Breckinridge, Butler, Carter, Casey, Clay, Clinton, Cumberland, Crittenden, Edmonson, Elliott, Estill, Floyd, Grayson, Graves, Green, Greenup, Hopkins, Jackson, Johnson, Knox, Laurel, Lawrence, Lee, Lewis, Magoffin, Marshall, Menifee, McCracken, Metcalfe, Monroe, Morgan, Ohio, Owsley, Pike, Powell, Pulaski, Rockcastle, Rowan, Russell, Wayne, Whitley, Wolfe.

Louisiana: Avoyelles, Bienville, Beauregard, Caldwell, Catahoula, Claiborne, Concordia, De Sota, East Feliciana, Evangeline, Franklin, Grant, La Salle, Lincoln, Livingston, Morehouse, Natchitoches, Red River, Richland, Sabine, St. Helena, St. Landry, Union, Vernon, Webster, West Carroll, West Feliciana, Winn.

Michigan: Alcona, Clare, Iosco, Iron, Wexford.

Minnesota: Aitkin, Itasca.

Mississippi: Adama, Alcorn, Amite, Attala, Benton, Bolivar, Calhoun, Carroll, Chickasaw, Choctaw, Claiborne, Clarke, Clay, Coahoma, Copiah, Covington, De Sota, Franklin, George, Greene, Grenada, Hinds, Holmes, Humphreys, Issaquena, Itawamba, Jasper, Jefferson, Jefferson Davis, Jones, Kemper, Lafayette, Lamar, Lauderdale, Lawrence, Leake, Lee, Leflore, Lincoln, Lowndes, Madison, Marion, Marshall, Monroe, Montgomery, Neshoba, Newton, Noxubee, Oktibbeha, Panola, Perry, Pike, Pontotoc, Prentiss, Quitman, Rankin, Scott, Sharkey, Simpson, Smith, Sunflower, Tallahatchie, Tate, Tippah, Tishomingo, Tunica, Union, Washington, Walthall, Warren, Wayne, Webster, Wilkinson, Winston, Yalobusha, Yazoo.

Missouri: Bollinger, Butler, Carter, Dent, Douglas, Howell, Iron, Madison, Oregon, Ozark, Reynolds, Ripley, Shannon, Stone, Taney, Vernon, Washington, Wayne, Wright.

New Mexico: Mora, Rio Arriba, San Miguel, Sierra, Socorro.

North Carolina: Alexander, Alleghany, Anson, Ashe, Avery, Bladen, Buncombe, Brunswick, Burke, Caswell, Catawba, Cherokee, Clay, Cleveland, Columbus, Davidson, Duplin, Graham, Halifax, Haywood, Hyde, Jackson, Lincoln, McDowell, Macon, Madison, Mitchell, Montgomery, New Hanover, Onslow, Pender, Person, Polk, Rutherford, Scotland, Stanly, Swain, Transylvania, Tyrrell, Washington, Warren, Watauga, Wilkes, Yancey.

Ohio: Gallia, Guernsey, Noble.

Oklahoma: Adair, Atoka, Cherokee, Choctaw, Coal, Creek, Delaware, Haskell, Hughes, Latimer, Le Flore, Lincoln, McCurtain, McIntosh, Okfuskee, Okmulgee, Pittsburg, Pushmataha, Seminole, Sequoyah.

South Carolina: Abbeville, Allendale, Anderson, Barnwell, Beaufort, Berkeley, Charleston, Cherokee, Chester, Chesterfield, Clarendon, Colleton, Dorchester, Edgefield, Fairfield, Greenwood, Georgetown, Greenville, Hampton, Horry, Jasper, Kershaw, Lancaster, Laurens, Lee, Lexington, McCormick, Newberry, Oconee, Orangeburg, Pickens, Saluda, Spartanburg, Union, Williamsburg, York.

Tennessee: Anderson, Benton, Bledsoe, Blount, Campbell, Cannon, Carroll, Carter, Claiborne, Clay, Cocke, Cumberland, Decatur, De Kalb, Dickson, Fayette, Fentress, Giles, Grainger, Greene, Grundy, Hamblen, Hancock, Hardeman, Hardin, Hawkins, Haywood, Hickman, Houston, Humphreys, Jackson, Jefferson, Johnson, Lauderdale, Lawrence, Lewis, Lincoln, Loudon, McMinn, McNairy, Macon, Madison, Marion, Meigs, Monroe, Moore, Morgan, Overton, Perry, Pickett, Polk, Putnam, Rhea, Roane, Rutherford, Scott, Sevier, Sequatchie, Smith, Stewart, Sullivan, Sumner, Unicoi, Union, Van Buren, Washington, Warren, Wayne, White, Wilson.

Texas: Angelina, Anderson, Bastrop, Bowie, Burleson, Camp, Cass, Cherokee, Duval, Franklin, Freestone, Harrison, Henderson, Houston, Lavaca, Leon, McMullen, Madison, Marion, Morris, Newton, Panola, Polk, Rains, Red River, Robertson, Rusk, Sabine, San Augustine, San Jacinto, Somervell, Titus, Upshur, Trinity, Walker, Wood.

Virginia: Alleghany, Appomattox, Bath, Bedford, Buchanan, Buckingham, Carroll, Charlotte, Craig, Dickenson, Floyd, Fluvanna, Grayson, Greene, Greensville, Halifax, Henry, Highland, Lee, Lunenburg, Mecklenburg, Patrick, Prince Edward, Russell, Scott, Tazewell, Washington, Wise, York.

West Virginia: Brooke, Barbour, Braxton, Cabell, Calhoun, Clay, Doddridge, Fayette, Gilmer, Harrison, Jackson, Kanawha, Lewis, Lincoln, Mason, Marion, Mercer, Monongalia, Monroe, Nicholas, Pleasants, Pocahontas, Preston, Putnam, Raleigh, Randolph, Ritchie, Roane, Summers, Taylor, Tucker, Tyler, Upshur, Wayne, Wetzel, Wirt, Wood.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I wish to point out that some of the areas have had high unemployment, of more than 6 percent, for 10 years, at least. For instance, Lawrence and Lowell in Massachusetts, ever since the survey was started in July of 1951, although formerly great textile centers have had over 6-percent unemployment. The last figure, as of this year, shows an unemployment of 6.7 percent in Lawrence, and 9.8 percent, or almost 10 percent, for Lowell, Mass.

Atlantic City, N.J., has had continuous, chronic unemployment ever since November of 1951. At the last account the figure was 15 percent.

Altoona, Pa., has had continuous unemployment since July of 1951. At present the unemployment rate is 8.8 percent.

Providence, R.I., has had continuous high unemployment since July of 1951. At present Providence has unemployment of 8.4 percent.

There are large numbers of the so-called smaller areas which have had continuous unemployment for long periods of time. All of this will be revealed by a close study of this table, which is being printed in the RECORD.

I wish to point out that of the 102 smaller areas designated, 77 have been surplus labor areas for longer than the past 5 years, and this number represents 75 percent of the total of the 102 smaller areas.

The Department of Labor, as is well known, classifies these surplus areas into three groups, called D, E, and F. Group D represents areas of unemployment from 6 to 9 percent; group E areas of unemployment from 9 to 12 percent; and group F areas of unemployment over 12 percent. Groups A, B, and C have less than 6-percent unemployment and are not classed as surplus labor areas.

OUR NATIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES

Mr. President, I know that some will ask a question at this point, and it is a logical one. Why do these people stay in these places? Why do they not leave and seek work elsewhere? The answer is that they do. That is why unemployment rates are 12 instead of 25 percent, or 20 instead of 40 percent. But migration alone cannot solve the problem.

In the first place, many of the persons thrown out of work are over 40 or 50 years of age, and face discrimination because of their age when seeking a job. They leave their families only to return more defeated than before. Second, they lack training for the available jobs in other areas. Third, their roots and homes are in these areas, and they keep up their hopes for the future. It is hard for someone to give up all he has worked for in his home, neighborhood, church, and local groups, especially after investing most of his life in them. Fourth, some families have gone deeply in debt and do not like to "run out" on their obligations. Moreover, those who migrate and find jobs are, because of low seniority in their new employment, the first to be laid off in a recession. So they head "back home."

There are other reasons. But the basic answer to the question "Why don't more persons in these areas move?" is that they would if they could, but they cannot.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield again to my good friend from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The Senator from Illinois is correct when he discusses the lessening of population in these areas, though the people still have roots in them. West Virginia, on the basis of a preliminary compilation of the current census, has lost, in some of the coal-producing counties, over a 10-year period, as many as 17,000 people. I say to the Senator from Illinois, that is the population loss within one county alone.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.

Mr. RANDOLPH. We know now, on the basis of figures which are not yet official but which are substantially correct, that West Virginia will lose one

Member of its House delegation. We now have six Members of the House of Representatives. Beginning in 1962, with the election in that year, we are quite likely to have only five Members of the House of Representatives from our State.

This is a very serious problem. The Senator is presenting it in a very factual manner.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. President, the next questions, also logical, might be, "Well, what can we do about it? Why send good money after bad? What good would it do? Anyway, is this not a local rather than a national problem?"

In some cases, perhaps, little can be done, for the program envisaged by our area redevelopment bill is not a handout or a dole. It is not a relief measure. Rather, it is a program of long-term investment in repayable loans to help these areas to help themselves.

The fact is that many of these areas have natural resources, strategic locations, and an available labor supply. They are ripe for new industries, but private capital is not available. In such communities local capital is normally limited and less venturesome than in places where greater prosperity prevails. Moreover, outside capital is reluctant to enter. Credit on favorable terms and at low rates of interest is needed in such communities both to develop their public facilities so as to make them more attractive to new industry and to establish new enterprises to create new jobs in the area.

I wish to emphasize, this is not a handout or a dole. This is not a relief measure. Rather, it is a program of long-term investment in repayable loans to help these areas help themselves. The Federal Government can be most helpful in assisting such communities, with the cooperation of private lending institutions and State and local governments, to raise the funds necessary to expand the economic base. A long-term loan at a low rate of interest granted by the Federal Government in some cases may be exactly the added incentive necessary for the unleashing of other private capital to develop many of these areas.

Failing to aid badly distressed areas which might recover with a little help is a waste of valuable resources. A prolonged depression in an area means the gradual disintegration of community facilities—schools, stores, hospitals, banks, office buildings, homes, churches, paved streets, sidewalks, sewer and water supply systems, and all of the community services which were acquired at great expense and which are now wasting away.

These facilities will have to be duplicated if we have a mass, wholesale migration from these areas into other areas. Moreover, a successful area redevelopment program would serve to reduce public outlays for unemployment compensation, relief, and various other forms of public assistance—payments for which no current production is received in return. It would help to replace the dole by constructive work.

The Employment Act of 1946 declares that the Federal Government should promote maximum employment. But there is a limit to the effectiveness of broad-scale programs to alleviate joblessness. Many—probably most of the cities of the United States—are not badly depressed. Moreover, a blunderbuss nationwide program to alleviate joblessness and poverty at this time, which affects all areas alike, might create inflationary pressures by causing new investments where unemployment is small.

In these cases, there would be no slack for the additional expenditures and employment opportunities to take up, and pouring new money into such areas would tend to bid up prices instead of actually increasing production.

Channeling investments into areas of high unemployment or underemployment is a different matter. Large reservoirs of idle manpower would be put to work and production would increase. This added output would offset in whole or in large part the extra monetary purchasing powers added to the industrial sector of the country, and hence cannot be called inflationary.

Thus, the area redevelopment bill will reduce unemployment and poverty where it is the worst. It will attack joblessness with carefully aimed rifle shots instead of a sawed-off shotgun. It is not a program designed to cure great industrial depressions or seasonal unemployment—and we have never claimed it to be so. But would reduce the persistent and deep pockets of unemployed workers and hence decrease so-called structural unemployment, which general monetary and fiscal policy cannot reach.

To make this problem clear to the membership, I have, as I have said, prepared charts which show the history of the high and long-term unemployment in these areas which are available at the rear of the Chamber for your inspection. If you examine these, I believe you will agree they completely refute the charge of the administration that the distress in the areas covered by S. 722 is only temporary in nature. It is clear that the problem is not a local one or a regional one, but is a national one that demands our favorable attention.

STATED REASONS FOR THE VETO ANALYZED

Let me now examine the reasons set forth by the President for this most recent veto:

First. The President states that S. 722 would "squander the Federal taxpayers' money where there is only temporary economic difficulty, curable without the special Federal assistance provided in the bill." Those are his words.

To answer this argument I have had a chart, to which I have referred, prepared, which gives the history of each of the areas presently qualified for participation under the bill.

Shown on this chart are 40 major labor market areas which would qualify under the provisions of S. 722, and 102 smaller labor market areas which would also qualify. Of the 40 major labor market areas, 11 are shown to have been so designated since 1951; 30 of these major areas have been so designated for at least 5 years, and 77 of the 102 smaller labor market areas have also been so rated for over 5 years. All of the areas designated have at least 2 years of excessive unemployment experience.

Two years of excessive unemployment can produce dire effects upon the economic base of a community. And with three-quarters of the areas, both large and small, having over 5 years of such experience, the records show that there is just no truth in the statement that the areas that would be covered by S. 722 are only temporarily in these economic difficulties.

In these 142 labor market areas, obviously there are great variations in the severity and nature of the needs. But the Administrator is not bound to give every form of assistance to every area. Under sensible administration, therefore, there is no reason to fear that areas needing only urban renewal or technical or planning assistance will "deprive" more heavily hit communities of needed loan funds, as the President charges. The President's use of the word "squander" is also ill suited to a bill in which $200 million of the $251 million authorized are in the form of repayable loans—and two of the grant programs are in the administration's own bill.

Second. The President next states that the provisions of S. 722 would "inhibit" local, State, and private initiative, and further that the 65-percent maximum Federal participation provided in the bill is too high a Federal share for an effective redevelopment program. First let us note that a lesser percentage than 65 may be granted; the 65 percent is only a maximum limitation. But some of the hardest hit areas may need that much to get started. My colleague, the minority leader, once urged upon the committee an even higher ceiling.

One has only to read the full provisions of S. 722, moreover, to see the lack of understanding of this bill by the administration. Subsection (b)(2) of section 6 specifically provides that such assistance shall be extended only to applicants which have been approved for such assistance by an agency or instrumentality of the State or political subdivision thereof in which the project to be financed is located, and which agency or instrumentality is directly concerned with problems of economic development in such State or subdivision.

In the event there is no such State or local agency, which will be the exceptional case, there is the further provision in subsection (c) of section 6 that the Administrator appoint a local redevelopment committee, but it must be composed of not less than seven residents of the area—representatives of labor, commerce, industrial, and agricultural groups and of the residents, generally, of the area, to form the basis for the redevelopment program of the area.

These are specific requirements designed to stimulate, not to stifle, local initiative. The bill recognizes that the success of redevelopment of these areas is dependent upon the will and efforts of the local citizens.

Third. The President next objects to the inclusion of the provision for Fed-

eral financing of plant machinery and equipment for the stated reason that such expenditure is "unwise and unnecessary and therefore wasteful of money that otherwise could be of real help."

This provision was included in the bill as a result of the recommendations of several witnesses who appeared during three congressional hearings conducted during 1956, 1957, and 1959, and which hearings developed 3,520 pages of hearings before three Senate committees. The Labor and Public Welfare Committee conducted the hearing in 1956, and the Senate Banking and Currency Committee conducted the subsequent hearings during 1957 and 1959. This authorization will be especially helpful where the area has available buildings and public facilities, but needs only new and different machinery.

At one point during the committee consideration in 1958, Senator Purtell, himself a manufacturer from Connecticut, strongly expressed the opinion that the inclusion of a provision for the use of funds for plant machinery and equipment was wise and necessary to do the job that needs to be done in these areas. The committee was persuaded by his argument and the other testimony before it. Surely the Administrator in his discretion will deny unneeded or unduly risky loans for this purpose. But to meet the exceptional need, the authority seems desirable—and surely is not grounds for veto.

Fourth. Objection is next made to the public facilities loan and grant program set forth in S. 722, and the President states that there is available under existing Government loan programs sufficient money to cover these needs.

The hearings developed information that in many areas, notably areas of New England, Pennsylvania, West Virginia, and eastern Kentucky, where the communities are located in somewhat narrow valleys, new lands must be developed for industrial parks for industry location. A program of this type requires the development of all types of public facilities—access roads, powerlines, grading and ground clearing, sewerage systems, and water, often large requirements of water for industrial use. These facilities may be the essential key to redevelopment. I know of no Federal programs which cover all of these needs.

The President suggests the Community Facilities Administration under the Housing and Home Finance Agency, which has a general authority for loans for some of these types of public facilities. But in this administration, it is apparent that they are largely concerned with building sewerage and water systems for small communities. This in no sense meets the needs of these areas which require a variegated, sizable, and adequate provision of industry water and industrial parks. It would also take away from the desirable coordination of major redevelopment programs to have the public facilities assistance handled separately. I know of no Federal program which covers all this need.

The grant program set forth in S. 722 is also criticized. In this connection, I would like to say that the evidence before us clearly showed that unfortunately there are a number of areas in the United States which are unable to repay all the costs of loans for public facilities needed for an effective economic redevelopment program. To meet these exceptional but needy cases, grants are authorized. But S. 722 cautiously requires that the Administrator obtain from the area seeking assistance a contribution to the costs in proportion to the ability of the area to contribute.

Fifth. The President then states that the provisions for a Federal loan program for the development of our rural areas is "incongruous and unnecessary," and again states that there are in existence Federal programs, namely the Small Business Administration and the Rural Development Program, which are capable of giving the needed assistance for curing the problems of the low-income rural areas.

The problem of underemployment in our rural areas is just as great as the problem of unemployment in our industrial areas. I think it is quite clear and that the record shows that the rural development program administered by the Department of Agriculture is wholly inadequate to solve this long-term problem of our poverty-ridden rural areas. For the most part, the rural development program of the Department of Agriculture does little other than organize and counsel. It should be termed the conversation department. There has been some vague talk about increasing industrialization and nonfarm employment opportunities. But the program has no funds to implement that talk. The Small Business Administration, as shown by the hearings, is wholly ineffective in reaching a solution to this rural redevelopment problem.

We propose to help start new industries where the families of low-income farmers may be employed, and the farmers themselves may be employed in the off seasons. Of course, the Small Business Administration has virtually nothing to do with this.

It was the opinion of the Senate committee which considered this bill that a rural program as set forth in S. 722 was the most effective way to solve the problem of rural underemployment. Perhaps one of the most cogent statements made by any of the witnesses before both the House and the Senate Banking and Currency Committees was that of Mr. Herschel D. Newsom, master of the National Grange, and I quote:

> From the long-range standpoint, it (area redevelopment legislation) could be one of the most important pieces of agricultural legislation during the 86th Congress.

I might add that the rural program set forth in the bill was also supported by the Farmers' Union.

Sixth. The sixth and last objection made by the administration is that a new Federal agency is not needed. The Department of Commerce, the President asserts, should administer the program.

This point has received much consideration and has been the subject of much debate. We decided that the Department of Commerce should not administer the proposed legislation. The major reason is that the Department of Commerce is the agency in which the principal opposition to this bill has been found, and to give Secretary Mueller the power to administer this program would be like designating a fox to take care of the chickens.

Mr. President, today we pass on the question of overriding the President's veto. I do not think the administration has been wholly forthright in dealing with this issue.

The bill before the Senate is a broad bill which seeks to provide a number of ways of meeting this widespread, long-term economic blight that exists in the United States. The unemployment fact gathering of the Department of Labor, the vocational training programs of the Department of Labor, and the subsistence retraining payment program, all suggest a definite interest of the Department of Labor in administering some phases of the bill. The rural program set forth in the bill is foreign to the functioning of the Department of Commerce. But the most basic reason why the program should not be under its jurisdiction is the unsympathetic if not downright hostile attitude displayed by the Department of Commerce through these last 5 years toward redevelopment of these areas in the broad sense.

The stated grounds for the President's veto thus are without foundation in reason or in fact. When coupled, as they are, with renewed expressions of interest in some affirmative action—affirmative action which the veto, however, seeks to block and which the administration has steadily fought—these appeals of the President are contradictory and confusing.

Only Congress by a reaffirmation of its support for an effective program, with enlarged majorities, can give the clear lead that is essential to the meeting of this problem.

Let me turn briefly to some of the main, affirmative reasons why we should enact S. 722, notwithstanding the veto.

HOW MUCH DOUBLETALK CAN THE PEOPLE TAKE?

Each year the President has asked for an area redevelopment program, and each time when Congress passes such a bill the President vetoes it on one pretext or another.

His callous acts as compared with his soul-warming and solicitous words reminds me of Lewis Carroll's story of the walrus and the carpenter who lured a multitude of oysters into taking a little walk with them along the beach and then after some pleasant and soothing talk, proceeded to eat them all up.

> "I weep for you," the Walrus said;
> "I deeply sympathize."
> With sobs and tears, he sorted out
> Those of the largest size,
> Holding his pocket handkerchief
> Before his streaming eyes.

The hypocrisy of the walrus is well paralleled by the hypocrisy of the administration in dealing with this measure.

ARE WE TO HAVE MINORITY RULE? IS THE PRESIDENT TO BECOME THE LEGISLATURE AS WELL?

There is another principle involved in our action on this bill. It is whether we are to substitute minority for majority rule in this country. The President has boasted that through the veto, as long as he can command one more than a third of the votes in either House, he can stop anything the majority of the Nation, expressing themselves through their representatives, want, or dictate the terms of any legislation which is passed.

He has already vetoed the water pollution bill under these conditions, and he has twice vetoed this area redevelopment bill. He vetoed the housing bill twice, and has threatened to do it again this year, and he has the ax poised in a similar position for any school aid bill.

This is an assertion of minority rather than of majority rule.

Under the strict terms of the Constitution, the President, of course, has the power to do this. But is it wise and in the interest of the Nation, and in the interest of national unity for him to carry out this policy.

The President and his followers are demanding the most rigid obedience to their will and tactics in the field of foreign affairs. Even the most reasonable criticism of methods is bitterly resented and denounced as unpatriotic.

I believe that history will record that never has an opposition party holding the majority of Congress been so understanding and so cooperative in its relationships with a President of the opposite political faith than we Democrats have been during the last 7½ years. One need only to compare our behavior with that of the Republicans toward Woodrow Wilson in 1919–20, and toward Franklin D. Roosevelt from 1935 to 1945, and throughout the Truman administration, when an eminent Republican led the pack in referring to the Korean war as "Truman's war." The contrast is almost one between daylight and darkness.

Not only does the administration demand that we follow them to the last comma and numeral on foreign policy and foreign aid, but they resent and attack any suggestion from us as to how they might carry out those policies in a better fashion.

The bitter words which have been uttered by them during the last few days indicate that they would put a figurative gag in the mouth of every prominent Democrat who, although not questioning their motives, criticizes their competence.

COOPERATION SHOULD BE A TWO-WAY STREET

We are willing to cooperate in the field of foreign policy for the sake of national unity. I believe we have done that, and we will continue to do so. We will continue to cooperate. However, cooperation is a two-way street. It is a reciprocal affair. Should not the administration in turn cooperate with us in domestic affairs, instead of repeatedly trying to impose its will in the smallest degree in these matters as well as in foreign affairs? We have tried to meet the administration halfway. We have cut the total amounts included from $379 million to $251 million, or by $138 million. We eliminated the authorization for bond issues in order to require later appropriations. Apparently that is not enough. The President now demands complete and final submission. He wants to be the legislature as well as the Executive. He wants to prevent the majority from legislating, by the free use of his veto, and to heap scorn upon us, for partisan effect, that we have not accomplished much and have not passed much legislation. If he would cooperate we could pass the legislation but his stubborn vetoes are making this impossible.

The dignity of the legislative branch alone demands that we override the veto. But more than the dignity of the legislative branch is involved. The welfare of the Nation is involved, and that demands that we put into the hands of the unemployed the means for them to go back to
ployed the means for them to go back to

The President of the United States is insisting that we spend billions of dollars for foreign aid, and in great detail. I have in my hand a list of some of the projects which have been compiled by the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING]. This book, which I hold in my hand, weighs 6 pounds 4 ounces. The projects are listed in great detail. They are in nearly every country of the world. The President is saying, "Do not cut a single cent from these foreign projects." Yet he refuses to permit a more-work program to go into effect for the people of this Nation.

I say for the sake of our dignity and for the sake of the country and for the sake of the people of the United States, we should override the veto.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I congratulate the distinguished Senator from Illinois. He is the author of the depressed areas concept. He carried the first depressed areas bill satisfactorily through the Senate, only to see it die in the House of Representatives. He carried the second depressed areas bill successfully through the Senate. It passed the House. Then it was vetoed. He undauntedly and untiringly arose again to lead in the passage through the Senate of a third bill, a better bill than the one the President has vetoed.

I congratulate him for his indomitable will and his strong feeling of urgent need to help those unfortunate people who are without jobs through no fault of their own. I only wish that his efforts had been more successful. However, he who fights and runs away will live to fight another day.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am not running away.

Mr. CLARK. No. However, we can see the handwriting on the wall. To not let this matter be entirely serious, I notice that the Senator quoted from Lewis Carroll. In that connection I wonder if he does not recall these lines also from Lewis Carroll's "Through the Looking Glass," as appropriate and quite pertinent to the mess which the administration has created during 7 years of inaction in dealing with depressed areas. I am sure the Senator from Illinois will recall these lines:

"If seven maids with seven mops
Should sweep for half a year,
Do you suppose," the Walrus said,
"That they could get it clear?"
"I doubt it," said the Carpenter,
And shed a bitter tear.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I wish to thank my friend from Pennsylvania for his comment, which I do not deserve but which I appreciate. Ever since the Senator from Pennsylvania has joined the Senate, no one has been more faithful or more determined in pushing for the passage of a good bill as has the Senator from Pennsylvania. He deserves as much credit as I do in this whole matter.

Mr. CLARK. Would that it were true, but it is not.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I rise in support of the effort to override the veto. I do so without much hope of success, but I think it is worth while to at least make the record of how many Senators disagree with the President in his veto message.

I do not even know if it will turn out to be a majority. I hope it will be a substantial majority. I am afraid it will not be the necessary two-thirds majority. However, I concur in the judgment of my colleagues that it is worth making the effort, anyway.

Let me point out that the bill which we are trying to pass, notwithstanding the action of the President, is not nearly so good a bill as the one which passed the Senate a year ago. It goes further in meeting the President's untenable objections than the bill we passed. Yet when all things are considered, it is clearly a better bill than no bill at all.

I should like to deal with the six unsound reasons given by the President of the United States for vetoing the bill. He says, first:

S. 722 would squander the Federal taxpayers' money where there is only temporary economic difficulty.

Yet it is clear to the most casual observer that the bill does not provide 1 cent of money. How can the taxpayers' money be squandered when the bill does not call for an appropriation? Actually, one of the defects in the House bill was that it required appropriations for the loan funds instead of permitting them to be financed through borrowing from the Treasury. I think any junior high school student would know that the President was wrong when he said an authorization bill would squander the taxpayers' money. Surely a man cannot have served for 7 years in the White House and be unaware of the distinction between an authorization bill and an appropriation bill. Equally clear, if the President believes the bill calls for too much of an authorization, all he has to do is either to propose a smaller appropriation or not spend the money if Congress ignores his will. So the first reason given by the President is clearly untenable.

Second, he says that Federal participation up to 65 percent on industrial projects as a loan is excessive. Yet, again, this is not a requirement; it is a ceiling. The administrator appointed by the President would not have to make a loan of more than 5 percent, if he did not want to. The 65-percent ceiling, in my judgment, was desirable, as anyone who has taken the trouble to travel through the depressed areas, which the President has not done, would know.

So it should be equally clear to a student in high school that the objection to a 65-percent limit is not tenable, because 65 percent is not a requirement; it is a ceiling. Again, the President's own administrator could determine how far it was desired to have Federal participation go.

The President's third objection is to the inclusion of loans for machinery and equipment, in addition to lands and buildings. This provision he thought unwise and unnecessary. Again, this provision is not a directive; it is merely an authorization. Again, the President's own administrator could determine not to make a single loan for machinery and equipment, if he did not want to make it. Anyone who has traveled through the depressed areas of West Virginia, Pennsylvania, and Kentucky which the President has not done will realize the critical condition of the economies in those communities, and will, I believe, conclude that there will be many cases where loans on machinery and equipment would be not only wise but also sound. But, in any case, they would not have to be made.

So I say again that any junior high school student who studied the President's veto message carefully would see that there is no merit in the President's third objection.

The President's fourth objection is that loans for public facilities are unnecessary because such assistance is available under another program. That is not true. The community facilities program has run out of money. True, the President has asked us to replenish it, but there is no priority in that program for areas of heavy unemployment that would have been helped under this bill.

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

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, may I have 3 additional minutes?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield 3 additional minutes to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, as I have said, the funds for loans for public facilities are not now available. Certainly the President must know this. Certainly he must also know that even if he got the funds he has requested, through the authorization process and then through the appropriation process, for the Federal loans for public facilities, there is no authority which is meaningful to assist depressed areas. Therefore, I believe that any reasonably intelligent teen-age boy or girl would recognize that this objection of the President is simply untenable.

Fifth, the President says that provisions for loans for the industrial development of rural areas are incongruous and unnecessary. I suggest that the President has not stopped shooting quail long enough to go out and look at some of the rural areas close to where the big plantations of some of his Republican friends are located, where the desperate need and the poverty-stricken condition of their inhabitants, together with their inability to obtain an income from the produce of their farms sufficient to support themselves in any standard of decency, constitute a shocking national disgrace.

Therefore, I say that anyone, regardless of his age, who undertakes to study this objection must come to the same conclusion: that the President's fifth reason for vetoing the bill is wrong.

Finally, the President objects to the creation of a new Federal agency. He says it is not needed and would delay the program. In this case, perhaps, theoretically, one could make a strong case for the President. Actually, there would not be any more employees. There would have to be the same number of employees if the program were conducted in an existing agency. There would be no saving to the taxpayer by having the program administered by the Department of Commerce. I believe most people in the administration know why a new agency was proposed in the bill. It was done because the whole administration, from the Secretary of Commerce through the Secretary of the Treasury to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget—and all down the line—is publicly opposed to any program of this kind. If it were placed in the Department of Commerce, that Department would kill the program. That is why a new agency was proposed.

However, there will be a new administration in January, and there will be a new Secretary of Commerce. I hope he will have a little more compassion in his soul than his predecessors had.

If this were the only objection to the bill, we might be able to meet the President on the ground that, organizationally speaking, this arrangement might be satisfactory.

So I think it must be abundantly clear that none of these six reasons given by the President for vetoing the bill would convince even a reasonably intelligent adolescent who wanted to study the problem.

I turn now, briefly, to that double standard, of which the Senator from Illinois and the Senator from Alaska have spoken so eloquently on the floor during the past few weeks. It is all right to take care of the depressed areas in Ceylon, in Formosa, in Vietnam, in India, and elsewhere. That is all right; it is patriotic. But to take care of people in the United States is socialistic and wrong. The cynical nature of this untenable position must be clear to all Americans.

I shall vote for the foreign aid program, in view of the current world crisis in world affairs. I shall vote for every cent the President asks for the foreign aid program. However, I believe it is utterly indefensible to say at the same time that we will not do anything for American citizens because of an alleged "squandering" of taxpayers' money particularly at a time when no real effort has as yet been made to bring in the billions of dollars of additional revenue which are available through adequate tax enforcement and for closeup of iniquitous tax loopholes.

Finally, let me speak about the President's somewhat—well, I will not use the adjective of which I was thinking. Let me talk about his profound hope that sound new legislation will be promptly enacted.

I do not want to question anybody's motivation, but, again, I think it is abundantly clear that any reasonably intelligent high school youngster would know that there will be no new legislation on this subject enacted at this session of Congress. Why? Because it is not possible to get one Republican vote in the House Rules Committee to report a bill in that body. Two conservative Democrats and the four northern Republicans are ganging up together to make it impossible to pass any bill of this kind in the House.

I see my colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] on his feet. If he thinks I am not right, let him go over to the body, where he served with such distinction, and get a bill passed in the House. Then I will undertake, with the help of my friend from Illinois, to help get it passed over here. Let us not kid ourselves. It is the Republican Party in the House, headed by CHARLEY HALLECK, which is preventing the bill from going through that body at this session of Congress.

I take it my colleague [Mr. SCOTT] desires to speak on the subject, so I yield to him.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time yielded to the senior Senator from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I should like to have some time.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The junior Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I understand that my colleague [Mr. CLARK] has yielded the floor.

Mr. CLARK. Yes. I thought my colleague wished to ask me a question.

Mr. SCOTT. I should like to direct a question to my colleague from Pennsylvania.

I think it extremely unfortunate that we inject politics into this issue, because the senior Senator from Pennsylvania and myself are arguing for the same thing.

Mr. CLARK. Of course, my colleague feels that way about the colloquy on yesterday also; does he not?

Mr. SCOTT. I shall confine my remarks to today's colloquy.

I said that the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] and I are arguing for the same thing, namely, for the passage of an effective bill to aid

depressed areas and to relieve the problem of chronic unemployment. To me, the unemployed are not to be considered as either Republicans or Democrats. Instead, they are to be considered as unemployed.

Mr. CLARK. Unfortunately, most of them are Democrats.

Mr. SCOTT. Certainly, the passage of a bill to aid the unemployed is desperately needed.

With that fact in mind, my colleague has referred to my 16 years of service in the other body, some of it on the Rules Committee. He knows very well that if I were presently a Member of the House and a member of its Rules Committee, my vote would be in favor of a distressed areas bill.

Mr. CLARK. I am sure it would.

Mr. SCOTT. But in my considered opinion, my colleague has gone a little too far, as he is sometimes tempted to do—because he is an earnest and extroverted and intelligent gentleman—in suggesting that the present minority members of the House Rules Committee would automatically vote against any depressed areas bill.

Mr. CLARK. Will my colleague yield?

Mr. SCOTT. One moment, please.

I would suggest that the administration bill, which was sent here, and was introduced in this body and in the other body, was introduced in the other body, at the direction of the minority leader, by Representative WIDNALL, of New Jersey; and it bears the stamp of the approval of the administration. Although it is not, in the opinion of either Senator from Pennsylvania, precisely what we would like, I have no doubt that the minority members of the House Rules Committee would lend the necessary support to the reporting of that bill to the floor of the House. It would be my hope that in so doing, it would come under an open rule, and therefore would be subject to amendment.

But I do hope the senior Senator from Pennsylvania will revert to the position which both he and I have heretofore taken, namely, that the important thing is to get a bill. I am going to ask for hearings on my own bill and on the administration bill and on any other bills which may be introduced by Members on that side of the aisle; and I am prepared to support any bill that we can get out of committee, if the bill is pointed toward the areas of need.

I ask the senior Senator from Pennsylvania whether he is prepared to make as comprehensive a statement as that.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the calm, judicious, and nonpolitical approach made by my distinguished junior colleague moves me, as it always does. Needless to say, I would support any meaningful bill, and would stand, if not shoulder to shoulder, at least at arm's length with my colleague from Pennsylvania in working to get such a bill through.

But, again, I say to my good friend that the place to get that done is in the other body; and I urge my good friend to use his good offices, as a former Member of the other body, with the quarreling factions over there, so we can get from the House a bill which we can accept over here, instead of going through the futile gesture of having the Senate pass a bill, and then have it die in the House of Representatives because the Rules Committee will not support it.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, as a former Member of the other body, let me say that when one leaves that body and makes the journey down the long corridor to this body, he often is regarded in the other body as a stranger far from home, and does not have in that body any exceptional influence—and perhaps not in this body, either.

Mr. President, I rise to do something which I very much dislike to do, because I am caught between my loyalty to the President and my conviction that something must be done for the unemployed.

I do not accept the suggestion of my colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] that there is any absence of compassion on the part of the administration or the officers of the Cabinet. The Secretary of Labor, Mr. Mitchell, has visited the areas in Pennsylvania, and has indicated that he is aware of the problem, and that he fully supports as considerable aid as can possibly be obtained by the Congress to the depressed areas; and a committee headed by the Assistant Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Ray, has reached the same conclusion.

The fact that the President has compassion for these areas makes it almost incredible that anyone would suggest that President Eisenhower is not a compassionate man. His compassion has been demonstrated long before those who now make the most noise about the problem became aroused in the interest of this cause.

On several occasions the President announced that he would support and would approve a bill which would meet the needs of the depressed areas, which are concentrated largely in Pennsylvania, West Virginia, southern Illinois, Kentucky, and parts of Massachusetts.

The difficulty was that in the other body, in presenting such a bill, the House Members went far beyond the criteria employed in the Senate bill which had been passed by the Senate, after being introduced by my friend, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], and also went far beyond the criteria set forth in the bill which was offered here as an amendment, but was not accepted; and the House increased the number of regions to which such assistance theoretically would have been applicable.

Without impugning the motives of anyone, I think that in order to secure a broad area of support for the bill, elements of the pork barrel or the grab bag may have entered into the final bill which went to the President.

The President has submitted another bill.

Assuming that the veto will not be overridden today, I now urge that hearings be held on the President's message, which does go to meet these criteria and these needs; that hearings be held on the bills which may be introduced by Members on the other side of the aisle; and that hearings be held on the Scott bill, which is Senate bill 3568.

I believe that this body and the other body have equal obligations. I believe it is incorrect to say that the only way to get a bill is to have the other body act on it. The other body will have an opportunity to act following the introduction of the bill and its passage through the ordinary procedures. But, in my judgment, if the will exists on the part of both parties over there, we shall get a bill from the House.

Meanwhile, we should not wait and listen to the counsels of futility, which indicate that it is too late to get a bill. It is not too late for either body to take some action on things the people need and on a measure the President has requested. After all, it has not been too late for this body to indulge in all manner of oratory on all manner of subjects.

It is high time for us to get down to an agreement with the President on a bill which will meet the needs of the needy.

I have said that I am torn between my loyalty to the President and my conviction that something for the unemployed must be done. I think it is fairly well known that I got quite a few delegates for the President in 1952, at the convention—delegates greater in number than those represented by many a State. I think it is pretty well known that I love the President and that I support him wholeheartedly in matters of foreign policy, and usually in matters of domestic policy.

But on this issue, I wish to make crystal clear the fact that my support——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time yielded to the junior Senator from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 10 additional minutes to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized for 10 additional minutes.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, as I was about to say, I wish to make crystal clear the point that on this issue my support of depressed areas legislation can be made manifest here only by voting to override the President's veto.

This bill, as the President has rightly said, has many faults. This bill, which the President has vetoed, would give less assistance to the unemployed people of my State of Pennsylvania than my $200 million amendment would have given. It would even give less assistance than the $50-odd million bill first introduced by the administration. And that has not yet been successfully controverted by anyone.

Therefore, in passing a bill which was in effect a pork-barrel measure, the sponsors of the bill defeated the purpose of depressed areas legislation. And because they did, and because we must fight this issue out, and because I want my record to be clear, and not because I question the accuracy of the President's reasons, or the factuality of the President's reasons for vetoing the bill, but because I want to make it clear I have gone as far as I can on this bill to get out a good bill, I shall do as I have stated.

Then, when the veto is sustained, as, in my judgment, it will be, I am going to renew my efforts to get a good bill. In my judgment, we can get one, and get it without resort to politics. We do not need political references because, if the bill is passed, the people of the areas involved are going to know it has got to be passed with the support of both parties. The Democratic Party has a two-thirds majority in both Houses. However, the situation being what it is, the support of my party is essential to the passage of a good bill, and that support should be forthcoming.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? If he does not have enough time, I shall get some time if it is needed. I have asked the Senator to yield at that point because I am interested in the question of whether any Republican should vote to override. I voted for the bill, and naturally, to be consistent, I would, in the normal course, vote to override. I should like to ask the Senator from Pennsylvania if he agrees with me that the reason why this matter is before us today is solely to make it a political issue, because everybody knows the veto is not going to be overridden. The theory is to say, "Well, the President did the wrong thing," in view of the fact that the administration has put in a bill now to get the legislative process started all over again, which the Senator from Illinois introduced, and of which I am a co-sponsor.

Is it not a fact that Republicans who voted for the bill and who vote to override the President's veto are affirming the fact that we are for depressed areas legislation, and that we are not allowing ourselves to become strictly partisan, and that we intend to follow through to get such legislation, therefore getting some of the political heat out of the issue on the question of overriding the President's veto?

Mr. SCOTT. I will say to the Senator from New York that if some of the Republicans wished to gain the maximum political advantage, the thing to do would be to vote to sustain the President's veto, to assert unequivocally that we support the position taken by the President without reservation, and then turn to the majority party and say, "You are wrong and you must bear full responsibility."

I think, on the other hand, when we feel it necessary to vote against action taken by our President, we indicate that we wish to keep the issue alive on a bipartisan basis, and that it is our duty to insist on hearings, rather than to do nothing and let this become a political issue.

Both the Senator from New York and I are aware of the fact that there are people who would prefer to have issues rather than laws. One of those people certainly is not the majority leader of this body, who has consistently asserted—and I agree with him—that the important thing is to get legislation rather than political issues. If we are going to play this straight down the line on the basis that the unemployed need help, in my opinion we are pursuing the right path.

Mr. JAVITS. Would another point served by a vote in favor of overriding be the fact that those who supported the bill know that a bill which involves approximately $250 million comes a lot nearer the mark, considering what needs to be done, than the measure proposed by the administration, starting with something in the neighborhood of $60 million?

Mr. SCOTT. Yes. The administration proposed something on the order of $55 million or $57 million. It is now proposing an ultimate expenditure of something like $180 million.

Mr. JAVITS. That is much nearer the mark; is it not?

Mr. SCOTT. That is much nearer the mark. I introduced a bill which would provide for the expenditure of in the neighborhood of $100 million, and on that I wish to have something to say.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator for yielding to me.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, on Friday last I introduced without comment a new area redevelopment bill, S. 3568. At that time the Senate was working under a consent agreement which precluded a discussion of my bill.

At this point I desire to include a brief explanation of the bill and give the reasons for its introduction. I ask unanimous consent to have included in the RECORD, following my remarks, a comparison of the area redevelopment bill as vetoed, with revisions incorporated in S. 3568.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that there be included in the RECORD following my remarks an editorial from the Harrisburg Sunday Patriot-News of May 15, 1960; an editorial from the Philadelphia Inquirer; an article from the Harrisburg Patriot of May 19, 1960; an article from the same newspaper of Saturday, May 14, 1960; and an article from the same paper of May 13, 1960.

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

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, ever since becoming a Member of the Senate, I have been identified with legislation to secure relief for economically distressed areas in my State, and others similarly situated, where persistent unemployment and drying up of financial resources are of many years' duration.

When S. 722 was still in the Senate, and while it was delayed in the House Rules Committee, I urged that we enact a reasonable bill and one that would have a chance of avoiding veto. Efforts were made in the House, and by myself in the Senate, to substitute a revised version, prior to final action on S. 722.

The bill I introduced on Friday is another effort in this direction, in that it would meet the principal objections set forth in the President's veto message of May 13.

There is invitation and encouragement in the President's message to reintroduce a new bill on which the Congress and the Executive can agree.

Whether or not we can agree on all of the points at issue, I am sure most of us would rather see a revised bill acted upon than no bill at all. The latter would serve only our own annoyance or chagrin, and not the welfare of the people whom we try to serve.

There seems to me not much politics to be made out of the misfortune and misery of our fellow citizens.

I was not advised of the second administration distressed area bill presented. Perhaps if those of us who have fought for area redevelopment legislation—and that goes for those on both sides of the aisle—had been brought into the discussion of a compromise measure, the Scott-Van Zandt bill would not have been introduced; but a compromise between the administration bill and the Scott-Van Zandt bill might have been agreed upon.

However, I am inclined to feel that S. 3568 is the better of the two bills and that it offers a solution which will be acceptable to many of my colleagues. I point out that it relates directly to the areas in need and that the aid could be given promptly. The bill in large part would meet the President's objections to the other bills. I urge it be given prompt attention by the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, of which my colleague, the senior Senator from Pennsylvania, is a member.

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

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me 2 more minutes?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized for an additional 5 minutes.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I hope that my colleague, the senior Senator from Pennsylvania, with his active interest in this proposed legislation and his influence as a member of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, will in good part and in total absence of politics urge that hearings be held, as adequately as may be needed, on the administration bill and on any other bill which may be introduced, including the Scott bill. I assure my colleague I am prepared to testify at any time, and I am prepared to support any reasonable bill which will help to solve the problems of unemployment in Pennsylvania, in West Virginia, in southern Illinois, in Massachusetts or in Kentucky.

Every effort will be made by my colleagues in the House, I am sure, to secure similar action upon a companion measure.

Mr. President, in conclusion I make one more plea. I plead that we try to avoid politics on this issue. I am not a candidate for election in the coming election. Neither is the senior Senator from Pennsylvania. We are both, however, concerned and compassionate, I am sure, when the needs of Pennsylvanians are concerned. Those needs have been

too long neglected. Those needs have been neglected by both bodies of the Congress, despite repeated requests of the President of the United States for compassionate action.

If we are to act, there is ample control in both bodies, through the leadership and through the committee system, to see that an adequate bill is presented. I do not insist upon my bill. I do not insist upon the administration bill. I do not insist upon any one bill. I simply point out that if no bill is sent to the President reasonably along the lines he has suggested, the fault will be that of those who do not support the proposed legislation, no matter what may be their party and no matter in which House they may serve.

I thank the distinguished minority leader for yielding me the time.

EXHIBIT 1

Comparison of area redevelopment bills

Subject	S. 722 as passed and vetoed	S. 3568, H.R. 12290, H.R. 12291, and H.R. 12298
1. Organization	Separate Area Redevelopment Administration	Department of Commerce, with Administrator having Secretary status.
2. Division of redevelopment areas	Administrator to designate industrial and rural areas of persistent unemployment and underemployment.	Industrial areas only. No industrial loans for rural areas. (NOTE.—Technical assistance available to rural.)
3. Revolving fund loans:		
Industrial	$75,000,000	$75,000,000. (Reference to purchase of machinery removed.)
Rural	$75,000,000	None.
Public facilities	$50,000,000	$25,000,000.
4. Federal participation in loans	65 percent	35 percent (and not less than 15 percent participation by State, Agency, or instrumentality).
5. Maximum loan period	40 years	25 years.
6. Grants for public facilities	$35,000,000	None.
7. Retraining subsistence payments	$10,000,000	$5,000,000.
8. Vocational training grants	$1,500,000	No funds specified. Secretary of Labor to determine needs. Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to provide through existing institutions.
9. Technical assistance	$4,500,000	$3,000,000 (also available to rural areas).
10. Criteria of unemployment	At least 6 percent at time of application, and 12 percent for 12 months preceding, or 9 percent for 15 of 18 months preceding, or 6 percent for 18 of 24 months preceding.	An average of 6 percent, excluding seasonal, throughout qualifying period, and 50 percent above national average for 4 out of 5 preceding years; or 75 percent above national average for 3 out of 4 years preceding; or 100 percent above national average for 2 out of 3 years preceding.
11. Interest on loans	Maximum permitted 2⅞ percent	To be determined by Secretary based on going rates.
12. Cost	$251,000,000	$108,000,000.
13. Urban areas that may qualify for Federal assistance under these two proposals: [1]		
Major	40 areas	16 areas.
Smaller	103 areas	48 areas.

[1] Estimated upon current unemployment figures by Bureau of Employment Security, Department of Labor.

EXHIBIT 2

"NO" A SECOND TIME, ALAS

The $251 million depressed area bill, vetoed by President Eisenhower, is not nearly as bad as he made it out. It is, as Mr. Eisenhower's Secretary of Labor, James M. Mitchell, pointed out in a speech at Scranton less than 24 hours before the veto a bill "good enough so that any Senator or Congressman from a State with areas of chronic unemployment would have no alternative but vote for it"—even though it might not be exactly what the individual Senators and Representatives might want.

Secretary Mitchell spoke before an audience of prominent Scranton business and industrial leaders who had worked long and hard for passage of the depressed area bill and who had then appealed to President Eisenhower to sign it. The Secretary's audience was made up of members of the Scranton Chamber of Commerce. (Perhaps it hadn't been emphasized nearly enough that the chambers of commerce at the State and National levels are speaking strictly for themselves, and not especially for the organizations with the same name back in the home communities when, with such great fanfares of publicity, they brand a program of Federal loans and aid for depressed areas as such a terrible thing.)

What the President has done—again—is done.

It is probably impossible for the depressed area bill to be passed over his veto, in either House or Senate, although the majority Democrats probably will go through the motions just for the tremendous political talking point it will give them in the presidential-congressional campaign. For the same reasons the Republicans, too, will go through the motions of trying to get action on a new compromise bill that is somewhere in between the inadequate Eisenhower administration bill and the program the President rejected. With less than 2 months to go and with the makeup of this Congress what it is, it is doubtful that a new depressed area loan-aid bill can be achieved the second time around. Just the same, Republican Senator SCOTT and Republican Representative VAN ZANDT deserve all the "good luck" wishes they can get as they make the attempt. They deserve, too, the support of Pennsylvania's Democratic Congressmen, who, we are sure, are willing to put party partisanship second and Pennsylvania first on this issue. Pennsylvania, with its chronic unemployment, has a bigger stake in the depressed area legislation than any other single bill that will come before this Congress.

The President, when he gets back home, might support his own Republican Pennsylvania Congressmen—for a change—on this issue. When the Van Zandt-Scott bill is unveiled, the least the President can do is announce publicly whether he's for it or against it.

Secretary Mitchell, after getting a first-hand look at what Pennsylvania's depressed communities have been doing to help themselves, started out his Scranton speech this way:

"One thing I learned today is not to have a preconceived notion about an area. As a result of today, my point of view with relation to Scranton and the people in it has caused me to tear up my prepared speech."

It is a pity it was not the President instead who made the excursion into Pennsylvania's depressed areas. If he had, Mr. Eisenhower probably would have torn up his veto message.

TIME YET FOR AID TO DEPRESSED AREAS

Introduction of two new measures to provide Federal aid for redevelopment of economically depressed areas gives grounds for hope that in spite of politics something may yet be done by Congress this year to meet this urgent need.

President Eisenhower was right in vetoing the $251 million measure railroaded through Congress by legislators who for the most part were motivated by political considerations. It was an extravagant proposal, which could have opened the way to inexcusable waste, and probably would have been opposed by many of those who voted for it if there had been any real prospect of its becoming law.

The administration's move to introduce a new bill that would cost about $70 million less than the one vetoed, and a still less expensive proposal by three Pennsylvania Republicans, Senator HUGH SCOTT, and Representatives JAMES E. VAN ZANDT and JOHN P. SAYLOR, offer a sounder basis for providing help.

In many areas, this rates as the No. 1 problem. It is certainly high on the list in Pennsylvania, including not only such areas as Pottsville, Uniontown-Connellsville, Wilkes-Barre-Hazelton, and others, but Philadelphia as well.

The revelation the other day that even though job opportunities are high in this city, the relief rolls are more overburdened than ever, showing the longrun gravity of the problem. It isn't only that new industries must be found in regions where old ones have succumbed but that hundreds of thousands of workers whose old jobs have been eliminated by modern technology must be retrained; and that equally large numbers of totally unskilled jobless must be shown how to make themselves useful.

This is not a temporary economic difficulty. It is one, in fact, that could become increasingly burdensome to a vast number of communities as the pace of technological progress accelerates, unless a systematic program to speed retraining is set up.

In that respect, the administration measure could be strengthened by recognition that the needs of those being retrained must be met somehow until they are competent to find new employment. On one point those supporting the original depressed areas bill are right; it is as important for the United States to deal fairly with its own distressed as it is with those in lands overseas.

Congress should not let politics interfere with this responsibility.

[From the Harrisburg (Pa.) Patriot, May 19, 1960]

TWO AREA AID BILLS SUBMITTED BY GOP

(By Milton Jaques)

WASHINGTON.—Two Republican compromise area redevelopment bills were introduced in Congress Wednesday in a move to get action after President Eisenhower's veto last week of a $251 million measure.

The administration picked a New Jersey Congressman to offer a bill which asked $180 million, while three Pennsylvanians, led by Senator HUGH SCOTT, presented a $108 million program designed to meet White House objections. Previously the administration had held to a $53 million limit.

There was momentary confusion when the Pennsylvanians were confronted with the so-called administration bill at the same time they were going ahead with their own attempt at compromise. They had been given no advance warning that the $180 million bill was on its way.

Democrats had no immediate comment on compromise efforts in the wake of the President's stern rejection May 13 of their aid program.

The House meantime, Wednesday, was embroiled in the educational bill debate, with no prospects for an attempt to override the President's veto or to consider a new bill for area redevelopment.

In the House, Republicans JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, Altoona, and JOHN P. SAYLOR, Johnstown, introduced the Scott compromise version.

VAN ZANDT said he did not object to the administration bill but thought it would have been better for administration forces to consult with veteran backers of area redevelopment and with the Democratic leadership in the committees handling such legislation.

"It just shows the lack of political understanding of these (administration) people downtown," VAN ZANDT said.

"But the $180 million indicates the administration is weakening as far as the amount of money is concerned," he said.

VAN ZANDT said if a program is finally enacted it will come only through compromise "because the Democrats can't override the President's veto." It takes a two-thirds vote to override.

VAN ZANDT indicated his bill would not be necessary if the administration and the leadership of both Houses "could work out a bill acceptable to the President."

"They're playing politics with distressed areas," he charged, "and it's not going to satisfy these people who are living on surplus commodities."

Both the administration's version and that drafted by the Pennsylvanians are similar on provisions for administering and allocating Federal aid to community industrial redevelopment projects.

The administration bill, introduced by Representative WILLIAM WIDNALL, Republican, a member of the House Banking and Currency Committee, includes an additional $100 million authorization to be used by the housing and home finance agency for public facility loans to cities.

The loans would help hard-hit communities with industrial plant construction or "refurbishing" utilities and streets serving industrial sites.

Representative IVOR D. FENTON, Mahanoy City Republican and dean of the GOP State delegation, said he would support either bill "as long as it has a chance of becoming law."

The bills were referred to the House Banking and Currency Committee where a spokesman indicated they faced a chilly outlook.

One of the major differences between the Eisenhower administration's aid program and that passed by Congress is choice of agency for running it. The administration wants the Commerce Department to handle the program, while Congress sought a new agency similar to the HHFA.

The Scott-Saylor-Van Zandt bill includes $75 million for industrial loans and $25 million for public facility loans. It removes Federal aid for purchase of machinery to which the President objected in his veto message.

It also carries $5 million for subsistence for jobless workers during retraining, $1.5 million for vocation training and $3 million for technical assistance to depressed areas seeking new industries.

STATE DEPRESSED AREAS DEPEND ON WHOSE LIST YOU HAPPEN TO READ

(By George Draut)

When are the depressed areas in Pennsylvania under terms of the $251-million loan-aid bill just vetoed by President Eisenhower?

It depends upon whose list you accept.

The hard-hit coal communities are on everybody's list.

One list reports President Eisenhower's farm is in the "depressed area" of Adams County.

LISTS DON'T JIBE

The U.S. Labor Department has issued one tabulation at Washington.

The Pennsylvania Labor and Industry Department has issued another one here.

They don't jibe.

Various Congressmen involved in the controversy don't agree either.

There's even disagreement on whether Philadelphia and York of the State's main labor market areas would have qualified for depressed area aid under the Democratic bill, with unemployment of more than 6 percent for 18 of the last 24 months.

Yes, says the Labor Department at Washington.

No, says Labor-Industry here.

SEASONAL FACTORS

Philadelphia had 6.6 percent unemployment at last report and York had 6.5 percent, but this was due to "temporary and seasonal factors," the bad weather of March and April which held down construction employment, a Labor-Industry spokesman said. Both areas were under the 6 percent break point last year and probably will be again when this month's report is completed, he added.

But at nearby Scranton on Thursday night, Labor Secretary Mitchell declared in a speech:

"The most obvious fault with this present bill is the broadness of criteria for identifying areas that qualify for loan assistance. Certainly Scranton should not be in competition with New York or Philadelphia for Federal funds. Under the present criteria, that situation could easily occur because of a temporary, seasonal shift in monthly employment figures."

DIFFERENCE IN BILLS

President Eisenhower bore down heavily on the same theme in his veto message. He scored the most striking defect of the bill this way: "It would make eligible for Federal assistance areas that don't need it—thus providing less help for communities in genuine need than would the administration's proposal."

In Pennsylvania, the Democratic bill covered seven more areas than the administration proposal on the Labor-Industry Department tabulations. The seven: Pittsburgh labor market of Allegheny, Washington, Beaver, and Westmoreland Counties; Indiana County, Oil City-Franklin-Titusville, Sharon-Farrell, St. Marys-Emporium, Williamsport, and Wellsboro.

NEW AREAS

That leaves 30 Pennsylvania areas both bills would have included, Labor-Industry statistics show. For the first time, this listing includes as depressed areas, eligible for aid under administration or Democratic plans, these midstate districts:

Gettysburg and Adams County.

Marysville-Newport (Perry County).

Chambersburg-Waynesboro (Franklin and Fulton Counties).

Huntingdon County.

Labor-Industry refused to disclose the unemployment statistics upon which these tentative depressed area classifications are based. A spokesman argued it would only confuse the public and if they were made public for one area, all of the areas in the State would demand the same information.

OTHERS IN GROUP

Fifteen of the thirty-seven areas named by Labor-Industry as depressed on a tentative determination made on a basis of insured unemployment rates are in this "you'll just have to take our word for it" group. Others are: Bedford, Clarion, Forest City-Montrose, Punxsutawney, Tunkhannock, Waynesburg, Coudersport, Dushore-Laporte, Honesdale, Wellsboro, and Lehighton-Palmerton.

None of them are covered in regular labor market surveys and reports, but the percentage of covered workers drawing unemployment compensation is available for each place. It is this information which Labor-Industry refuses to announce. Total unemployment also includes the jobless who are not eligible for jobless benefits, and this is projected conservatively by adding 1 percent to the cold fact UC jobless total.

OTHERS ON ALL LISTS

The President's home county of Adams has substantially more than 6 percent unemployment right now, the Labor-Industry Department spokesman said, but he refused to reveal what "substantially" is.

It would take a month to 2 months to officially classify any of the areas, he reported.

Other areas of the State, besides those already mentioned, which are classified by all lists as depressed: Scranton, Wilkes-Barre-Hazleton, Pottsville, Uniontown-Connellsville, Erie, Johnstown, Berwick-Bloomsburg, Clearfield-Du Bois, Kittanning-Ford City, Sunbury-Shamokin-Ford City, Altoona, Butler, Lewistown, Meadville, New Castle, and Sayre-Athens-Towanda.

STATE REPUBLICANS READY WITH NEW AREA AID BILL

(By George Drault)

Pennsylvania's Republican Congressmen, fighting against the political disaster of another depressed area bill veto by President Eisenhower, have a substitute plan ready to go.

A compromise bill—in between the $251 million proposal now on the President's desk and the restricted $53 million administration program—will be flagged simultaneously in the Senate by Republican Senator HUGH SCOTT and in the House, probably by Republican Representative JAMES VAN ZANDT, of Altoona, when President Eisenhower announces his expected veto. The Presidential turndown, second in a row on the long-sought depressed area aid program, may come today.

With the congressional agenda already piled up because of the long civil rights fight earlier in the session and with only 2 months to go chances are very much against a second depressed area bill's clearing Congress. The Dixie Democrat-controlled House Rules Committee even refused to clear the present bill, and it was pried loose only with an extraordinary parliamentary maneuver that probably would not be successful a second time.

But the Republicans will have a campaign talking point to throw against the Democrats in the Pennsylvania campaigning. One GOP leader conceded privately that this

will be the only chance to salvage the candidacy of Republican William W. Scranton against the incumbent Democratic Congressman, STANLEY A. PROKOP, in the 10th District. PROKOP ousted the Republican Congressman 2 years ago, largely on the strength of the first Eisenhower veto of a depressed area bill.

The shape of the GOP answer to Democratic campaigning was lined up Thursday by SCOTT.

"We have a conviction," he said, "that the Democrats would rather have a Presidential veto than any program to help our depressed areas."

The new depressed area bill, to be pushed by SCOTT and the Republican Representatives from Pennsylvania, will call for $125 to $150 million program with requirements for a depressed area to qualify for Federal loans and grants more stringent than are now laid down in Senate bill 722, which the President will veto.

This will be largely in the pattern of proposals earlier urged in floor debate by SCOTT and VAN ZANDT, along with Representatives JOHN SAYLOR, of Johnstown, and IVOR D. FENTON, of Mahanoy City.

SCOTT insisted Thursday night that he is "sure" the President would sign a bill taking the "Van Zandt-Scott approach."

"Without attempting to quote the President," SCOTT said, "I am perfectly satisfied in my own mind that the President would sign a $150-million program tailored to meet the needs of the States and regions which have the really depressed areas."

What States or regions?

These would be Pennsylvania, West Virginia, Kentucky, Massachusetts, and southern Illinois, SCOTT said.

Democrats earlier made a point-blank issue of what the President would or would not sign during the debate on Senate bill 722.

At one point, Pennsylvania's Representative JOHN H. DENT asked VAN ZANDT and SAYLOR if they could "promise" that Eisenhower would sign a $150-million bill. The Republicans said they could not.

The Pennsylvania GOP Congressmen's new depressed area appeal will come in the wake of the unsuccessful appeal by State GOP leaders and Congressmen to President Eisenhower to sign the pending bill.

But at his press conference this week, the President said that the bill, takes a "shotgun" approach and is "getting to be a pork-barrel bill, as I see it."

Although the President said Wednesday he hasn't made up his mind yet, his decision to veto the depressed area bill is one of the worst-kept "secrets" in Washington.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the minority leader desire that the time be charged to him?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time not be charged to either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that cannot be done, under the previous order, for the vote must occur at 2 o'clock.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, do I correctly understand that the unanimous-consent agreement calls for a vote at 2 o'clock?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Then, automatically, any time for the call of the roll would have to come from the time of both sides. I must therefore object to the request of my colleague from Illinois.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. DOUGLAS. May I ask if the minority leader has any speaker at the present time?

Mr. DIRKSEN. There is a speaker present, but he is not quite ready to proceed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the senior Senator from Illinois desire to avail himself of any time?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, this is an extraordinary situation. We have used approximately an hour of our time. Apparently the minority is not ready to proceed with a discussion in opposition.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state that this time must necessarily be charged to the minority leader or to the majority leader or to both.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I intend to vote to uphold the veto of the President and against the bill. I shall not recite the parts of the veto message of which I approve or disapprove. My objection to the bill has already been indicated, when I voted against the bill at the time of its passage. I think it is an unrealistic bill which does not deal properly with the subject matter. It seeks to set off the urban and industrial distress against agricultural situations which in many instances are merely fancied distress, as I shall show in a moment. It does not concentrate upon bringing help to the places where it ought to be brought, where I would be glad to participate in having it brought—such areas as those in West Virginia, in Pennsylvania, in Kentucky and in other States where there has been long, continued, and distressful unemployment. Such situations as those call for the sympathy of every good American.

Mr. President, without belaboring the matter at great length, I simply wish to say that those who are familiar with the bill know that substantially half of the total amount to be provided would be devoted to expenditures in so-called rural counties. The map which is displayed at the rear of the Chamber has been prepared by the Department of Agriculture, as shown by the text, in the effort to carry out the mandate of the bill. As I understand it, the map displayed is relied upon by the advocates of the bill.

Mr. President, I know something about the counties of my own State. I know something about the counties of the States of Georgia, Alabama, and other States shown on the map. I shall simply refer to certain situations in my own State.

Mr. President, this map shows in the most serious classification—branded as serious and shown in pink upon the map, with respect to low income and low living standards—counties in my State which are highly prosperous, which are doing well, which do not want and do not require any assistance. It would be a travesty for me to vote for a bill which pretends to bring relief to distressed areas, when these counties in Florida are listed among those requiring such aid.

Mr. President, in the bill we note there would be covereage for the County of Escambia, the county in which Pensacola is located, with the great naval air training station and numerous large and prosperous industries there located. Some of those are of recent establishment. That county is one of our fast-growing counties, one of our highly prosperous counties. Anyone who, with the faintest show of seriousness, could describe that county as one requiring aid as a depressed area simply does not know anything about the county.

Mr. President, I could mention several other counties. Let us consider Okaloosa County, where the great Eglin Air Force Base complex is located. In 1950 that was the fastest growing county in our State. It is still one of the fastest growing counties in our State. It is a highly prosperous county. Anyone who could ascribe to that county a characterization as a seriously depressed area simply does not know anything about it.

Mr. President, looking at the map a little further, the county in which our capital is located, Leon County, is indicated as one of the seriously depressed areas. Mr. President, Leon County is a highly prosperous county because, among other things, much of the State business of one of the fastest growing States in the Nation is concentrated in that county. The county and the city of Tallahassee have grown tremendously and are highly prosperous. In addition to the State personnel, Mr. President, two great universities are there located, Florida State University and Florida A and M University. There are many other activities which make that county a fast-growing and highly prosperous area. There is not any semblance of reason for classifying the county as a depressed area needing Federal help.

Mr. President, the county adjoining Leon County is Gadsden County, the county in which much wrapper-leaf tobacco is grown. Gadsden County is generally characterized as perhaps the most prosperous basic agricultural county in our State or in our whole area. That county is shown as a depressed area on this map.

Without laboring the question further I simply wish to call attention to the fact that the county of Alachua, where the city of Gainesville and the University of Florida are located, a highly prosperous and fast-growing county, is also shown as a depressed area requiring assistance under the terms of the bill.

Mr. President, no self-respecting Senator from the State of Florida, no matter how sympathetic he is with situations such as those which exist—and they are terrible—in parts of the State so well represented by the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH],

who is seated by me, could agree that the counties which I have mentioned and others listed in our State are depressed or distressed counties. I do not know why we cannot bring up appropriate legislation which concentrates on the bringing of aid which should be brought and aid which is needed by human beings who are suffering.

I wish to say to my friends from West Virginia, Pennsylvania, Kentucky, and other States where there are actual hard pressed areas that I long for the time when we will have a realistic approach to the problem, and when I can in good conscience vote for a bill which would give them aid.

Without going into great detail, I notice that just above the Florida-Georgia State line, Thomas County, Georgia, is classified as seriously depressed. Thomas County is thriving—it is almost wholly occupied with great plantations which are known all over the Nation.

Thomasville is a city of rapid growth and prosperity, populated by fine people, and they would not appreciate being placed in a category of depressed areas which need the help of the United States to get on their feet.

Going to North Carolina, which I do not know so well, I notice that Henderson County, in which is located the city of Hendersonville, is labeled a depressed and distressed area. Hendersonville is one of the greatest resort cities in our whole southeast, and one of the most prosperous cities, a city teeming with visitors and people spending money, and a city of stable prosperity. In addition the county is a very fine vegetable producing area, which is almost without equal in our whole southeastern area.

Why we cannot be realistic I do not know. I do not think it is necessary to play politics with this venture. I do not think it is necessary to hold out bait to people who are not suffering to influence them to vote for people who are.

This Congress has been noted, and our people have been noted, for coming to the aid of human beings, whether in our country or elsewhere, but particularly in our country, when they are shown to be in distress and in need of assistance. The Senator from Florida wishes always to be counted among those who desire to do that kind of service which he thinks is not only good government, but is decent human consideration and good Christianity.

There cannot be any justification for the approach built into this bill. For that reason, much as I dislike to do so, I shall certainly vote to uphold the veto of the President.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President——

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President——

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I yield 8 minutes to the Senator from West Virginia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from West Virginia yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I wish to cooperate with the minority leader and my colleague from New York.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority leader is recognized.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I shall not talk for more than 5 minutes. I am grateful to the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH]. I have an appointment for 12:45 in the radio section of the gallery.

Mr. President, like other Members of the Senate, I have been vexed as to what to do about this veto. It seems clear to me that the veto will be sustained. Certainly this is clear from the votes in the Senate and the votes in the other body. There are political overtones in the matter of bringing before the Congress this measure, and the delay—which has been symbolized by the cart before the horse—before the measure was brought up is significant.

Nevertheless, I have decided to vote to override for the following reasons: Having tried to work out a compromise on this very critical matter, and coming from the State which is the largest taxpayer in the United States, it would be ill-befitting now to part company with that effort to compromise. I feel I must lend by my vote support for the proposition that we need to stress area redevelopment legislation in about the magnitude which is incorporated in the proposed legislation.

I join in urging favorable consideration of the new administration bill, which I think comes very much closer to meeting the need, and I am very hopeful that after we are through with this proceeding, we shall yet have a bill in this session.

The essence of my position is incorporated in the following: When I voted against the original distressed areas bill because the amount of money involved was far more than was needed, due, I think, to the wrong inclusion of the opportunity for supplying machinery and equipment to the areas which were designated as distressed under the bill, I voted out of a conviction that we should not proceed wastefully. When the bill returned from the House to the Senate it was still in a form containing the machinery and equipment feature which I still thought was entirely wrong, but with the amount very much cut. I felt that with a reduced amount it was very unlikely that any administrator would have any money available for machinery and equipment.

I think the question now is not whether the vote will be large enough to override—I am confident that the veto will not be overridden—but will the vote be large enough to bring about action at this session?

I wish to contribute to that endeavor because I feel that in my State with its enormous business complex interested in the general prosperity of the country, there must be a spirit of generosity and understanding of the difficulties in States like Kentucky, Pennsylvania, and other States in which there are depressed areas.

Second, in representing a State which is thoroughly committed to the mutual security idea and to its critical importance to the future of freedom and peace in the world, I feel that I must at the same time take a sympathetic look at the distressed areas in my own country, and where it is possible to do something about the problem in a way remotely approaching a degree of size and effectiveness, I feel it is my duty to do so. So I am very hopeful that by some Republican votes upon this question we can remove the political colorations which, most unfortunately, I feel, are sought to be placed upon the measure, and that we can affirm by our vote, on this side at least, our desire to cooperate in seeing that there is depressed area legislation at this session of the Congress.

This is also of some importance to a good many communities in New York State. Not only places of lesser population are included in the bill—namely, Amsterdam, Auburn, Elmira, Gloversville, Jamestown-Dunkirk, Newburgh-Middletown-Beacon, Ogdensburg-Massena-Malone; Plattsburg and Wellsville—but also if unemployment goes up as high as 6 percent, it might conceivably encompass New York City. The bill relates also to the Buffalo, Utica-Rome and Albany-Schenectady-Troy areas.

For all the reasons stated, Mr. President, I shall vote to override the veto.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] yield some time to me?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I yield 8 minutes to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, there is a crucial need for the overriding of the President's veto of S. 722. Lengthy and exhaustive hearings have been held; the testimony of expert witnesses has been received; and both bodies of the Congress have deliberated fully the merits of this bill. Therefore, I will address my remarks to the logic and assumptions of the President's veto message.

Mr. President, during the past 2 years, the Democratic leadership in the Congress has compromised in meeting the administration's position on this issue—as well as on many others.

To go further would be to surrender the two-party principle of our Government, and even surrender of the equal status of the legislative with the executive branch. But the President has maintained unyielding opposition. He has recently enunciated his philosophy of representative government as "one-third plus one," and now he lectures the Congress of the United States to the effect that "The people are properly becoming increasingly impatient and are rightfully desirous of constructive action." In this respect, at least, I agree most heartily. Indeed, the people are becoming impatient. The people of West Virginia as well as the people of many other States are becoming impatient. But if there is still no constructive action on this measure, let us by our votes again today declare that the responsibility for inaction rests not with the Congress but with the executive opposition.

The veto message of the President maintains that the passage of S. 722 "would squander the Federal taxpayers' money where there is only temporary

economic difficulty." That is not a correct characterization of the reasons why this legislation is before us. When applied to chronic conditions of human suffering, this is stretching the term beyond the bounds of compassion and understanding. It will bring small comfort to the thousands of willing but unemployed citizens who wish to work, and to their families, in the distressed areas of West Virginia and the neighboring States of Kentucky and Pennsylvania, as well as in many other sections of the country, to be told that theirs is only a "temporary economic difficulty." That is not correctly appraising the situation. It causes me to plead—and I use the word advisedly—for an overriding of the veto.

The President then says that "local, State, and private initiative would be materially inhibited" by the passage of the bill. I can only say that that statement is predicated upon misunderstanding, because it is a misconception of the true character of the people of the State of West Virginia and of the other States. It flies directly in the face of all Federal experience in the use of matching funds. The people in the communities of our distressed areas are not asking for a handout. They are asking for and deserve the opportunity and the means to aid themselves.

I am reminded by the curious logic of the President's veto of one of the prevailing arguments against the establishment of social security during the early days of the New Deal, when I was privileged to be a Member of the House of Representatives. It was maintained then by some persons, in the most serious and lofty fashion, that if men and women had social security there would no longer be an opportunity for the beneficent act of Christian charity.

By the same logic, I presume that the President would find S. 722 sapping the rugged independence of West Virginia's unemployed. That is not true. These people are rugged folk. They desire only an opportunity for gainful employment, and also responsibility under a free government.

They ask for the necessary assistance with which they can help themselves. I know these people. I have more faith in the quality of the American character than those who declare Federal assistance in this instance is leading us down the road to economic instability.

Overreaching all the specific reasons in the President's veto message is the unacknowledged but all-pervasive one which lies at the heart of this message and of so many other vetoes during recent years. I speak of the tragic failure of this administration to acknowledge the meaning of "a more perfect Union." We are the United States, Mr. President, in which the effects of economic distress, of unemployment, of inadequate school facilities, and of insufficient care of our aged, are communicated throughout the length and breadth of our Republic.

These are not merely local issues. These are fundamental and chronic problems in many sections of the country which have sapped the strength and vitality of our entire Nation, not only of these particular sections.

I ask every Member of this body to give most careful consideration to the overriding of this veto, because our first obligation is to help maintain the respect of every loyal, law-abiding, hard working citizen of this Nation.

This means that we must give to him an opportunity to use his strength and skill and to put forward his intelligence in some form of constructive labor, to enable him to assume his role as a freeman and as a provider for his wife and for his children. No one can gage the dreadful cost in human terms and in the erosion of morale which is brought on by enforced idleness, which I must face in West Virginia, and which must be faced by other Members of the Senate in their areas, when we know these conditions exist in certain sections of our States and of our country.

We have ample statistics on the loss in the gross national product because of chronic unemployment. Indeed, the total cost of S. 722 would be a mere pittance as compared with the cost of the recession of 1958.

Who, I ask, can gage the psychological cost of thousands of skilled men forced into idleness by technological changes, not in the last few months or years, but over a long period of time? Who can gage the cost in self-respect and the dislocation of family life when men, in some instances, leave their families so that their wives—it is tragic, but true—may claim nonsupport and thereby qualify for public assistance? Yet these conditions exist even now as we begin to bask in the glow of the "Fabulous Sixties"— as the coming decade has been described by certain persons.

I hope it will not be considered untimely if I say that we should take a sterner look at the inventory of our national needs. At the present time I refer only to the area redevelopment bill, although there are others which the 86th Congress must face and which deserve our attention by affirmative action during the remainder of the year. The need for S. 722 is immediate and pressing.

Convincing testimony has been given before the committees of Congress, and the Senate and the House have acted favorably. The evidence is set down, not only in the written record, but more grimly in the dulled eyes of men who find no work for willing hands, and in the drawn and desperate faces of their weary wives and hungry children. This is the hour to aid those who deserve our assistance.

Mr. President, in urging that we override the President's veto, I am not taking partisan action for the purpose of creating a political issue, as some of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle allege. Rather, I seek the enactment of legislation—a vitally needed measure.

Neither was I taking partisan action when, on May 12, 1960, I sent a telegram to the President urging him to approve S. 722. In that sincere message to the Chief Executive, I said:

Senate bill 722, incorporating House amendments and providing for a program of area redevelopment, is vitally needed legislation. Your favorable consideration of this measure is urgently and respectfully recommended. West Virginia and other States need the encouragement and assistance which S. 722 would provide citizens and communities in their efforts to help themselves.

Yes, Mr. President, I sent that telegram to the Chief Executive urging that he sign this second bill passed by the Congress since 1958 to aid distressed areas. But for the second time he maintained unyielding opposition. I urge the overriding of the veto.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 6 minutes to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I am deeply concerned over the plight of certain areas of this country which are chronically affected by unemployment. I believe strongly that action must be taken to alleviate the conditions in these so-called distressed areas and to achieve a healthier economic status of a continuing nature.

I am in agreement with the President that S. 722 does not do the job effectively and properly. I believe that the bill which he has not approved is wasteful in that it applies funds where they are not needed; harmful in that it would inhibit badly needed local and State initiative and resourcefulness; and unwise in its provisions for financing industrial buildings in rural areas, plant machinery and equipment, sewers, and access roads and the like.

With particular reference to my own State, S. 722 would encourage pirating of industries away from Massachusetts, which is one of the reasons for some of our depressed areas, in the first place. Federal funds must not be used for the stealing of industries from communities which already have and need those industries. I regret that the Senate rejected an administration amendment to S. 722 which would have prevented aid in cases where industries would be shifted between areas.

The fact that the bill which has been returned by the President would stifle local initiative is an important argument in itself against passage of this bill. Cities of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts have a proud record of resourcefulness, energy, and dedication in rebuilding themselves and improving their economic health. These worthy activities might even be penalized by Federal intervention under S. 722 which could aid less diligent areas, and thus discourage self-help and self-sufficiency.

The bill does not focus on the real basic causes of unemployment, and creates in my opinion a dispiriting illusion that simply by the construction of buildings and purchase of equipment jobs can be created on a continuous, deep-rooted and dependable basis.

Furthermore, I feel that S. 722 is discriminatory through unrealistic standards for determining aid. Conceivably, citizens of Massachusetts cities could be forced to aid other areas both inside and outside of the State when their own city itself is in need but does not happen to qualify. For example, a city with 8 percent unemployment might get no benefits while a neighboring city with 9 percent unemployment would get

benefits, as indicated in the minority views of the House Banking and Currency Committee report. Page 31 of this same report states that an area such as Kinston, N.C., would be considered a depressed area under this bill with unemployment of 4.5 percent. It is interesting to note that Pittsfield, Mass., with unemployment of 6.1 percent at the present time, would not be eligible for Federal aid under this bill.

A major provision of S. 722 would grant aid to 663 rural depressed areas. Massachusetts has none of these. This is clearly indicated on page 32 of the House Minority Report. Assuming that this kind of Federal aid is sound in the first place, Alabama would benefit with 55 out of 67 counties eligible for aid. Mississippi would also reap substantial rewards, as would other southern States—524 of the 663 rural areas scheduled for aid under the bill are found in the South.

The State which I represent, in part, would receive disproportionate treatment under the bill. Massachusetts taxes would support the programs established by this legislation without balanced returns, and the opposite ratio would be the case with certain other States. Therefore I believe that Congress should work to pass legislation which does not depend upon arbitrary standards which largely discriminate against already-industrialized areas of the Northeast.

The President has indicated his keen awareness of the need for area redevelopment legislation, and has submitted an administration bill which would fairly and realistically move forward to alleviate unhealthy conditions which we are concerned about—in his own words "truly sound and helpful legislation." He has urged the Congress to enact legislation in this area for 5 years, and expressed his sincere cooperation in obtaining a law within certain general standards, accepting the eligibility criteria originally set forth in the Senate version of S. 722.

I urge my colleagues in the Senate to rise to this challenge of constructive cooperation. I shall vote to sustain the President in his veto of S. 722 for the reasons which I have expressed.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I shall vote to sustain the President's veto of S. 722, the area redevelopment bill, for reasons I outlined in a statement on the Senate floor on Monday, May 16.

I express again my hope that the majority party will abandon attempts to reap political capital from the plight of areas having chronic unemployment, and will accept the President's offer to cooperate in the enactment of sound legislation which can give genuine, not illusory, assistance to such areas.

I have joined with the minority leader, the able senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], and other Senators in introducing S. 3569. Although this is not an administration bill, it was drafted in an attempt to meet the President's major objections to S. 722, and to provide a sound, workable program to meet the problems of areas of chronic unemployment which are in need of special assistance.

I invite attention to the fact that the new bill flatly prohibits, as I have consistently advocated, the use of Federal funds to assist business establishments in relocating from one area to another. I am confident, Mr. President, that the President's veto of S. 722 will be sustained, and express the hope that the Committee on Banking and Currency will promptly consider S. 3569.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of Senate bill 3569 may be printed in the RECORD following these remarks.

There being no objection, the text of S. 3569 was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Area Assistance Act of 1960."

DECLARATION OF PURPOSE

SEC. 2. The Congress declares that, even during periods of prosperity for the Nation as a whole, some of our communities suffer substantial and persistent unemployment; that such unemployment causes 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 to take effective steps in planning and financing their economic development; that Federal assistance should enable communities to achieve lasting improvement and decrease economic vulnerability by the establishment of stable and diversified local economies; and that new employment opportunities should be created rather than merely transferred from one community to another.

AUTHORITY OF SECRETARY OF COMMERCE

SEC. 101 (a) The Secretary of Commerce, hereinafter referred to as the Secretary, may designate as an area of substantial and persistent unemployment any area certified as eligible for such designation by the Secretary of Labor.

(b) To assist areas in the United States designated as areas of substantial and persistent unemployment, the Secretary is authorized—

(1) to make grants for technical assistance for such areas in accordance with the provisions of section 106(a) of this Act; and

(2) to provide loans for such areas in accordance with the provisions of section 107 of this Act.

(c) The Secretary is also authorized—

(1) to extend the full cooperation of the Federal Government to all areas in the United States (including Puerto Rico) in promoting the more effective use of local resources, in the establishment of new industries based on local resources, and in the expansion of existing industries; such cooperation to be provided through technical advice and consultation and, when necessary, through the conduct of special studies.

(2) to decrease, through grants made in accordance with the provisions of section 106(b) of this Act, the economic vulnerability of (i) towns predominantly dependent on one industry, (ii) small towns which could serve as centers for economic diversification of low-income rural areas, and (iii) other low-income rural areas not subject to assistance as in (ii), by helping them to develop manufacturing, processing, and other activities calculated to diversify and improve their economies; and

(3) to coordinate his functions under this Act with those of the Secretary of Agriculture and other officials administering Federal programs affecting local economic conditions.

(d) As used in this Act:

(1) The term "United States" includes the several States and the District of Columbia;

(2) The term "State" refers to an individual State or the District of Columbia; and

(3) The term "loan" includes loans, immediate participation in loans, and purchase of evidences of indebtedness.

AUTHORITY OF SECRETARY OF LABOR

SEC. 102. (a) The Secretary of Labor shall from time to time, or upon the request of the Secretary, certify the existence of areas eligible for designation as areas of substantial and persistent unemployment whenever he finds, on the basis of available labor force data, or studies which he initiates when he deems necessary that—

(1) the rate of unemployment in the area, excluding unemployment due primarily to temporary or seasonal factors, is currently 6 per centum and has averaged at least 6 per centum for the qualifying time periods specified in (2) below; and

(2) the annual average rate of unemployment in the area has been at least—

(A) 50 percentum above the national average for three of the preceding four calendar years, or

(B) 75 per centum above the national average for two of the preceding three calendar years, or

(C) 100 per centum above the national average for one of the preceding two calendar years.

(b) In the case of labor market areas for which appropriate historical labor force data have not been complied, the Secretary of Labor shall certify as eligible for designation as areas of substantial and persistent unemployment those areas in which the unemployment rate and duration, based on a survey of available labor force data, generally equals or exceeds the rate and duration specified in section 102(a).

(c) The Secretary of Labor may also certify under subsection (a) or (b) of this section the existence of eligible areas upon request of any appropriate State government agency, instrumentality, or political subdivision.

(d) The Secretary of Labor is authorized, upon request and whenever he determines that such studies are needed, to undertake, or to provide assistance to others in studies of the size, characteristics, skills, adaptability, occupational potentialities, and related aspects of the labor force of an area certified under this section.

(e) When skills of the labor force in an area designated under section 101 are not such as to facilitate full utilization of the human resources in such area, the Secretary of Labor is authorized to provide advice and technical assistance in developing and carrying out a program to improve the utilization of such labor force.

(f) Whenever the Secretary of Labor finds a need for vocational education services in an area designated under section 101 and when such area has an economic development program as provided in section 107 (b)(9), he is authorized to assist interested agencies to determine the vocational training needs of unemployed individuals residing in the area, and he shall notify the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare of the vocational training or retraining requirements of the area. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, through the Commissioner of Education, is authorized to provide assistance, including financial assistance when necessary or appropriate, to the State vocational education agency for

the provision of such services in the area. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $1,500,000 annually for the purpose of providing financial assistance under this subsection.

AUTHORITY OF HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE ADMINISTRATOR

SEC. 103. Title I of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, is amended by adding the following new heading and section at the end of title I:

"AREAS OF SUBSTANTIAL AND PERSISTENT UNEMPLOYMENT

"SEC. 113. (a) When the Secretary of Commerce certifies to the Administrator (1) that any county, city, or other municipality (referred to as 'municipality' in this section) is situated in an area designated by the Secretary of Commerce pursuant to the Area Assistance Act of 1960 as an area of substantial and persistent unemployment, and (2) that there is a reasonable probability that with assistance provided under the Area Assistance Act of 1960 and other undertakings the area will be able to achieve lasting improvement in its economic development, the Administrator is authorized to extend financial assistance to a local public agency in any such municipality under this title and the provisions of this section.

"(b) The Administrator may provide such financial assistance under this section without regard to the requirements or limitations of section 110(c) of this title that the project area be clearly predominantly residential in character or that it will be predominantly residential under the urban renewal plan.

"'(c) Financial assistance under this section may be provided for any project involving a project area including primarily industrial or commercial structures suitable for rehabilitation under the urban renewal plan for the area.

"(d) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this title, a contract for financial assistance under this section may include provisions permitting the disposition of any land in the project area designated under the urban renewal plan for industrial or commercial uses to any public agency or nonprofit corporation for subsequent disposition as promptly as practicable by such public agency or corporation for the redevelopment of the land in accordance with the urban renewal plan: *Provided,* That any disposition of such land to such public agency or corporation under this section shall be made at not less than its fair value for uses in accordance with the urban renewal plan: *And provided further,* That the purchaser from or lessees of such public agency or corporation, and their assignees, shall be required to assume the obligations imposed in conformity with the requirements of section 105(b) hereof.

"(e) Following the execution of any contract for financial assistance under this section with respect to any project, the Administrator may exercise the authority vested under this section for the completion of such project notwithstanding any determination made after the execution of such contract that the area in which the project is located may no longer be an area of substantial and persistent unemployment.

"(f) Not more than 10 per centum of the funds authorized for capital grants under section 103 after June 30, 1960, shall be available to provide financial assistance under this section."

SEC. 104. (a) The first sentence of section 202(c) of title II of the Housing Amendments of 1955 is amended to read as follows:

"(c) In the processing of applications for financial assistance under this section, the Administrator shall give priority to applications of counties, cities, and other municipalities and political subdivisions for financing needed public facilities in areas determined to be areas of substantial and persistent unemployment under the Area Assistance Act of 1960: *Provided,* That the Secretary of Commerce certifies there is reasonable probability that with assistance made available under the Area Assistance Act of 1960 and other undertakings such areas will be able to achieve lasting improvement in their economic development; and equal priority to applications of smaller muncipalities for assistance in the construction of basic public works (including works for the storage, treatment, purification, or distribution of water; sewage, sewage treatment, and sewer facilities; and gas distribution systems) for which there is an urgent and vital public need; the Administrator shall give a first priority above all others to applications for financing needed public facilities in connection with, and that will directly serve, a project eligible under section 107 of the Area Assistance Act of 1960."

(b) The first sentence of section 203(a) of title II of the Housing Amendments of 1955 is amended to read as follows:

"(a) In order to finance activities under this title, the Administrator is authorized and empowered to issue to the Secretary of the Treasury, from time to time and to have outstanding at any one time in an amount not exceeding $100,000,000, notes and other obligations, which limit shall be increased by such amounts, not exceeding $100,000,000, as may be specified from time to time in appropriation Acts."

URBAN PLANNING GRANTS

SEC. 105. Paragraph (3) of section 701(a) of the Housing Act of 1954 is amended by inserting after "Cities, other municipalities, and counties which" the following: "(A) are situated in areas designated as areas of substantial and persistent unemployment under section 101(a) of the Area Assistance Act of 1960, or (B)."

GRANTS FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

SEC. 106. (a) In carrying out section 101(b)(1), the Secretary is authorized to make grants for technical assistance including studies evaluating the needs of, and developing potentialities for, economic growth of areas designated under section 101(a). These grants may be made without regard to section 3648 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 529). Appropriations are hereby authorized for these grants in an amount not to exceed $1,500,000 annually.

(b) In carrying out section 101(c)(2), the Secretary is authorized to make similar grants for the benefit of towns and areas described therein. Negotiations taking into account the financial ability of the grantee and other relevant considerations shall be made for contributions to costs of projects undertaken hereunder. These grants may be made without regard to section 3648 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 529), and appropriations therefore are hereby authorized in an amount not to exceed $2,000,000 annually.

LOANS

SEC. 107. (a) In carrying out section 101(b)(2) of this Act the Secretary is authorized to purchase evidences of indebtedness and to make loans (including immediate participations therein) to aid in financing any project within an area of substantial and persistent unemployment for the purchase or development of land and facilities for industrial usage, for the construction of new factory buildings, for rehabilitation of abandoned or unoccupied factory buildings, or for the alteration, conversion, or enlargement of any existing buildings for industrial use. Such financial assistance shall not be extended for working capital, for purchase of machinery or equipment, or to assist establishments relocating from one area to another.

(b) Financial assistance under this section shall be on such terms and conditions as the Secretary determines, subject, however, to the following restrictions and limitations:

(1) The total amount of loans and loan participations (including purchased evidences of indebtedness) outstanding at any one time under this section shall not exceed $75,000,000;

(2) Such assistance shall be extended only to applicants, both private and public, approved by the State (or any agency or instrumentality thereof concerned with problems of economic development) in which the project to be financed shall be located;

(3) The project for which financial assistance is sought is reasonably calculated to provide more than a temporary alleviation of unemployment or underemployment within the area of substantial and persistent unemployment wherein it is, or will be, located;

(4) No such assistance shall be extended hereunder unless the financial assistance applied for is not otherwise available from private lenders or other Federal agencies on reasonable terms;

(5) No loans shall be made unless it is determined than an immediate participation is not available;

(6) No evidences of indebtedness shall be purchased and no loans shall be made unless it is determined that there is a reasonable assurance of repayment;

(7) No loan, including renewals or extension thereof, may be made hereunder for a period exceeding thirty years and no evidences of indebtedness maturing more than thirty year from date of purchase may be purchased hereunder: *Provided,* That the foregoing restrictions on maturities shall not apply to securities or obligations received by the Secretary as a claimant in bankruptcy or equitable reorganization or as a creditor in other proceedings attendant upon insolvency of the obligor, or if extension or renewal for additional periods, not to exceed, however, a total of ten years, will aid in the orderly liquidation of such loans or of such evidence of indebtedness;

(8) Each loan shall bear interest at a rate equal to the interest rate currently payable under section 108(e) on advances from the Treasury, plus one-half of 1 per centum per annum for administrative expenses and a reserve for losses on loans;

(9)(A) Not less than 15 per centum of the aggregate cost to the applicant (excluding all other Federal aid in connection with the undertaking) of acquiring or developing land and facilities, and of constructing, altering, converting, rehabilitating, or enlarging the building or buildings of the particular project shall be supplied by the State or any agency, instrumentality, or political subdivision thereof, or by a community or area organization, as equity capital or as a loan repayable only after the financial assistance hereunder has been repaid in full according to the terms thereof and, if such loan is secured, its security shall be subordinate and inferior to the lien or liens securing the financial assistance hereunder;

(B) Of the remaining 85 per centum of the aggregate cost, 35 per centum of the aggregate cost may be loaned by the Secretary under the terms of this Act and security for such a loan may be subordinate and inferior to the lien or liens which secure any loan or financing other than funds required by section 107(b)(9)(A).

(C) Loans shall not be available hereunder unless other funds are available in an amount which, together with assistance provided hereunder and funds provided under section 107(b)(9)(A), shall be sufficient to pay such aggregate cost; and

(10) No such assistance shall be extended unless there shall be submitted to and approved by the Secretary an overall program

for the economic development of the area and a finding by the State, or any agency, instrumentality, or local political subdivision thereof, that the project for which financial assistance is sought is consistent with such program: *Provided*, That nothing in this Act shall authorize financial assistance for any project prohibited by laws of the State or local political subdivision in which the project would be located.

AREA ASSISTANCE FUND

SEC. 108. (a) There is hereby authorized to be established in the Treasury of the United States a revolving fund to be known as the area assistance fund (hereinafter referred to as the "fund"), which shall be available to the Secretary for the payment of all obligations and expenses in connection with the loans authorized under section 101(b)(2).

(b) When requested by the Secretary, advances shall be made to the fund from the appropriations made therefor. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the purpose of making advances to the fund, without fiscal year limitation, an amount not exceeding $75,000,000.

(c) Receipts arising from the loan program shall be credited to the fund.

(d) Any moneys in the fund determined by the Secretary to be in excess of current needs shall be credited to the appropriation from which advanced to be held for future advances to the fund.

(e) There shall be paid into miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury at the close of each fiscal year interest on advances to the fund at rates which shall be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury at the time the advances or commitments for advances are made after taking into consideration the current average market yields of outstanding marketable obligations of the United States having maturities comparable to loans made by the Secretary.

(f) Contributions shall be made from the fund to the civil service retirement and disability fund, on the basis of annual billings as determined by the Civil Service Commission, for the Government's share of the cost of the civil service retirement system applicable to employees (and their beneficiaries) performing activities authorized under section 101(b)(2). Contributions shall also be made to the employee's compensation fund, on the basis of annual billings as determined by the Secretary of Labor, for the benefit payments made from such fund on account of employees performing activities authorized under section 101(b)(2). The annual billings shall also include a statement of the fair portion of the cost of the administration of the respective funds, which shall be paid by the Secretary into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

TERMINATION OF ELIGIBILITY FOR FURTHER ASSISTANCE

SEC. 109. Whenever the Administrator shall determine that employment conditions within any area previously designated by him as an area of substantial and persistent unemployment have changed to such an extent that such area is no longer eligible for such designation under section 101(a) of this Act, no further assistance shall be granted under this Act, with respect to such area and, for the purposes of this Act, such area shall not be considered an area of substantial and persistent unemployment: *Provided*, That nothing contained herein shall—

(a) prevent any such area from again being designated an area of substantial and persistent unemployment under section 101(a) of this Act if the Administrator determines it to be eligible under such section, or

(b) affect the validity of any contracts or undertakings with respect to such area which were entered into pursuant to this Act prior to a determination by the Administrator that such area no longer qualifies as an area of substantial and persistent unemployment. The Administrator shall keep the departments and agencies of the Federal Government, and interested State or local agencies, advised at all times of any changes made hereunder with respect to the designation of any area.

BUDGET AND AUDIT

SEC. 110. In the performance of and with respect to the functions, powers, and duties vested in him by section 107 of this Act, the Secretary shall—

(a) prepare annually and submit a budget program as provided for wholly owned government corporations by the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended; and

(b) maintain a set of accounts which shall be audited annually by the General Accounting Office in accordance with the principles and procedures applicable to commercial transactions as provided by the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended, and no other audit shall be required: *Provided*, That the Secretary with respect to the program of financial assistance authorized by section 101(b)(2) shall determine the character of and the necessity for obligations and expenditures and the manner in which they shall be incurred, allowed, and paid, subject to provisions of law specifically applicable to Government corporations.

AREA ASSISTANCE ADMINISTRATOR

SEC. 111. There shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate an Area Assistance Administrator in the Department of Commerce who shall receive compensation at a rate equal to that received by Assistant Secretaries of Commerce. The Administrator shall perform such duties in the execution of this Act as the Secretary may assign.

POWERS

SEC. 112. In the performance of, and with respect to the functions, powers, and duties vested in him under this Act, the Secretary may—

(a) adopt, alter, and use a seal, which shall be judicially noticed; and subject to the civil service and classification laws, select, employ, appoint, and fix the compensation of such officers, employees, attorneys, and agents as shall be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act, and define their authority and duties;

(b) hold such hearings, sit and act at such times and places, and take such testimony, as he may deem advisable;

(c) under such regulations as he may prescribe, make such findings and determinations as may be required for the proper administration of this Act and such findings and determinations, together with those required to be made by the Secretary of Labor pursuant to section 102 hereof, shall be final and shall not be subject to review in any court by mandamus or otherwise: *Provided*, That with respect to the validity, effect, and enforcement of section 101(b)(2) hereof or security taken thereunder, statutes, rules, and regulations pertaining generally to suits by and against the United States shall be applicable;

(d) under regulations prescribed by him, assign or sell at public or private sale, or otherwise dispose of for cash or credit, in his discretion and upon such terms and conditions and for such consideration as the Secretary shall determine to be reasonable, any evidence of debt, contract, claim, personal property, or security assigned to or held by him in connection with the payment of loans granted under this title, and to collect or compromise all obligations assigned to or held by him and all legal or equitable rights accruing to him in connection with the payment of such loans until such time as such obligation may be referred to the Attorney General for suit or collection;

(e) deal with, complete, renovate, improve, modernize, insure, rent, or sell for cash or credit, upon such terms and conditions and for such consideration as the Secretary shall determine to be reasonable, any real property conveyed to or otherwise acquired by him in connection with the payment of loans granted under this title;

(f) pursue to final collection by way of compromise or other administrative action prior to reference to the Attorney General, all claims against third parties assigned to the Secretary in connection with loans made by him. Section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (41 U.S.C. 5), shall not be construed to apply to any contract of hazard insurance or to any purchase or contract for services or supplies on account of property obtained by the Secretary as a result of loans made under this title if the premium therefor or the amount thereof does not exceed $1,000. The power to convey and to execute in the name of the Secretary deeds of conveyance, deeds of release, assignments and satisfactions of mortgages, and any other written instrument relating to real property or any interest therein acquired by the Secretary pursuant to the provisions of this title may be exercised by the Secretary or by any officer or agent appointed by him for the purpose;

(g) acquire, in any lawful manner, any property (real, personal, or mixed, tangible or intangible), whenever deemed necessary or appropriate to the conduct of the activities authorized in section 101(b)(2) of this Act; and

(h) in addition to any powers, functions, privileges, and immunities otherwise vested in him, take any and all actions, including the procurement of the services of attorneys by contract, determined by him to be necessary or desirable in making, servicing, compromising, modifying, liquidating, or otherwise administratively dealing with or realizing on loans made or securities acquired under the provisions of this title: *Provided*, That no attorney's services shall be produced by contract in any office where an attorney or attorneys are or can be economically employed full time to render such service.

ADVISORY BOARD

SEC. 113. To advise the Secretary in the performance of functions authorized by this Act, there is authorized to be created an Area Assistance Advisory Board, hereinafter referred to as the "Board", which shall consist of the following members, all ex officio: The Secretary, as Chairman, the Secretaries of Agriculture, Health, Education, and Welfare, Labor, and Treasury, the Administrators of the Housing and Home Finance Agency and of the Small Business Administration. The Chairman may from time to time invite the participation of officials of other agencies of the executive branch interested in the functions herein authorized. Each member of the Board may designate an officer of his agency to act for him as a member of the Board with respect to any matter there considered.

DEPOSITARIES AND AGENTS

SEC. 114. The Federal Reserve banks are authorized and directed to act as custodians and fiscal agents for the Secretary in the general performance of the powers conferred by this title. Each Federal Reserve bank shall be entitled to be reimbursed for all expenses incurred as such fiscal agents. Any banks insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, when designated by the Secretary of the Treasury, may act as custodians and depositaries for the Secretary.

PENALTIES

SEC. 115. With respect to financial assistance authorized by this Act:

(a) Whoever makes any statement knowing it to be false, or whoever willfully overvalues any security, for the purpose of obtaining for himself or for any applicant any loan, or extension thereof by renewal defer-

ment of action, or otherwise, or the acceptance, release, or substitution of security therefor, or the purpose of influencing in any way the action of the Secretary, or for the purpose of obtaining money, property, or anything of value, under this Act, shall be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000 or by imprisonment for not more than five years, or both.

(b) Whoever, being connected in any capacity with the Secretary—

(1) embezzles, abstracts, purloins, or willfully misapplies any moneys, funds, securities, or other things of value, whether belonging to him or pledged or otherwise entrusted to him, or

(2) with intent to defraud the Secretary or any other body politic or corporate, or any individual, or to deceive any officer, auditor, or examiner of the Secretary makes any false entry in any book, report, or statement of or to the Secretary, or without being duly authorized, draws any order or issues, puts forth, or assigns any note, debenture, bond, or other obligation, or draft bill of exchange, mortgage, judgment, or decree thereof, or

(3) with intent to defraud participates, shares, receives directly or indirectly any money, profit, property, or benefit through any transaction, loan, commission, contract, or any other act of the Secretary, or

(4) gives any unauthorized information concerning any future action or plan of the Secretary which might affect the value of securities, or, having such knowledge, invests or speculates, directly or indirectly, in the securities or property of any company or corporation receiving loans or other assistance from the Secretary shall be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000 or by imprisonment for not more than five years, or both.

(c) As used in this section, the term "Secretary" shall mean, with respect to the lending activities of the Housing and Home Finance Administrator authorized under this Act, the Housing and Home Finance Administrator.

USE OF OTHER FACILITIES

SEC. 116. (a) To avoid duplication of activities and minimize expense in carrying out the provisions of this Act, the Secretary shall to the extent practicable and with their consent use the available services and facilities of other agencies and instrumentalities of the Federal Government on a reimbursable basis.

(b) Departments and agencies of the Federal Government shall exercise their powers, duties, and functions in such manner as will assist in carrying out the objectives of this Act. This Act shall be supplemental to any existing authority and nothing herein shall be deemed to be restrictive of any existing powers, duties, and functions of any other department or agency of the Federal Government.

CONSULTANTS

SEC. 117. The Secretary is authorized to obtain services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55(a)), at rates not to exceed $75 per diem for individuals.

ANNUAL REPORT

SEC. 118. The Secretary shall make a comprehensive annual report of his operations under this Act for the fiscal year ending on the preceding June 30, to the President, for transmission to the Congress as soon as practicable in each year, but in no case later than the third day of the following January.

AUTHORIZATIONS FOR APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 119. In addition to appropriations specifically authorized by sections 106 and 108, appropriations are further authorized for the carrying out of other provisions and purposes of this Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the minority leader desire to avail himself of additional time?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, if the minority leader has a speaker ready, I shall be glad to defer to him.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I thank the minority leader for yielding me time to speak on the President's veto of S. 722.

I shall vote to override the President's veto of S. 722. Since 1957, I have supported bills to provide assistance to the depressed areas of the United States; in fact, I am one of the original cosponsors of S. 722, the bill which has been vetoed and about which we are speaking today.

In 1959, the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] asked me to join with him in sponsoring S. 722. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], and I introduced S. 722. I have supported this bill and similar legislation as strongly as I could with my votes, in many speeches on the Senate floor, and in consultations with the President of the United States.

I do not intend today to speak at length or in detail concerning the reasons which have led me to support legislation to assist areas of chronic unemployment in the United States. In simple language, I have done so because I know that thousands of men and women are out of work in the depressed areas—some in cities, others in rural communities, many in semirural communities, such as the areas in which the coal industry operates. These people are out of work without fault of their own. Technological changes in industry, mechanization, automation, and the shift of industry from one section of the country to another, have put these people out of work.

The dynamism of our economy and the more effective use of tools—the very factors which have increased the wealth of most of our people in most of the areas of the Nation, have brought unemployment to thousands in the depressed areas.

It has been my position that the growing wealth and prosperity of the Nation, its increased production, its large increase in wages to the organized workers of the country, the increase in personal income and in corporate profits, the increase in investment, and the higher standards of living which have been enjoyed, yes, since 1953, by most of the people of the Nation, are reasons which make it more imperative that those who have prospered and that a rich Nation take action to assist their fellow countrymen who have been left behind in the march of progress.

I have never considered the area redevelopment bill the only means of providing help to these depressed areas and needy people, and I do not believe that my cosponsors have argued that the bill is the perfect answer. But the bill is one means, and it is the only instrument now before the Congress. For that reason, I was glad to cosponsor and to support the bill.

Today, because this bill is one instrument available to us to help those who are in dire need, and because of the prosperity of the great part of the Nation, I think it just, human, and decent to provide a means of developing the areas which have been left behind in the great march of progress in our country.

Therefore, Mr. President, I shall vote to override the President's veto.

Without further discussion of my reasons for supporting S. 722, for I have elaborated them many times in the last 2 years—I now turn to the future.

I think it is generally assumed that the Senate will sustain today the President's veto. The question which then will arise is, What will the Congress and what will the administration do about this problem? Shall we forget it? Shall we sweep it under the rug? Shall we treat it as a political issue? It is a political issue, and I am not so naive as to think it is not. But the fact that it is a political issue is not an argument for deferring until after the November election action to help those who are in need. It would be cynical and cruel if the Congress and, I may say the administration did not work together to produce, this year, a bill to give assistance to these areas. It would be cynical if the veto and the vote on this bill were used simply for politics alone—and no further effort made to secure a bill.

So, Mr. President, I shall appeal, as I have done before, to the majority leader of the Senate, to the majority leader of the House to the minority leader of the Senate, to the minority leader of the House, and to the President of the United States to consult and to see whether it is possible to agree and work out a bill which can be passed before this session of Congress adjourns.

During the last month I have talked twice with the President of the United States about this legislation. The President told me that he favored legislation, and that he hoped appropriate legislation to assist the depressed areas could be passed.

I find some comfort in section VI of the President's veto message, in which the President says:

> Moreover, during the process of developing a new bill I would hope that in other areas of past differences solutions could be found satisfactory to both the Congress and the Executive.

I would say to my cosponsors and to my friends on the majority side, with whom I have worked so hopefully for 2 years in an effort to secure the enactment of this bill—and they know that I have been loyal in my efforts—that the amount authorized by the bill should not be the decisive factor at issue, because it is hardly probable that a large amount could be allocated and put to work in the next fiscal year.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time yielded to the Senator from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. COOPER. May I have 3 additional minutes?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 3 additional minutes to the Senator from Kentucky.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky is recognized for 3 additional minutes.

Mr. COOPER. On the other side, I point out that the proposal of the administration that the States or local communities advance 66⅔ percent of the cost of a project is, to my mind, unrealistic. The very fact that these communities are depressed and their tax bases are in consequence adversely affected, make it impossible for such communities to advance two-thirds of the amount needed to initiate business projects.

I hope the administration and the President of the United States will accept the provision of Senate bill 722 that only one-third of the cost shall be advanced from local resources.

Mr. President, while I stand firm in my belief that Senate bill 722 should have been approved by the President, I now urge my colleagues and the leadership on both sides of the aisle to consult with the President during the few weeks remaining in this session of Congress, to agree upon a bill which can be passed, one which will initiate a program that will bring help and relief to those who are out of work. Men and women are out of work, and they and their children are in need; surely they should be the objects of our thoughts today and in the remaining weeks of this session of Congress.

So, Mr. President, I shall not vote reluctantly to override the veto. I vote to override it because a program should be started, and to voice my concern that we take steps to help those who are unemployed and do not share in the general prosperity of the Nation.

I plead with my colleagues and with the leadership to do something in the days which lie ahead to produce a bill which can be passed and approved before this session of Congress adjourns.

At a later date I will speak again, as I have spoken several times during the session, on the elements of a Federal-State program to build up the basic resources of such coal mining areas as eastern Kentucky, West Virginia, and Pennsylvania.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, the veto message sent to Congress by President Eisenhower when he returned the area redevelopment bill has little relationship to the needs the bill is aimed to meet.

I recommend to my colleagues the analysis of the President's veto message delivered in this Chamber on May 16 by the senior Senator from Pennsylvania. They will find it on page 10325 of that day's RECORD. I wholeheartedly agree with Senator CLARK that the six points made by the President beg the issue and miss the point.

The point of this dispute, Mr. President, is this: In this country there are hundreds of areas which need help. They are depressed through no fault of their own. The changing economy and the changing utilization of resources and automation have thrown many out of work.

One of our great national challenges is to increase our productivity. We must keep ahead of the Soviet Union, which we are told is increasing its output by something like 7 percent a year, as compared to our 2½ percent.

But, more than this, we must make our economy fit the needs of our people. It does not meet the needs when millions are unemployed and—worse—unemployable because of industrial changes and because they therefore need retraining.

A great national problem was created when changing industry, migrating industry, and displaced industry left areas full of willing workers no longer competent to contribute to their country's strength and well-being. The most notable example of this has been in the coal mining industry. But it is by no means solely confined to that industry.

This bill is a step toward meeting the national need in this regard. I do not say it is an adequate bill. But it is moderate and it is a step. To end up with no bill, should the President's veto be sustained, or to end up with one scaled down to meet the administration's pygmy requests, would be tragic in the one case and most inadequate in the other.

The vetoed bill would set up a small administrative organization to handle the problem.

It defines areas in need of redevelopment—both urban and rural—and proposes to assist them through loans and participation by the Federal Government.

It will provide low-cost loans and grants to local governments to develop badly needed public facilities.

It provides for gathering of information for depressed areas.

It provides technical assistance to determine needs and set up programs in distressed areas.

It continues the urban renewal programs which have been so successful in rebuilding blighted areas in cities and towns.

Most important, it provides for vocational training for persons who became unemployed by virtue of changing industry in their area.

The bill gives the depressed areas of the Nation an opportunity to retrain their people for new endeavors. It will help industries rebuild themselves. It will help communities rebuild themselves. Most of the cost of the programs—which the President finds excessive, but which I feel is quite the contrary—will be repayed.

I think this is sound national policy. Without it our efforts to keep abreast of Soviet strength will be badly crippled. Even the President recognizes that area redevelopment is sound national policy. But he says redevelopment should be accomplished locally, with local funds. Every expert on local scenes tells us this is impossible.

Even though I look upon this program as sound national policy, Mr. President, I want to add that few States are in as great a need for it as is my State of Tennessee.

We have two major areas in need of redevelopment help: the Chattanooga and Knoxville sections.

We have two smaller areas of great need: La Follette-Jellico-Tazewell and Bristol-Johnson City-Kingsport.

In addition, 41 of our rural counties are in need of help and would qualify under terms of the bill which Mr. Eisenhower has vetoed.

In all, a total of 1,500,000 Tennesseans reside in these areas. This is 44 percent of my State's population:

In last year's Senate Banking and Currency Committee hearings on this bill, three distinguished Tennessee officials appeared to urge enactment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RANDOLPH in the chair). The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I yield an additional half minute to the Senator from Tennessee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee is recognized for an additional half minute.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Herbert J. Bingham, executive secretary of the Tennessee Municipal League; Hugh Heatherly, city recorder of La Follette; and Mayor Dwain Peterman of Livingston, told about the depression in the State, especially in the coal mining regions of eastern Tennessee.

They pointed out the staggering loss which the State has incurred in migration of young people—255,000 in the years 1950 through 1957 alone.

They pointed out the folly in the past of trying to finance redevelopment on strictly State and local bases.

They showed that the State of Tennessee and these specific communities simply have not got the resources to do the job alone.

Mayor Peterman summarized their presentation. He said simply: "We need help."

Mr. President, there are areas in every State of our Union which echo his words: "We need help."

We must meet this national problem by voting to pass this measure despite the President's objections.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, as a cosponsor of the area redevelopment bill, I was much disappointed that the President saw fit to veto it again.

I cannot agree with the President that many of the economic difficulties covered by this bill are temporary.

Nor do I agree that the bill would impair local initiative. It would, in fact, increase it.

I have been in many distressed areas in the last few months, and have talked with many of the people concerned with their development.

They do not lack initiative. They lack money.

And that is precisely what this bill, vetoed by the President, would provide.

Experience has shown that if it is to attract industry, a community must offer good living as well as good business.

It takes more than a new factory building, ready for occupancy. It takes roads, schools, sewers, playgrounds, plus all the other things which make any town a good place in which to live and work.

One of the best investments we can make is in job security for working people.

A plan that will create jobs for American workers is a gilt-edged, blue-chip investment. This is true because the American worker outproduces every other in the world.

Since our Nation is now producing at the rate of $500 billion a year, surely we can afford to insure that no area of this country—and no family—need live under the cruel cloud of continued high unemployment.

Personal security is as important to our freedom as national security.

To attain this job security, every man and woman willing to work should be able to work—at a wage consistent with self-respect.

But the basic question is not whether we spend this money, but how we spent it.

Do we invest it in new jobs and prosperity, as this bill would do? Or do we give it out for relief, unemployment compensation, and the other medications of a sick economy?

Surely, every American would choose the prosperity of production to the emptiness of idleness.

This must be the choice, if ours is to remain the No. 1 economy, symbol of the good life to all the world.

Therefore, I urge we vote to override this veto, and get on with this redevelopment project, which has been stalled for so long.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I yield 4 minutes to the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I quote a United Press International News Service story, dated May 21, 1960:

PITTSBURGH.—West Virginia, as a result of the 1960 census, will lose at least one of its congressional seats because of declining population, it was revealed here today.

Regional census Director Edgar L. Bryan also said that when complete figures are in from all parts of the country, the Mountain State might lose two of its Representatives.

Although census figures are not expected to be completed for several weeks, Bryan said there was no doubt West Virginia would lose at least one of its seats in Congress.

To magnify this story, I point to the Fifth District of West Virginia. Three of the seven counties in this southern West Virginia district have lost a total of over 40,000 citizens in the past 10 years.

The basic reason for this population loss is the lack of employment opportunities in this particular area.

I use the loss of population in the State of West Virginia as an example of what is happening in some parts of the country.

The President objects to several aspects of S. 722. He says we should not have a program for rural areas in this country suffering from chronic unemployment. It would be well to note that during the tenure of the present administration farm income has fallen precipitately. On the average, income for the 4,600,000 farms in America was $32 a week. This is almost unbelievable; but last year the total farm income was only $11 billion. Take away the food grown on the farm and the rental value of the farm housing and that figure drops to $7½ billion. The picture would not be so dark were the rural areas to receive aid for industrial development.

The President does not agree with that section of the bill which provides for the retraining of workers. We must be farsighted enough to realize that unskilled workers, and those with specialized skills, are being displaced by machines. A worker may spend a lifetime learning a trade, and then see that trade, or skill, become obsolete overnight. Not only does this worker have to be retrained in another skill; but there are those workers who must be trained to operate in an automated factory or office. There must be a balance between the number of jobs available and the number of jobseekers. Jobseekers must be equipped to perform in new jobs.

This bill would not provide for Federal handouts, as some opponents say. This would be an investment in the future of the country. Benefits would redound to the people and also to the Federal Government.

Mr. President, we have been asked to provide in excess of $4 billion to help people overseas; yet, the President proposes an area redevelopment measure of $53 million here at home. He continues to call for an effective bill—Congress gives him this bill—he does an about-face and vetoes it.

The people of this country want depressed areas legislation. The people of this country wanted the President to sign the bill. Congress met its challenge. The President did not. It is up to Congress, therefore, to override the veto of Senate bill 722.

As of May 1960, there were 40 major areas and over 100 so-called minor areas which could have qualified for loans under this bill. For this reason alone there is certainly need for such legislation.

We are considered the richest nation in the world; yet, we do not meet this responsibility. The civil needs of this country must be met. Not only is Senate bill 722 a sound business investment, but it is also humanitarian in its results.

I urge that this Chamber override the President's veto of the depressed areas legislation.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. May I ask how much time we have remaining and how much time the minority leader has remaining.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In answer to the Senator from Illinois, the Senator has control of 14 minutes and the minority leader has control of 27 minutes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I wonder if the minority leader would be good enough to use some of his time?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished junior Senator from New York.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I regret that I find myself in disagreement with the conclusions which the President has reached with respect to this legislation.

I voted against the original area redevelopment bill last year, because I felt it not only went too far, but also was not soundly conceived, and the formula under which the money would have been apportioned to the various States was not a sound one. The vetoed bill, speaking parochially for a moment, would affect and benefit 20 communities in the State of New York, which I ask unanimous consent to outline in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNG of Ohio in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New York?

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

New York State communities which would qualify under the requirements contained in the pending bill, according to statistics supplied by the Department of Labor: Albany, Amsterdam, Auburn, Beacon, Buffalo, Dunkirk, Elmira, Gloversville, Jamestown, Malone, Massena, Middletown, Newburgh, Ogdensburg, Plattsburg, Rome, Schenectady, Troy, Utica, Wellsville.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, a most significant feature of the measure now under consideration is the fact that it would provide substantial help to these many harder hit communities in my State. In this respect it is thus a great improvement over the limited number of areas which would have benefited under the original bill considered by the Senate last year.

This bill is also a great improvement in terms of the formula under which funds would be supplied to New York State. Whereas most Federal programs are rigged in such a way as to give my State very much the short end of the stick, this bill provides a much more equitable means of apportioning funds. It gives my State a much better break than usual.

Mr. President, we are enjoying the greatest prosperity in our history. Every index of economic activity is up. Employment is up. It does remain a fact that there are certain areas where there are pockets of unemployment, pockets of poverty, in this country. I believe it to be a legitimate and necessary function of government and a matter of both local

and national concern if there is any single man or woman who wants a job—who is ready, able, and willing to work—who cannot find employment. I feel strongly that we should act to provide needed relief to these critical areas of our country.

I have toured through my own State in some of these areas and have witnessed at first hand the need for assistance, which is very real and very pressing. The most significant and fundamental problem which arises is the human suffering which results from having large numbers of persons out of work in limited areas of chronic economic difficulty. The dignity and, in fact, the physical well-being of the affected workers and their families are the real test of the need for this proposed legislation.

In a related sense, Mr. President, this measure is sound because it does not in any way contemplate that affected areas should become "wards" of the Federal Government. I could not for a moment dream of such an arrangement, nor would the communities involved.

We need above all to get these areas over the hump—to give them the technical assistance and loanable funds which will enable them to revitalize and revive their ailing economies. It is clearly both preferable and more economical to provide helpful loans than it is to pass out public relief checks in these depressed areas.

Of course, this bill is no panacea. It merely provides for a little wherewithal by means of which these areas can and should be better able to help themselves. It also contains protections against the pirating of industries between States. This is very important and is another reason why this legislation is a very definite improvement over the original bill submitted to us for action.

Mr. President, the doctor has been diagnosing the disease for many months. He has a pretty good idea as to the type of medicine which will help. But he knows that the real and long-run cure depends in the final analysis upon the spirit and desire of the patient.

I believe the measure before us represents a proper vehicle for promoting the economic well-being this Nation needs. It represents a way to do it in line with the proper diagnoses which have been made.

This measure is a moderate but substantial means for the Federal Government to live up to its national responsibilities to eliminate those pockets of unemployment where joblessness has become chronic and depressing. It is not a budget-busting measure. It does meet the human and economic realities of this problem.

I regret we are going through the motions through which we are going. I see no great purpose to be served by this, because it is obvious there are not sufficient votes to override the veto.

For this reason, I am far more concerned about further action on legislation in this field this year than I am about today's vote. I hope the relevant committees of Congress will now get down to work, taking the administration's new bill as the basis for action. What we need is a sound and effective measure that can be passed, that will be signed into law, and that will go into effect very shortly to help these tragic areas of chronic unemployment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from New York has expired.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Illinois.

I was shocked and disturbed when I learned of the President's veto of S. 722. His ill-timed and ill-considered veto came on the heels of a legislative message in which the President asked for a bill to help economically depressed areas to help themselves.

This bill would do exactly that. It represents a bare minimum program. It is, in the first place, an authorization bill and not an appropriation measure. In the second place, $4 out of every $5 authorized are for loans and not grants. These loans would have to be repaid with interest by local communities which need these funds to augment what they have been able to raise themselves to rebuild sick economies.

Anyone who has availed himself of the opportunity to read figures knows, Mr. President, that there are 31 chronic and acute depressed areas in our country today. Unemployment is about 4 million—more than 5 percent of the available labor force. Regardless of honeyed words and slogans about prosperity and figures from profit statements of certain corporations, a great portion of our Nation is not sharing in this abundance. On the closing day of the first session of this Congress, we in the Senate adopted a resolution directing the establishment of a committee to study unemployment in this country and to report to the Senate. I was named as a member of this committee, which thereafter studied unemployment problems in many sections of the United States—North, South, East and West. It was my privilege to participate in more of the field hearings than any other member.

Certainly no one who heard the pleas of the jobless, who viewed the empty stores and factories, the abandoned mines and silent railroads, who listened to stark statistics and stared into eyes of men whose jobs no longer exist could vote to sustain such a veto. These people do not want handouts. They get surplus food, barely enough to keep their bodies functioning, but food all the same. They have had unemployment benefits. They have walked the streets in search of work. They seek no more handouts. They simply want jobs to be available. They are willing to do almost anything simply to be able to work for a living.

Now, the Committee on Unemployment Problems received a substantial appropriation to study the plight of the jobless, and then was given an additional sum with which to continue certain operations beyond its originally scheduled life. Meanwhile, it has reported findings to the Senate, many of which were agreed to by both majority and minority members. Among these unanimous findings was the need for an area redevelopment bill.

Was the establishment of this committee, a move supported unanimously by the Senate, a mere idle gesture? Was it merely sop for the 4 million unemployed? If it was merely that and nothing more, it was a waste of time, energy and money. When I sacrificed many days of a vacation period to gather information and to help prepare reports, I felt I was serving a great national need. If the veto is sustained today, there are many who will believe with some cause that our work was, indeed, in vain.

We learned as we traveled the country for these hearings that most of the chronic unemployment areas have tried mightily to help themselves. We learned that some have been successful. We learned that fierce local pride in a few areas among a few organizations resisted any Federal aid. But, by and large, we learned that aid from the Federal Government was solicited and needed.

In my own State of Indiana, there are 5 communities listed among the 31 of the Nation which are severe depressed areas. Many more barely escaped this list.

Permit me for a moment, Mr. President, to point out the particular plight of one city—my own hometown of Evansville. A series of events over which the community itself had no control resulted in the loss, during a comparatively short period, of some 20,000 industrial jobs in a city of 140,000 persons. This city then undertook a complete community evaluation survey. Following this, $1 million in private capital was raised for potential industrial expansion and $300,000 for small business risk capital. This has not been enough to solve the problem since workers must be retrained and since unemployment is a problem that knows no community or State boundaries.

It is obvious that the country has an obligation to assist those communities which need help. This is no less a crying need than that which the administration sees as an obligation abroad. It is difficult for me to see how we can justify assisting sick areas overseas while denying sick areas in this country a modest domestic point 4 program. Frankly, our own unemployed, our own suffering businessmen, see their own communities as underdeveloped and in need of assistance. In the name of decency and justice, we must help them.

I hope that all Senators will put aside their feelings of partisanship or their feelings of kinship for the President and will recognize that his veto has been ill-advised. I hope the Senators will support an authorization for loans and grants to needy American communities to help themselves.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MANSFIELD in the chair). The Senator from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, we have only one speaker remaining on this side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The senior Senator from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, in the language of checkers, I think it is the move of the minority leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority leader says he has only one other speaker.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Very well. Since I am forced to use up our time I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING].

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, in his message returning without approval S. 722, a bill of which I was happy to be a cosponsor, the President had this to say with respect to one part of the Congress-passed area redevelopment program.

> S. 722 would authorize Federal loans for the acquisition of machinery and equipment to manufacturers locating in eligible areas. Loans for machinery and equipment are unnecessary, unwise and costly.

These were to be loans repayable in American dollars. Still the President was against them.

A week ago Monday I indicated what the Eisenhower-Nixon administration, operating under its double standard, is telling Congress it must approve to the last penny—or face a special session.

I mentioned two projects which the Eisenhower-Nixon administration said were not unnecessary—were not unwise—were not costly—even though they were for projects of exactly the same type as those contemplated under S. 722.

At that time I mentioned the loan of $1,350,000 for the Taiwan Aluminum Corporation, repayable in 5 years in New Taiwan dollars.

At that time I mentioned a loan of $5 million to India, repayable in 15 years in Indian rupees.

It puzzles me—this double standard. It also nauseates me.

I have been for some time now searching for the distinction between what the Eisenhower-Nixon administration opposes at home but not only proposes, but also insists upon abroad. What can be the basis for this distinction? Does a project take on some special aura because it is to be carried out in some far distant foreign clime?

What is the factor missing from domestic projects? Can it be, perhaps, that the Eisenhower-Nixon administration is opposed to loans repayable in American dollars but prefers loans repayable in soft foreign currencies?

A look at the steadily mounting public debt, at the mounting interest rates, at the Eisenhower-Nixon administration's hard money policies, would cause one to doubt that this can be the explanation for the double standard.

Let us look further. Perhaps an answer can be found if we can but examine another example or two.

Let us consider the loan, under the Development Loan Fund, of $2,800,000 to Turkey for the Koruma insecticide plant. This is repayable in 10 years at 5¾ percent in Turkish lira. What is the money to be used for? Information from the fund states:

> This loan is to be utilized to import machinery and equipment needed to construct a chemical plant for insecticides and related byproduct chemicals.

This also is for a project which would be permitted under S. 722 but which the Eisenhower-Nixon administration has branded as "unnecessary, unwise, and costly" if it were to be carried out at home.

Even after examining this additional foreign project, Mr. President, I must confess that I can still find no reason for the distinction between domestic and foreign projects which would explain the strange attitude of the Eisenhower-Nixon administration favoring foreign projects.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I yield 1 additional minute to the Senator from Alaska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska is recognized for 1 additional minute.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I will further confess that after careful examination of the many projects contained in this book setting forth the fiscal 1961 estimates of the Development Loan Fund, a summary of which I inserted in the RECORD, Monday, May 16. I can still find no reason for the distinction which the Eisenhower-Nixon administration makes between what is needed at home and on what it insists must be given abroad. I for one can discover no reason for such a distinction and I think the American people, when this matter is brought to their attention, will come to the same conclusion.

I could go on indefinitely citing the contradictions of the double standard of the Eisenhower-Nixon administration.

Mr. President, the foreign aid program, is carried on by this administration, is essentially an area development program, but it is an area development program for 104 foreign countries, and we are enjoined by the administration not to cut that program a nickel. If we do, we are threatened with a special session of Congress.

The difference between the program which is sacrosanct in the eyes of the Eisenhower administration and the one before us is that few loans under the foreign aid program are repayable. It consists largely of grants, is badly administered, is gaining the United States few friends, and is 25 times the size of the program which we are considering for our own people at home. So I shall vote to override the veto, calling attention to the undeniable, unanswerable, and irrefutable fact that the Eisenhower-Nixon administration will go down in American history as the first administration to prefer the interests of the people of other lands to the interests of the American people.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, since I understand I have only 7 minutes remaining and the minority leader has 24 minutes remaining, I suggest that he use some of his remaining time.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I shall use all of my remaining time at one time, and I respectfully suggest that the proponents of overriding the veto conclude their argument now, and then I shall conclude my argument to sustain the veto.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MANSFIELD in the chair). Does the Senator from Illinois wish to be recognized?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state to the Senator from Illinois that a time certain has been set for the vote at 2 p.m. If there is a quorum call now, the time for such a quorum call will come out of his time. To rescind the order for the quorum call would require unanimous consent, which might possibly not be forthcoming.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, we have been engaged in an extraordinary debate, in which the defenders of the President have really not tried to discuss the bill or justify his actions. Three of the Senators to whom time has been assigned by the minority leader have, in fact, spoken in favor of overriding the veto. I believe only two Republican Senators spoke in favor of sustaining the veto. We have been forced into a situation in which we are using up our time and our opponents are holding back, reserving their remaining time for a final speech. The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], who was to conclude the debate for us, is on his way to the Senate Chamber. I suggest, in the interest of good sportsmanship, that the minority leader use some time now and then allow the Senator from Minnesota to speak when he arrives, and then my colleague will have an opportunity to conclude the debate.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, only one speaker will address the Senate on behalf of those who wish to sustain the veto, and that will be the minority leader. I prefer to make my remarks continuous and consecutive, and for that reason I respectfully insist that the proponents use their time and then I shall conclude the debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. What is the pleasure of the Senate?

Mr. DOUGLAS. The minority leader is pointing a pistol at our heads. He has so manipulated the discussion as to insist upon closing the debate. The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] is on his way to the Senate Chamber.

I wonder whether the minority leader would give us a philosophical discussion of the double standard followed by the Eisenhower administration?

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] yield to me?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I do not have the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair wishes to inform the Senator that time is running. The Chair would like to suggest that the time remaining be split into two equal parts, if that is agreeable.

Mr. DIRKSEN. To that suggestion I must object.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, since the Senator from Minnesota apparently will not reach the floor, I will say that this vote is the real test. Members of the Republican minority can talk all they wish about their desire to have an area redevelopment bill. They have balked at every turn, with the exception of a few very gallant and high-minded Senators on the other side, to whom I individually pay tribute. But these fine Senators have voted to work against the overwhelming majority of the Republican Party, which in this body and the other body has voted in overwhelming proportions against similar bills on every occasion. The President has vetoed such bills twice. Now we have a final chance, and we shall welcome 11th-hour and 59-minute converts. We will welcome them. But I do not wish to hear such talk as, "Oh, we are for a bill. We are for a good bill. If we do not override the President's veto, you must do what we want and agree to the bill that we suggest."

Such procedure is legislation by a minority, and I protest against it, not only for the sake of upholding the dignity of this body, but in the best interests of the people of the United States.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Is it not a fact that, in attempting to reach a compromise position, dollarwise, at least, the Senate has yielded to the extent of $137 million.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is true; and we have also compromised in making these provisions mere authorizations instead of mandates for bond issues.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Is it not a fact that the legislation on which we shall vote within a few minutes, in reference to the President's veto, is in fact a moderate approach to an overriding problem in many sections of the United States?

Is it not also true that a cursory attention to this problem will not suffice? It is a full-time obligation of the Senate to act on a measure of the moderate proportions of the one which we embrace affirmatively in an attempt to override the veto.

I shall also ask the Senator from Illinois this question——

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I rise to a point of order. I have 24 minutes remaining. The vote is scheduled for 2 o'clock. I did not yield any time. I am not accountable for the interplay which was indulged in a moment ago, and I must respectfully insist that I be given my allotted time. If the vote is to be at 2 o'clock, I am entitled to 2 minutes more than the clock presently shows.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I request the opportunity, under a parliamentary inquiry, to say that I did not realize I was transgressing on the time of my friend the minority leader; so if I have failed to observe the rules of debate, I wish to have him understand it was not my intention to do so.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I understand.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I thought I was contributing to the debate under time still remaining under the time controlled by the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair considers himself at fault. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is recognized for 21 minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, in the President's veto message he alludes to the fact that for 5 consecutive years he has asked Congress for legislation in the field of area redevelopment. A bill did get to him in 1958. The amount was rather astronomical. The President found it necessary to veto that bill. Now comes another bill, passed by the Senate and passed by the House, in a reduced amount of $251 million. The President finds a defect here, and I believe he clearly sets out in his veto message what he regards as defective in the bill.

First, he says the bill includes areas of only temporary need, and points out that the number of areas over and above the administration position were doubled.

Second, he says there is an excessive Federal share, and that about 65 percent of Federal funds can be spent under this program, and only 35 percent either from a proprietary interest of States or localities. He points out that that would diminish local initiative.

He says the bill includes machinery and equipment, and that might be considered a subsidy for those who might move into an industrial plant.

The distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] and also the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] undertook to have that provision removed from the bill in the Senate. However, it remains in the bill now, and it was a proper subject for comment by the President.

Fourth, the President points out that grants and loans for public facilities are provided up to 100 percent of the cost, and he points out that there are a great many areas where, because of tax exemptions, it would be possible for them to finance facilities and projects of a public character.

He pointed out also that the facility loan program of the Housing and Home Finance Agency was under way and that an additional $100 million in credit had been requested in the form of an authorization to carry on that program.

Finally he said the bill makes 600 or more rural areas eligible for industrial loans, and then pointed to the authority of the Small Business Administration and also the rural development program to operate in that field.

Then he pointed out that it creates a new agency. That is true. It was the President's desire—and I believe also the desire of others—to have this authority located in the Department of Commerce, rather than to create another agency. Everyone knows the proliferating character of a governmental bureau once it is set up. I believe in that respect the President was on good ground.

He urged action on this Congress in his veto message, and he did say that he would set a broader definition of criteria.

There is a new bill, which has been introduced with cosponsorship, and among other things it includes broader eligibility criteria. It adds 1 major area and 11 smaller areas to the earlier bills. There are $75 million provided in loans for industrial plants. The limits in the bill are set at 35 percent for Federal assistance. Then it doubles the Housing and Home Finance Agency authority for public facilities from $100 to $200 million.

A million and a half dollars are provided for vocational assistance, and a million and a half for technical assistance. There is also an authorization of $2 million for technical aid to rural areas and so-called one-industry towns.

I believe that the President's veto should be sustained, first, because he clearly sets forth defects; secondly, because the attack on the veto thus far has been political in nature.

My distinguished colleague from Illinois, when the veto message was written last week, referred to the message as "ignorant, unduly unctuous, and hypocritical." That is fine language, indeed, to apply to a message from the President of the United States, no matter how one figures it.

It was also said in the course of the Senator's remarks that "in all probability the President did not write the message."

I could point out how many staff members come on the floor to assist Members of the Senate, and I might point out how much assistance is rendered with respect to other statements and speeches and messages that are prepared. Here is the President of 180 million people. I simply say it is in poor grace to say that the President did not write the message. Perhaps he did not. But clearly there was an innuendo in the very statement itself. It was on political grounds also. There was a reference in the speech of last week by my colleague that after the 1959 bill was passed in the Senate, Republican leaders in the House refused to consent to a rule. That puts is squarely on a partisan, political basis.

There is not any question in the mind of anyone who heard the remarks in the Senate this afternoon as to exactly what is being designed.

I sent to the Office of the Official Reporters so that I could quote a little from the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK]. Perhaps I should send for him. However, we have other work to do, we cannot always be sending for Senators. I should like to read from the official transcript a portion of the Senator's remarks:

> I do not want to question anybody's motivation, but again I think it is abundantly clear that any reasonable, intelligent high school youngster would know that there will be no legislation on this subject enacted at this session of Congress. Why? Because it is not possible to get one Republican vote in the House Rules Committee to report a bill in that body. The two southern Demo-

crats and the four northern Republicans are ganging up together to make it impossible to pass any bill of this kind in the House.

"They are ganging up." He does not question the motivation, so he says, but they are ganging up. What do we do when we gang up? Ganging has a peculiar, conspiratorial connotation, if I know anything about the law. However, I will not charge the Senator with the intention to make the implication. I merely say that he is setting the foundation, not I. They set it with a kind of unrestrained language that has been used on the floor. I do not mean to let it go by unchallenged.

My colleague from Illinois referred to the 1959 bill in his address last week, and he came here late in the evening. However I was here and I heard it. There were only a few other Senators on the floor. The Senate was practically vacant, and most of the galleries had been vacated. But with respect to the 1959 bill he said:

There is a coalition of four Republicans and four southern Democrats to prevent a rule.

A coalition, Mr. President——

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, does the Senator deny the truth of my statement?

Mr. DIRKSEN. No; I do not yield. The language speaks for itself. It is in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. How does my distinguished friend from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] think about it?

I have never asked one southern Senator to vote for or against depressed areas legislation. I have never asked one of them to vote one way or the other upon the veto message. But there is my colleague's language. He talks about the message, calling it "ignorant, unduly unctuous, and hypocritical"; and then he talks about a coalition.

Then he goes on to discuss the 1958 bill. The vote was 216 to 170. What was the comment on that vote?

Of the 170 who voted nay, 57 were Democrats—almost all of them southern Democrats.

That is not the language of the majority leader; that is the language of my colleague from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] as it appears in the RECORD. Yes; a coalition; putting it on a strictly political basis, and making light of a serious message by the President of the United States.

Then finally came the vote on Senate bill 722, which passed this body in March and passed the House recently. What was the vote? 202 to 184. It got out of the House by 18 votes. Evidently a number of Members of the House were not persuaded of the merits and the virtues of the bill which was sent to the House and later modified by that body.

What was the vote in the Senate when this bill was passed? We voted on the 23d of March. The bill certainly did not overwhelm the Senate, because the vote was 49 to 46. It got through this body by 3 votes. It got out of the House by 18 votes, despite the frustrations, despite the limitations, despite all the activities at the wailing wall. Evidently there were many Members of the House and Senate who were not persuaded on this point.

The bill which is talked about contains major areas, 40 in number, and 103 smaller areas. What are the major areas? Louisville, Ky. It is no wonder that a distinguished Ohio Representative referred to Louisville as the sweepstakes depressed area.

Atlantic City is included. So are Detroit, Mich.; Albany and Buffalo, N.Y.; Newark, N.J.; and Terre Haute, Ind.

Among the smaller areas, if time permits, I shall refer to only one, in my State, the little town of Olney. The center of population is located at a point, according to the Census Bureau, just a mile north of this town—and it is a lovely town. In the Olney Daily Mail for May 10 a letter was published which refers to an article in the U.S. News and World Report. In the time remaining, let me see if I can read most of it. It is entitled "Well, Come Along," and reads as follows:

At page 125 of the issue of May 16 of the U.S. News & World Report edited by David Lawrence, Olney is referred to as being among the "depressed areas." News to us, Mr. Lawrence. Along with Olney, is placed in the same category our neighbors, Centralia, Harrisburg, Herrin, Murphysboro, West Frankfort, Mount Carmel, and Mount Vernon.

The writer not being too familiar with the prosperity of these neighboring cities, will not venture an opinion as to whether they are depressed areas (which he doubts) or that this designation is just the mouthing of political candidates for office who are trying to garner votes for themselves.

For the information of Mr. Lawrence and any other politicians interested, the combined assets of the two banks in Olney and the Olney Loan & Building Association, as to their last report was $17,652,000 and of this $7,084,000 was in savings accounts.

And that is a little town, Mr. President.

I continue to read:

Is this the earmark of a depressed area?

When it became necessary to raze one schoolhouse and build a new one, to build and equip additions to four schools, repair and equip seven schoolhouses, we didn't go down to Washington and beg for Federal funds. Our citizens last fall voted by a big margin a bond issue of $572,400 and will pay for it out of general taxation.

Is that the earmark of a depressed area?

For several years Olney has been the leader in southeastern Illinois in sales tax collected.

Is this the earmark of a depressed area?

For the further information of the erudite author of the article, Olney has a branch of the International Shoe Co., the Carmi Ainsbrooke factory, both employing numerous people, and a branch of the Prairie Farms Creamery Co., which spends thousands of dollars weekly in payroll and the purchase of milk, the State accounting offices of the General Telephone Co. and many small industries. We could in addition list several oilfields supply and service companies, as well several drilling companies engaged in the drilling of oil wells.

Our chamber of commerce through its activities, is now building a factory for Kex Products, to be occupied this coming fall, at which time it plans to start work upon another factory, which will employ several hundred persons. The money for this is being raised locally, and not by grants from Washington.

Since 1936 the citizens of Richland County have been the recipients of large sums of money monthly for oil royalties, many of its citizens have been employed in the oilfield.

Farmers of the Olney area have been industrious and prosperous, through soil conservation practices, bringing our soil to comparatively high fertility.

Thank you, Mr. Lawrence and your political friends. We are not a depressed area, and we resent your insinuation that we are. We are red-blooded Americans, able to stand upon our own two feet, and we do not ask, seek, or want any dole from the Federal Treasury. If we have any problems, we are fully capable of handling them ourselves.

Mr. President, do they want a bill? The new bill has been introduced. It provides for $80 million. It has been changed in some respects. The machinery and equipment item, to which the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] objected, has been removed. The House version of the bill has been modified and made consistent with the Senate bill. The bill is in the Committee on Banking and Currency. I wrote the chairman of that committee a letter and urged that he summon his committee and take some action on the bill, because it is pending there at present.

I have pointed out what is contained in the bill. For the benefit of the Senate, I shall simply reiterate. It broadens the criteria. It adds 1 new major area and 11 smaller areas to the original administration bill on depressed areas. It provides $75 million in loans for industrial plants. It limits Federal aid to 35 percent. It doubles the authorization from $100 million to $200 million which will be available to the Housing and Home Finance Agency with respect to the program for public facilities.

The bill includes $1,500,000 for vocational training. It includes $1,500,000 for technical assistance. It includes $2 million for technical aid to rural areas and one industrial town.

The bill is pending before a standing committee of the Senate. There is the President's request in the veto message. There he says, "For 5 consecutive years I have asked for legislation, and I hope that before this Congress concludes its labors there will be legislation on this subject."

The bill now before the committee will do the job. Are we going to get action? We have no control of the committee. We have one-third of its membership. What happens finally will have to be energized by the majority. If there is no legislation on this subject, after all these repeated requests, then the responsibility is certainly not on this side of the aisle, because we have asked for legislation and we have refined the bill.

The bill is waiting for action. I earnestly hope that the Committee on Banking and Currency will meet at a very early date, and that the bill will be reported.

Mr. President, the hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, I have completed my statement. I earnestly urge the Senate to sustain the President of the United States, because I think he has made an

effective case in his veto message against the bill which is now before the Senate.

Mr. HUMPHREY subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD prior to the vote on the overriding of the President's veto, my statement on the subject, which urges that the Senate override the President's veto.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUMPHREY

Once again the President has vetoed legislation approved by Congress to bring new life and new hope to thousands of American families in economically depressed communities throughout the Nation.

In so doing, the President ignores the plight of almost 150 American communities with chronic unemployment and lagging economies. He ignores the plight of thousands of men and women without jobs in these depressed and declining communities.

The Department of Labor currently lists 142 areas with substantial unemployment. I have seen the heart-rending human suffering behind the statistics. I have seen this suffering in Duluth and northern Minnesota, and I have seen this suffering in West Virginia and many other communities throughout the Nation.

We have an obligation to assist in alleviating the economic difficulties of these areas. But this administration seems to be more concerned with balancing the fiscal budget than in balancing the budget of human needs. I want to see America's economy thriving. I want to see America's people happy and productive, adequately fed and well housed.

The President's veto is contrary to the desire of the American people that their government promote maximum employment. The Employment Act of 1946 pledges that the U.S. Government will follow policies to promote employment. It does not say that Duluth, Minn., or Charleston, W. Va., or any other city with serious unemployment is not covered by this law.

I say that this administration is ignoring the will of the people by imposing a veto straitjacket on carefully planned legislation to help depressed areas with persistent unemployment.

This administration argues that the Government of the United States cannot afford to help families and communities recover and develop their full economic potential. I say that we cannot afford not to give constructive aid to such communities.

What are we trying to do in this area redevelopment bill?

We are trying to stimulate economic activity with low interest loans for private industry and public projects. With grants for public facilities and technical assistance to help State and local governments and development groups we will increase the number of permanent jobs in depressed communities. And we are authorizing subsistence payments to unemployed workers who go into a training program to acquire new skills to help them find jobs.

How much would it cost?

Of the total $251 million cost of this program, $200 million is for secured loans which will be repaid with interest. These loans include $75 million for redevelopment in depressed industrial areas, $75 million for redevelopment in depressed rural areas, and $50 million for public facilities loans.

And I might add that these loans will be made only if there is State and local financial support for redevelopment projects.

Our redevelopment bill provides for direct grants of $35 million for public facilities and $4½ million for technical assistance, which includes economic studies and economic planning for economic development in depressed areas. The bill also includes $10 million for subsistence retraining payments to help the States support unemployed people as they prepare themselves for new jobs.

Let us briefly examine the President's objections to the area redevelopment bill.

First, he says this bill would squander the taxpayers' money where only temporary economic difficulties exist. If a community's economic problems are only temporary, the community will not be eligible for redevelopment assistance as soon as its unemployment rate drops below 6 percent.

Second, he says State, local, and private initiative would be inhibited by excessive Federal participation. Any one who has visited a depressed area knows that local initiative and local resources have been overtaxed and exhausted. If these poverty-stricken areas do not get Federal assistance, they will just not be able to break out of the demoralizing circle of unemployment, declining purchasing power, declining economic activity, and declining tax revenues.

Third, the President says that it is unwise and unnecessary to provide Federal financing for machinery and equipment. If the President is right, this authority will never be used, but I believe that many depressed communities will find occasions when they will have to provide financing for plant and machinery as well as for land and buildings to attract new industries.

Fourth, the President says that loan assistance for public facilities is unnecessary because such assistance is already available under existing Government programs. There is a public facility loan program of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, but there is almost no money available under this program. Furthermore, it seems reasonable to consolidate assistance for depressed areas in one agency, rather than dividing responsibility among executive agencies with differing purposes.

Fifth, the President says that Federal loans for creation of jobs in rural areas are unnecessary. I must disagree with such a conclusion. There are hundreds of rural counties which do need economic redevelopment and rehabilitation just as much as depressed urban areas. Low-income farm families suffer just as much as low-income city families, and usually there is much less opportunity for the rural families to get the welfare services which are available to city families.

Sixth, the President says that creation of a new Federal agency is not needed. Apparently he thinks the Department of Commerce should handle this program. Congress approved establishment of a new agency instead of giving area redevelopment authority to the Department of Commerce largely because of this administration's open lack of sympathy for the objectives of this program.

The area redevelopment bill is a sound constructive approach to economic blight and human suffering in the depressed communities of America. These is no excuse for these conditions being allowed to continue in our wealthy country.

The free people of America can mobilize the strength and their resources—but they cannot do so if the President's veto stops constructive action approved by large majorites in both Houses of Congress.

I urge my colleagues to override this veto.

It is time that our concern for people takes precedence over slogans about balancing the budget. It is time we restore prosperity and hope to those communities and those people who have endured too long the indifference of this Administration to their distress and suffering.

Mr. McCARTHY subsequently said: Mr. President, because of the limitation of time for debate on the depressed areas bill, I was unable to speak before the vote was taken on whether the President's veto should be sustained. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that these remarks may appear in the RECORD prior to the vote on the veto.

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

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, at the end of the last session the Senate established a Special Committee on Unemployment Problems. The nine members were directed to investigate unemployment conditions in the Nation and to give particular attention to areas of chronic unemployment. We were also instructed to report back our recommendations for alleviating the effects of unemployment and for reducing this problem.

The members and the staff worked diligently, and I believe that the report which we submitted last March 30 represents an objective appraisal of the problems. Both the majority and the minority members were in general agreement that unemployment is a serious national problem and that the Congress should take a number of steps to reduce unemployment and to alleviate its effects.

Mr. President, after its study the majority members of the committee reached the conclusion, while a variety of programs are required, that "highest priority be given to the enactment of an effective area redevelopment program." I ask unanimous consent that pertinent paragraphs from the committee's study be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

PRIVATE, LOCAL, AND STATE EFFORTS

At nearly every hearing the committee received evidence that local communities are trying to rehabilitate their own areas, to enlarge their economic base, and to provide employment opportunities. The spirit of determination and the vigor of these efforts certainly deserve commendation.

Several thousand industrial development organizations, usually begun as a project of the business community, have been organized in the United States. In labor-surplus areas these organizations often develop into community and regional enterprises, and represent a united business, labor, and civic effort. Funds are raised by individual contributions and by borrowing money and, in some instances, by issuing bonds.

The financial activities of the industrial development groups range from making outright grants to extending credit. The local development organizations often make plant sites and even plant "shells" available to prospective occupants. Some offer technical assistance in advertising campaigns describing community facilities, and detailed counseling in management, production, engineering, and marketing problems.

Every State in the Nation has an agency whose function is to promote economic development. During the past decade a number of States have sponsored statewide privately financed development credit corporations to stimulate industrial growth.

A COMPREHENSIVE FEDERAL PROGRAM

Postwar experience has demonstrated that existing local, State, and Federal programs are inadequate to deal with the serious problems of chronic unemployment and underemployment.

The committee received convincing testimony that communities subject to chronic unemployment cannot solve their problems alone. Most local leaders of business and labor agreed on the need for Federal action to assist distressed areas. The statement submitted by the Scranton, Pa., Chamber of Commerce is typical:

"While Scranton's industrial development program in itself has infused new life and new hope in its industrial economy and provided jobs for thousands of its people, it is felt, nevertheless, that by itself it is inadequate to overcome a continuing unemployment problem which has plagued the area for so many years that it has become intolerable. It is clear, therefore, that the time has arrived when the resources of the Federal Government itself should be mobilized in one nationwide effort to finally and completely eradicate these pockets of chronic unemployment from our national economy."

The president of the Northeast Pennsylvania Industrial Development Commission also asserted strong support for a Federal area redevelopment bill.

With few exceptions, the mayors and civic leaders of distressed areas testified to the inability of their communities to solve the problem of chronic unemployment. At the hearings in West Frankfort, Ill., five mayors and five representatives of local chambers of commerce asked for Federal action. One of the most effective industrial development groups is the Community-Area New Development Organization (CAN DO) of Hazleton, Pa., described in a special paper written for this committee. CAN DO has collected or borrowed $6 million from individuals, banks, and the Pennsylvania Industrial Development Authority to assist in locating new industry. But its problems are immense. Approximately 3,000 new jobs were created as a result of community efforts, yet unemployment in 1959 was estimated to be 16 percent of the area labor force. The author of the committee study concluded:

"Because of the magnitude of Hazleton's problem and because of the economic and social costs that accumulate as long as the problem remains (in 1958, for example, over $5 million was expended in Hazleton for unemployment benefits, and this is aside from the much greater cost in wasted manpower which can never be retrieved) any outside assistance which would accelerate the Hazleton program seems warranted."

The principal rural redevelopment efforts of the Federal Government have in the past been directed toward assisting individual farmers maintain parity of income and providing education and guidance through the county and State extension services. Little has been done on a community or regional basis. Greater economic interdependence and a sharing of social services and facilities have brought farmers and citizens of towns and smaller urban cities closer together, however, and many common problems would probably respond best to a rural-regional approach. The committee heard testimony on the success of the rural-resource development approach of the 15 counties in the Upper Peninsula of Michigan. The Michigan program, under the leadership of the Michigan State University Extension Service, indicates that the traditional roles of the county agent and the State extension services might profitably be reviewed.

A program to help economically distressed areas does not constitute a new area of Federal activity. Such a program is consistent with the spirit and intent of the Employment Act of 1946, and with established Federal policies of helping selected industries. Traditionally, the Federal Government has been active in developing and fostering industries through tariff, subsidy, and tax policies. The 1956 platforms of both major political parties called for Federal legislation to aid economically depressed areas.

No single remedy will cure the deep-rooted problems of chronic unemployment and underdevelopment. A Federal program must offer various forms of assistance adaptable to the varied needs of the depressed areas. These forms include direct financial aid, technical assistance, training and retraining facilities, urban renewal programs, homebuilding incentives, Government contract preference, a Youth Conservation Corps, and community facilities programs.

Mr. McCARTHY. Other Members of the Senate have pointed out the differences between the analysis of the special Senate committee and the veto message of the President. I should like to add an additional comment on one phase of the veto message, that concerning the rural redevelopment program.

The President stated:

> The provisions for Federal loans for the construction of industrial buildings in rural areas are incongruous and unnecessary.

Later in the message the President added:

> S. 722 would make a minimum of 600 rural counties eligible for Federal loans for the construction of industrial buildings in such areas. The rural redevelopment program and the Small Business Administration are already contributing greatly to the economic improvement of low income rural areas. Increasing the impact of these two activities, particularly the rural development program, is a preferable course.

Mr. President, I believe that members of the special committee were in complete agreement as to the need for a rural redevelopment program in addition to existing agencies.

The existing agencies are not able and were not devised to solve problems of chronic unemployment that exist in rural areas. Mr. President, this is not a partisan issue. It is simply a fact. In their minority views, the three Republican members of the committee, Mr. COOPER, of Kentucky, Mr. PROUTY, of Vermont, and Mr. SCOTT, of Pennsylvania, stated:

> It is a matter of prime importance that an area redevelopment bill be enacted and that it contains means for stimulating local effort.

In specifying conditions for such a bill, the minority members wrote that the area redevelopment legislation should, among other objectives:

> Provide for industrial development of rural areas suffering from chronic unemployment or underemployment. Many coal mining areas fall into this category.

I ask unanimous consent that the section of the minority members concerning rural redevelopment be placed in the RECORD.

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

I. AIDING DISTRESSED AREAS THROUGH AREA REDEVELOPMENT LEGISLATION

> It is a matter of prime importance that an area redevelopment bill be enacted and that it contain means for stimulating local effort. Our task is to evolve a practical program which will be assured of approval at this session of Congress.
>
> * * * * *
>
> (k) Provide for loans for industrial development of rural areas suffering from chronic unemployment or underemployment. Many coal mining areas fall into this category.
>
> * * * * *

RURAL AREAS

> It is absolutely essential that assistance be provided for rural areas. Many of the coal mining areas are in this category.
>
> Numerous witnesses testified to the gravity of unemployment and underemployment in rural areas. Moreover, studies by the Department of Labor and the Department of Agriculture indicate that the number of farm jobs required in the 1960's will decline further, as they have in the last three decades. If many of the people now living on farms, and especially the young people, are to find a livelihood without moving out of the area it will be necessary to develop industrial activity. This is widely recognized. Work is under way through the rural development program of the Department of Agriculture to improve the situation in these areas, but that program is primarily oriented to agriculture and makes no provision either for technical assistance or for loans for industrial development. Therefore, the minority believe that aid to rural as well as urban areas is essential to the attack on the problem of chronic unemployment.
>
> We recommend that the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of Labor be authorized to develop more effective measures for the identification of chronically depressed rural areas, within a broad provision indicating that they are to be selected from low-income areas with high levels of unemployment and underemployment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the bill pass, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding?

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BEALL (when his name was called). On this vote, I have a pair with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE]. If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea," as would the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE]. The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] would vote "nay." I therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, on this vote, I have a pair with the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA], both of whom, if present and voting, would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE], are absent on official business.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA] and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] are absent because of illness.

On this vote the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] are paired with the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS]. If present and voting, the Senator from

Nevada and the Senator from Idaho would vote "yea" and the Senator from Florida would vote "nay."

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE] and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] are paired with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Wyoming and the Senator from Missouri would vote "yea" and the Senator from Georgia would vote "nay."

I further announce that if present and voting, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] would vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent because of a death in his immediate family.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG] is absent on official business as a member of the official delegation to attend the 150th celebration in Buenos Aires.

The pair of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL] with the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] has previously been announced. If present and voting, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] would vote "nay."

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 45, nays 39, as follows:

[No. 199]

YEAS—45

Anderson	Hayden	Monroney
Bible	Hill	Morse
Byrd, W. Va.	Humphrey	Moss
Carroll	Jackson	Murray
Chavez	Javits	Muskie
Clark	Johnson, Tex.	Pastore
Cooper	Keating	Proxmire
Dodd	Kefauver	Randolph
Douglas	Kennedy	Scott
Engle	Kerr	Smith
Gore	Long, Hawaii	Sparkman
Green	Lusk	Symington
Gruening	McCarthy	Williams, N.J.
Hart	Magnuson	Yarborough
Hartke	Mansfield	Young, Ohio

NAYS—39

Aiken	Eastland	Martin
Allott	Ellender	Morton
Bennett	Ervin	Mundt
Bridges	Frear	Prouty
Brunsdale	Goldwater	Robertson
Bush	Hickenlooper	Russell
Butler	Holland	Saltonstall
Byrd, Va.	Hruska	Schoeppel
Carlson	Johnston, S.C.	Stennis
Cotton	Kuchel	Thurmond
Curtis	Lausche	Wiley
Dirksen	Long, La.	Williams, Del.
Dworshak	McClellan	Young, N. Dak.

NOT VOTING—16

Bartlett	Church	McNamara
Beall	Fong	O'Mahoney
Cannon	Fulbright	Smathers
Capehart	Hennings	Talmadge
Case, N.J.	Jordan	
Case, S. Dak.	McGee	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 45; the nays are 39. Two-thirds of the Senators present and voting not having voted in the affirmative, the bill, on reconsideration, has failed of passage.

Mr. DOUGLAS subsequently said: Mr. President, during the discussion of the area redevelopment bill, the distinguished senior Senator from Florida questioned the classification of certain counties in his State as being major problem areas. There was not time at the moment to go into the statistics prepared by the U.S. Department of Agriculture from which the map which I presented was drawn. Since the vote has been taken, I have had the sources looked up. I ask unanimous consent that a statement which I have prepared on this subject be printed in the body of the RECORD at the conclusion of the vote on the question of overriding the veto of the President of the area redevelopment bill.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I have no objection to the inclusion of the statement in the RECORD. My point was that there was no real distress in the areas which I mentioned, and there is none, and that the standards set up by the bill were not, in my opinion at least, sufficient to separate the areas of real depression and distress in the Nation which need help from those which do not, as was true in the case of the counties in my State which I mentioned, and with respect to other counties as well. I thank the Senator.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator from Florida for his very courteous comment. I do not wish to carry this discussion further. However, I will say that the list of 500 or 600 counties merely constitute eligibility under the area redevelopment bill. They do not require the administrator to make loans for new industries in any one county. They merely provided a panel of counties in which the administrator could use his discretion according to relative needs. Therefore the list was in no sense a mandate to the Administrator that remedial loans must be made.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR DOUGLAS

The Florida counties which are shaded pink on the map [not printed in RECORD] which is in the rear of the Senate Chamber were selected by the U.S. Department of Agriculture and listed among the major problem areas, in the study issued by the Department on April 27, 1955, and entitled "Development of Agriculture's Human Resources," now House Document No. 149, 84th Congress.

As reference to the study will show on pages 6, 7, and 8, the map in the Senate Chamber is a faithful and accurate reproduction of the map presented in the study.

In describing the selection of these areas the study states as follows:

"THE MAJOR PROBLEM AREAS

"Farms with low income are found in all parts of the country, but such farms are most numerous in areas of dense rural settlement with high birth rates, where there are few outside jobs, and where topography or other obstacles hinder the use of modern machinery. In some places the land is overcrowded, so to speak. The abundance of hand labor has tended to reduce the incentive for making adjustments which would give the farms higher earning power per worker.

"Problem areas are shown on the map. Of course the nature of specific problems and the range of possible adjustments vary greatly among and within these generalized areas.

"These areas were set up on the basis of three criteria: Net income of full-time farmers, level of living, and size of operation.[1] Thus areas with incomes under $1,000, or having a level of living in the lowest fifth of the Nation, or having 50 percent or more of the commercial farms classed as low production, were selected for study. The area colored red on the map shows where all three of these criteria are applied and represents those parts of the country where the problem is more serious.

"These problem areas, so-called, strikingly contrast with the rest of the United States. Within these areas in 1950 there were a million full-time farmers of working age who sold less than $2,500 worth of products. Out of this gross sum they had to pay expenses and rent as well as family living. They represented about 40 percent of all the farms in these areas. Another 40 percent also sold less than $2,500 of products but were primarily nonfarmers or were more than 65 years old. Less than a fifth of the farms in these areas produced and sold $2,500 worth of products.

It is clear from the more detailed statement of the criteria for the selection of these counties found in the footnote on page 8 of the study that the references are to levels of farm income, levels of living on farms and production levels on farms—and the statements of the Senator from Florida, Mr. HOLLAND, about other enterprises not related to farming thus do not contradict the data reported by the Department of Agriculture and shown on the map.

It is true that the data upon which the map was based by the Department of Agriculture are for the year 1949. But it is interesting to note that in the 1957 study by the Library of Congress, 15 of these same counties in northern Florida, including Leon County and Okaloosa County mentioned by the Senator from Florida, are among the 500 counties marked lowest in levels of living of farm operator families for the year 1954.

In addition three more of these northern counties marked pink on the map together with two more counties, Taylor and Valousa in northern Florida but not marked pink on the map, were included in lists of 500 coun-

[1] The criteria by which each State economic area in the low-income and level-of-living areas was delineated are as follows:

1. A residual farm income to operator and family labor in 1949 of less than $1,000 provided the State economic area had a level of living index below the average for the region and had 25 percent or more of its commercial farms classified as "low production." Residual farm income to operator and family labor represents the income (including value of home use) above operating expenses and a return to capital invested in land and machinery. See Strand, E. G., Heady, E. O., and Seagraves, James, "Productivity Levels in the United States," USDA, ARS, Tech. Bul. (in process).

2. A level of living index in the lowest fifth of the Nation. Items in the index include (1) percentage of farms with electricity, (2) percentage of farms with telephones, (3) percentage of farms with automobiles, and (4) average value of products sold. See "Farm Operator Families Level of Living Indexes," by Hagood, M. J., USDA, BAE, 1952.

3. "Low production" farms comprising 50 percent or more of the commercial farms. Low-production farms are those with sales of $250–$2,499 with the operator not working off farm as much as 100 days and farm sales exceeding family income from other sources. See "Low Production Farms," Agri. Inf. Bul. 108, by McElveen, J. V., and Bachman, K. L., USDA, BAE, 1953.

ties furnished to me by the Bureau of the Census in 1956 as among the 500 counties with the highest percentage of commercial farms producing less than $1,199 and $2,500 worth of products for sale in 1954.

By any authoritative information we can secure from appropriate governmental agencies, therefore, the data submitted on the map presented to the Senate seems fully supported.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolutions, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 2130. An act to authorize a payment to the Government of Japan;

H.R. 9465. 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;

H.R. 9818. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to the State of Florida;

H.R. 10809. An act to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for salaries and expenses, research and development, construction and equipment, and for other purposes;

H.J. Res. 502. Joint resolution authorizing the erection in the District of Columbia of a memorial to Mary McLeod Bethune; and

H.J. Res. 546. Joint resolution 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.

LAUNCHING BY UNITED STATES TODAY OF 2½-TON MIDAS EARTH SATELLITE

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, some very interesting news has just come over the wire. We hear so much criticism and so much talk about failures of the United States, about the missile race, the satellite race, the gap in the air, and so on, that I think the Senate should take due notice of this event.

I read from a news dispatch dated today:

CAPE CANAVERAL.—The United States launched a 2½-ton Midas earth satellite today to test a spy-in-the-sky system for detecting hostile missiles within seconds after they are fired.

An 88-foot, two-stage Atlas-Agena blasted from the cape at 12:37 p.m., e.s.t, (1:37 p.m. e.d.t.) with the limousine-sized moonlet. The rumble may echo in diplomatic halls.

The satellite, dubbed Midas II and essentially a repeat of a shot which failed February 26, was equipped with a super-cooled infrared sensor to spot missile launchings from an orbit about 300 miles above earth.

The space-borne alarm system, peering over thousands of square miles each second, would give America a 30-minute warning of an impending missile onslaught. This is about twice the warning time available with present radar systems.

The Air Force planned to test the satellite with flares fired at Edwards Air Force Base and Vandenberg Air Force Base, Calif., this week. It also was reported the Air Force might time the launchings of intercontinental ballistic missiles to coincide with a pass by Midas II.

Sources said the flares will be seen as a rosy glow over a radius of 50 miles. Scientists also said the satellite would be able to tell the difference between missile firings and other heat sources on earth.

Midas—short for missile defense alarm system—is the first step in a top-secret U.S. military plan for an international open skies arrangement of its own, hinged on space satellites circling in polar orbits above every inch of earth's surface.

In the three-part system, Midas satellites will pick up enemy missile firings almost instantaneously, Samos reconnaissance satellites will get television views of military installations and Advent communications satellites will relay the information to U.S. authorities.

Operational versions of the spy satellites may be in the skies in groups of about one dozen within 2 years.

Midas II—last of the series to be launched here—was a prototype designed to see whether the alarm system will work. It was aimed toward an orbit that would carry it over a comparatively narrow band around the Equator, but not over Russian territory.

The big rocket eased from its pad slowly at first as its 360,000-pound thrust engines built up power. This was the same propulsion system which drove an Atlas missile a record 9,000 miles last week.

The Atlas was to drop away after burnout. Then 10 minutes of coasting and after that, the firing of the bullet-shaped Agena section to drive the satellite into orbit.

During the coasting phase two small helium jets perform their task of getting the satellite into proper position with its nose pointing to earth and putting the payload into an orbit as nearly circular as possible.

The instrument package weighed more than 3,000 pounds, largest ever sent into space by a U.S. rocket. The instruments and the second-stage casing were designed to remain attached for a gross weight of about 5,000 pounds.

The planned orbit would carry Midas II 28 degrees north and south of the Equator—as far north as Cape Canaveral and the southern section of Red China and as far south as the southern tips of Brazil and Africa.

The complex satellite was secret but the key to its success lay in the performance of the deep-frozen "eye" which was designed to spot a missile by infrared radiations from its exhaust.

Mr. President, I think that is one of the most gratifying and one of the most successful things we have achieved since we have been part of the space age, and certainly since the Russians sent up the first sputnik in October 1957.

We hear a great deal about the failures of the United States of America. The minute a missile which is fired from Cape Canaveral fails, the information is hurled all over this country and all over the world. The Russians advertise only their successes, and conceal their failures.

All along during the last few months, and in the last 2 or 3 years, we have heard never a word about any failure of the Russians, but we have always heard of their successes. I think it is time to talk about some of the American successes. One of our successes was the 9,000-mile shot of the Atlas missile the other day. Today, Midas II, which is a tremendous step forward, a step of which all Americans can be proud, is another of our great successes.

QUESTIONS FOR RUSSIA TO ANSWER

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, when the Foreign Relations Committee hears representatives of the State Department and others on the developments which took place in connection with the contemplated summit meeting, I will wish to get the answers to the following questions:

First. To what extent has the Soviet Union been spying in the United States, West Germany, and other nations?

Second. How many times it has breached its commitments to other nations in the world—especially the captive nations?

Third. Is there a difference between spying by foot on land on the one hand, and by plane in the air on the other?

Fourth. Is it in the interest of our country that we abandon the general and traditional methods of acquiring intelligence?

Fifth. If we do so, what are the probabilities of the Soviet Union following a similar course?

Sixth. Why did the Communists break their treaty with the Poles in World War II and stab the Poles in the back while the latter were fighting the Nazis?

Seventh. What are the details concerning the brutal massacre of Polish soldiers by the Communists in the Katyn forests?

Eighth. Why, in World War II, did the Reds, while advancing westward and nearing Poland, induce the Polish people of Warsaw to heroically rebel against the Nazi occupiers and then abandon them to slaughter by the Nazis?

Ninth. Why did the Soviet break its pledged word that the people of the satellite nations, under free and open elections, would be permitted to choose the type of government they wanted?

Tenth. Why did the Soviet aid and induce the Red Chinese to use their military power against South Korea, resulting in death and injury to thousands of American boys?

Eleventh. Why did the Soviet encourage the Red Chinese in the bombardment and killing of innocent people at the Quemoy and Matsu Islands?

Twelfth. What is the explanation for the mass and merciless murder of the freedom fighters of Hungary, Poland, and East Germany, who were fighting for liberation in those respective countries?

I do not contemplate, as a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, allowing a crafty leader of a Communist government to point the finger of suspicion and guilt toward our Nation, when the hands of that person are dripping with the blood of innocent people.

THE RIGHT TO CRITICIZE

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, it was almost 10 years ago on June 1, 1950, when I made what ultimately was referred to as the "declaration of conscience." In that statement I stated my disagreement with some segments of my own Republican Party on certain political tactics. In that statement I said that I believed in certain basic rights—among them being the right to criticize, the right to protest and the right of independent thought.

I still believe in those rights—and that the Democrats should have them in the fullest extent for criticizing the Republican administration. I do not believe that anyone should have to appear, out of loyalty, to condone behavior with which he takes issue.

I believe that the Republican administration is subject to criticism on the handling of the U-2 affair—and consequently fair game politically for the Democrats. I do not believe the Democrats should be silenced by a loyalty gag.

Instead I believe that full and open discussion is in the best interest of our country and our people. I believe that honestly expressed difference of opinion—constructively expressed difference of opinion—should never be smothered. I believe that the opposition party has the obligation to criticize that with which it does not agree.

I believe that private citizens are to be commended for speaking their minds whether by letters to the newspapers, publicly, or by letters to their Senators and Representatives.

Yes, Mr. President, I believe in speaking up when I disagree with the President of the United States even though he be the head of the political party of which I am a member. I have done it in the past. I have done it today in voting to override his veto of the depressed areas bill. I shall do it in the future.

But, Mr. President, in my belief in the full right to disagree and criticize, I do not believe that President Eisenhower has disgraced the United States, as was implied on the floor of the Senate yesterday.

I do not believe that the overwhelming majority of the people of Maine believe that President Eisenhower has disgraced the United States, as was implied on the floor of the Senate yesterday.

Nor do I believe in publicizing and upholding the slur made upon the President of the United States, as was done yesterday on the floor of the Senate, with the reading into the RECORD of the statement that "we had better start electing Presidents who are young enough to keep their wits until they finish their terms." Nor do I believe that the overwhelming majority of the people of Maine subscribe to such a slurring statement against the President of the United States.

I believe that the administration is subject to criticism on the handling of the U-2 affair. But I want no part of slurring statements charging the President with disgracing the United States, and reflecting upon his mentality.

AGRICULTURAL AND FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION APPROPRIATIONS, 1961

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

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. MORSE. Mr. President, if I may have the attention of the Senator from Georgia, unfortunately an emergency matter has arisen which will take me from the floor of the Senate, and I have a statement on the agriculture bill which I shall ask to insert in the RECORD. However, there happens to be one special question which I would like to have answered by the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. I shall be glad to answer the question if I can.

Mr. MORSE. May I say now, as I said in my statement, that there is not a single Senator who does not appreciate the wonderful work which the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] has done on the agricultural appropriation, as he has done in so many years past.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the distinguished Senator from Oregon for that commendation.

Mr. MORSE. In the course of my statement I would have observed:

> I am happy to see that the committee has seen fit to institute a pilot program for estimates on tomatoes and celery. In this connection I can only express my hope again to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee that this action this year may break the logjam which has precluded the Department of Agriculture from submitting requests for funds to provide crop reports upon our cane and bushberry production. Can the chairman provide me with any suggestions as to how those of us who recognize the importance of these small fruits to the agricultural economy of our States, may further impress the Department with our needs in this area?

Mr. RUSSELL. The distinguished Senator from Oregon will recall that last year, I believe, we included some funds in the appropriation bill for this purpose.

Mr. MORSE. That is correct.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Department has taken a rather dim view of the proposal.

The department officials seem to be very dubious about the value and the necessity for it. All that we have been able to get from them is a statement that they would furnish us with a report as to the yearend production, and would begin developing a plan for a reporting service that they would submit if the Congress desired to adopt a more complete program.

Mr. MORSE. There is no question about the fact that the chairman of the subcommittee has made clear that he thinks we should have such reports.

Mr. RUSSELL. Last year the subcommittee added language in the committee report that within the amount provided in the bill, that the Department should institute this program. The matter was brought up in the hearings again this year, and we were told that they would make yearend reports as to the total production and would submit to us next year some plan for a reporting service.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from Georgia very much. I intend to continue to press for Agricultural Department approval of this request. In my State it is of importance.

The people in the fruit and berry industry of my State, in my judgment, are entitled to this service from our Department of Agriculture. Again I wish to thank the Senator from Georgia for the assistance he has been to us. I am pleased to repeat on the floor of the Senate what I have said to farm groups in Oregon, that we have not a better friend in the Senate Committee on Agriculture than the Senator from Georgia, the chairman of the subcommittee, and I am sure he will do everything he can to be of assistance to us in getting the reports we have been pleading for.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am grateful to the Senator for his remarks. Because of the condition in which the farmers of this country find themselves today, there is very little Congress can do for them. Therefore, I have felt a greater desire to assist them in such ways as I can in the appropriation bill in view of the fact that we have been unable to secure the two-thirds vote necessary to enact new legislation over the President's vetoes.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks the statement I prepared to use in the debate this afternoon.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MORSE

The distinguished Senator from Georgia and his colleagues have earned our thanks for having improved the agricultural appropriations bill in many particulars as the result of their study. Those of us who hail from the Western States particularly would commend the increases which have been provided for soil and water research and facility needs. The increase of $495,800 for this program for operating funds and the $200,000 for the development of plans and specifications for needed construction at existing facilities are sound expenditures.

The $25,000 for a further step-up in the sheep scabies eradication program and the $19 million provided for brucellosis eradication will both be welcomed by many Oregon farmers. Likewise the committee action to restore the full amount of the budget request for State experiment stations is laudable. Even though the increase for this purpose is over a million dollars more than allowed by the House, it is justifiable.

The Extension Service increase of $1.13 million over the budget reflects a confidence in the importance of this vital program which is shared by a great many of us who have profited by the advice and counsel of our own extension agents. I am particularly gratified that the committee is recommending $250,000 over the budget estimate to permit the staffing of 20 additional soil conservation districts. Letters from every part of my State have told me of the difficulty faced by existing districts as SCS personnel were spread thin to service the districts being newly organized. Small watershed protection funds, a million and a quarter over the

budget estimate, and $9,250,000 over fiscal 1960 will be of great help in protecting this most important natural resource.

The $18 million provided by both House and Senate for flood prevention work in the 11 authorized watersheds, is $3 million more than the Bureau of the Budget was willing to recommend. Here, too, in my judgment the committee took action in the public interest.

The Agricultural Marketing Service recommendations of the committee, especially those relating to accelerating the lamb-on-feed reports will be particularly important to many sheepmen of our Western area.

Both the Rural Electrification Administration and the Farmers Home Administration increases are to be commended highly. The services provided by these agencies to our farmers are among the finest contributions made by any of the farm agencies. Both agencies have in the past striven to help the farmer to help himself in the improvement and modernization of his farmstead. Both are based upon sound financial principles, and each needs to have its operations extended.

The soil and water loan program of Farmers Home Administration has been especially helpful to many of our farmers, in the past, and, in my judgment, as funds and personnel to administer them are made increasingly available, the productive use of this financial resource will again increase.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I merely wish to join with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], first in his well-merited commendation of the Senator from Georgia for his great work on this appropriation bill for the Department of Agriculture.

Second, I testified before the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations in connection with the expansion of the crop reporting service, particularly for the crops which were mentioned, that is, the small fruits that are presently not given the reporting services that are required for good economic programing.

The State of Minnesota is one of the 17 States which we call the small fruit-producing States, which vitally need this service. The people have asked me to make representations to the appropriate committees, which I have done. As I understand, and as I have told our constituents, so far as new legislation is concerned, there is adequate authority right now to do this job, and the committees and the Congress have provided funds to make at least a beginning on this job, but the resistance is in the Department of Agriculture where, despite the authority and the funds, no effort has been made to adopt a program. Is that correct?

Mr. RUSSELL. The Department has not approved any part of this program even though it has had substantial support. The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] as well as the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] have both been before the committee on two different occasions, I believe.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. RUSSELL. They have urged some action, and the committee has been impressed to the extent that it recommended in last year's committee report that the Department make some start on reporting on these small-fruit crops.

We feel that in view of the attitude of the Department of Agriculture we are making as much progress as we can at the present time. We will get the year-end report this year—which we have not had before—and we will have submitted next year a program for a more complete reporting service for fruits and berries. I must say, however, that we have no assurance the department will approve such a program.

DIRTY WORK OF DOCTORS OF ALEXANDRIA, VA.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have received a copy of a letter from Mr. Guy L. Brown, grand chief engineer of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, which he has sent to Hon. Arthur S. Flemming, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, in regard to a very sad case of an old person who is living in great misery these days because of a failure, in my judgment, on the part of the Government of the United States to carry out its moral obligation to the old people of America.

I think this case is what we can call a very fitting exhibit of our dereliction as a Congress in respect to a duty which we owe the old people of this country.

I ask that there be inserted at this point in my remarks a letter from Guy L. Brown, grand chief engineer, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, to Hon. Arthur S. Flemming, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, dated May 13, 1960, and a copy of the letter which this elderly person had sent to Mr. Brown, in the first instance, which caused Mr. Brown to write the letter to Mr. Flemming.

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

BROTHERHOOD OF
LOCOMOTIVE ENGINEERS,
Cleveland, Ohio, May 13, 1960.

Hon. ARTHUR S. FLEMMING,
Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I am attaching a Verifax copy of letter addressed to me by a member of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers living in Alexandria, Va., which as you will see describes one of the most pitiful conditions I have ever seen.

It does not seem possible that a condition such as this can exist in these United States, and my purpose in bringing this to your attention is with the hope that it is evidence that will in turn be helpful in progressing legislation to assist our older citizens who have through no fault of their own arrived in the position in which this man now finds himself. If anything can be done to relieve this specific case certainly it will be appreciated not only by the man himself but by us.

I am furnishing our national legislative representative, Mr. John W. Turner, room 816 Labor Building, 400 First Street, NW., Washington, (phone District 7-7936) with a copy of this letter and also a Verifax of the letter from Mr. Layman. If he can be of any assistance to you do not hesitate to call upon him.

I will appreciate any action you may take.

Sincerely yours,

GUY L. BROWN,
Grand Chief Engineer.

DIRTY WORK OF DOCTORS OF ALEXANDRIA, VA.

To All Members of Our Grand Lodge.

DEAR SIR AND BROTHERS: As I am a retired engine man, 70 years of age. Spent 35 years on engine out of Alexandria, Va., and now nothing but a wreck. I lost my wife in 1955 on Thanksgiving Day. At that time we were both in hospital for 2 months which the doctors, druggists, hospital and undertaker took all my life's savings, left me flat. Since then my health hasn't been any too good and at present time I manage to get to bathroom on two crutches. I draw $164.20 pension, pay house rent $107, water, light, and fuel so you see that doesn't leave much to live on, pay doctors and hospitals.

On April 8, 1960, I got down almost helpless in both legs which comes from bad circulation, legs were injured when on engine about 20 years past. Today I sit here unable to get a doctor to come to my home to examine me or try to give me a little relief, just sit for day suffering with swollen stomach, short of breath, pains in legs severe. And every doctor I call says they don't make any home calls, for me to meet them in the hospital. First place I can't walk on second floor, cannot get down steps and on $60 how can I get to any hospital, $25 a day, doctor $8, ambulance $10 each way, bottle of pills $5 or $10, then other expenses. It is impossible to get any help or relief. Therefore, I sit here and suffer day and night. I have carried hospitalization with American Assurance Society of Richmond, Va., for 30 years or more. When the hospitals jumped to $25 I was 68. I tried to increase my amount like the younger ones did but nothing doing, so I get $11 for so many days in hospital. This may not do any good now but do hope it may help some one in the future, or in making laws to help the disabled pensioned men. I have wrote my condition up to Senator BROYHILL and told or tried to show him the dirty work of the doctors in this city right in the shadows of the Capitol doors. I do know that there is cases of illness that requires the hospital and there is an untold number sent to hospital that are not able to pay, that can be treated at home by the doctor and traveling nurses. They are not treating the traveling nurse as they should yet every time you turn around or pick up a paper they are begging for donations to build another hospital. The doctors have a hospital here but a poor man cannot stand their fees.

It sure looks hard. I owe no man one cent, have no bills whatever and in my old age and crippled up I can't get a doctor to come in and wait on me. The doctors call at home all out through the country but nothing but colored doctors will call in Alexandria and but few of them only treats venereal diseases and the whites is afraid of them. About all they give you is a bottle of dope to numb you. I have one of them next door to me here.

If you see fit at any time to put this where it can cause laws to be made to give us disabled men some medical help you can use every word of this with my name signed to it as I can prove it. There sure must be a clique between the doctors and hospitals and half the time in Alexandria hospitals halls are full of maternity cases, and maybe a curtain around you a few minutes then move it to another one. And the hospitals here are after the city all the time as there

is an immense bill against the city that the city has to send there down-and-out destitutes.

I hope both or all pensions will soon form some kind of relief to help the poor and aged and force the doctors to help charity. All stop and think a doctor charging you $15 to $35 for a physical exam just because he has put a speciality to his name.

Brothers, I do hope that my few words here will be of some help to cut out the dirty work of the doctors as they are doing and try to give the people a little service. I pray to our God for help.

Yours fraternally,

A. J. LAYMAN.

AREA REDEVELOPMENT—VETO

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I deeply regret that the Senate did not override the President's veto of the so-called depressed areas bill. I had hoped to participate in that debate, but because of the limitations of time, this was not possible. The arguments which I heard advanced to sustain the Presidential veto only further convinced me that there is an urgent need for the type of legislation which was passed in both Houses and sent to the President. It is my understanding that the so-called administration bill is before one of the committees of Congress, and I hope that that committee will act.

I hope that in the process of acting, it will add amendments which are a part of the bill that the President vetoed. I do not believe Congress should retreat 1 inch. I believe I have some personal knowledge from personal observation in several States of the Union as to the need for legislation along the lines of that we passed in Congress on two separate occasions, not this halfhearted, weak, and totally inadequate proposal advanced by the administration.

U.S. LEADERSHIP FOR PEACE—THE WORLD COURT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the Wichita, Kans., Morning Eagle has used the recent comments of an Indian diplomat to point up most effectively the basic contradiction between American statements and actions as the leader of efforts to secure peace with justice and the American failure to recognize the appropriate role of the World Court in this effort.

Mr. President I ask unanimous consent that an editorial from the Wichita Morning Eagle of May 9 1960 entitled "U.S. and World Court," be printed in the RECORD.

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

U.S. AND WORLD COURT

Indian Ambassador Chagla chides the United States for making a mockery of the International Court of Justice by restrictions on its jurisdictions. This refers to the so-called Connally amendment reserving to the United States the right to determine whether a dispute is essentially a domestic matter and not subject to adjudication by the World Court.

"You must not forget," said the Indian Ambassador, "that the United States claims to be the leader of the free world. She wants peace but peace with justice, and how can you ever have justice if the only forum which can settle international disputes is reduced to a humiliating position where it cannot entertain any disputes which ought to be properly decided by it?"

President Eisenhower, Vice President NIXON, the American Bar Association and many others have advocated repeal of this amendment. Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota, has a repeal resolution pending in the Senate. It is vigorously opposed by many powerful organizations as a surrender of U.S. sovereignty.

But the Indian diplomat is right in saying that the World Court will never amount to much until the United States, and all other nations supposedly adhering to it, use it as an instrument for the adjudication of international disputes. No doubt a few well publicized decisions by the court would accustom the peoples of many nations to the rulings of a body designed to promote world order.

RETENTION OF THE CONNALLY AMENDMENT—PRO AND CON

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, two distinguished American lawyers, both past presidents of the American Bar Association, debated in the columns of the Christian Science Monitor of April 28, 1960, the question: "Should the Connally Amendment Be Retained?"

This exchange between Frank E. Holman, arguing for retention, and Charles S. Rhyne, arguing for repeal as called for in my proposal, Senate Resolution 94, is a great service to the responsible discussion of methods for peaceful settlement of disputes among nations. The participants and the Monitor are to be complimented on presenting it.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this most interesting and valuable debate be printed in the RECORD.

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

SHOULD THE CONNALLY AMENDMENT BE RETAINED?

(At the request of the Christian Science Monitor, two prominent American lawyers have agreed to present this written debate on the question of whether to retain the Connally amendment. This is the amendment which specifies that the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice shall not apply "to matters * * * essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of the United States as determined by the United States." Both debaters are former presidents of the American Bar Association.)

ARGUMENTS FOR

(By Frank E. Holman)

Nature of the reservation

The United Nations Charter, in establishing a World Court, accorded it no compulsory jurisdiction except as each nation agrees in a "declaration" deposited with the Secretary-General. The U.S. declaration reserved the right to determine when a particular matter is domestic and hence not properly a subject of international control.

Domestic questions protected by the Connally reservation

Immigration: The reservation prevents the Court holding that the United States, contrary to its immigration laws, must absorb nationals from overpopulated areas—China, India and elsewhere.

Tariffs: Traditionally a domestic matter; yet this affects world commerce. Without the reservation, the Court could treat tariffs as international, and regulate them.

Offshore rights: These involve fisheries, oil and other natural resources. The Court could internationalize offshore rights, holding they should be shared with other nations.

Panama Canal: Its control is essential to the safety and welfare of the United States. We paid for it. Without the reservation, the Court could internationalize this strategic waterway.

Foreign aid: The World Court has jurisdiction over breaches of international obligation and the nature and extent of reparation. The United Nations Charter contains many humanitarian obligations—committing nations to promoting full employment and social and economic progress for all peoples of the world. Undeveloped nations could complain we have not complied with such obligations, and the Court could grant reparations therefor.

It is said the Court can be trusted to treat such matters as domestic. This is unlikely, as demonstrated by the known activities of the Human Rights Commission.

Comparison between World Court and Commission on Human Rights

Actually, the World Court is not a court. No tribunal functions as a court where not bound or guided by definite rules of law. Formulating its own rules, it adjudicates according to the individual concepts and national interests of its members.

The Court is only an international commission of 15 members—one each from United States, Great Britain, and Australia—others from United Arab Republic, Nationalist China, Greece, Poland, France, Mexico, Panama, Argentina, Uruguay, Norway, Pakistan, and the Soviet Union.

The Human Rights Commission also had one member each from the United States, Australia, and Great Britain. Like the Court, other members came from countries having different historical and legal backgrounds not fitting them to appreciate what, to us, is domestic rather than international in character.

Why should the Court approach matters differently than the Commission, whose members were likewise distinguished citizens of their respective countries—a number also able lawyers? The Commission reflected their differing historical and legal backgrounds so that, regardless of charter prohibitions (like art. 2, subpar. 7), against intervention in matters essentially within the domestic jurisdiction, they formulated various conventions violating such charter provisions. The Court, man for man and in the aggregate, represents no different ability or integrity than did the Human Rights Commission.

The difficulty is inherent in both instances. Nations like Pakistan, United Arab Republic, Greece, Lebanon, Poland, South American countries, and the Soviet Union are grounded in systems of law not fitting them to understand what to us is a domestic matter.

Among many unbelievable results in the Commission's deliberations was that, after 400 meetings, the majority refused to include in the Human Rights Covenant any provision recognizing the basic American right to own private property and be secure in its enjoyment against arbitrary seizure by government.

In connection with many other American concepts like freedom of speech and of press, a majority of the Commission, in formulating covenants, so little understood our concepts that these freedoms, rather than being recognized and protected, were highly restricted to conform to a common denominator agreeable to the political systems of other counties.

Violations of the letter and the spirit of the charter

At first, Americans believed the charter provisions sufficiently protected our control over our domestic affairs. Soon, disillusionment followed.

John P. Humphrey, Director of the Human Rights Commission, stated (January 1948) that the Commission proposed to establish a supernational supervision over the relationship of a state to its citizens—a matter "traditionally within the domestic jurisdiction of nations."

Moses Moskowitz, of the United Nations staff, stated (April 1949) that, under the official view, any matter becoming the subject of a U.N. convention or even of a resolution ceased to be a "matter essentially within the jurisdiction of a member state."

The Acheson State Department (Publication 3972) stated: "There is now no longer any real difference between domestic and foreign affairs."

Following such pronouncements, without the Connally reservation, named for its sponsor, former Senator Tom Connally, Democrat of Texas, why would the Court hesitate to hold that domestic affairs are international and hence subject to adjudication by the Court?

Favorite arguments for repeal of the Connally reservation

These arguments assert that in making and retaining the reservation, we are guilty of an unworthy act which is a disturbing factor in the achievement of world peace. Such arguments are fallacious.

When we limited our adherence to the Court by the Connally reservation, we only exercised a right granted under the Court Statute (chap. 2, art. 36(5)).

Other nations filed declarations limiting their acceptance of the Court's jurisdiction. Our American internationalists do not consider those declarations as unworthy acts, disturbing to world peace.

The reservation does not prevent use of the Court for the settlement of truly international disputes. It does not occasion the paucity of litigation in the Court. How could it possibly deter the Court in trying international issues? Governments presently believe that genuine international questions should be settled at the diplomatic level through negotiations and conferences and not at the judicial level. Since Communist countries refuse outright to use the Court, settlement of international issues at the judicial level is not realizable. Moreover, the causes of wars are often political or economic, and not usually judicable by a court. As a result, not only has the Court been bypassed, but also other United Nations agencies. Major powers prefer conferences, regional, summit or otherwise, organized outside the United Nations.

The reservation has existed for 13 years. Until recently resurrected by Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, a world-government-minded enthusiast, nobody was suggesting that its existence adversely affected world peace.

Conclusion

In any consideration of the matter, the background events connected with the activities of the United Nations—particularly the deliberations of the Human Rights Commission—must never be overlooked. The Commission had no hesitation in promulgating covenants and conventions interfering with the sovereignty of the United States as to its internal affairs. The only protection against similar interferences by the World Court is the Connally reservation.

Interference with our courts: In 1949, the United Nations entertained a complaint from one of its consultative organizations, condemning Judge Harold R. Medina for his trial, in the Federal court, of 11 Communists, as a violation of the Human Rights Declaration. Only a member state may file a complaint in the Court; but Uruguay or any other nation, under leftwing pressures, could file complaints criticizing our courts. Due to such pressures in Uruguay, our State Department interfered in Caryl Chessman's execution. Without the reservation, Communist and leftwing nations could complain against the United States for prosecuting Communists and other culprits.

ARGUMENTS AGAINST

(By Charles S. Rhyne)

Violence as decision method

The world today is poised between hope for total peace and fear of total war. Ending war is mankind's greatest need. A frenzied unchecked race is on to improve nuclear warheads and their delivery via intercontinental missiles—today's ultimate method for resolving disputes between nations. A new method is urgently essential to avoid atomic holocaust. President Eisenhower has said:

"Man's hope for world peace does not rest in opposing armed camps, but in an idea. That idea is the concept of a rule of law as the means for settling disputes among sovereign states."

Courts best nonviolent method

Finding facts and applying law in a court are the best nonviolent methods conceived since the dawn of history for resolution of disputes. A court is a worldwide symbol of peaceful decision. No one decisionmaking process is surrounded with such an aura of fairness or commands more public esteem, confidence and trust.

In the beginning of time disputes between men were settled in a fist fight; then with sticks, stones, spears, and guns. Today in civilized nations such disputes are decided in courts. But from the beginning until now, the primitive rule of violence is the ultimate resort in disputes between nations.

The creators of the United Nations knew this, and sought to substitute a courthouse for the battlefield. They established the World Court to decide:

"All cases which the parties refer to it and all matters specially provided for in the Charter of the United Nations or in treaties and conventions in force."

An empty Court

Speedy communications and transportation create more international contacts and disputes. Yet the World Court has remained almost empty—deciding only 11 cases on their merits in 14 years. For this our U.S. Senate is primarily responsible. In accepting the Court's compulsory jurisdiction it attached an amendment, sponsored by Senator Connally, of Texas, which makes that acceptance a sham. Senator Connally's amendment provides that when sued in the World Court, the United States itself will decide whether the case involves domestic or international issues. Since the United Nations Charter prohibits the Court from exercising jurisdiction over domestic affairs of any nation, Connally gives us control over whether a case against us may be decided.

No sovereignty can be surrendered

Eliminating Connally is not a surrender of sovereignty over our domestic affairs—the United Nations Charter prohibits the Court from accepting or exercising such sovereignty even if offered. The real question here is shall we keep power to bar a decision in those few close cases where a decision might go against our position on whether a matter is "domestic" or "international." Should the slight change of a wrong decision in such a close case be allowed to continue to render useless the best peaceful decision method known to man when even a wrong Court decision—if contrary to fact or law—can be changed, whereas the millions of gravestones the world over are mute evidence of the unchangeability of the results of war?

Connally violates the age-old maxim that "no person should sit as a judge in his own case." By it we are turned into a judge in every case to which we are a party.

Consent court won't work

Six of the seven complaints filed there by the United States (for damages through attacks upon our airplanes) have been dismissed because the Soviet Union, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, and Hungary refused consent that they be decided. This proves both Communist distrust of the Court and jurisdiction based on case by case consent will never work. The thousands of disputes decided by national course, however, prove that obligatory jurisdiction does work. President Truman has said:

"When Kansas and Colorado have a quarrel over the water in the Arkansas River, they don't call out the National Guard in each State and go to war over it. They bring a suit in the Supreme Court of the United States and abide by the decision. There isn't a reason in the world why we cannot do that internationally."

But Kansas would hardly sue if Colorado could cause summary dismissal of its complaint by refusing consent for a Court decision.

If traffic court jurisdiction depended upon each defendant's consent, traffic courts would have few cases to try. In fact the police would hardly waste their time arresting traffic offenders. And so it is with the World "consent" Court. Few nations sue other nations there. Nations do not really prefer war to the Court. The "blight of Connally" destroys their ability to get a decision there.

We need Court most

Because of our worldwide involvement we need the Court more than any other nation. But Connally closes the door to us. Under the Court's statute all rights are reciprocal. Any nation sued by us can rely upon Connally, refuse consent, and our complaint is dismissed. Connally is thus a two-way street with a boomerang effect.

If performance is proof, the fact that the Court never has exceeded its jurisdiction indicates Connally is unwarranted. Further, the Court's decisions in reasoning and result compare favorably with those of the best national courts.

The empty courtroom at The Hague is therefore not due to lack of a competent court or a lack of justiciable disputes.

Best informed urge Connally elimination

Those best informed on weapons available for international decision by violence support Connally's repeal. These include: President Eisenhower, Vice President Nixon, Secretary of State Herter, Attorney General Rogers, and many Senators and Congressmen on a bipartisan basis. Over 90 percent of the newspaper editorial comments urges repeal. The American Bar Association adopted a resolution in 1947 condemning Connally as "a serious backward step." The Catholic Association for International Peace, and the Board of World Peace of the Methodist Church are illustrative of organizations adopting similar recent resolutions.

Connally abandoned by others

Acquisition of the A-bomb by the Soviet Union, and its ever-increasing capacity to deliver it, has seemingly caused other nations who copied Senator Connally's idea to now abandon it. England, India, and France have led the way. Thirty-three nations now accept the Court's jurisdiction without a Connally-type reservation. President Eisenhower said in India:

"Plainly, one foundation stone in this structure (for peace) is the International Court of Justice (World Court). It is heartening to note that a strong movement is afoot in many parts of the world to increase acceptance of the obligatory jurisdiction of that Court. I congratulate India on the leadership and vision she has shown in her new declaration accepting its jurisdiction."

Law in a court is no "cure-all." It supplements other peace machinery whereby nonjusticiable disputes are resolved. We now exercise our sovereignty to maintain peace internationally through men, money, bases, and military might. Since disputes are inherent in the nature of men and nations, no more essential need exists today than a further exercise of our sovereignty to strengthen the World Court to avoid decision of disputes by atomic weapons.

Time has come to end war

In civilization's evolution the time has come when court justice must replace war violence if mankind is to survive. To speed that evolution few steps offer more in promise or potential than Senate repeal of Connally. Elimination of Connally is an imperative step forward out of the current balance of terror toward world peace which only our Senate can take. Our Senate will fail all mankind in the urgent quest for peace if it does not take that vital step.

REBUTTAL BY MR. HOLMAN

Many Americans are fooled today by internationalist phrase-makers. One current phrase is "world peace through law." Upon this, Mr. Rhyne largely bases his argument for repeal of the Connally reservation.

At the American Association of Law Libraries Meeting, July 2, 1958, Washington, D.C., Mr. Rhyne announced:

"There is no reason why peace through law cannot be sold with the same verve and enthusiasm that we sell soap and other products and programs."

The following day, no less an internationalist than Dean Acheson observed:

"While it may be that peace through law may be offered for sale with the same verve and enthusiasm as soap, the chances of a consummated sale seem to me infinitely less. If you think of yourself as ringing Mr. Khrushchev's doorbell with two packages in your hand, you can, I firmly believe, have no doubt as to which is salable and which is not."

Mr. Acheson then indicated why Mr. Khrushchev would not buy the Rhyne rule of law:

" 'Whose rule of law?' he (Khrushchev) would ask. You answer with verve and enthusiasm. 'Rhyne's grade A fancy, approved by the American Bar Association.'

" 'You have a nerve,' he shouts back as he slams the door. 'I'm the proprietor of Khrushchev's rule of Khrushchev, grade triple A, super-colossal. Guaranteed to bury you. Use it either as a tonic or embalming fluid, or both. Ask the Poles.' "

Mr. Rhyne, in selling peace like soap and other products, resorts to the patent medicine sales technique of casting epithets. He refers to Senator Connally's reservation as a "sham," as "generating distrust," as having a "boomerang effect," as the "blight of Connally" (although the Senate approved 51 to 12), as violating the maxim—"no person should sit as a judge in his own case."

The reservation does not violate this maxim. American law permits one to elect whether to submit his case to a particular tribunal. Relying on diversity of citizenship, he may remove his case from a State to a Federal court; or he may take a change of venue. Similarly, the World Court Statute permits a nation to elect not to submit to that Court the question of whether a matter is domestic. There is a basic difference between judging one's case, once in court, and, as of right, not submitting a particular question to that court.

Mr. Rhyne not only relies on epithets rather than argument, but also upon personalities and newspaper editorials. Space is insufficient to analyze all his statements, but it is denied that "over 90 percent of the newspaper editorial comment" urges repeal. Many oppose repeal—Los Angeles Times, Arizona Republic, Dallas News, Times-Picayune, Indianapolis Star, Chicago Tribune, and others. A majority of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee opposed repeal. A modern enigma is that President Eisenhower and some in his administration should approve any measure authored by Senator HUMPHREY, explainable only on the theory that they thoughtlessly succumbed to the Rhyne "soap sales" program for "world peace through law."

However much we favor settling matters by law instead of by force, we are still compelled (through no fault of ours) to deal at arm's length with the Soviet Union and other nations and are not ready for military disarmament nor for legal disarmament, by abandoning the Connally reservation and its protection of our domestic affairs.

The present nonuse of the World Court is occasioned, not by the Connally reservation, but by the refusal of nations, chiefly the Soviet Union, to use it, and by their preference for dealing with world affairs by negotiation and conferences.

To insure peace through law requires the following governmental powers: legislative (to establish law), judicial (to interpret law), executive (to enforce law). Without these, a rule of law is as impossible as is water without two parts of hydrogen and one of oxygen. In absolute monarchies, all three powers were merged in the monarch; in other governments they were partially merged; in ours there is a separation of powers. But to have effective government, national or worldwide, there must be legislative, judicial, and executive authority; thus the achievement of "world peace through law" inevitably adds up to world government.

Mr. Rhyne does not recognize this stubborn fact. His sales program is, therefore, based on cure-all phrases and vague unfounded hopes substituted for reality. Assuredly war is terrible. But Americans should not be panicked into world government where their lives and liberties, even their religious faiths, would be dominated by alien majorities, for we represent only 8 percent of world population.

Mr. Rhyne says: "The United Nations Charter prohibits the Court from exercising jurisdiction over domestic affairs." But the United Nations has nullified this supposed protection by official statements and overt acts, as shown in my principal article. Why trust the Court, itself an organ of the United Nations, to enforce this protection? The Connally reservation insures it.

REBUTTAL BY MR. RHYNE

Fear of the Court

Mr. Holman supports Connally because of fear the World Court may exceed its specified jurisdiction. He cites not one thing that the Court has said or done as a basis for his fears. He selects other targets, agencies, and people totally unconnected with the Court, and by farfetched innuendo seeks support for his fears. He favors existing dispute settlement methods internationally—methods which have never prevented war—to decisions in court, yet he gives no logical reason for this negative position.

U.N. Charter, not Connally, protects domestic areas

He erroneously claims Connally protects six domestic areas from World Court decision. Actually it is the United Nations Charter, not Connally, which prohibits World Court jurisdiction over domestic matters. Under universally accepted international law, immigration, tariffs, and offshore rights are clearly domestic matters outside the Court's jurisdiction. The treaty of 1903 with Panama confers all rights, powers, authority, and sovereignty upon the United States over the canal so the Court could not possibly internationalize it. Our domestic court cases and what we spend on foreign aid are irrefutably domestic matters which the World Court cannot pass upon. The extremity of Mr. Holman's six illustrations destroys the reasonableness of his fears. Connally and the World Court have no possible relation to our State Department's interference in Caryl Chessman's execution.

A false analogy

Finding nothing in the Court's record to support his position, Mr. Holman selects the record of the Human Rights Commission to assail. Realizing this glaring weakness, he seeks to strengthen his case by himself declaring the World Court is not a court but a commission. The U.N. Charter and the Court's statute flatly refute this legerdemain. They require the Court to follow fixed legal procedures and law principles. The Commission is a political body. Membership qualifications, functions, and work products of the Court and Commission are vastly different. It is interesting to note that Mr. Holman is unable to point out one instance where the World Court has exceeded its jurisdiction. Since he cannot do so, he attempts to impute to the Court the alleged shortcomings of an entirely different body. Use of such a technique discredits his position rather than the Court.

His claim that justices from other nations cannot recognize domestic issues is directly refuted by decisions of the Court. And other nations guard their domestic affairs as jealously as we do.

Illogical deductions

Reliance upon strained interpretations of statements made 12 years ago by John P. Humphrey, a United Nations official from Canada, and 11 years ago by a private person, Mr. Moses Moskowitz, plus lifting of one sentence out of context from a 99-page State Department publication demonstrates how desperately unfruitful has been the search for evidence to support his "fear the Court" position. Mr. Moskowitz, contrary to what Mr. Holman says, was in 1949 and still is an employee of the Consultative Council of Jewish Organizations—never "of the United Nations staff." Yet on the basis of these statements—by people never even remotely connected with the Court—Mr. Holman argues the Court would hold domestic affairs are international, hence subject to adjudication by the Court. Obviously, he would offer real evidence if any existed rather than that presented. The Court's record and the law governing its jurisdiction prove the opposite of Mr. Holman's thesis.

Trial by battle

To keep the record straight, it was President Eisenhower, not Senator HUMPHREY, who first suggested repeal of Connally.

Reliance upon settlement of disputes between nations by negotiation has resulted in many bloody battles. When Connally was adopted the Soviet Union had neither the H-bomb nor intercontinental missiles. Since then the arms race has accelerated. And every such race since the dawn of history has exploded into war. Trial by battle today is a negative backward step into extinction of mankind. If allowed a choice, mankind would certainly choose the Court over atomic holocaust. Disarmament according to Secretary Herter depends upon rules of law which prevent "nations from attacking other nations" plus "a world court."

Undecided

Mr. Holman concludes by another attack on the Human Rights Commission rather than the Court. These somewhat confusing arguments and targets of Mr. Holman are understandable when one realizes that he has changed his mind before on Connally. Perhaps he is on the verge of changing his mind again. We hope so. Fear of the Court is wrong in principle and experience.

I close with Mr. Holman's own words to the American Bar Association in 1947 vigorously urging repeal of Connally:

"We as lawyers ought to speak, and speak now, for the jurisdiction of the Court. * * * We should keep our consistent position as to the World Court, not lag behind with those who are afraid of it." (Quoted from 33 American Bar Association Journal 401.)

CONGRESS, THE UNITED STATES, AND THE WORLD COURT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, although my proposal, Senate Resolution 94, calling for repeal of the self-judging reservation to the U.S. adherence to the Statute of the World Court has been temporarily postponed, there are certain practical steps which can be undertaken now to make a repeal a reality in the near future.

Mr. President, the distinguished senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] has clearly set forth these practical steps in an address before the section of international and comparative law of the American Bar Association in Washington, May 19, 1960. I ask unanimous consent that this excellent address be printed in the RECORD.

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

CONGRESS, THE UNITED STATES, AND THE WORLD COURT

(Speech by Senator CLARK at section of international and comparative law of the American Bar Association, Washington, D.C., Thursday, May 19, 1960)

The collapse of the summit conference, disclosures of illegal espionage flights, and threats to Allied air bases and to West Berlin—all appear to make sadly misdated this discussion of the relationship of the United States to the World Court.

What has U.S. participation in the infrequent and relatively unimportant litigation at the Court in The Hague got to do with the burning issues which divide East and West and endanger world peace today? Discouragingly little, it must be admitted by even the stanchest supporters of the Court.

And yet the errors, hostilities, fears, and disillusionments of the last 2 weeks demand stock-taking and reassessment. What better time than now to focus renewed attention on our relationship to one of the institutions known to be essential to the achievement of a just and lasting peace. What better time than now to concentrate on the limited but obtainable objectives in the continuing and vital effort to promote the rule of law in the world community.

The repeal of the self-judging Connally reservation to the United States ratification of the Statute of the International Court of Justice is such an objective—obtainable next year, if not in 1960.

We can take little pride in reviewing U.S. ties with the World Court over the last 14 years.

On August 2, 1946, the Senate adopted 55–12 Senator Connally's 8-word amendment to add the clause "as determined by the United States of America" to the reservation of U.S. jurisdiction over domestic matters after a brief and inadequate debate. Only three Senators spoke against the amendment. The three reasons given by Senator Connally in support of his amendment—that it was needed to prevent the Court from taking jurisdiction over immigration, tariff and Panama Canal matters—were all shown to be inaccurate in the excellent report filed last August by the Tondel Committee of this section.

And yet the damage was done. A number of other nations followed our example and enacted similar self-judging reservations, although it is encouraging to note that France, the United Kingdom, and India dropped such reservations in recent years.

The United States has invoked the self-judging reservation in one of the handful of cases brought against us to date, a complaint lodged by Switzerland in the Interhandel case, although the Court decided the case in our favor on other procedural grounds.

The substantive arguments for repeal are familiar to this section's members, who have taken such a commendable lead in advocating full U.S. participation in the Court's jurisdiction: (1) A recognized body of international law, a court system to administer such laws, and adequate enforcement sanctions are as essential to peace with justice on the international scene as they are in national and local community life; (2) While purely domestic questions are beyond the jurisdiction of the International Court under the terms of Article XXXVI of its Statute, the decision as to what is a domestic issue should be made by the Court rather than the litigant nation; (3) The Connally amendment permits the United States to determine unilaterally what is a domestic question and to decide whether we will let other nations take us to court.

We must indeed plead guilty, at least in part, to the charge leveled at us by our good friend, Ambassador Mahommedali Currim Chagla of India, when he stated recently that the Connally amendment "reduces the Court to a mockery and effectively prevents any rule of law from ever being established in the international field." The London Economist echoed this charge in an editorial earlier this month which stated that "the work of the Court has been hampered greatly because so many other countries follow the American example."

An analysis of the so-far unsuccessful effort to repeal the Connally reservation in the 86th Congress leading to suggestions as to ways in which that effort can be made successful in the future may be useful at this time.

The history of the repeal move to date is the old, old story of too late and too little. Although 12 of those who voted for the Connally amendment in 1946 are still in the Senate and only Senators FULBRIGHT and MORSE remain of those who voted against it, the approach to the repeal question has been entirely casual.

In December of 1958 the Washington press corps indicated that the President would ask for repeal of the Connally amendment. Accordingly it was no surprise when Mr. Eisenhower's state of the Union speech on January 9, 1959, included the following statement:

"It is my purpose to intensify efforts during the coming 2 years in seeking ways to supplement the procedures of the United Nations and other bodies with similar objectives, to the end that the rule of law may replace the rule of force in the affairs of nations. Measures toward this end will be proposed later including a reexamination of our own relation to the International Court of Justice."

Early in the first session of a new Congress with elections almost 2 years in the future is an ideal time to take up controversial issues. Committees have time for full hearings. Floor debates that take 2 or 3 days can be scheduled without upsetting adjournment plans. But during the first 2½ months of 1959 the 86th Congress received no further message or requests from the administration regarding the World Court.

On March 24, 1959, Senator HUMPHREY introduced his resolution (S. Res. 94) to repeal the Connally amendment, and it was referred to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. On March 25, the committee asked the State Department and the Department of Justice for comment on the resolution. In the end of April an Assistant Secretary of State wrote to Chairman FULBRIGHT to advise him that State supported repeal. A similar letter from a Deputy Attorney General was received in early June.

The further message promised by the President in his state of the Union message was not forthcoming and Congress adjourned in September without taking further action on the repeal proposal.

It was not until late last November that the President's views in favor of repeal were elicited in response to a written appeal by Senator HUMPHREY. When Senator JAVITS and I spoke to Secretary Herter to urge Executive support of Senate Resolution 94 at about the same time, we learned that the Department still had no poll indicating whether the Senate would support the measure.

The President's state of the Union message on January 7, 1960, contained a few sentences reiterating the support for the repeal resolution stated in his letter to Senator HUMPHREY.

At this stage some proponents of repeal thought they could relax since so many formal statements of support had been obtained from the administration. The opponents of repeal were just beginning to roll.

Although my mail last year reflected a slight majority of opinion in favor of repeal, in the early weeks of 1960 I started to receive mass mailings directed against Senate Resolution 94, stirred up by the press of the right fringe, the American Legion, the DAR, and other self-styled patriotic organizations. The communications were violent and extreme and contained all the misconceptions you would expect: Our courts and Constitution would be subverted by passage of the resolution; proponents were guilty of treason.

Senator FULBRIGHT saw the storm signals and requested the Secretary of State and the Attorney General to appear personally in support of the repeal resolution when hearings were held in January to indicate genuine administration support. Both Cabinet members did testify in favor of Senate Resolution 94 on January 27. Many requests to be heard required a second day of hearings on February 17.

By the time the opposition mail campaign was in high gear and the earlier estimates that Senate Resolution 94 would receive the support of two-thirds of the Senate (necessary to modify a treaty reservation) began to look dubious.

On March 28 the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, much to the distress of Chairman FULBRIGHT, voted 9 to 8 to postpone indefinitely further consideration of the Humphrey resolution. Opposition to the measure and fear that it would be defeated if reported to the floor combined to produce the result * * *.

Senator AIKEN, of Vermont, was the only Republican on the Committee who voted against the tabling motion and in favor of reporting the repeal resolution to the Senate.

What more could the administration have done, you may ask, in view of the Administration's formal support which I have already referred to.

The answer is: "A lot." A few sentences in favor of a legislative proposal in a presidential address mentioning scores of proposals and indications of approval in routine statements of Departmental officers submitted on request by Congressional Committees present one type of support. Special pleas for legislative action in talks to the Nation, which characterized the President's interest in labor reform last summer, followed by phone calls and visits to the Hill to round up needed votes by the White House staff

and other Executive officials, present another type of support. Plainly Senate Resolution 94 rates only the former.

It has been reported that the repeal issue has not been the subject of any of the White House sessions with Republican congressional leaders. The subject was omitted from the list of legislative matters on which the Administration wanted action before the end of the session in the message transmitted to Congress by the President on May 3.

The exertion of real executive leadership will inevitably result in the votes of more than one lone party member on a large committee. Obviously the repeal proposal has been assigned a low legislative priority by the Executive. Apparently this is another instance where words replaced deeds.

Similar expressions of support for the repeal resolution by lawyers and others have been far from overwhelming. My mail this year has run 560–180 against repeal. Other Members of Congress have reported even higher opposition mail. If my own correspondence were a true reflection of attorney sentiment in the Commonwealth, there is far more interest in passage of the Keogh tax relief bill for worthy, self-employed members of the bar than in U.S. participation in the World Court. If the lawyers are disinterested in the World Court, imagine the apathy of other groups.

Clearly it will take a concentrated effort by the executive branch and public interest groups to reactivate and pass Senate Resolution 94 this year, and at this date there is no indication that such an effort will be made. Floor discussions and correspondence I have had with a number of my colleagues on and off the Senate Foreign Relations Committee lead me to believe that less than two-thirds of the Senate, and possibly not even a majority, are in favor of repeal at this time.

Certain steps will have to be taken to make repeal a reality, this year or next.

1. Interested groups and persons, especially attorneys, will have to demand by word and letter that the executive branch assign high priority to the repeal effort and that the President put the full weight of his office behind it. Of course, resolutions at yearly meetings are helpful, and I hope that at the coming convention the American Bar Association will be able to defeat those opposed to repeal by a larger margin than the 100 to 93 edge recorded at the midwinter meeting. Such resolutions, however, can never substitute for personal appeals.

2. The report prepared in August of 1959 by a special committee of the section of international and comparative law of the American Bar Association in support of repeal of the self-judging reservation is unquestionably the best paper that has been prepared on this subject. I hope that it will be supplemented and brought up to date to cover the hearings of this year and the latest actions at The Hague, and then distributed to all Members of the Senate with covering letters from attorneys in each of the States.

3. Senator Kennedy, Governor Stevenson, Senator Symington, and the Vice President, are on record as favoring repeal, but Senator Johnson is uncommitted. The successful candidates should be pressed to give the matter a high priority early in 1961.

4. Candidates for the Senate on both tickets should be briefed on this issue and commitments for repeal sought before November.

None of these suggestions may work. Even the extremely modest step of accepting the full jurisdiction of the World Court may remain too controversial to gain Congressional approval. The rule of law may never be more than a goal for lawyers to talk about. The unhappy events of recent days may place in the ascendancy forces who believe that security can only be achieved by armed might.

The nuclear arms race may have gone too far to be stopped. If so, the sooner we establish that fact the better, because the military effort we will have to make to keep the race in balance in coming years as well as the risks of failure will be stupendous.

But I submit that the rule of law is the only hope for the survival of civilization; the only practical goal for this Nation and others at this advanced date; that the isolationist goal of the 19th century ultranationalists is no longer tenable; that world peace through world law can and must be achieved in the 1960's—and the early 1960's at that—before it is too late.

INTEREST DISCLOSURE BILL

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD following my brief remarks a news story from the New York Times of Sunday, May 22, 1960, headlined " 'Simple' Interest Isn't So Simple; Lending-Truth Bill Stirs Dispute."

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, this news story is the result of a recent address in New York by our distinguished colleague, Senator WALLACE BENNETT, of Utah, and describes the difficulty which would ensue after the passage of the so-called interest disclosure bill in its present form.

I wish to make clear that I was one of the original sponsors of the bill, on the basis that I believed in the principle of disclosure, and also on the basis that I thought the bill had some desirable anti-inflationary aspects. However, the hearings we have held so far indicate to me that the interest rate disclosure requirements of the bill, as now drafted, cannot be made effective.

Furthermore, despite the fact that some 34 States have legislation dealing with this same subject, the committee has not heard a single representative of the enforcement agencies of any of these States. We have had no testimony at all from the States as to how these disclosure laws are working or how they have been enforced.

Furthermore, the enforcement provisions of this bill call for the policeman to be the Federal Reserve Board. The Board has testified through its Chairman, Mr. Martin, that it does not feel able to do the job, that it does not want the job, that it is not a credit matter, that it is a policeman's job, and they do not feel competent to take it on.

The Federal Trade Commission has been suggested as an alternative, but they have not been invited to testify before the committee.

Yet, despite the fact that we have these gaps in the testimony—and they are very important gaps—and we have not heard other witnesses who would have something to say on this important subject, the subcommittee reported the bill to the full committee not very long ago, and there the bill is.

In view of the remarks I have made and the reasons I have stated, I withdraw my support from the bill, although I was one of the original sponsors, until we can have more hearings and get testimony which I think is essential before Congress should consider such a measure.

EXHIBIT 1

"SIMPLE" INTEREST ISN'T SO SIMPLE; LENDING-TRUTH BILL STIRS DISPUTE

(By Albert L. Kraus)

How simple is simple interest?

Elementary, says Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS, whose truth-in-lending bill would require that installment finance charges be stated in simple annual rates. The Illinois Democrat taught economics at the University of Chicago 28 years before being elected to Congress.

Beyond the comprehension of ordinary retail clerks, says Senator WALLACE F. BENNETT who asserts that the DOUGLAS bill would place an impossible burden on American businesses and Government enforcement agencies. The Utah Republican runs a department store and automobile agency in his hometown of Salt Lake City.

Behind these opposing views of the state of the Nation's arithmetic lies the latest debate over consumer credit. People have been buying too much, too fast on the installment plan, Senator DOUGLAS believes, because the cost of credit has been camouflaged.

Even the young, he says, have become targets of the creditmongers. Teenage credit, he said recently, is "aimed at a youngster too old to spank, too young to garnishee, who should be learning the savings habit."

Senator BENNETT, on the other hand, finds nothing alarming in the present levels of consumer credit. Economists, he notes, can't seem to agree on what constitutes a dangerous or unstabilizing level of consumer credit. And anyway, over the last 4 years, installment credit has held at a relatively stable 10 percent of disposable personal income and 7 percent of the gross national product, the total of the Nation's goods and services.

Few would deny Senator DOUGLAS' assertion that if the consumer got more information on the cost of credit, he should be able to decide better when to buy and when to borrow. To oppose such a view, Senator BENNETT has said, would be to favor sin.

But a number of lenders have questioned the ability of retail clerks, automobile salesmen and television dealers to express financing charges in simple annual interest.

Nothing to it, Senator DOUGLAS has said in effect. "Most people learn about rates early in grade school—in simple annual terms. As a saver in a bank or savings and loan association, he is paid in simple annual terms. As a homeowner he pays his mortgage in simple annual terms."

The lenders say there would be no problem if all contracts were to run for an even year, with payments made in equal installments at equal time intervals. But few contracts, they note, are written that way. They generally are written for periods shorter or longer than a year, with payments weekly, biweekly, or monthly, often with no payment for the first month or two of the contract, or with smaller payments at first and larger payments at the end.

Senator BENNETT tried out such a problem—the purchase of a $20 battery on which there would be a $2 finance charge—on a member of his staff who is an economist, on the Library of Congress, on a professor of marketing, and on several other persons, including a statistical expert.

The problem ran thus:

The battery was bought on a Monday, with four biweekly $5 payments beginning the following Friday and the final $2 payment made 2 weeks afterward. The finance charge was calculated variously at 129.5 percent, 118.9 percent, 80 percent, 117.7 percent and 125.33 percent.

The California Bankers Association tried out a simpler problem on seven mathematicians at three universities in the State. It asked them to calculate the effective rate of interest charged on a loan of $1,000 when a total of $1,060 was repaid over 12 equal montly payments. The mathematicians took five pages to describe the formulas they used in arriving at their answers. Even then, the answers varied.

One way out would be to figure the answers in advance—assuming the experts finally could agree—and supply store owners with the tables. But Senator BENNETT says that every merchant in the country would have to have a book of interest tables bigger than a Sears, Roebuck catalog. And their clerks would have to get special training to use them.

NO STATE HAS STATUTE

While an amended version of the Douglas bill would give enforcement to the States if they met minimum standards of disclosure, not 1 of the 31 States that have automobile installment sales laws would qualify because none require that finance charges be stated in simple annual interest rates. Senator DOUGLAS says he won't back down.

This reflects on States such as New York, where a fellow Democrat, former Governor Harriman, several years ago pushed through what he considered was model consumer credit legislation—with finance charges stated not in simple annual rates but in dollars of purchase price a year. The New York law says installment lenders may not charge more for credit than $6 a year for each $100 of purchase price.

It also reflects on the Congress. For, only several weeks ago, the Congress passed an automobile installment loan law for the District of Columbia that uses the same method.

CROWDED DOCKETS OF FEDERAL COURTS

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, shortly after coming to the Senate, I began an effort aimed at providing more realistic recognition of the appalling problem facing our Federal courts. In my own State of Colorado, the backlog of cases has forced litigants to wait as much as 3 or 4 years before their cases come up for hearing.

This situation is not unique in the Nation. Everywhere we are besieged by jurists and lawyers, by bar associations, and private citizens to provide the necessary relief. Articles in all media of the press have appeared almost universally in favor of speedy action by this Congress to create the needed judgeships.

Mr. President, a very timely, clearly written article of this nature appeared in the May 15 edition of the Denver Post. Its author, Reporter Tom Wilson, who spent part of last year here as an intern in government with the Congress, documents the judicial logjam in our area in a manner I am sure will be of interest to all. So that all Senators may have the opportunity for study of this article, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

JUSTICE IMPAIRED BY OVERLOADED DOCKET IN DENVER'S FEDERAL COURT

(By Tom Wilson)

Justice delayed is justice denied.

This legal axiom has a special pertinence for the U.S. Federal District Court for Colorado. In this court, justice is constantly delayed and therefore, in many cases, denied.

The delay is not deliberate. The court's two judges, Chief Judge Alfred A. Arraj and newly appointed Judge Hatfield Chilson, work long hours.

The court has no summer recess. Visiting judges are brought from other districts to hear Colorado cases. The pretrial conference and revised rules for filing and administering the legal actions have been instituted to speed justice.

But because cases are filed at a faster rate than they can be disposed of, the backlog continues—and grows.

At the end of July 1957 there were 314 civil cases and 57 criminal cases pending before the court. Last April 30 the court faced a backlog of 427 civil cases and 75 criminal actions.

In fiscal 1959 the average Federal judge held nine criminal jury trials. Colorado's 2 judges held 41. North and South Dakota, each with two Federal judges, held eight such trials.

The delay particularly affects civil actions. The Federal Constitution requires a speedy trial for those accused of criminal violations.

Criminal cases, therefore, have precedence over civil cases. Thus new criminal cases push existing civil cases further back on the court's docket.

The court's average of 3 to 4 months between the filing of criminal complaint and the beginning of trial is one of the best in the Nation, according to Judge Arraj.

The 2-year average for civil cases is one of the worst.

There are many ways a 2-year delay can work a hardship on a litigant.

A court trial is a search for truth. Most attorneys agree the major problem in a trial is keeping the evidence as factual and as distinct as possible.

Facts are presented by witnesses or by documents presented by witnesses. In 2 years, memories dim, witnesses move or die.

The litigant is often forced to pay for an expensive search for a witness. Sometimes he finds he cannot afford such a search or meet the cost of bringing the witness to Denver for the trial.

And for the lack of a witness the case may be lost.

Financial hardships suffered by the plaintiff in waiting for a civil damage trial may lead to an out of court settlement, at a figure less than just, because he cannot afford to wait for justice.

A man injured in an accident may have a just claim for damages. He usually will have large expenses in medical bills and loss of time on his job.

Though the case must wait 2 years for a hearing, the plaintiff's creditors often will not. Thus a settlement that may serve the creditors but not justice often takes place.

In tort cases, those not involving contracts, the defendant who must pay damages does not pay interest on them until they are awarded at the trial.

In Colorado cases, the defendant will thus have the use of his money for 2 years. The plaintiff gets no compensation for the delay.

A man who files suit in Federal court to compel a defendant to comply with the terms of a contract or lease may find the disputed agreement has expired before the trial is set.

The law that establishes the district of Colorado says that the court shall hold sessions in Denver, Durango, Grand Junction, Montrose, Pueblo and Sterling.

No trials have been held outside of Denver for 4 years, Judge Arraj says, because the court cannot afford the extra time the judicial trips would use.

Litigants have been faced with the fact that it would cost them more to bring their attorneys, witnesses, and evidence to Denver than they would gain in their suit, if they won.

Outstate attorneys must pass on clients to Denver associates because they cannot expect the clients to pay for frequent trips to Denver to handle the many preliminary actions that precede the actual trial.

If Colorado were to get a third judge, the court would resume outstate sessions to try cases in the area where they originated, Judge Arraj says.

This third judge solution has been before Congress for several years.

A bill to create 45 new Federal judgeships, including one for Colorado, has been approved by the Senate Judiciary Committee and is before the same committee of the House of Representatives.

But the pressure of the early adjournment date, necessitated by the coming political conventions, and the unwillingness to deal with a major patronage plum just before the voters designate the relative strength of the parties, will probably put the issue off until the next Congress.

Next year the bill's chances may improve.

Many attorneys believe that delay in the administration of justice is not only unfair to the persons involved, but may be eroding away this Nation's traditional respect for justice.

"The judicial branch of Government is designed to protect the rights of the individual citizen," U.S. Attorney Donald G. Brotzman says.

"The citizen should have confidence that this branch will assist him in obtaining his basic legal rights and it is important that this confidence is maintained.

"I fear that as the public experiences injustice due to delay, their confidence in our judicial system will be diminished to the detriment of our whole concept of justice."

Without a third judge, Judge Arraj believes the Colorado Federal docket can be kept little more than current.

This would involve the continued use of visiting judges—an expensive and inefficient expedient—and the continued pressure of the backlog on the whole court.

The 2-year delay for civil cases would remain.

THE U-2 SPY PLANE INCIDENT AND THE SUMMIT CONFERENCE

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I have in my hand an article which is of particular significance in view of President Eisenhower's recent return from Paris. With the overwhelming display of affection and national unity represented by the tremendous crowd here in Washington still fresh in our minds, with the clarity of purpose and statesmanship of Mr. Eisenhower becoming more evident every day, here is one more piece of evidence to add.

Many correspondents, many spokesmen, were quick to leap upon the trap baited by the Russians into which we were supposed to have fallen when the announcement of the U-2 spy plane was made. But the facts have tended to show a somewhat different picture in recent days in light of Khrushchev's vile performance, his almost maniacal tirade before the press in Paris, and his insistent hammering at a single, threadbare theme. How threadbare is shown in this article by Nicholas Blatchford which appears in the May 20 edition of the Washington Daily News.

Mr. President, in a point-by-point countdown, Mr. Blatchford gives the lie to Khrushchev's tale of the shooting

down of the U-2, of his double deceit during his visit to this Nation, and of the premier's obvious intention to sabotage the summit, no matter what the excuse.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be reprinted in the RECORD at this point in my remarks so that we may have its added weight as permanent proof of the Russian premier's deceit.

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

KHRUSHCHEV AND THE CAT

(By Nicholas Blatchford)

Khrushchev made two serious errors in the raucous press conference he held after the summit collapse. The first could even cost him his hide.

Things were going along famously—bluff, bombast, threat, smile, snarl—when a correspondent for the National Broadcasting Co. cleverly baited a trap for him—proving that at least some radio-TV correspondents are on the ball. And Khrushchev promptly fell in—proving that he is not always as fast on his feet as he sometimes seems.

"Why," the NBC man asked, "since you knew about these (U-2) flights, did you not tell President Eisenhower about them and ask him to stop them when you visited the United States?"

It was a sneaky question—sneaky because the Russian leaders had not acknowledged, to their own people or to anyone else, that they knew of the U-2 flights until they'd brought one down.

Nevertheless, Khrushchev waded right in, saying, "I will answer that question with pleasure." He explained that when he was at Camp David with Ike "I almost opened my mouth to make that statement" but then decided "not to raise the matter with this friend of mine."

The cat was out of the bag. Here was a stark admission that:

Khrushchev had known about the U-2 flights ever since last fall and probably ever since we first started making them, some 4 years ago. Why did no one demand a public apology then?

He and his cohorts in the Kremlin had concealed these "aggressive espionage flights" from the Russian people. (For obvious reasons: They couldn't knock the U-2 down, probably because it normally flies too high.)

The big show of outrage, surprise, shock, indignation and horror at the ill-starred flight of Pilot Powers was, therefore, so much eyewash, a convenient way to scuttle the summit conference before it was launched.

We doubt that Khrushchev will be forgiven this slip by his stony-eyed friends back home.

The other blooper was made when Khrushchev told the assembled correspondents two true stores:

When he was a child and the family cat would try to mooch some cream, his mother "usually took the cat by the scruff of the neck and gave it a good shaking."

Apparently this left its mark on the boy, because we find Khrushchev coming back to the theme later in the conference.

"This recalls to my mind," he said, "what we used to do in the Donbass when I was the young boy. Whenever we caught a cat in the pigeon's loft, we would catch the cat by its tail and bang its head against the wall and that was the only way it could be taught some sense."

With that statement, Khrushchev probably lost twice as much ground as he had gained in all his travels. We don't just mean he lost the vote of all the nice, little old ladies in Dubuque, Iowa.

It is one thing for a boy to swing a cat against a wall by its tail. It is another thing for a grown man to boast of it.

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. HILL. Mr. President, the pending bill is a good bill, a sound bill, and one which will continue support for many of the tried and proved programs of American agriculture. In this bill there is much of the ability, much of the knowledge, much of the experience, and much of the wisdom of the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], who has served as chairman of the Senate Agricultural Appropriation Subcommittee since he first came to the Senate in 1933.

Mr. RUSSELL. I might remind the Senator from Alabama that for 2 terms, unfortunately, the electorate brought about a Republican majority in the Senate.

Mr. HILL. That was unfortunate indeed. However, ever since the Senator from Georgia has been in the Senate he has served as chairman of the subcommittee when the Democrats were in control of the Senate.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator.

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

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. There is a certain implication contained in the remarks of the Senator from Alabama, but I am sure that he did not mean to imply it was unfortunate that the distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] was the chairman at the time there was a Republican majority in the Senate. Being a southerner, he may feel that it was unfortunate we had a Republican majority in the Senate. However, I am sure he will agree with me that it was good to have Senator YOUNG at the helm at the time.

Mr. HILL. I agree with the distinguished Senator from South Dakota that, since we had to have a Republican Senate, we were extremely fortunate to have the distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], my good friend, the friend of the farmer, the very outstanding Senator from North Dakota, as chairman of this subcommittee.

Mr. MUNDT. I believe the reason that we had to have a Republican Senate—and it was certainly essential that we had one—had nothing to do with what the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] always does when he is at the helm of a committee.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HILL. Through the years, the distinguished Senator from Georgia has been a most eloquent spokesman in the battle to enable the farmers of our Nation to obtain a fair share of the national income and to enjoy the fruits of American prosperity.

As a member of the Senate Agricultural Appropriations Subcommittee, I have had the privilege, over a number of years, to witness at close range the ability, intelligence, and integrity, the fearless dedication and the absolute determination, of the Senator from Georgia to win justice and equity for our farmers.

The farmers and the farm families of America have no greater friend than DICK RUSSELL. His name stands in the forefront of any rollcall of Senators who have sponsored and worked and fought for price supports on basic farm commodities, rural electrification, soil conservation, farm credit, farm housing, the school lunch program, and many other great programs benefiting our farm families.

Mr. President, I take this opportunity to commend and congratulate my able and distinguished colleague from Georgia for his understanding, for his devotion, and for his magnificent leadership in the cause of agriculture and the farmers of America.

I am delighted that the good people of Senator RUSSELL's home State of Georgia had the richly deserved appreciation of him to again this year nominate him without opposition to a fifth full term in the Senate.

We all know that he is one of the great Members of this body, and we do hope that he may enjoy many more fruitful years of service to his State and to our country.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I am overwhelmed by the very eloquent speech delivered by my beloved friend, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL]. I am sure he must view me through eyes which are colored by glasses of friendship; otherwise he would never have made those statements. I am highly honored and deeply grateful.

Not in a back-patting attitude, I may say that I have often thought that of those who serve in the Senate today—and there are many great Senators here—the distinguished Senator from Alabama, through his great contribution to the cause of health in this country, through the Hill-Burton hospital program, and through his sponsorship of research to conquer the diseases that plague our people, is one of the few Members who will find a permanent place in the history of this country. That makes me all the more grateful for his very complimentary references to me.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, it is my understanding that H.R. 12117, the fiscal 1961 appropriation measure for the United States Department of Agriculture, does not include new funds for fruit research in the Agricultural Research Service.

The commercial fruit industry—and I refer particularly to the production of apples and peaches—is most important to the economy of West Virginia. In 1958 and 1959, West Virginia ranked 7th

in the Nation in the production of apples, which, in 1959, amounted to 5,700,000 bushels. In 1958, the cash value of our apple crop amounted to $8,500,000.

In the matter of peach crop, West Virginia ranked 17th in the Nation both in 1958 and 1959.

The labor force required to produce, harvest, and market in the industry is also important because of its contribution to needed employment in West Virginia. However, conditions in marketing are subject to constant change, and these changes bring new challenges which must be met by intensified and expanded research.

By and large, when we appropriate a dollar for research and apply it to the specific purpose for which the money has been appropriated, there is not only a return of the 100 cents on the dollar invested, but, also, a further return in the form of a dividend to the industry, to the productivity of the persons, and to development within the industry. This is important to a State like West Virginia.

I have received two communications in recent days from the organization which is representative of the apple growers in the States of West Virginia, Virginia, Maryland, and Pennsylvania. Carroll R. Miller, who is the secretary-manager of the Appalachian Apple Service, Inc., and who is a citizen of West Virginia, residing at Martinsburg, set forth in his communication this language which I call to the attention of the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], who presents the appropriation bill this afternoon, for his consideration:

> In apples, as in many fruits and vegetables, most growers are literally battling for survival in this riptide of change that has been gaining momentum in the past 10 years or more—nationally and worldwide. These changes have brought new conditions—new facts that must be faced. Only systematic research can find these facts. Research is the prime necessity today.

Then Mr. Miller uses this expression:

> We seem to be about 20 years behind with the facts, and it is hurting.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the telegram dated May 12, 1960, from Mr. Miller, and his subsequent letter of May 18, 1960, both of them on the subject matter which I have been discussing during the last few minutes.

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

MARTINSBURG, W. VA., *May 12, 1960.*

Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH,
Senate Offices, Washington D.C.:

House agricultural appropriations bill seems to have denied all funds for vital new fruit research asked for repeatedly by the highly responsible deciduous fruit advisory committee. Bill also cuts vital pesticide research funds from requested 1½ million to only 250,000. Both funds are most important to applegrowers and fruit and vegetable growers just now. This four-State organization of 1,308 applegrowers earnestly asks your help in restoring these funds.

APPALACHIAN APPLE SERVICE,
CARROLL R. MILLER, *Secretary.*

APPALACHIAN APPLE SERVICE, INC.,
May 18, 1960.

Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH,
The Senate Offices,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JENNINGS: Thank you for your quick response to our May 11 wire about the slashes the House inflicted on fruit and vegetable research funds; for both this threatening pesticide problem and for our marketing problems.

In apples, as in many fruits and vegetables, most growers are literally battling for survival in this riptide of change that has been gaining momentum the past 10 years or more nationally and worldwide. These changes have brought new conditions: new facts that must be faced. Only systematic research can find these facts. Research is the prime necessity today.

New chemicals have brought problems not yet understood by anyone as yet; fearsome to many; and fodder for sensation-hunting publicists, with possible sudden and ruinous effects on the industry. Only quick, competent research can get at the facts. The House slashed the considered request for $1½ million for this to a quarter million.

This tidal wave of change is running also in marketing. A successful independent grocer told me the other day that over two-thirds of the items on his shelves now come from a double handful of the giant food manufacturing firms: Swift and Armour, General Mills, Pillsbury, and General Foods, and so on. Apples must sell in this highly organized competition—but how? The right answers to this are imperative. The National Apple Institute has asked the Department of Agriculture to help find the facts, since they have the authority and the trained research personnel. They are willing, but it takes funds not yet authorized. We seem to be about 20 years behind with the facts and it is hurting.

We will genuinely appreciate your continued efforts to repair the House's slashes.

Sincerely,

CARROLL R. MILLER,
Secretary-Manager.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I am in the position, in a sense, of being after the fact rather than before the fact. The House did not act in the manner in which my constituency and the constituency of the Senators from the other States in the apple belt feel it should have acted in reference to new research moneys, especially for apples and peaches. However, I understand—and I feel certain there will be a clarification by the able Senator from Georgia—that the money which was requested—the figure proposed is $100,000—is not available during fiscal 1961 for intensified research in the field of commercial fruit. I believe the need is not only in the specific area for which I plead, but is also national in its scope and application, if the funds were to be provided for the purpose I have indicated.

I had the privilege earlier this afternoon of conferring with the Senator from Georgia. I am sure it is his desire to clarify the situation for me, and also perhaps to make a comment on the possibility of having funds, if not included in the present appropriation bill, at least actively considered for incorporation in the bill next year.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the distinguished senior Senator from West Virginia is always impressive and compelling in his statements. The approach to this subject is no exception to that rule.

I can reassure him as one of the matters which is dealt with by the telegram from his constituents. So far as concerns appropriations for needed research into pesticides and insecticides, and the residue therefrom, the Senate committee appropriated all the many funds which were requested by the Senator's constituents. We appropriated the full $1,500,000 which was asked for this very important study.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The Senator from Georgia is certainly correct and is helpful in this situation. I advised my constituency of the fact that the Senate had so acted, and we are grateful to the committee for the recognition of that need.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have listened with careful attention to the Senator's statement. As I said yesterday, and as I have indicated on other occasions, the subcommittee and the full Appropriations Committee have been most attentive to all requests for research which have been submitted to us. I do not know just what the Senator's constituent has in mind as to any specific area of research which would be beneficial to the fruit and vegetable interests of the Nation.

There is included in the bill some $500,000 for basic research in fruit—in apples, pears, peaches, and other stone fruits. Without knowing exactly what specific project the Senator's constituent has in mind, I cannot advise the Senator as to whether any of that money will be expended for that particular purpose or not.

But if the fruit producers will develop a specific program and will bring it to the attention of the committee, I can assure the Senator from West Virginia that next year we shall give it very sympathetic consideration.

Mr. HOLLAND. And perhaps this year, by means of a supplemental appropriation bill item.

Mr. RUSSELL. I may say that if the Senator can obtain a detailed statement, then—as suggested by my friend, the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] who is such a valuable member of the subcommittee—we might be able to give it consideration in connection with a supplemental appropriation bill before the adjournment of this Congress.

But without more definite information as to the specific area of research which Mr. Miller has in mind, I cannot inform the Senator from West Virginia whether the bill provides an adequate amount of money for such purpose or not.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, in response to the clarification the Senator from Georgia has given, which is helpful, and also in response to his assurance, which is, frankly, very pleasing, I wish to state that I believe the attitudes expressed by both the Senator from Georgia and the Senator from Florida are, indeed, most fair and much appreciated.

There rests upon me the responsibility to work with these apple growers, in reference to an intensification of research in the fruit industry which they believe to be necessary. I believe that

the hope of possible consideration of this subject in connection with a supplemental appropriation bill will give us an opportunity to move in the direction which these men have indicated should be taken.

Mr. RUSSELL. Let me say to the Senator from West Virginia that there is an old maxim that applies to these research items, as well as to many other areas of appropriations: "A squeaking axle gets the grease."

Over a number of years I have noticed that agitation which is carried on unremittingly for a number of years nearly always gets some results. So if the Senator from West Virginia will obtain detailed information and will press vigorously enough, I am sure that one of these days we shall be able to direct some research to the areas in which his constituents are interested.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, if the Senator from Georgia will indulge me long enough to permit me to make an observation in connection with my friend's reference to the squeaking axle, I would turn for a moment to the words of the poet, Josh Billings, who said in reference to a wheel:

I don't believe in kicking; it aint likely to bring one peace.
But the wheel that squeaks the loudest is the one that gets the grease.

So, although I would not want the wheel to turn improperly in connection with a matter of this kind, I repeat that I am grateful to my friend, the highly competent Senator from Georgia; and I am also grateful for the suggestion in which he is joined by my equally good friend, the able and diligent Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND].

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I should like to direct the attention of the chairman of our subcommittee [Mr. RUSSELL] to one item in the bill, in order that we may ascertain, by way of a statement of the legislative history, the intention of the Appropriations Subcommittee in marking up the bill in reference to the conservation reserve program.

I think perhaps the report as it appears on page 10 is not completely reflective of what the subcommittee had in mind.

So I should like to call to the attention of the chairman of our subcommittee the language which appears on page 21 of the bill. On that page, the bill shows that the House of Representatives allowed $310 million for the conservation reserve program—for the expenses of liquidating and administering the program which now is under way. But to that item, our committee added $25 million, so as to make a total of $335 million, and added the following proviso:

Provided, That not to exceed $12,000,000 shall be available for administrative expenses, of which not less than $10,000,000 may be transferred to the appropriation account "Local administration, section 388, Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938":

My reason for directing the attention of the chairman of the subcommittee to this item is that at times there is a feeling, when money is earmarked in this way and is lumped together, as funds for both Washington office expenses and State office expenses, that there is a tendency for the State office expenses to be curtailed, in favor of the administrative expenses incurred in the central office in Washington. But certainly that was not the intention of our subcommittee.

We recognized, from what we heard during the hearings and from our observations of the programs, that, basically, these programs are administered by the county committees; and next in priority are the State offices and the State committees, which must supervise the administration in the respective States.

So I wish to ask a question of the Senator from Georgia: Is it not true that what we had in mind in this connection, and in including the additional $25 million appropriation for this purpose, was that after the legitimate needs of the county committees are first met, our next concern is to see to it that the State offices and the State committees have sufficient administrative funds with which to work with the county committees in meeting the local problems?

Mr. RUSSELL. Certainly that was the committee's intention, as I understand it. As a matter of fact, this program has expired, insofar as the assuming of any new contracts is concerned; and no policies are to be formulated on the national level. The supervision on the national level is at a very minimum; and it seems to me that the only proper order of priority would be first to take care of the needs of the county offices which deal with the conservation reserve program; and second, to take care of the requirements of the State offices. And if there is to be any substantial reduction, it should occur in the Washington office, because of the fact—as I have stated—that the program has expired, and is now to be administered only in the field, in dealing with those who already have Government contracts in connection with the conservation reserve program.

Mr. MUNDT. I thank the chairman of the subcommittee. That certainly confirms the understanding of the subcommittee as I comprehend it, and what the chairman of the subcommittee has pointed out is emphatically correct. Since this program is expiring and new contracts are not to be entered into, and obviously no new policy is to be available, the funds for administering this particular program are not great. However, it is important that, at the State and county level, there be adequate funds to see that the contracts are fulfilled in conformity with the manner in which they were written.

I thought it was well, since the report did not go into these matters, specifically to add this statement as a part of the legislative history, so those administering the funds will know precisely and exactly what the subcommittee had in mind.

Before taking my seat, I should like to add my own words of felicitation to the wonderful services being rendered by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] in the U.S. Senate as a whole, and specifically today in connection with his chairmanship of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Agriculture.

I can say, as one who has sat in that committee for some time, that he questions the witnesses with penetration, with sympathy, and with an eagle eye for economy and for making a dollar do a dollar's worth of work. He administers the committee and conducts it in a completely nonpartisan manner. I cannot recall at any time in the history of our committee when we have had a vote divided on party lines. We have had differences of opinion as individuals, as Senators should have, but never has there been any partisan or political maneuvering in the committee. I think it is good for the country as a whole, and the farmers in particular, to know they have a good friend in DICK RUSSELL as chairman of the subcommittee, who watches over their interests, as do the taxpayers who do not happen to live on farms, but who can be assured that the economic philosophy of the Senator from Georgia is not limited to the committee room.

Mr. RUSSELL. I wish to express to the Senator from South Dakota my profound gratification. "Praise from Sir Hubert is praise indeed." The distinguished Senator from South Dakota has been an active, intelligent friend of the farmers of this country since he first took the oath as a U.S. Senator. I am pleased that he has stated there is no partisanship in this committee. I can certainly bear testimony to the fact that partisan considerations on the part of the distinguished Senator from South Dakota have played no part whatsoever in his activities on the committee. His sole guiding star is the welfare of the farmers of the United States, and during my tenure of office the farmers of this country have had no truer, more diligent, or more determined friend than the distinguished Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I hesitate to inject a discordant note at this time, but I shall vote against H.R. 12117, the Agricultural and Farm Credit Administration appropriation bill, 1961, in protest against the refusal of this and other Democratic-controlled Congresses to cooperate with President Eisenhower and Secretary of Agriculture Benson in the enactment of a farm program which makes sense.

The people of Connecticut are becoming increasingly outraged by the failure of this Congress to take action to solve the farm problem, and end a wasteful program which does not work, and never will work unless changes are made in existing law, as repeatedly recommended by the President.

Opinion in my State was accurately reflected in an editorial entitled "Three Thousand Seven Hundred and Fifty Dollars a Minute" in the Bridgeport Post of March 22, 1960, which points out that the taxpayers of the Nation "are paying a terrible price" for the present unsuccessful farm program and "are also paying a terrible price for the failure of our statesmen to develop a program that will work, or be big enough to scrap the one that doesn't."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial to which I have referred may be included in the RECORD following these remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, H.R. 12117 provides funds for programs which I heartily endorse, such as lunches for school children, watershed protection, State experiment stations, and emergency famine relief to friendly peoples. I wish it were possible for me to vote separately in support of adequate funds for these worthy purposes. However, of the $4 billion in the bill, approximately $3 billion is for the support of activities of the Commodity Credit Corporation. This agency administers the high, rigid price support programs insisted upon by the majority of this and prior Congresses. As a result, despite efforts to reduce CCC's inventories, the taxpayers' investment in surplus farm commodities is estimated to increase to $9.5 billion by June 30, 1961, from $8.6 billion at the start of the current fiscal year.

I cannot acquiesce in this continued waste of the taxpayers' funds. Consequently, I shall vote against the bill.

EXHIBIT 1

THREE THOUSAND SEVEN HUNDRED AND FIFTY DOLLARS A MINUTE

In a recent statement, President Eisenhower told the taxpayers that it costs them $1,500,000 a day for the Government's wheat program. That is at the rate of about $1,000 a minute. But that's only part of the story as the wheat bite is only a small part of the cost of agricultural stabilization, which costs the taxpayers more than $3,750 a minute, or about $5,400,000 a day.

A lot will be heard about this figure in the coming presidential campaign. There are only three brackets of taxpayers whose annual payments to the Treasury could pay for this program.

There are about 5 million citizens whose adjusted gross income runs from $5,000 to $6,000 a year. On the average they are heads of families, own one car and work hard. Each year they turn in to Uncle Sam about $3 billion. The stabilization program costs about $2 billion.

Then there are 3 million in the $6,000 to $7,000 bracket who pay about $2.4 billion a year. The third rich vein of income paydirt are the $10,000 to $15,000 people. There are about a million of these who turn in a little more than $2 billion annually.

The point is that the entire take of millions of taxpayers must go each year to pay for an unsuccessful farm program. The one undisputed fact about the program is that it does not work, never has worked, and it never will. The program is wasteful and ineffective and the taxpayers are paying a terrible price for it. They are also paying a terrible price for the failure of our statesmen to develop a program that will work, or be big enough to scrap the one that doesn't.

The farm problem is almost 40 years old and getting worse and more expensive.

But there is one thing the politicians never forget—the farm vote, and they are being just as careful about it today as they were in 1920, when the farm population was two and a half times greater than in 1960.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware and Mr. KERR addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware is recognized.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I was going to offer an amendment to the bill, but I am willing to withhold if the Senator from Oklahoma is in a hurry.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I am going to offer some amendments to the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognized the Senator from Delaware, in an effort to be impartial in the recognition of Senators.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I am willing to yield to the Senator from Oklahoma, if the Senator from Oklahoma is in a hurry. I can offer my amendment later, if that will accommodate the Senator.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I would be very grateful. I thank the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. President, I have at the desk three amendments. One relates to the amount in the bill for planning under the watershed protection program. One relates to the amount to be appropriated for the watershed protection program. The other has to do with the appropriation for the flood prevention part of the program.

I have given a copy of each one of these amendments, Mr. President, to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL].

I wish to say that I have listened with great interest to the kind things which have been said about the Senator from Georgia this afternoon. I know how well-founded they are, and I am happy to join in the spirit of what has been said in tribute to the Senator for the great work he has done as chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. President, I arise in behalf of items in the agriculture and farm credit appropriations bill which, in my opinion, must be adjusted before this bill is finally acted upon by the Senate.

I refer Senators to page 7 of the Senate report, under the headings "Watershed Protection" and "Flood Prevention." The language in the report is as follows:

The committee recommends an appropriation of $32 million, as proposed by the House, an increase of $4,250,000 over the budget request, and $9,250,000 over the appropriation for 1960. The committee recommends $3,500,000 for investigations and planning as proposed in the budget. This action provides an additional $1,400,000 for installation of works of improvement to be prorated proportionately between the pilot watersheds and those approved under Public Law 566.

An appropriation of $18 million for continuing work in the 11 authorized watersheds is recommended. This is the amount of the House bill, $3 million over the budget request, and the amount provided for fiscal 1960.

As I understand the action of the Senate committee, they have appropriated $32 million for the watershed protection program. Only $3,500,000 of that can be used for investigations and planning for projects under this great program.

Mr. President, I was greatly in hopes that the Senate committee would see fit to raise the construction figure to $50 million and increase the planning funds to $5 million. These were the figures that the Oklahoma State Soil Conservation Board urged to be appropriated on the basis of current needs. In my opinion, their request was the minimum which should be considered at this time.

Senators will note that, under the flood prevention program, the Senate committee suggests $18 million for the continuing work in the 11 authorized watersheds. Again, I was in hopes that this amount would be increased to $25 million. This I believe to be the minimum amount consistent with the need for getting the work on these watersheds completed, in order that the benefits accruing from them can be realized.

This program has been under construction now for 14 years, and it is time that we are finishing up the job rather than stretching it out and delaying the benefits which flow from it. Each year that we delay means the cost is greater than if we go ahead and finish the program as originally anticipated.

Let me return now to the matter of the funds for the planning parties to work on the watershed protection programs. The present planning party organization was built up over a period of several years of recruitment and training in the face of strong competition for critically scarce engineers, hydrologists, geologists, and so forth. Failure to maintain this planning group at the present level will set back the small watershed program by several years.

Applications for assistance under Public Law 566 continue to exceed the planning assistance now available. Even the current $4.9 million of Federal planning funds supplemented by the current $1.1 million of State and local funds, there is a backlog of 733 unserviced applications, a number one-third larger than the total of 549 that have received planning help since 1954.

In Oklahoma there are 43 applications before the State soil conservation board and 8 which have already been approved for planning, making a total of 51 projects for which planning parties will be needed this year.

Under the present rate of planning in the State of Oklahoma, we can only plan six watersheds so, at that rate, if not one single application were to be submitted, it would be 8 years before the planning could be completed. This, I think, is a fair example of what we do to this worthy program when we fail to make adequate funds available for the planning of these projects.

Therefore, I would urge the chairman of the Agriculture Subcommittee on Appropriations to accept three amendments, one increasing the funds for planning of these programs to $5 million as a first priority, the second increasing the funds to $44,250,000 for watershed protection, and the third increasing the flood prevention funds to $20 million as a third priority.

I hope that the chairman may see fit to accept all three amendments.

Mr. President, I did not pull these amendment out of thin air. In the first place, the Oklahoma State Soil Conservation Board, after careful consideration of these matters, urged that I support even a larger amount for planning

and construction under the watershed protection program than I am proposing.

I did, however, contact the Department of Agriculture and asked them to supply me with figures to indicate what this program should be and I shall place in the RECORD a table which shows that, as a minimum requirement, $44,250,000 is needed for the watershed protection program and $20 million is needed for the flood prevention program for the fiscal year 1961.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I should like to read a statement from the House report which I believe fully justifies the action I am seeking, entirely aside and apart from the recommendations of the Soil Conservation Service, or my folks in Oklahoma.

Watershed protection and flood prevention: For watershed protection, the bill carries an appropriation for 1961 of $32 million. During the 1960 fiscal year, a total of $32,276,964 is available for this program, including an appropriation of $22,750,000 and a carryover of unused funds from fiscal year 1959 of $9,526,964. The amount of $32 million included in this bill, therefore, will make available approximately the same amount for fiscal year 1961. The amount is sufficient to restore the planning funds available in 1960 and to finance a total of 42 planning parties during the next year.

Testimony before the committee indicates that more than 1,200 communities throughout the Nation have requested help in developing watershed plans. It further shows that assistance has been authorized for about 500 of these, that some 200 plans have been approved, and that construction has started on about half of these. In view of the large number of applications still awaiting plans, and in view of the large number of approved projects awaiting construction funds, the committee has increased the watershed protection funds above the amounts requested. In the opinion of the members of the committee, the amount of interest in this program in all areas of the country, and the urgent need for increased attention to the conservation of the soil and water resources of this country, warrant even larger amounts than those recommended in the bill.

For the flood prevention work in the 11 major watersheds authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1944, the committee has included an appropriation of $18 million, the same as provided for fiscal year 1960.

Legislation just enacted authorizes additional works of improvement in accordance with the provisions of section 4 of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act in connection with the 11 watershed improvement programs provided for by the Flood Control Act of 1944. It also authorizes the making of loans to cover the local share of both the flood prevention and nonflood prevention features of these 11 watersheds. Therefore, language has been included to make the flood prevention appropriation available for these purposes.

As pointed out in last year's report, the work under this program has lagged far behind that envisioned when the program was initiated in 1944. It now appears that this flood prevention work, which was originally estimated to take 15 years to complete, will take 40 years or more to complete at the present rate of progress. If slowed down even more, as proposed in the 1961 budget, this time could be extended another 10 years.

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

Mr. KERR. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I wish to join the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma in support of the amendments which he has offered. I join the chairman and the other members of the committee in expressing appreciation for the watershed program. I think it is an excellent program. It is doing a great deal of good. There is much interest in it all over the Nation.

I know that in my own State of Tennessee many watersheds are being planned, but we do not now have the necessary personnel and teams to do the planning and engineering work. The head of our Watershed Association has called me, to urge that the $1.4 million particularly not be taken from the amount for investigation and planning.

Mr. President, I certainly join the Senator from Oklahoma in urging the chairman of the subcommittee and the Senate to restore the $1.4 million for investigations and planning. I think the other amendments of the Senator from Oklahoma are well-founded, and should also be agreed to.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I am grateful to the Senator from Tennessee for those remarks and his support.

I wish to invite attention to the fact that my distinguished colleague from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] is also a sponsor of these amendments.

In further support of the amendments, and in further urging consideration of this matter by the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, I invite attention to the fact that on February 8, in response to a letter from the senior Senator from Oklahoma, the Department of Agriculture submitted a table of the requirements for these programs for fiscal years 1961, 1962, 1963, 1964, 1965, and 1966. In that table from the Department of Agriculture it is shown that for planning in fiscal year 1961, $5.5 million would be required; for watershed protection, including planning for 1961, $44,250,000, the amount asked for in my amendment, would be required; and for installations under the flood prevention program $20 million, as asked for in the third amendment which I have offered, and which I now urge the distinguished Senator from Georgia to accept, would be required.

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

Mr. KERR. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I asked the Senator to yield so that I might lend one extra voice to a plea for acceptance of these amendments. I can think of no programs which yield greater dividends for every dollar invested than the Soil Conservation Service program, the watershed protection program, and the flood-control program, all of which involve watershed protection and soil conservation. It is quite obvious that unless there are adequate funds for planning these great efforts cannot be undertaken in an economic and feasible manner.

The requests of the Senator from Oklahoma are modest. The watershed protection request, as I understand it, is for $44 million instead of the committee recommendation of $32 million. Is that correct?

Mr. KERR. $44,250,000.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes. The flood protection would have an additional $2 million, to raise the figure from $18 million to $20 million?

Mr. KERR. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The funds for work planning would be increased to $4.9 million?

Mr. KERR. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I surely wish to join in support of these amendments. These are areas in which I have previously indicated, in my testimony before the subcommittee, my interest, and also the interest of the people of the State of Minnesota. I had a number of letters and resolutions, as well as personal visitations, from members of the soil conservation districts in our State, and the people who are deeply concerned about watershed protection. These people came to call upon me. I forwarded the information to the committee.

Today I merely wish to state the great support which this program has in the State of Minnesota. I know that what I am asking for now, in support of the Senator from Oklahoma, is exactly what the people of my State would expect as a prudent and reasonable program in this area of soil conservation and watershed protection.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Minnesota.

I have only one further thing to say, which is that no man in the Senate has done more for this program than has the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. That fact is reflected in the history of the proposed legislation. It is also reflected in the status of this work in the great State of Georgia.

It was my privilege to be in Georgia a few days ago, as well as in the State of South Carolina, where we were holding some hearings for the Senate Select Committee on National Water Resources.

One of my outstanding impressions in my visit to that part of the country was the great progress of this program which had been made in the State of my great friend from Georgia. In offering this amendment I know that I am doing so in connection with a program which is as near and dear to the heart of the distinguished Senator from Georgia as it is to any Member of this body.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair inquires of the Senator from Oklahoma as to which amendment he wishes to have considered first.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Chair permit me to make a statement before the Senator from Oklahoma makes his election?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from Georgia may proceed.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma for the remark which he last made. I am and have been greatly interested in the entire program of soil and water conservation. I know of no other program within the entire farflung scheme of our Gov-

ernment that carries more promise for the future of this country than these soil and water conservation projects. It is difficult to realize that within a period of some 40 years we will have twice our present population. These people will have to be fed and clothed. That food, clothing, and fiber must come from these very acres, because we are not going to create a great deal more agricultural land in this country.

I have a direct, almost selfish interest in every phase of this program. It so happens that my own State has submitted a total of 74 applications under Public Law 566. We had two projects under the old pilot program, which are embraced within this appropriation. We have 1 project in Georgia among the 11 projects under the Flood Control Act of 1944 which have been under way for many years. Rising costs have postponed the scheduled date of completion, even though we have consistently increased the appropriation.

I have tried not to be swept away completely by my intense interest in these projects, and yet I have endeavored to carry them forward. For the last 3 years we have appropriated more money than was requested by the Bureau of the Budget in all three of these areas. I do not feel authorized to accept an amendment which would cut back the allocation which was made in the committee for the planning of new projects and for the surveys. However, I can assure the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma that I will not be adamant in a conference if the House desires to insist upon its position. It was thought in the committee when the subject was discussed that we were getting these projects planned a great deal faster than we were authorizing funds to complete them. For that reason the subcommittee voted, although not with any great determined position, to allocate more of the funds for construction rather than for planning.

For the 11 authorized projects, we are already carrying in the bill $3 million above the budget estimates; and I do not feel that, in the light of the action of the subcommittee that I would be authorized to accept any increase in the proposed amount, but we do have a great backlog on the small projects.

In an effort to confirm what the Senator has said, I would be willing, if no member of the subcommittee present in the Senate objects, to accept a $5 million increase for Public Law 566 watershed protection item, which would give us some room to negotiate on the surveys and would provide for a very substantial increase above the budget estimates for installation of works of improvement under that program. I do not feel authorized to go beyond that limit.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I am grateful for the statement of the Senator from Georgia, but in light of the fact that the $4,900,000 figure was the figure included in the House measure, would not the Senator be willing to accept that amendment and the $5 million addition on the watershed protection provision, which in reality would not change the total amount?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I should like to agree with my distinguished friend, but I feel that in view of what transpired in the subcommittee, I would not be authorized now to accept the cutback in the operational funds. I have told the Senator I would be glad to consider the proposal carefully in conference, but I do not think I could accept the $4,900,000 now for planning. I think the $5 million additional for watershed protection work is as far as I feel justified in going.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I modify my amendment to conform with the suggestion of the chairman of the subcommittee as to what he would be willing to accept.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Oklahoma proposes, in his amendment No. 2, on page 11, line 10, to strike out "$32 million" and insert "$37 million"?

Mr. KERR. That is correct.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Would the proposed increase be exclusively for the pilot project?

Mr. RUSSELL. No; it would be for Public Law 566 and the pilot projects. We stated in the report that the fund would be distributed proportionately.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. The increase, then, would go to both projects?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes. I am frank to say the great bulk of it would go to the Public Law 566 projects, but the pilot projects would not be excluded. Is that agreeable to the distinguished member of my subcommittee?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. That is satisfactory.

Mr. RUSSELL. I will accept that amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 11, line 10, it is proposed to strike out "$32,000,000", and insert in lieu thereof "$37,000,000".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I should like to direct my remarks to the attention of the Senator from Georgia in connection with the proposal on page 32 beginning at line 23, wherein it is provided:

> The Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation is authorized to make such expenditures, within available funds and in accordance with law, as may be necessary to liquidate its assets: *Provided*, That funds realized from the liquidation of assets which are determined by the Board of Directors to be in excess of the requirements for expenses of liquidation shall be declared as dividends which shall be paid into the general fund of the Treasury.

As the Senator from Georgia knows, this agency is a depression-born agency and one which has not functioned since 1947. It has not made a single loan since 1947 and in 1955 it disposed of all of its remaining assets under instructions from Congress. It then sold its remaining notes to the 12 Federal land banks.

I am advised that last year its outstanding accounts were reduced to eight notes, payable annually. It collects eight checks from the Federal land banks, which is a semigovernmental agency. It receives those eight checks and turns them over to the Federal Treasury, and last year that little bit of work cost about $5,000 or about $600 or $800 per check. I understand from the Senator from Georgia that the agency has advised the committee that it could probably operate with $600 or $800 next year, but even that is close to $100 for the handling of each check.

Remember this is just the transfer of eight checks from one agency to another.

This agency should be abolished and gotten off the taxpayers' backs.

Why not stop appropriating money to an abandoned agency? There is a bill before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry which would abolish the agency.

This agency, the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation, has no authority to make any loans. Congress repealed that authority 23 years ago. Nevertheless, the agency does have authority to borrow $2 billion in the name of the U.S. Government and to pledge the credit of the Government.

I agree that the bill to abolish the agency should be dealt with by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry; however, I am hoping that the Senator from Georgia will accept this amendment to stop its appropriation. Its work is done; let us get it off the taxpayers' backs for good. In conference, if for some reason it were found necessary to protect the transfer of these checks temporarily, the matter could be worked out. However, I am advised that this appropriation is not needed. The eight Federal land banks can simply make their checks payable to the U.S. Treasury and mail them direct. Why have the Government pay $75 to $100 per check merely for transferring them? Last year it cost about $5,000 to process these few checks. That was an average of about $800 per check.

I am wondering whether the Senator from Georgia would accept the amendment to strike out that language of the bill dealing with this subject and thereby eliminate this appropriation. I realize that the amount involved is small, but it is the way to get this agency abolished. We cannot forget that the real danger here is that this agency has $2 billion in borrowing authority.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, there is a great deal of merit in the Senator's position, but I would not feel authorized to accept the amendment, because I do not know exactly what effect it would have. The Senator has a bill pending in the standing committee to abolish the corporation. It would be a much more orderly procedure to handle it through the enactment of that bill. It provides for an orderly transfer to the Secretary of the Treasury of all the cash, accounts receivable, and other assets which are owned by the Farm Credit Mortgage Corporation.

I understand that the bill has been approved by the Farm Credit Administration. I understand also it has been

approved by the General Accounting Office, and is not resisted by the Department of Agriculture.

The matter could be handled much more efficiently through the enactment of the bill the Senator has introduced. It would be much better to handle it in that way than by striking out the language from the pending bill.

I understand that it has cost only $600 per year for this, and it could cause some confusion with reference to the transfer of these funds. As of December 31, 1959, there was still outstanding $3,933,000 that was owing to this defunct Corporation from the Federal land banks.

Of course all the money belongs to the Treasury of the United States. The Senator's bill is the appropriate way in which to transfer these assets to the Department of the Treasury. I hope the Senator will not press his amendment to strike out this language in the bill, because I do not know what effect it will have.

I will be glad to join him in undertaking to pass his bill, which apparently has been drawn with great care, and which transfers all of the rights to these assets to the Treasury Department and provides for the proper handling of any suits or actions at law that may be instituted for the collection of any sums owing to the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation. That would be a much more orderly way of handling it than by striking the item the Senator refers to from the bill. If the adoption of the Senator's amendment would result in a substantial saving, I would be glad to support the Senator. However, only a $600 saving is involved.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I agree with the Senator that the bill itself should be enacted. However, I point out that the agency does not have any assets other than the eight notes. Those notes are due from the Federal Land Bank. The money all belongs to the Treasury. All the Federal Land Bank will have to do is write checks payable to the Secretary of the Treasury. At least we could save $600 if this language were stricken. Of course it is not only the amount of money that is involved. It has been my experience in the Senate that as long as we keep appropriating money to an agency, it keeps up their hopes that an emergency may arise again so that they can continue in operation. The adoption of this amendment would remove what little opposition there might be remaining, and we would finally be putting this agency to rest.

Mr. RUSSELL. I cannot agree that the adoption of the amendment would in any way remove or eliminate the powers and authority of the Farm Mortgage Corporation. The organization would still be in existence. It would be on the books, and could be revived at any time if an appropriation were enacted by Congress.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is true, but it would be a step toward its abolishment.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator's bill provides the only orderly procedure for handling the matter. In 1955 the Corporation owned papers valued at $11,600,000.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. But it cost $572,000 to handle that $11 million.

Mr. RUSSELL. I believe that is correct. However, now it has gotten to the point where it has only $3,933,000, and is now a quiescent agency, which is costing only $600. I believe that striking out the language would be a rather imprudent way of handling the situation. I hope the Senator will not press his amendment. He has received some favorable reports from all the Departments on his bill, and I hope the bill will soon be reported to the Senate. I am sure it will pass on the call of the calendar.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I hope so. Nevertheless, I would still very much like to strike out the language in the pending bill. At least it would serve notice to these agencies that Congress expects them to get off the taxpayer's backs. It seems to me to be a ridiculous situation to pay a governmental agency between $75 and $100 for transferring a check from one Government agency to another. We could eliminate this agency and save the money.

This agency has not made a loan in 23 years. It has disposed of all its assets. Even its capital stock has been retired to the Federal Treasury. All of its assets except eight notes have been liquidated. Those eight notes represent balances due from the eight Federal Land Banks. The process for handling those checks costs $75 to $100 each—merely for the acceptance of those checks and turning them over to the Treasury.

Mr. RUSSELL. Unfortunately, the Senator does not know whether they can turn over those checks without this authority in the bill. If we struck out the language, there might be something in the law which would prevent them from doing that. The Senator has been a most valued Member of the Senate in pursuing useless agencies. This is the first time I have seen him level his lance on a $600 dragon. This is the smallest of all dragons in the Government's stable of dragons. He is getting very much exercised about this teenie-weenie little dragon. It is so small that he could hardly pursue it with his lance, it seems to me.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. It may be a teenie-weenie little dragon to the Senator from Georgia, but this little dragon in 1951 cost the American taxpayers $1,128,836. In 1952, it cost $989,810; in 1953, $834,731; in 1954, $691,945; in 1955, $572,539. Let us remember that all that now happens is that some people will be sitting around waiting for eight checks to come in. They had a few more accounts in those years but not many more.

They have this tremendous task of picking up the eight checks and forwarding them to the Secretary of the Treasury each year, when the checks could have been sent direct. Certainly, it should not cost $75 to $100 to handle each check.

Why keep an agency with a $2 billion borrowing authority alive with this $600 appropriation?

Mr. RUSSELL. I understand the $600 is used to pay a small part of the salary of someone who handles the machinery in the processing of these checks. I do not want these checks stopped. It may have cost a great deal of money in the years to which the Senator has referred.

It would be just as logical to say that because a war was carried on at a cost of $200 billion a year, therefore the Department of Defense ought to be abolished. That is about as sensible as the argument the Senator makes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. No. When the war has ended, a peace treaty is signed. But when the service of an agency is no longer needed it is kept alive 20 years by these token appropriations.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator does not know whether checks could be issued under existing law. He is trying to use this bill to propagandize his bill in the standing Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. He has all the reports. I am sure that if he would attend the meeting of that committee, of which he is one of the most distinguished members—no; I believe he left that committee a short time ago to become a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations—if he would go before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, I am certain they would report the bill. That is the orderly way to proceed.

The Senator from Delaware did not come before our committee, where we could investigate and determine the effect of striking the language from the bill. Without having some knowledge of what the effect of striking the language would be, I could not accept the amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. It is not simply the fact that we can save $600 next year. They did spend about $5,000 last year. This subject will still be in conference if we adopt the amendment. I have been advised that the adoption of this amendment would not handicap the Government in any way.

We should not lose sight of the fact that we are keeping alive an agency which has authority to borrow $2 billion and to pledge the credit of the United States in repayment thereof. That is a lot of authority to allow to lie around loosely and idly; and to continue to appropriate $600 or $800 to this abandoned agency only serves to keep it alive.

If this amendment is approved, the conferees could work out any language they thought appropriate to accomplish the purpose. I think it is time that we served notice on these agencies that when their useful life has been ended we expect them to be abolished.

Mr. President, I submit the amendment. I hope the Senator from Georgia will take the amendment to conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 32, beginning with line 23, it is proposed to strike out all the language to and including line 6, page 33.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Delaware.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, I should like to ask a few questions of the chairman of the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations. First, I should state that perhaps my questions may not be in conformity with the bill itself, but they will be in conformity with an operation of the Department of Agriculture.

The first question is: Is there any amount of money provided in the bill for the administration of Federal milk marketing orders?

Mr. RUSSELL. There is the sum of approximately $300,000 under the Agricultural Marketing Service for the administration and policing of milk marketing orders.

Mr. FREAR. Is that by way of direct appropriation or by way of assessment?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am not too certain about that; we have not considered the matter of milk orders for some time.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I think there must be an appropriation for the maintenance of the Washington office. However, the marketing area expenses, I am sure, are paid by assessments on the farmers who ship milk into the areas. That is true of Boston and New York and of other cities with which I am familiar, and I believe it to be true of all of them. There is a deduction of a certain amount per hundred pounds—2, 2½, or 3 cents.

Mr. RUSSELL. About $300,000 is provided for general administration; and that is for the activity in the Washington office. However, the direct cost of the supervision of the milk orders is, as the Senator from Vermont states, supported by something in the nature of a tax.

Mr. FREAR. I shall ask questions along that line in a moment.

Mr. AIKEN. I am trying to be helpful to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. FREAR. I know the Senator is. I will let him be helpful in a little while. However, he is getting me out of line.

If the $300,000 was not appropriated, what would happen to the administration of the local milk marketing areas?

Mr. RUSSELL. Very frankly, I cannot answer the Senator.

Mr. FREAR. Then I shall ask the Senator from Vermont to answer, if the Senator from Georgia will permit him to do so.

Mr. AIKEN. I think that when there is any program requiring any Federal supervision at all, there must be a Federal appropriation for it. In the case of milk marketing orders, the Secretary is required to find a fair minimum price, and to fix the minimum price for each order area. However, the expenses of the area itself are taken care of by a deduction from the price of the milk which the farmer receives. In my own area, I believe it is probably 2 or 3 cents a hundred pounds, though I am not certain of that. However, that will pay the local administrator and his assistants, and will pay the cost of the salaries of clerks, secretaries, and so forth, in that area. The farmer himself pays that amount.

Mr. FREAR. I am certain the Senator from Vermont can answer the question I asked. What would happen to the administration of the milk orders, at the local level, if the $300,000 were not appropriated to the central office?

Mr. AIKEN. I am not sure. What would happen if there was no amount of any kind appropriated for the maintenance of the White House?

Mr. RUSSELL. I have been thinking over the matter since the Senator asked his question. I do not believe it would have any direct application, but it would prevent the formulation of any new marketing orders.

Mr. AIKEN. I never contemplated any such horrible thought as apparently runs through the mind of the distinguished junior Senator from Delaware. If he is inclined to take away the $300,000 which maintains an orderly marketing system for some 50 percent of all the milk production in the United States, I simply would not want to contemplate such a situation.

Mr. FREAR. Anyhow, it is reasonable to assume that if the $300,000 were not appropriated, the Department of Agriculture, in its central office in Washington, could no longer render assistance in the administration, at the local level, of the Federal milk-marketing orders in the local areas, could it?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am inclined to believe that they would not be able to lend any assistance. Certainly they could not formulate any new marketing orders or to embrace any new areas. It has been a long time since the passage of the bill providing for marketing orders. I doubt very much that the refusal to appropriate $300,000 would completely close the local administration of the milk-marketing orders.

Mr. FREAR. The most charitable thing I could say to the Senator from Vermont, and the most horrible thing I could think about the Senator from Delaware, is that he did not propose this a year ago, before the Order No. 127 went into effect.

Mr. AIKEN. The Dairy Division of the U.S. Department of Agriculture has other functions besides the administering of milk-marketing orders. I think practically the entire cost of the administration of the milk-marketing orders is borne by the farmers themselves. However, the Dairy Division has many other things to attend to.

Mr. FREAR. I believe the Senator from Vermont said that the entire cost of the administration of the area in which the milk-marketing order is issued by the Department of Agriculture is borne by the producers of that area.

Mr. AIKEN. I believe that practically all of the cost is borne by the producers.

Mr. FREAR. Where does the other money come from?

Mr. AIKEN. What other money?

Mr. FREAR. If all the cost is not borne by the producers, where does the remainder of it come from?

Mr. AIKEN. The Dairy Division of the Department of Agriculture existed long before the orders for the marketing of milk. The Dairy Division has the oversight of the dairy industry of the United States, just as there is a division for the oversight of cotton, grain, foreign agriculture, and so on.

Mr. FREAR. Then it comes from the Department of Agriculture, through an appropriation? Is that correct?

Mr. AIKEN. Undoubtedly it costs a little money to maintain the Dairy Division; and it may cost a few thousand dollars more because it has oversight of the dairy marketing areas. I would not be surprised to find that was so. But what part of the $300,000 is used for that purpose, I am unable to say.

Mr. FREAR. Do any of the funds which are used to pay the cost of administration for a local area, in connection with a milk-marketing order, come from the handlers?

Mr. AIKEN. The funds come from the farmers, the producers. I think the funds come indirectly; the deductions are made from the checks which go to the farmers, and are paid to the district area offices.

Mr. FREAR. Is it not a fact that when a Federal milk-marketing order is issued and is put into execution, demand is made on the handler or the distributor to pay whatever percentage per hundredweight is authorized by the order; and that is collected from the producer?

Mr. AIKEN. I think so. In the marketing areas with which I am familiar, the distributors themselves do not vote on the question of whether to have a milk-marketing order or not; and thus far it seems to have worked out fairly well for them.

Mr. FREAR. I am glad the Senator from Vermont has made that point, because I had it in mind, too.

Just how is a Federal milk-marketing order established?

Mr. AIKEN. A petition is made to the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. FREAR. By whom?

Mr. AIKEN. By the farmers of the area.

Then the Department of Agriculture, if it finally approves the formula which is set forth, submits it to the vote of the farmers. In my area, if two-thirds of the farmers vote for the marketing order, it goes into effect.

It so happens that in my area some 90-odd percent of them do vote for the marketing order. In fact, I think almost 100 percent of them vote for it. There may be a few who do not.

Then, since it has been approved by the farmers of the area, it goes into effect.

I understand that in some places a 75-percent affirmative vote is required.

I am sure the Senator from Delaware now has further questions.

Mr. FREAR. Yes, I have several.

Then, apparently the Federal milk-marketing orders are not established in the same way in all areas; that is to say, in Vermont, such an order can be established by the affirmative votes of two-thirds of the farmers; but in another area, the affirmative votes of 75 percent of the farmers may be required; and it is conceivable that in another area the affirmative votes of 100 percent of the farmers would be required.

Mr. AIKEN. If they so voted beforehand, yes.

Mr. FREAR. But the provision would have to be included in the order before it could be put into execution, would it not?

Mr. AIKEN. A two-thirds favorable vote is required, I believe, in all the New England marketing areas. A 75-percent affirmative vote may be required in some other areas; I am not sure.

Mr. FREAR. So there is no uniformity about it; is that correct?

Mr. AIKEN. I do not know that it is uniform throughout the country.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I can cast a little light on that point. There are two types of orders. One is the marketing type of order; it requires a two-thirds favorable vote of those who participate in the referendum. The other type is a handler order. It requires a three-fourths favorable vote by the handlers.

I am not too familiar with this matter, because in my State we have a State law which deals with the subject. We have no Federal milk marketing orders in the dairy industry there.

Mr. FREAR. Again I say I think the State of Georgia is extremely wise in that respect and has used very good judgment. I think State control is much superior to the Federal control which is had in the States which have Federal milk marketing orders. Under State control, the respective areas have the right to determine for themselves.

Mr. AIKEN. From 85 to 90 percent of the milk produced in Vermont is marketed outside of Vermont.

Mr. FREAR. Did I correctly understand the Senator from Vermont to say that in the area which serves Vermont approximately 90 percent of the producers voted in favor of the order?

Mr. AIKEN. No other areas serve Vermont. Instead, Vermont serves other areas. Vermont exports almost 90 percent of the milk which is produced in Vermont. It is exported to Boston, Hartford, southeastern New England, Haverhill, Lawrence, and New York City areas.

Mr. FREAR. Did the Vermont producers vote on the question of whether they wanted to have a Federal milk-marketing order or not?

Mr. AIKEN. That is true, I think; nearly 100 percent of them—certainly more than 90 percent of them—voted for it.

Mr. FREAR. Then I correctly understood the Senator from Vermont. I know he has a fine background on this matter, on which I should like to be educated.

May I have the permission of the Senator from Georgia to continue a short time for that purpose?

Mr. RUSSELL. Indeed, so. As chairman of the subcommittee, I regret that for the first time I find myself with an almost complete lack of information on these milk-marketing orders. I do not think the question has been brought up during the 24 years I have presided over the subcommittee. No questions in regard to the Federal milk-marketing orders have been presented during that time. Of course, the legislation for them is handled in the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and thereafter is handled in the milksheds. So I am not too familiar with the matter.

Mr. FREAR. If the farmers in Vermont and whatever other area was covered by the milk-marketing order had voted 50 percent in favor of the establishment of a milk-marketing order and 50 percent against its establishment, would a milk-marketing order have been issued?

Mr. AIKEN. No.

Mr. FREAR. Then did the producers themselves decide that they wanted to have a milk-marketing order issued?

Mr. AIKEN. They did.

Mr. FREAR. In other words, each producer had one vote and each distributor had one vote; is that correct?

Mr. AIKEN. I do not know if the distributors vote. I think not. But each producer has one vote.

Mr. FREAR. Would a two-thirds affirmative vote or a three-fourths affirmative vote be required? Just now I understood the Senator from Georgia to say that in order to have a producer order, a two-thirds affirmative vote would be required. And in order to have a distributor or handlers order, a three-fourths affirmative vote would be required; is that correct?

Mr. AIKEN. The latter is a different kind of order.

It so happens that in the Boston area, which is the largest market, the producers only participate.

Mr. FREAR. So a producer can vote in either one of them—either in the one in which a three-fourths affirmative vote is required or in the one in which a two-thirds affirmative vote is required; is that correct?

Mr. AIKEN. Well, a producer could not vote in connection with the setting up of an order on a distributor basis.

Mr. FREAR. Yes. But a producer could vote in connection with either a producer order or a distributor order, could he not?

Mr. AIKEN. If the formula so provides.

Mr. FREAR. Who provides the formula?

Mr. AIKEN. The formula was approved originally in Boston in 1937. That was when milk was bringing $1 a hundred pounds, which is a very low price for it—2 cents a quart. The distributors did not like the order at the time; but it was put into effect, for the producers had to have something. The Department of Agriculture, under Secretary Wallace, approved it.

At that time, I was Governor of Vermont, and I approved it, and it worked out well. Then the price of milk began to reach a reasonable level.

At first, the distributors opposed it; but after a while they found that it stabilized their business, too; and in the last 20 years there has been no opposition from distributors, so far as I know.

Mr. FREAR. I think that was quite commendable, for certainly at that time the farmers were not being overpaid for the milk they produced; neither do I think they are overpaid today.

Mr. AIKEN. No, they are not.

Mr. FREAR. However, I am trying to obtain the answers to some of my questions.

My next question is as follows: If an order, however formulated, required the affirmative votes of two-thirds of the producers, in order to put the Federal milk-marketing order into effect, but if the affirmative votes constituted less than two-thirds of the total number of votes, such an order would not be issued, would it?

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct. In other words, if 34 percent opposed the issuance of the order, it would not go into effect.

Mr. FREAR. Thirty-four percent?

Mr. AIKEN. Yes, a little more than one-third.

Mr. FREAR. Yes.

Are there marketing cooperatives in that area?

Mr. AIKEN. Almost every dairy farmer in Vermont belongs to a marketing cooperative.

Mr. FREAR. How did the marketing cooperative count the votes of its producer members when they voted on the question of the issuance of a Federal milk-marketing order?

Mr. AIKEN. They voted en bloc. That is why the dairy farmers joined the cooperative—so their votes would count, and so they could get out of the difficulties they were in.

I would say that 98 percent of all the milk going out of Vermont to other States is shipped by cooperatives—and probably more than that, probably 99.9 percent. But I wish to be conservative in my statement.

Mr. FREAR. The Senator from Vermont is always conservative, and certainly I would not question his statement.

Mr. AIKEN. I am not always called too conservative.

Mr. FREAR. Well, I have read something of that sort, too; but I do not always agree with what I read.

In voting on the question of whether such an order shall be issued, they vote as a bloc, do they not? If there were 300 producers in one cooperative, and if a majority of them voted in favor of the issuance of the order, all 300 votes would be recorded in the affirmative, I assume.

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct.

Mr. FREAR. If 149 producers voted in the negative and 151 farmers voted in the affirmative, then all 300 votes would be cast by the cooperative in the affirmative; is that correct?

Mr. AIKEN. Yes, but that is not the whole story. If the 149 felt differently, they would not belong to the cooperative. There is no requirement to join in a cooperative. The reason why they do so is so they can vote together and work together, and pool their products, and ship their products together, and thus save their industry.

The Senator is right. If 151 voted for the marketing order and 149 voted against it, I think there would be 300 votes cast for it; but that cooperative would not last overnight if it was that evenly divided.

Mr. FREAR. I recognize that the people of New England and that area are a bit different, perhaps, from people in other regions of the Nation.

Mr. AIKEN. Not so much.

Mr. FREAR. I think they have many qualities that are very beneficial to this country, and we count on them for a lot of things to keep our country stabilized. They are pretty sound people, and I recognize it.

Mr. AIKEN. Almost all of them are.

Mr. FREAR. And the Senator is a fine representative of those people.

The Senator may have thought the question I asked was a hypothetical question.

Mr. AIKEN. No.

Mr. FREAR. The Chesapeake Bay marketing order went into effect 2 months ago, and is known as Order No. 127. To make that order become effective, a cooperative voted as has been stated. It voted for the entire membership in the affirmative. I do not know the figures exactly, although from a pretty official source we have had it told to us that approximately 40 percent of the producers voted against it and 60 percent of the producers voted for it. But it was voted 100 percent. Assuming there were 1,200 members of the cooperative, to use a round number, 1,200 producers were voted in favor of a marketing order by the Federal Government. Outside of this one cooperative, whose concentration of delivery is in the city of Baltimore, Md., there are other producers in the area circumscribed by the order, who are not members of the cooperative. Those producers had the right to vote and did exercise the right to vote. They voted in the majority against the marketing order. So when the number of votes against, on the outside, were added to those who voted against in the cooperative, those voting against the order amounted to more than 50 percent of the total.

Mr. AIKEN. The solution to that problem, of course, is that no one has to belong to the cooperative; and if they do not belong to the cooperative they cast their own votes as individuals rather than en bloc. They have to weigh one value against the other.

Mr. FREAR. Then the Senator would want to penalize a producer member of the cooperative by having him get out of the cooperative to get his vote counted as he voted.

Mr. AIKEN. Oh, no.

Mr. FREAR. Because he wants the advantage of belonging to a co-op, he joins, but, in order to get his vote counted, he would have to get out of the co-op.

Mr. AIKEN. No. The majority rules in a co-op, as it does in a town meeting, or in the Senate. The Senator from Delaware would not want to get out of the Senate just because he had lost a couple of votes.

Mr. FREAR. I have lost a few.

Mr. AIKEN. But the Senator is still here, and very likely, he will continue to be here for a long time.

Mr. FREAR. But I would not be here if a majority of the people of my State did not want me to come back again. I hope they do not feel that way.

Here is a situation in which a man who voted in the negative had his vote counted in the affirmative for something he did not want. That is why the milk order was put into effect, because the total vote of the cooperative was counted in favor.

Does the Senator from Vermont agree with that type of operation or voting?

Mr. AIKEN. Do I agree with majority rule in a cooperative? Yes.

Mr. FREAR. If the majority votes a certain way, the entire membership can cast all of their votes in the affirmative?

Mr. AIKEN. Yes; I would say that would be representative of the views of the cooperative members as such.

Mr. FREAR. I think, if that was the only co-op voting, I could agree with the Senator; but when they were put on the defensive—or on the offensive in this case—against those who were voting individually on the outside, it seems it was a bit unfair.

Mr. AIKEN. If I had not gone through this some 25 years ago, perhaps I would feel differently about it, but I vividly recall the time when dealers who wanted to come into my State, which had half of the producers in New England, would say, "We will give you an extra price if you do not do so and so, which will help the rest of the farmers." They worked it pretty well for a long time, until milk was worth but 1 to 2 cents a quart. They carried it too far, and they forced the farmers to get together in their cooperatives. They have been in them ever since. As I said, about 99 percent of the milk that is shipped out is shipped by the cooperatives, and the voting on the marketing orders is voted on by cooperatives today.

Mr. FREAR. The Senator has been diligent in answering my questions, and he has been quite persuasive, but not quite enough. I wish to ask a question or two. I would not want to impose too much on the time of the Senate, because it wants to vote on the bill, and my colleague has something to say that is perhaps more important than this.

The Senator is familiar with classification of milk under milk marketing orders, is he not?

Mr. AIKEN. I am. There are classes I and II.

Mr. FREAR. Class I and class II.

Mr. AIKEN. And in some cases there is a class C.

Mr. FREAR. What are the classes?

Mr. AIKEN. They are class I and class II. Class I is the milk which is sold for family consumption and to restaurants. It is sold as fluid milk. Class II represents the surplus, which is more than can be sold for direct human consumption in the form of fluid milk. That is called class II. It goes into powdered milk and cheese and into butter and powder.

In New England, I do not think they break even on class II milk. Nevertheless, for a dealer to be sure of enough milk to meet his trade on weekends and holidays, he has to have about 20 percent more milk than he needs, on the average—at least 20 percent of class II milk—in order to meet the demand, day in and day out.

Formerly there were dealers who would go to certain farmers and say, "We will take your milk. We will pay you this price, which we can afford to pay, because we will sell all of your milk for household use, and you will not have to take any of the loss on the surplus milk that is produced in the area."

They worked that fine for a while, by paying the best of the farmers a fair price, and paying all the rest of the farmers a low price. They were carrying all of the class II milk. However, after the farmers got together and organized cooperatives, all of the farmers got more than the best paid farmers had previously gotten for the fluid milk. All of the farmers then got a uniform minimum price, and they all had to bear their share of the surplus production of the area. It worked out very well.

After we got away from that $1 a hundredweight milk, or $1¼ a hundredweight milk, which was the price in 1937, the price gradually went up. It is not high enough today. The price of milk has not gone up anywhere near in proportion to costs of production. However, the price is definitely better than it would have been if the farmers had not organized, because otherwise they would all be getting a much lower price.

Mr. FREAR. I do not want the Senator from Vermont to get the idea that I am not in favor of producers joining together to obtain better prices for milk.

Mr. AIKEN. I know the Senator favors that.

Mr. FREAR. I am leading up to another question.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator simply has in his State a higher percentage of farmers who have sales for class I milk than I have in my State. That makes for a difference of opinion.

Mr. FREAR. It is a fact that some States have more surplus milk than other States. There is no question about that.

Mr. AIKEN. Not for the same reason, however.

Mr. FREAR. It is also true that any producer is a pretty good producer if he can keep his flow of milk even for 365 days a year.

Mr. AIKEN. He cannot.

Mr. FREAR. And no distributor can keep his sales on a level for 365 days a year.

Mr. AIKEN. Neither can the farmer.

Mr. FREAR. There has to be some fluctuation, both in regard to production and distribution. I recognize that there has to be some tie-in to take care of the ups and downs on either side.

The Senator has told me that the class I milk is the fluid milk for human daily consumption. The class II milk is the surplus, and the class III milk has some other distinction.

Mr. AIKEN. In the marketing order areas the class II milk is usually of the same quality as the class I milk, only it is in a supply which is more than is needed on a particular day for fluid milk consumption.

Mr. FREAR. As a matter of fact, if the fellow is on a blended price, two-thirds of a can of milk would be class I milk and one-third of it would be the class II milk. I can recognize that. There is no difference in the milk.

Mr. AIKEN. Not in the marketing order areas. Where there is no marketing order area there could be a difference in the milk.

Mr. FREAR. Does the Senator mean that cannot happen?

Mr. AIKEN. In practically all of the areas the milk is subject to board of health requirements. There are certain sanitary requirements.

Mr. FREAR. I do not think the Senator quite understood me.

Mr. AIKEN. I think so.

Mr. FREAR. So far as the sanitary requirements are concerned, if the butterfat content is correct and the bacteria count is low enough and the temperature below a certain degree, the milk will come to the producer or the handler and will be class I or class A or whatever it may be called. That producer will have two-thirds of the sales in fluid milk and one-third of the sales in byproducts.

Mr. AIKEN. It is all of the same quality.

Mr. FREAR. Every can of milk that producer receives is class I milk.

Mr. AIKEN. It could qualify as class I milk, but if it is not all sold for fluid milk consumption the part which is left over in any area is the class II milk.

Mr. FREAR. We are basing this discussion upon the quality.

Mr. AIKEN. The class II designation does not change the quality.

Mr. FREAR. It does not make any difference whether it is the top half of the milk or the lower half.

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct.

Mr. FREAR. Does the Senator know of any class II milk which is purchased for the class II established price in a Federal milk marketing area and which is sold for fluid milk, without there being considered the blend price which is paid to the producer?

Mr. AIKEN. Oh, yes. That used to be done quite often. The class II milk was taken from one area into another market and sold as class I milk. That way the price received would be $6 a hundredweight instead of $3 a hundredweight.

Mr. FREAR. Very well.

Mr. AIKEN. That was done rather extensively in New England. The farmers were losing $1.5 million or $2 million a year as a result of that practice, so they petitioned to have the area to which the class II milk was being transported and sold for class I milk included in the larger marketing area. That was voted. Now the farmers really get a better price; and the distributors, I suppose, are doing very well, but not making their earnings quite so easily as they were before.

Mr. FREAR. Let us forget about the distributors and assume they are on a par.

Mr. AIKEN. We cannot forget them.

Mr. FREAR. Yes, we can.

Mr. AIKEN. Oh, no.

Mr. FREAR. If the producer is in a class I area and if he has a surplus and he sells it as class II milk, and it goes to another area as class II milk and is sold in that area as class I milk, at a much higher price——

Mr. AIKEN. That is a common practice, where it can be done.

Mr. FREAR. Then how would that producer be paid?

Mr. AIKEN. He would be paid the class I milk price for the overall production of the class I milk, but he would be paid the class II milk price for that which the distributor takes into another market, which he sells as class I milk or which is used for manufacturing purposes.

Mr. FREAR. Very well. I do not agree with all of that, but let us assume that is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. It is a fact. I can prove every word of it.

Mr. FREAR. Oh, no.

Mr. AIKEN. Yes, I can.

Mr. FREAR. No. I will contest with the Senator on that, because I can give examples.

Mr. AIKEN. I have particular areas in mind, where that has been done extensively.

Mr. FREAR. I agree with regard to the practice, as to what the Senator said has been done. I agree with that.

Mr. AIKEN. Of course, I do not know whether it is being done in Delaware, in Maryland, or in the Baltimore area.

Mr. FREAR. If a producer is in an area where the blended price is 95 percent class I, and that area is a class I area because of increased consumption of fluid milk in that area, the producer would get the advantage of the difference between two-thirds and 95 percent in that instance, would he not?

Mr. AIKEN. Well, if he sends the milk to market and two-thirds of it is sold as class I milk, we will say at $6 a hundredweight, he will get $6 a hundredweight for two-thirds of the milk. The other one-third will be the class 2 milk. He may get $3 a hundredweight for the other one-third of the milk.

Mr. FREAR. That is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. The blend price would be the composite price as between $6 and $3. It would come out about $4.50 or $5 per hundredweight.

Mr. FREAR. Four dollars and fifty cents?

Mr. AIKEN. Four dollars and fifty cents or five dollars a hundredweight.

Mr. FREAR. That is correct. If the producer is getting $4.50 or $5 per hundredweight on that basis and the distributor makes the area a 95 percent class I market, what would the producer get?

Mr. AIKEN. Well, if the distributor sells the milk as fluid milk in that marketing area——

Mr. FREAR. He has to, if it is class I.

Mr. AIKEN. Then he would have to pay the fluid milk price for what is sold as fluid milk. If he can ship to another market——

Mr. FREAR. That is not the question.

Mr. AIKEN. Then he can get the higher price. The farmer would not get that.

Mr. FREAR. That is not an answer to the question. That is not a solution to the problem. If the distributor makes the area a 95 percent class I market, he will have to pay the producer 95 percent class I prices, will he not?

Mr. AIKEN. I never heard of a distributor paying 95 percent class I price for class II milk. He will pay for about 50 percent of it as class I.

Mr. FREAR. Again I have a question for the Senator from Vermont. I can show to the Senator that there are distributors who do that.

Mr. AIKEN. If any area can get 95 percent of the class I price for the class II milk, it is a very fortunate area, I would add.

Mr. FREAR. I agree. There is an area like that. What the Federal milk marketing order is doing now is cutting down the price. The producers in the area, instead of getting 95 percent class I prices, are assessed so that they have to put the milk in a pool, so that the farmer in another area is going to benefit and the producer in the particular area is going to have the money taken from him.

Mr. AIKEN. It would all depend upon whether the 95 percent class I price which is received for the class II milk amounts to more than what the farmer and all of his neighbors would get if they cooperated and all of them went under an order.

Mr. FREAR. Well, there is an area laid out. It comprises two counties.

Mr. AIKEN. Yes.

Mr. FREAR. As a matter of fact, we can take the whole peninsula.

Mr. AIKEN. I am not questioning the situation set forth by the Senator from Delaware. It is entirely possible, because before we got the marketing order in New England we had certain distributors who would favor certain groups of producers, but the result was that the distributors kept down the prices for all producers, with the possible exception of those few.

They were used as a lever, and they would pay a high price when production was short. They would go out and steal each other's producers. But when the surplus season arrived, they would drop all the producers down to the bottom.

Mr. FREAR. Yes. I believe also there were people who used to put rotten apples in a basket.

Mr. AIKEN. I have seen that happen.

The Senator from Delaware has observed that the people of Vermont do not do that any more.

I will not admit that they ever did.

They are much better off now than they used to be.

Mr. FREAR. Yes. And that is due in no small part to the efforts of the Senator from Vermont. I will say that for him.

In response to an inquiry addressed to the Secretary of the Department of Agriculture, Mr. Clarence L. Miller, Assistant Secretary, in explanation of the

background of the Federal marketing program in Upper Chesapeake Bay, Order No. 127, stated in part:

Since the minimum prices which all handlers must pay are equal in each use, no handler is placed at a competitive disadvantage with respect to his sales of milk within the regulated marketing area.

I will take that for granted. He goes on:

The other major facet of the order program is the equal sharing among farmers of returns from sale of milk. In this way, all farmers have an equal share in the Class I market and also assume an equal share in any surplus delivered to the market. This method of sharing returns is an important stabilizing influence, for it removes the necessity for farmers to undercut each other in an attempt to retain an equitable share of the Class I market.

This equal sharing of returns is carried out through a so-called equalization fund. Handlers use different proportions of their receipts of milk as Class I and Class II. Hence, the utilization prices of individual handlers will vary from the marketwide average price. The attainment of uniform returns to all producers, therefore, requires that those handlers whose utilization price is higher than the market average uniform price pay the difference between such uniform price and their own particular utilization price into the equalization fund, and those handlers whose utilization price is lower than the market uniform price draw money out of the fund.

That statement struck me as a little curious, because it has not been too long ago when this administration was talking about some type of social order. To me that is taking money from a producer in one area and putting it in a pool so that a producer in another area can draw it out. To me that is economic equalization. Does the Senator from Vermont agree or disagree?

Mr. AIKEN. I will say that Mr. Miller is correct when he says each producer is required to carry his share of the surplus production of that area. He is not quite correct when he states they all get the same price for the milk, because under the Federal marketing order the Secretary fixes a minimum price for the milk. Conditions may be different in the Baltimore market from what they are in the Boston market or other markets. Distributors in the New England markets frequently pay premiums, and some of them pay premiums at certain times of the year which run up to 60 or 80 cents a hundred pounds. Others will pay a premium only a few cents per 100 pounds above the minimum price fixed by the Secretary under the marketing agreement. For example, for milk in bulk tanks, most of the companies up to now have given about 15 cents per 100-pound premium for the milk above the price paid for milk shipped in cans. So there is nothing in the marketing order which would prevent any distributor from continuing to pay a higher price to special producers if he saw fit. But they will have to carry their share of this surplus, and that will be based on the average price.

Mr. FREAR. I have a great deal of respect for Mr. Miller, but I have a little more respect for the Senator from Vermont because I think he knows a little more about what he is talking about.

Mr. AIKEN. I have seen people in the milk business for 40 years who have not learned all there is to know about the business. I have seen them get tripped up after spending all their lives in the business by someone who had outfoxed them. It is one of the most competitive businesses on the face of the globe.

Mr. FREAR. Yes. I believe the Senator is looking at one right now. There are a number of small producers and small handlers in our State. In my opinion, if some large distributors on the other side of the bay wished to take another area into their distribution system, they might use the milk order as a means of forcing those handlers and producers under a milk order, and the only result would be to put the small handlers out of business, and then the small producer would be at the mercy of the large operator.

Mr. AIKEN. Frankly, I do not know what the formula for the Baltimore marketing area is. I believe the situation on the Eastern Shore is undoubtedly as described by the Senator from Delaware, and if it is—and I expect it is—I would be doing exactly what he is doing here. I recall that 20 or 25 years ago in New England there were 18 auctions of dairies in 1 town in 1 week; small dairies going out of business. The milk producers just had to get together.

Mr. FREAR. I believe the producers have every right to get together in order to market their milk, and I believe the distributors have a right to have a fair margin of profit. But the ones I am most interested in are the producers of milk. I am frank to admit that. I do not wish to see the producers of milk in Delaware compelled to market 95 percent of their class I milk in the 66⅔-percent class. That is the whole object of the proposal.

I think the Senator from Vermont has taken care of his constituents in Vermont, and I know they are grateful to him for it. The senior Senator from Delaware and I wish to do a little something for our constituents in Delaware. I apologize to the Senator from Georgia and the Senator from Vermont for utilizing so much time, but I am grateful to both of them.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, the people of Delaware are fortunate to have such able Senators as the senior and junior Senators from Delaware.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Delaware need not apologize to me. I expect Senators to represent their constituency with the same feeling and determination which the Senator from Delaware always displays. Again may I say that I discussed this subject at an earlier date with the senior Senator from Delaware, and I can say that the farmers of Delaware are mighty lucky they have representing them the two Senators who are presently with us.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] and myself I send to the desk an amendment and ask to have it stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware on behalf of himself and the Senator from Illinois will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed on page 14, lines 1 and 2, to strike out "$250,000,000" and to insert in lieu thereof "$100,000,000."

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, the budget request for this particular item, which is for the ACP payments, is only $100 million. The testimony of the representatives of the Department of Agriculture clearly states that all that they are requesting or all that they think they need is $100 million. I talked with officials of the American Farm Bureau, and they recommended that this item be reduced to $100 million; and they stated emphatically in the testimony before the committee that they thought the money could better be used elsewhere so far as the American farmer was concerned.

The purpose of this appropriation is to finance a portion of the cost of lime and other types of fertilizers for farmers. The Government pays about half of the cost under certain conditions.

Thus we have a situation in which we are spending $4 billion to $5 billion a year to support the prices for American agriculture. We have about $9 billion worth of agricultural commodities on hand, and in the proposed legislation we would be giving $250 million presumably to enable the farmers to produce more surplus. The proposal is to give free fertilizer to produce more crops at the expense of the American taxpayer. This is a ridiculous contradiction. There may have been a use for these programs in the past, but I do not think they are needed at a time when we have more agriculture crops than we need.

There are many other features of the bill which deal with soil conservation that can be justified, but I think this is one item which can well be returned to the budget request, thereby saving $150 million. I know the Senator from Georgia will agree that we cannot reduce the amount of the appropriation this year. This is an item under which we appropriate one year in advance. Last year we had a similar debate in an attempt to cut the figure back, and we lost. Congress last year insisted upon the $250 million figure. As a result we are appropriating in this bill $242 million to pay last year's commitments.

I agree fully with those other Members of the Senate who say it will be unrealistic to try this year to cut the $242 million figure, although I did try to cut it last year. Last year when we rejected an amendment similar to the one which is now being offered, we in effect instructed the Department of Agriculture to make these contracts with the American farmers to the extent of $250 million annually. Once they are made they must be paid. We have no alternative.

By the same token if we reject the amendment today we will automatically increase the expenditures in the next fiscal year by $150 million over and above the amount which is recommended by the Bureau of the Budget. I repeat that the Department of Agriculture, the

American Farm Bureau, and many other farm organizations have endorsed this reduction.

I do not for 1 minute question the sincerity of the Senators who are opposing the amendment—they believe in the program—but it is significant that the strongest supporter for the $250 million in the bill is the National Agricultural Limestone Institute. As a matter of fact, they favor raising the amount to $500 million, which would be an increase to five times more than the request of the Bureau of the Budget. The membership of this institute sells most of the lime under this program. It maintains a Washington representative, Robert M. Koch, as a lobbyist. It realizes, of course, that its best customer is the U.S. Government and that all they have to do is to have the appropriations increased in order to sell more lime. All they have to do is sit back and sell the lime to the U.S. Government. In an effort to get larger appropriations they circulate millions of copies of letters throughout the various States calling the direct attention of the farmers as to how Members of the Senate voted on this appropriation. They pointed out in their letters how disastrous it would have been if the appropriation had been cut even a little bit.

Disastrous for whom? Disastrous for the organization which is selling the lime to the Government. Mr. Koch sent this letter over his signature as president of the organization throughout the country. Certainly I do not question his sincerity, because he has a nice thing, living in Washington as a lobbyist and getting an appropriation out of the Government under which the Government will buy his lime. All he has to do is sit back and let the Government pay for it.

I have before me what is allegedly a reprint from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that was circulated by this high-powered lobbyist. It even has the seal of the United States of America on it to make it look official.

It is labeled "Congressional Record" and is described as "proceedings and debate of the 86th Congress, 1st Session, June 2, 1959." It indicates that this was the entire debate on the amendment last year. However, even though it looks like a reprint from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, it is actually not a reprint at all. He has skipped around on several pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and taken excerpts from speeches of various Senators, and then assembled those excerpts as being the debate in support of his big appropriation. This is definitely and deliberately misleading.

Various Senators are quoted in this allegedly true transcript of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 2, 1959, but the quotes are taken out of context and reassembled to support his own argument.

I realize that everyone has the right to quote from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It is public property once it has been printed. No one has the right, however, to go through the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, take out of context statements by various Members of the Senate, assemble those excerpts, and then present them as a statement of a Senator's position, and further to indicate that he has reproduced the Senate proceedings and debate. That is deliberately being misleading.

Every Member of the Senate knows that if we wish to make a reprint from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD we must print the transcript in its entirety or clearly state that it represents excerpts only. We cannot just eliminate the remarks of Senators who happen to be in opposition to what we advocate.

These letters with the alleged reprints of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD were mailed to millions of farmers. They call the attention of the farmers to how the Members of Congress from their States voted and indicate that those who voted to cut the appropriation almost destroyed the American farmer.

I have here the letter that was sent throughout the State of Delaware. Its enclosure allegedly is a reprint of the debate last year when an effort was made to reduce this same appropriation. The letter states that Senator FREAR and Senator WILLIAMS voted against this program and continues by saying:

> Fortunately, they were in the minority, and the program was left at $250 million.

The letter further states that the vote was 51 to 26 to defeat the Williams amendment. Presumably they think it would have been disastrous if the amendment had been accepted. They even claim that 84 percent of the farmers in Delaware were against the vote cast by Senator FREAR and Senator WILLIAMS. Mr. Koch knows how to sell lime to the Government, but he does not know the Delaware farmers. I think the two Senators from Delaware know what we are doing when we represent our farmers. It might interest Mr. Koch to know that our farm organizations have strongly supported the position we have taken here on the floor of the Senate. Mr. Koch is just another lobbyist whose only interest in the American farmer is how much money he can make selling lime to the Government.

Whether a lobbyist is for or against a bill or proposal is his business, and I respect his right to represent his clients; but I raise serious question with respect to the propriety of any lobbyist's taking excerpts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, assembling them in this fashion, and then circulating them throughout the country, representing them to be the complete Senate proceedings, in an attempt to obtain a larger appropriation. Unquestionably, this is a threat by a lobbyist to defeat the representatives in Congress who do not comply with his wishes by voting as he says.

I wonder whether Mr. Koch should not register the expenditure for circularizing what is supposedly an accurate reproduction of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and whether he should not also file with the appropriate elections committees the contribution he is making toward the election or defeat of various Members of Congress who do not knuckle down to what he wants.

I will ask the Department of Justice to review these letters to see if it is a proper lobbying activity for a registered lobbyist to take. I do not believe it is proper for him to take from the congressional proceedings excerpts from several pages and assemble them in such a fashion as to make them look like a continuous debate. Can this be charged off as expenses which would be indirectly attributed to lobbying?

The strongest supporters of this increased expenditure are those who stand to make the most money; namely, the Limestone Institute. It wants to sell $500 million worth of lime throughout the United States without the necessity of having salesmen go out on the road, as they ordinarily would have to do. They know that they can get a good price for it in this way.

I raise a question about the advisability of appropriating two and a half times as much money as the Department of Agriculture or the Bureau of the Budget recommends. Why should we spend $250 million to furnish free fertilizer or to subsidize lime for American farmers to produce more crops when we already have an overabundance of these agricultural products? We are already paying around $350 million under the bill to get farmers to take out of production some of their land.

This contradictory program will bankrupt the American taxpayers.

In the interest of the farmer and in the interest of the taxpayers I believe it is about time that Congress made up its mind in which direction it wishes to go. Do we want to curtail the surpluses or are we trying to increase them? If my amendment is rejected it will automatically increase the appropriation in the bill by $150 million above what is needed. In the interest of economy and in the interest of America the amendment should be agreed to. It may not be in the interest of the American Agricultural Lime Institute, but I am not concerned about the Lime Institute. It is about time that they realize that if we are going to have a free enterprise system in this country they had better accept some responsibilities. As one Member of the Senate, I do not hesitate to tell them that it is not their place to sell their lime here in Congress but to get out on the American farms and do it the way it used to be done.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator from Delaware has just mentioned the National Agricultural Limestone Institute. About 3 months ago I received an invitation to be present at a banquet sponsored by that association. The letter came to me about a week after I had received a letter from an Ohio constituent, a farmer, which enclosed a letter which the Limestone Institute had sent to Ohio farmers. The letter was written by the Limestone Institute, and in substance stated:

We call your attention to the fact that Senator LAUSCHE voted in favor of the Williams amendment, which would have reduced the appropriation for this program from $250 million to $100 million. We do not point this out to you for the purpose of prejudicing Senator LAUSCHE in his political position, but we want you to know that he voted against the amendment.

I wonder why they pointed out that I voted against it, if they did not intend that I should be prejudiced in the eyes of Ohio voters.

The Ohio farmer who wrote to me said, in effect, "Instead of being influenced by the letter, I have become fortified in the conviction that the position which you and Senator WILLIAMS, of Delaware, took is right." I do not know whether it has been disclosed on the floor of the Senate that letters of the type which my Ohio constituent referred to were sent out.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I have just discussed that point and pointed out how they were being mailed to farmers in several States.

Mr. LAUSCHE. In what unprejudiced, objective, national-serving purpose is this institute engaged? Is it interested in the strength and the fiscal stability and the goodness of our Government? Or is it sending out letters of this type for the purpose of insuring that there shall be made available to them a large lime-purchasing public? The questions are rhetorical; they answer themselves. The interest of the Limestone Institute is the selling of lime, even though the taxpayers generally have to pay for it.

I want it clearly understood by the farmers of Ohio, in particular, and by all the taxpayers of Ohio, in general, that I will not vote for the spending of money to reduce farm production, on the one hand, and then for the spending of money for the purpose of increasing farm production, on the other hand. It is similar to the situation of a man who is building up the front of his house while the back of it is on fire.

I commend the Senator from Delaware for the position which he has taken in this matter. If we intend to reduce farm production to, in a measure, equal the consumption of farm products, the way to do it is not by spending this amount of money to provide fertilizer and other things which will increase farm production.

I commend the Senator from Delaware for the position which he took. I shall gladly support him in the amendment which he has offered today.

The time has come to declare the facts as they exist. It is argued that each farmer will get about $170. There are 1,100,000 of them—1,100,000 voters. How can we afford to pay each one $170? The farmer has rebelled against this. He does not want to be offended in that way. Yet that is what we are doing on the floor of the Senate. I will not be a party to it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I thank the Senator from Ohio for his statement. I fully agree with his statement. I say again that I know there are Members of the Senate who sincerely believe in the full appropriation for this program. I respect the right of any Senator to differ with the position I take and which I know the Senator from Ohio takes. But I join with the Senator from Ohio in questioning whether there is any degree of sincerity in the statement of Mr. Koch, the president of the National Agricultural Limestone Institute, so far as the American farmer is concerned. His only interest is in selling $500 million worth of lime to the U.S. Government. He is interested in what he can make on the farmer and not in what he can do for him.

I point out again that in the letter sent throughout Ohio and throughout Delaware as well as throughout other States he has noted that the amount involved is $250 million and has suggested that instead of cutting it to $100 million it should be increased to $500 million a year. He is strongly against the action of those who voted against the increase.

He was careful in the letters to point out and emphasize the fact that the institute is calling this to the reader's attention not with the idea of defeating a certain Senator; but that objective is certainly foremost in his mind. The letter was sent out for only one reason, and that was to be a warning to Members of the Senate that if we continue to vote against their recommendations for appropriations, they will circularize the farmers of our States in an attempt to defeat us in the election. There is an implied threat in every one of the letters.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Does the Senator have a copy of that letter?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Yes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I have not been able to locate my own copy.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. It so happens that I have a copy of the letter that went to the farmers in Ohio as well as copies of the letters which were sent to the various other States including Delaware.

I call attention again to the fact that along with each of the letters that went to the various farmers was an alleged reprint from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It was described as a part of the proceedings of the 86th Congress, 1st session, under date of June 2, 1959.

That enclosure was not the proceedings of the Senate of that day on the debate on this question. All contain excerpts from statements which various Senators made as they spoke on the amendment. It is made to appear that practically all the speakers were opposed to the amendment.

If a man wishes to distribute the proceedings of the U.S. Senate from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, they are supposed to be printed in their entirety. He does not have a right to take a paragraph from a man's statement at one place and another paragraph from another man's statement, assemble them, and send them out under the heading "CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Proceedings" without an indication that they are only excerpts from the RECORD.

I believe Mr. Koch has gone a little too far in his concern to sell lime to the U.S. Government. I wonder if it would not do him good to get out in the old-fashioned way, as many American farmers do, and work for a living rather than to sit back and gouge the American taxpayers as well as the farmers as he has been doing for the last several years.

I hope the amendment will be adopted, not as a repudiation of Mr. Koch, but on its merits. Certainly the taxpayers can well use the saving of $150 million, which would be saved, and it would bring the amount down to the budget recommendations.

COMPACT FOR APPORTIONMENT OF WATERS OF BIG BLUE RIVER BETWEEN STATES OF KANSAS AND NEBRASKA

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to Senate bill 1605. After I make a short explanation, I desire to move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House of Representatives.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill—S. 1605—granting the consent of Congress to the States of Kansas and Nebraska to negotiate and enter into a compact relating to the apportionment of the waters of the Big Blue River and its tributaries as they affect such States, which was, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the consent of Congress is hereby given to the States of Kansas and Nebraska to negotiate and enter into a compact relating to the interests of such States in the waters of the Big Blue River and all its tributaries, and providing for an equitable apportionment between said States of the waters of the Big Blue River and its tributaries and for matters incident thereto: *Provided*, That one qualified person appointed by the President of the United States shall participate in such negotiations as chairman, representing the United States, and shall make a report to the President and to the Congress on the proceedings and on the compact. The person so appointed shall be chosen from among persons who are regularly employed full time by a department or agency of the United States and shall receive no additional compensation by reason of appointment under this Act. His travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, shall be borne by the department or agency from which he is appointed. No compact, the negotiation of which is authorized by this Act, shall be binding upon the parties thereto until it has been ratified by the legislatures of each of the respective States, and approved by the Congress of the United States.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, the House has amended the bill, which was passed last year by this body, by inserting an amendment in the nature of a substitute. The effect of the amendment is to limit the appointment by the President of the United States of the person who will represent the United States to

a person who shall be chosen from among persons who are regularly employed, full time, by a department or agency of the United States, and it is provided that such person shall receive no additional salary.

The Senate version allowed the appointment of the Government representative to be made by the President from among persons either within the Government or outside the employ of the Government.

Before I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House, let me say that I consulted with the Senators from Kansas and also with my colleague from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS]; and all of them are in agreement with the motion which I shall make, and are in support of it.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. HRUSKA. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I understand that the amendment relates to Senate bill 1605, which grants the consent of Congress to the States of Kansas and Nebraska to negotiate and enter into a compact relating to the apportionment of the waters of the Big Blue River and its tributaries as they affect such States.

Mr. HRUSKA. That is correct.

Mr. CARLSON. I also understand that, under the bill, the President will make the appointment; and I further understand that, under the amendment of the House of Representatives, instead of appointing any person, the President must appoint someone who already is employed by the Federal Government.

Mr. HRUSKA. That is correct; and no additional compensation will be paid to such person for his services on the Compact Commission.

Mr. CARLSON. Very well.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, having made that explanation—and let me say that the matter has been cleared by the leadership on both sides—I now move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House of Representatives.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Nebraska.

The motion was agreed to.

CONTINUATION FOR 2 YEARS OF EXISTING SUSPENSION OF DUTIES ON CERTAIN LATHES

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield to me?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to House bill 9862.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 9862) to continue for 2 years the existing suspension of duties on certain lathes used for shoe last roughing or for shoe last finishing, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. BYRD of Virginia, Mr. KERR, Mr. FREAR, Mr. CARLSON, and Mr. BENNETT conferees on the part of the Senate.

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——

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. Let me say that I can understand the feeling of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS]; but I should like to suggest to the Senate that when Senators vote on the amendment of the Senator from Delaware, they should distinguish between the two issues.

The Senator from Delaware has been talking about the practices of a representative of the Limestone Institute, as I understand it. But when the vote is taken, Senators must vote on the ACP on its merits.

I know nothing about the matter of propriety to which the Senator from Delaware has referred. I assume that whatever he has said is correct. But I say that when the Senate proceeds to vote, it should consider whether it wishes to support the ACP.

I should like to point out to the Senate that the agricultural conservation program is a cost-sharing program. The costs are shared between the Federal Government and the farmers themselves.

As to the limestone used in the program, I believe I am correct in saying that a few years ago, in 1953 or 1954, because questions had been raised about the use of limestone to increase crop production, the Department of Agriculture changed the regulations so as to provide that ACP limestone could no longer be used on any farmland for any crop, but must be restricted to land already in grass or legumes, or land being put into permanent or rotation pasture. That is, limestone can now be used only on fallow ground, for green-manure crops, for soil-building and conserving practices, not for crop production purposes. In most cases, I understand, the land must remain in grass for 3 or 4 years. If limestone is being used on cultivated land to increase crop production in the State of Delaware, that is something about which the Senator from Delaware can inquire.

I think the ACP has been one of the best farm programs, reaching large numbers of small farmers at a relatively small cost per farm. It encourages a great variety of soil-building and water-conserving practices, and the farmers share the costs. The ACP makes it possible for thousands of farmers to build up their soil, establish and maintain vegetative cover, provide erosion control, follow better forestry practices, and engage in any number of other sound conservation practices. I have always supported this program, and I have seen the results it has brought to Kentucky.

I intend to support the action taken by the committee to provide the full regular authorization of $250 million for the ACP. With all due deference to my friend the Senator from Delaware, I call attention to the fact that when the vote is taken, Senators will not be voting on whether some representative of the Limestone Institute followed a practice which might not be proper. Instead, we shall vote on the agricultural conservation program on its merits. I shall oppose the amendment, and I hope it will be defeated.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as an illustration of the worth of the ACP, a statement about the agricultural conservation program in Kentucky.

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

AGRICULTURAL CONSERVATION PROGRAM IN KENTUCKY

Again for 1959 the owners and operators of over 40,000 Kentucky farms made use of agricultural conservation program (ACP) cost-sharing to make additional progress on their soil, water, and woodland conservation goals. These farmers, whose farms include about three-eighths of the cropland in the State, utilized over $7 million of ACP funds, and matched that amount by their own contributions.

The establishment and improvement of permanent vegetative cover for soil and watershed protection have continued in recent years to be the most used ACP practices. However, there has been some reduction in the percentage of Kentucky's ACP funds used for these purposes, while forestry and mechanical or earth moving types of practices have increased. The establishment of livestock water facilities as a means of protecting vegetative cover or making practicable the utilization of land for vegetative cover, is an important practice in the State, accounting for about one-seventh of the program. During the last 5 years, over 22,000 livestock water storage dams have been constructed in the State with ACP assistance.

For several years there has been a strong increase each year in the acreage of forestry practices. The latest annual report shows that 11,524 acres of trees were planted for forestry and erosion control purposes on almost 3,000 farms in 91 counties, and that 3,242 acres of timber stands were improved in 49 counties. The leading counties in tree planting were Perry, 763 acres; Clay, 548 acres; Floyd, 546 acres; Johnson, 457 acres; Knott, 449 acres; and Ohio, 443 acres.

During 1959, 1,735 farms in small watersheds organized by local groups in 20 counties, usually under the provisions of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act (Public Law 566), utilized $410,000 of ACP funds to carry out land treatment

measures in the 12 watersheds involved, which had been authorized for operations. When local groups are ready to move forward with organized watershed efforts, the ASC State committee gives special consideration to the allocation of ACP funds to the counties in which these small watersheds are located in order that the funds can be used as effectively as possible in advancing the farm and watershed conservation programs in the area. Additional amounts of ACP cost-sharing were used in several watersheds authorized for planning, but not then authorized for the construction of major works of improvement.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. In my remarks I made it clear that there can always be an honest difference of opinion among Senators and that many Senators and organizations are sincerely supporting this program.

Certainly I do not question their sincerity, but I do question the sincerity of Mr. Koch. I think he is primarily interested in selling lime regardless of what the farmers get out of its use; and furthermore I seriously question the propriety of the manner in which he seeks to generate support in having these appropriations increased. I think that is an entirely off-base activity by him and his organization.

In this country we have a system in which lobbyists have a right to submit their views to Senators—and certainly I respect the right of any organization to present its views to us—however, I believe that as a lobbyist, Mr. Koch has gone too far. When he tried to distort the RECORD by attempting to make the farmers believe that all Members of Congress, except a very few, are in favor of this proposal he goes too far.

Furthermore, I point out that it is definitely established that the material which Mr. Koch distributed as a reproduction of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD was only excerpts from the RECORD. Obviously he did not include all of the congressional proceedings in connection with that matter. Nevertheless, the material which was sent out by him was handled in such a way as to give the impression that it constituted all of the congressional proceedings in connection with the debate of June 2, 1959.

I have offered the amendment on the basis that it will be better for the American farmers if my proposal is adopted.

In my opinion it is time to stop spending this extra $150 million to produce more crops when we already have more than we know what to do with, and I think the taxpayers can use the $150 million which would be saved.

But again I want it clearly understood that I desire to have the amendment voted on on its merits.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I am delighted that the clarification has been made, and that it is now clear that the Senate will not vote on the practices or activities of Mr. Koch.

Mr. President, 1,114,459 American farmers are putting up their own money in order to participate in this great program to conserve the fertility of the soil of the Nation and to defend against erosion by wind or water.

Every Member of the Senate is familiar with this program, and it is not necessary to discuss it at any great length at this time.

For some incomprehensible reason, ever since Mr. Benson took over the Department of Agriculture, he has undertaken to weaken and, in fact, to defeat the agricultural conservation program.

I say for some incomprehensible reason; I would not say that if Mr. Benson had not equally urged the conservation phase of the soil bank program, under which the Government finances 100 percent, and which reaches only 300,000 farms, and costs 3 times as much per acre as the agricultural conservation program.

In my opinion, we get more conservation value per dollar from the appropriation for the agricultural conservation program than we do from any other activity for which we appropriate.

There are a great many different phases of the constant struggle to defend the fertility of our soil, in order that it may be handed down unimpaired to coming generations. We get more real value out of this program than any other. The farmers are all familiar with it. Plans are made 2 or 3 years ahead, sometimes, as to the practices farmers will employ on their farms.

The Senator from Delaware is correct in saying that this provision goes to the 1961 program. It does. But it would be a great tragedy to cut this program back to $100 million. I have said before, and I repeat now, that it would be better to cut it out altogether than to cut it back to that amount. Some $42 million of this amount goes to pay for the local county committees, and other agencies in administration of the program. It would be better to abolish it altogether than to undertake to carry on what would amount to a $56 million conservation program and spend some $40 million to administer it.

I think the Senator is familiar with this program. We have had this program before us time and time again. I think it would be a distinct step backward to adopt the amendment proposed by the Senator from Delaware.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I want to identify myself with this particular recommendation of the committee. I believe, as the chairman of the subcommittee has stated, that the ACP is the most constructive endeavor that we make in the field of conservation. To cut it back to the dimensions proposed by the Senator from Delaware would make it totally ineffective, and really highly discriminatory, because it surely could not cover the amount of programing for conservation which is contemplated. What is more, it seems to me that, rather than think in terms of a reduction of this particular program, we might well give serious thought to a greatly revised and expanded conservation program, in which there is farmer participation and cost sharing, because that kind of program lends itself to better soil management than pulling whole areas out of production and letting them stand idle.

If any Senator wants a demonstration of what happens when vast areas are taken out of production under the soil bank, all he has to do is travel around this country and see the great growth of weed patches. That is happening in area after area.

In my State we do not use much lime. After all, the use of lime relates to the condition of the soil. In some areas we use lime. In others we do not. If the soil is alkaline, lime is not used. If it is acid or rancid, lime is used. As has been indicated, under a previous order of the Department of Agriculture, lime is supposed to be used for soilbuilding, so it cannot be used, under the ACP program, on soil that is seeded for crops. The purpose of the program is to encourage soilbuilding practices, and is related to the long-term fertility of the soil.

I never have had any opportunity to associate with the Limestone Institute. It seems to me once I attended a banquet at the Statler Hotel and heard a good speech. That was about all. They do not spend much time on me. I was for the soil conservation program long before I heard of the Limestone Institute. I know, as a druggist, that lime is a reasonably good chemical. The institute has probably gotten a little free publicity here today. It seems to me that when these institutions are publicized on the floor of the Senate they are given undue attention. I prefer to publicize the agricultural conservation program.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I did not want this opportunity to pass without at least expressing my approval of the soil conservation program. I concur in the statement that has been made by the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. It is an annual program. It is a program in operation. I think it is the best farm program we have at the present time. Not only that; it is not a program to increase crop production, but a program for the conservation of soil.

There has been much discussion about lime this afternoon. Lime is being used, under the program, where it is needed. It is not a case of sending out for lime to be placed on soil. In my State there are areas where we do not need lime, but there are areas where it is needed. I am glad it is part of the soil conservation program. I am glad the Senate recognizes that we should not reduce an item which is a very important item in the bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I recognize that one of the most unpopular things we can do is to try to cut appropriations. It is always easier to vote for increased appropriations. Nevertheless, it is the increases in appropriations that have caused the

deficits we have had for the past several years. This is one place where we can save $150 million.

Many Members of Congress have expressed concern over our inability to live within our national income. The reason for our inability to live within our national income is that Congress continues to appropriate more money than is collected from the American taxpayers.

This is another instance in which the bill provides for $150 million more than recommended by the Budget Bureau, by the Department of Agriculture, and by a great farm organization, the American Farm Bureau, as well as many other American farmers.

Certainly, the American taxpayers can use this $150 million saving resulting from the adoption of this amendment.

I think the amendment should be approved.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Delaware.

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I should like to call the attention of the chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. RUSSELL] to that portion of the bill which deals with brucellosis treatment.

On page 4, line 1, the committee figure of $52,236,000 represents the plant and animal disease and pest control program, of which a part will be for the brucellosis program.

Mr. President, I recognize that members of the Senate Appropriations Committee increased this item from the amount proposed by the Department of Agriculture, $15,582,000, to the more nearly adequate sum of $19 million. The committee members recognized that the Department recommendation would fall far short of the needs. The economics of the accelerated brucellosis eradication program have been discussed previously when the agriculture appropriation bill has been brought up.

Each year, the Department's own figures show that the sooner we bring this disease under control the sooner we can reduce this expenditure. And each year, the Department recommends a reduced appropriation. Last year this program was cut back almost 20 percent, even though Congress did not concur in a figure as low as that requested in the budget. Department expert witnesses have said that at the level of program activity permitted by an appropriation of around $16 million it would take 14 more years before we could attain a nationwide modified, certified brucellosis-free condition. However, the same expert witnesses state that under an accelerated program, this certified condition would be reached, not in 14 years, but in approximately 6 years. Following nationwide certification, another 5 to 10 years would be required to accomplish complete eradication.

It is a simple matter of mathematics that the go-slow program will cost the Nation more in the longer period of time it will take to reach a successful conclusion. I appreciate that the committee took this into account when it increased the appropriation to $19 million. I ask that we take the additional step which will bring the program operations almost to the level of the 1958 program, when the Federal contribution was $22,252,000.

Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 4, line 1, it is proposed to strike out "$52,236,000" and to insert in lieu thereof "$55,236,000."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the amendment would restore the brucellosis funds to the level of operations which we had in 1958. The testimony of the Department of Agriculture shows that there is a great need for this money. Actually, the expansion or the spread of the brucellosis disease results in one of the most costly operations we have in this country. If we can strike a greater blow at the brucellosis condition—which means, of course, essentially, buying up the herds once they become infected—we shall have that much better chance of reducing the costs in the long run and getting our country in a so-called brucellosis-free condition.

As I recall the testimony before the committee, it indicates that the Department witnesses, as I have mentioned, were of the opinion that with a stepped up program we could reduce the time element by about 50 percent. I hope that the chairman of the subcommittee will not find it too difficult to accept an amendment which would restore the appropriations not to some new high figure but to the level of the 1958 program.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the committee is fully aware of the great importance of the brucellosis program.

I regret that I cannot accept the amendment which the Senator has offered. This proposal was discussed in great detail in the subcommittee. The subcommittee agreed on the figure of $19 million. The figure we have allowed for this very important program is $3½ million above the budget estimate.

It is quite true that in years gone by the appropriation for this item has been as great as $25 million, I think, in 1 year.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. RUSSELL. We have made great progress with this program. There are a number of States which are practically free of this, and a larger number of States which have modified certification.

There is another reason why I would oppose increasing the appropriations for this item at this time. We have provided adequate funds to carry on the work in the States which are carrying their full share of the load. We have been endeavoring to get some equality of participation on the part of each of the States in this program for several years, without having succeeded in doing so. At present the participation runs from 85 percent in one State to as low as 16 percent in another State. If we continue to dole out and to shovel out Federal funds as requested we will maintain this inequality as among the several States.

I do not wish to be invidious by calling out the names of any of the States which have low participation, but the committee feels very strongly that the Department has failed in the effort to get some of the States to contribute as substantially as they should for this program.

The $19 million, when weighed against the job remaining to be done, is really more money in proportion than the $25 million was when that amount was appropriated, because we have made great progress in this campaign. There are entire States which now have been declared completely brucellosis free. There are 1,718 counties in the United States—including 21 entire States—which have received the modified certification of complete elimination of brucellosis.

This is undoubtedly a vital campaign. It is important to public health. It is important to the people who own dairy herds. However, we are making splendid progress with the program. I do not think we can justify increasing the appropriation by that great an amount above the budget estimate.

Mr. HUMPHREY. May I make one other observation?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I believe it was stated in the testimony that in the 1960 budget the appropriation was approximately $16¼ million. The Senate provided some $17½ million, while the House provided approximately $15 million, and the final amount, as the bill came from the conference, was $16¼ million. I believe that was the figure for 1960.

According to the testimony, within 30 days after Congress adjourned last year it appeared that the Department of Agriculture would be short at least $5 million of funds necessary for carrying on the brucellosis eradication program, and additional funds had to be requested of the Congress for the brucellosis eradication effort.

While there are some discrepancies in the level of State participation, and while I agree with the Senator that those wide variations ought to be narrowed down and it would be desirable if there could be some uniformity as to the amounts the States contribute, there is no doubt that the brucellosis program thus far conducted has been a great asset. While the $25 million, the high peak of appropriations, related to the need, was not as much in proportion, let us say, as $19 million would be now, the need for action is still very great.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is very true.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I have a feeling that, while there is, of course, a good deal to be said on behalf of trying to bring these programs along in an orderly way and on a more uniform basis, there is nothing in the bill to compel the Department to exercise its good influence upon the States.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes, indeed. We did include a provision in the bill to be ef-

fective for the following year. We did not let the provision affect the appropriations for next fiscal year.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That relates to 1962?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes. We did not think it was fair to make it applicable now, while the State legislatures are not in session. We did not undertake to put the provision in the bill for the next fiscal year.

We have stated in the committee report year after year that the Department should take steps to require a larger participation on the part of some States which were failing to participate properly, and the Department paid no attention to the request, so we have put a provision in the bill for the 1962 campaign.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes. I observe that has been done.

Mr. RUSSELL. We will get some results now. I have a deep feeling with respect to this program. I think it is a very important program. It might be true that $3 million or $4 million more could be spent to advantage but we are making fine progress and the incidence of this disease has been reduced by 50 percent in the past 5 or 6 years

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. RUSSELL. We are making fine progress. Let us have a chance to get the States participating on a more equal scale, and then I will go along with the Senator on bringing the program to a conclusion.

Mr. HUMPHREY. May I say most respectfully that I know the Senator from Georgia has been most helpful in respect to this subject all along. I might add that had the Congress not increased the appropriations, we would be so far behind now that the figure the Senator from Minnesota is indicating would be puny indeed.

Mr. RUSSELL. This is the third successive year in which we have suggested substantial sums above the budget estimates.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I believe those sums have lent themselves to wise economy, because there is nothing more expensive than the failure to get this disease under control.

Mr. President, I offer my amendment, and in the light of the discussion which the Senator from Georgia has stated in respect to the action of the committee, I gather that the opposition is rather strong. Nevertheless I feel rather strongly about the importance of increasing the appropriation of these funds, so I ask for a vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 9, line 16, it is proposed to strike "$83,132,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$83,882,000."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the purpose of the amendment is to add additional funds in the sum of $750,000 for the technical services which are provided by the Soil Conservation Service to the farmers who are participating in the soil conservation program at the soil conservation district level.

The proposed amendment would increase the funds available for the technical assistance which would be available to the soil conservation districts. As reported by the committee, the appropriation is $250,000 more than the budget estimate. I had intended to offer an amendment which would request a substantially larger sum than that proposed in the present amendment, but I believe the most important consideration is to continue to make some recognizable progress in the expansion of technical assistance efforts for the Soil Conservation Service.

The increase provided by the committee of $250,000 is for the staffing of an additional 20 districts during fiscal 1961.

Mr. President, soil and water conservation is one of the most important subjects which ever comes before this body. We have discussed it considerably this afternoon. Actually only about one-third of the Nation's agricultural land today is adequately safeguarded, and I have listened to much discussion about how we spend the taxpayer's money on matters relating to conservation.

I have just returned from my home State. While there, I talked with some accountants who had figured the income tax returns for some of the farmers in the southern part of the State of Minnesota, which is one of the most productive agricultural areas in the Nation. One accountant after another told me that farm income in that area was down anywhere from one-quarter to one-third of what it was the year before. If there was as much concern in the Senate for the income of our farmers as there is for some of the so-called expenditures that we make for farmers, we would not have to make as many expenditures for farmers. I have never been able to agree with the philosophy that the way to protect the United States is merely to cut back its expenditures. I happen to believe in the increase of its income, because there is a basic minimum on expenditures below which we should not go. There is a time when we either must abandon a program entirely or make it effective.

I have gone very carefully into the matter of technical assistance for soil conservation districts. In my own State of Minnesota, which has a fine soil conservation program, farmers find themselves handicapped because of inadequate technical assistance. I am not talking about grants of money or payments to farmers. I am talking about employing trained soil conservation specialists who are needed for the soil conservation program. Our farmers are not able to progress with their plans to maintain the resources of their farm lands.

Recently, I received a letter from a constituent, Mr. E. F. Borgmann, of Sauk Centre, Minn., regarding the Soil Conservation Service personnel situation in his area.

Mr. Borgmann wrote to me as follows:

It is my understanding that the local Soil Conservation Service is running out of funds and the service unit at Sauk Centre will be hampered because of lack of personnel out of this office.

Will you kindly check into this matter as to reasons for this lack of funds and, if you will, kindly advise what we can do from this end toward counteracting this. We feel very strongly this office should expand rather than curtail their services.

Thank you for this consideration.

This letter was referred to the Administrator of the Soil Conservation Service, Mr. D. A. Williams, and I have an exchange of correspondence which I am going to insert in the RECORD in a moment.

I am sure the situation Mr. Williams describes is as true nationally as it is in my own State. In order to know the exact situation in the State of Minnesota, I requested that information be supplied showing how many farmers were denied the opportunity to share in the agricultural conservation program because there simply were not sufficient funds available. The reply I received from Mr. E. J. Person, an administrative officer of the Minnesota State ASC office, revealed that in 1959 the requests of 1,659 farmers for assistance were turned down. Mr. Person estimates that in 1960, 1,675 Minnesota farmers will be turned away.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of these respective communications, the one from Mr. D. A. Williams, the Administrator of the U.S. Department of Agriculture Soil Conservation Service, the letter from E. J. Person, administrative officer, Minnesota State ASC office, and the letter from Mr. E. P. Borgmann, of Sauk Centre, Minn., be made a part of my remarks.

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

BORGMANN IMPLEMENT CO.,
Sauk Centre, Minn., April 30, 1960.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
Senate of the United States,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: It is my understanding that the local soil conservation service is running out of funds and the service unit at Sauk Centre will be hampered because of lack of personnel out of this office.

Will you kindly check into this matter, as to reasons for this lack of funds and if you will kindly advise what we can do from this end toward counteracting this. We feel very strongly this office should expand rather than curtail their services.

Thank you for this consideration.

Yours very truly,

E. F. BORGMANN.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE,
Washington, D.C., May 10, 1960.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: This is in response to your communication of May 5, 1960, with an attached letter from Mr. E. F.

Borgmann, Sauk Centre, Minn., regarding a shortage of Soil Conservation Service personnel in the Sauk Centre area.

As you know, the primary responsibility assigned to the Soil Conservation Service by the Congress is to provide technical assistance to farmers in planning and applying conservation programs on their land through local soil conservation districts. The Congress appropriates funds for the Soil Conservation Service for this purpose.

The situation in Mr. Borgmann's area is a familiar one to us. We are currently assisting some 2,865 soil conservation districts throughout the country. District governing bodies from every State report urgently needed soil and water conservation work that cannot progress as rapidly as it should because of a shortage of technicians. The problem is that the resources available at this time will not permit staffing districts with the additional technicians which are needed. Therefore, technical manpower is the limiting factor in the amount of conservation work which can be done in many areas.

We are appreciative of Mr. Borgmann's evaluation of the services rendered by the Soil Conservation Service. His letter is herewith returned as requested.

Sincerely yours,

D. A. WILLIAMS,
Administrator.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
AGRICULTURE STABILIZATION AND
CONSERVATION COMMITTEE,
St. Paul, Minn., May 12, 1960.

Hon. HUBERT HUMPHREY,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: We are enclosing the material which we stated in our letter dated April 26, 1960, would be furnished to you as soon as we received a report from our county ASC offices. A report was received from every county except for Martin County. In this particular county we did experience some difficulty in getting the SCS technician to accept additional referrals under the 1959 agricultural conservation program, and probably some farmers were denied cost sharing because of inadequate technical service by the SCS. However, we do not believe the number involved would be very substantial and, therefore, would not materially affect the totals for the 1959 and 1960 programs. It will be noted that we have listed only the names of those counties reporting that farmers' requests for practice approvals under the 1959 ACP were disapproved because of inadequate technical services by the SCS or where it is estimated that some of the farmers' requests under the 1960 program will be disapproved for the same reason. In the unlisted counties adequate technical services were available in 1959 and will, no doubt, be available for 1960 so that all approved requests will be serviced by the SCS. For your information we are also enclosing a copy of our communication to the county ASC offices requesting the data furnished herewith.

Under the 1959 program a transfer of approximately $271,000 was made to the Soil Conservation Service so as to provide for additional technical services to farmers who desired to participate in the agricultural conservation program. However, over 1,600 farmers were unable to participate in the 1959 program because of inadequate technical services from the SCS technicians. The same amount of transfer will be made for the 1960 program, but it appears that even a larger number of farmers will not have the opportunity to participate because of a shortage in the needed technical services from the SCS.

We appreciate having the opportunity to be of service to you. It is our desire that the information which we have submitted will be beneficial to you in resolving the problem which materially affects farmer participation in the ACP. This is especially true where we have available adequate funds to approve these farmers' requests.

Very truly yours,

E. J. PERSON,
Administrative Officer,
Minnesota State ASC Office.

County	Number of referrals not serviced in 1959	Estimated number of referrals that will not be serviced in 1960
Beltrami	25	20
Brown	16	
Clay	60	25
Clearwater		25
Cottonwood	49	15
Dakota	25	15
Fillmore	110	50
Goodhue	81	54
Grant	124	150
Houston	100	65
Kittson	109	50
Lyon	10	
Mahnomen		25
Marshall	368	400
Mille Lacs	15	25
Murray		50
Olmsted		24
East Otter Tail	50	60
Pine	16	47
Pipestone		25
West Polk	59	65
Red Lake	144	120
Roseau	100	125
Scott		130
Swift	48	
Wabasha	150	50
Wadena		30
Wilkin		30
Total (28 counties)	1,659	1,675

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I gave some of my colleagues present in the Senate the contents of the Borgmann letter. I took this communication through channels. I went directly to the national office in Washington and to the State office in Minnesota. Let me report what the State office in Minnesota said:

Farmers' requests for practice approvals under the 1959 ACP were disapproved because of inadequate technical services by the SCS or where it is estimated that some of the farmers' requests under the 1960 program will be disapproved for the same reason.

I have here a chart submitted by the Minnesota SCS committee showing that the number of referrals for technical assistance under the soil conservation program in 1959 not serviced was 1,659. The estimated number of referrals which will not be served in 1960 is 1,675.

These are farmers who live within soil conservation districts, and I believe I am correct in saying that the State of Minnesota has one of the better soil conservation district programs.

I read the third paragraph of the report of the National Administrator:

The situation in Mr. Borgmann's area is a familiar one to us. We are currrently assisting some 2,865 soil conservation districts throughout the country. District governing bodies from every State report urgently needed soil and water conservation work that cannot progress as rapidly as it should because of a shortage of technicians. The problem is that the resources available at this time will not permit staffing districts with the additional technicians which are needed. Therefore, technical manpower is the limiting factor in the amount of conservation work which can be done in many areas.

Mr. President, the State of Minnesota has suffered another very serious flood. Every year I plead in the Senate for some flood control funds. Every time someone says we cannot afford it. Mr. President, we could have put 14-carat gold-plated levees along the Minnesota River for what this flood cost us this weekend, with 12½ inches of rain in 28 hours. I get a little tired of hearing that we cannot take care of this wisest and best investment in the world, namely, the United States of America. We are talking about the Soil Conservation Service. It is a great program. I do not believe it costs the taxpayers one penny. In fact, the Soil Conservation Service makes money for the Government of the United States. If we have any vision, if we can look ahead for more than 5 minutes, we must realize that we are not legislating merely for this afternoon. I certainly trust we are not legislating merely for this afternoon.

I have seen the rolling hills of southeastern Minnesota, which are some of the most beautiful areas to be found anywhere in the land, eroded from water erosion. I have seen the rolling plains of western Minnesota eroded from wind erosion. I have seen the Soil Conservation Service restore those lands. Today they are productive lands. They need technical assistance. They do not need merely payments. Important as payments are, we do need technical assistance.

The committee was wise in its judgment in adding an additional $250,000 over the budget estimate. However, the $250,000 over the budget estimate is only a drop in the bucket. Funds for technical service and technicians are not expenditures. They are investments. When we put competent technicians into a business, we should not consider the costs expenditures, we should consider them investments.

The $750,000 that I am requesting is only a thimbleful of what is needed, but it will make it possible for some of the soil conservation district programs to supply the required services to the farm people in these areas.

I hope the committee will see fit to accept the amendment. At least it represents a little more progress than represented by the small amount which has been granted by the committee.

THE KIWIS

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may make a brief comment on another subject?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. KEATING. A very interesting organization is meeting in Washington this week. It is called the Kiwis. It is made up of former airline hostesses who retired from that profession when they were married. They use the name "Kiwis" because, as we all know, a kiwi is a bird that cannot fly.

It is an appropriate time to pay tribute to these fine young women who have so many of us in their care when we fly, as all of us do. It is appropriate that we welcome them to Washington. I appreciate my friend from Minnesota permitting me to make this intervention during his remarks.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am delighted with the intervention, so to speak, because while I was speaking on a rather earthy subject, soil conservation, I want the Senator to know that I have an esthetic nature also.

Both the charm of these lovely young ladies and the atmospheric areas in which they work give me reason to be happy with the comment of the Senator from New York.

Mr. KEATING. The Senator from Minnesota travels about the country as much as any one of us. I know he appreciates, as we all do, the fine service which these young women have given every one of us.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I surely do. Although the Senator from Minnesota has not always been too successful in his travels, he nevertheless always appreciates the kind thoughts and gentle words of the lovely young ladies who serve as stewardesses on our airlines. I thank the Senator.

Mr. RUSSELL. I hope that Senators will not confuse the issue before the Senate with what has been said in commendation of the airline hostesses of the United States.

Mr. HUMPHREY. If it will help, that is all right.

Mr. RUSSELL. In such a case I would be completely eliminated in my attempt to defend against the amendment.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE 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. HUMPHREY. Now to get back to the soil conservation amendment——

Mr. RUSSELL. There is a great deal of merit in the position taken by the Senator from Minnesota. Technically speaking, in light of the amount that is involved and the number of districts which have been created, I suppose we could even justify a much greater increase in the appropriation than is suggested by the Senator from Minnesota. However, there is more money available for this purpose than the Senator from Minnesota has indicated. If he will look at page 10, line 20, of the bill, he will find that there is a reappropriation of $600,000, which is made available for transfer and merger with this appropriation.

I am sure that he is likewise familiar with the fact that two and a half million dollars are available for employment in the Great Plains area. Three and a half million dollars—and before the bill goes to the President this may go to $4,900,000—are available for surveys in the watershed areas. That is directly connected with the work which the Senator from Minnesota so eloquently depicts. In addition, the sum of $5 million is transferred from the regular agricultural conservation program for technical work by the Soil Conservation Service.

All in all, while more money would be justified—and I would like to see it provided—I believe we have gone about as far in increasing the appropriation as we can. I hope Senators will realize that we are voting on the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota to increase the appropriation by $750,000 over and above the amount in the bill, which is already an increase over and above the budget estimate. It has nothing whatever to do with the comment made by the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING]. [Laughter.]

Mr. HUMPHREY. I think it is only fair that the Senator from Georgia should dissociate the comments of the Senator from Minnesota in that respect, if those comments should be prejudicial—even though I would like to have the comments be prejudicial slightly in my favor.

The comments of the Senator from Minnesota were made in the awareness of the soil conservation program for the Great Plains and for the regular soil conservation efforts. In fact, my letter to the Administrator, enclosing a letter from Mr. Borgmann, took into consideration that fact.

I believe I understood the Senator from Georgia to state that there is a need for additional soil conservation technical service, but he believes that we have made substantial progress in this bill, and therefore does not support the amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not believe that we shall ever close down this program. We shall never finish with the program of undertaking to preserve the soils of our country and to protect the water resources of the United States. As nature moves on, we shall have other problems, and we shall have to institute more intensive programs. Our increasing population will make it mandatory that we exercise the greatest care on each acre of land. However, I do say that in light of all that is involved in the bill we have a bill which deals fairly with the Soil Conservation Service as compared with the other activities. I hope the Senate will reject the amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I hope the Senate will not reject it. We have voted $250 million for the ACP program, which I strongly supported. There is a direct relationship between ACP and SCS. The technical services for the ACP come from SCS, and the SCS is no better than the technical program. Therefore, the conservation programs are no better than the technical personnel. It seems to me that the importance of additional technical personnel cannot be overestimated, because they use the funds which have been made available for payment purposes for the different tools or works that are utilized in the soil conservation program. I hope the amendment will be adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I submit another amendment which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 18, line 9, it is proposed to strike out "$110 million" and insert in lieu thereof "$135 million."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the purpose of the amendment is very simple. It adds to the school-lunch program the sum of $25 million, which I think is required in order to maintain the school-lunch program on a basis which will meet the needs of the growing school population and the increased cost of food supplies which are needed for the school-lunch program.

The committee provided or recommended for the fiscal year 1961 the basic appropriation at exactly the same level as was provided for fiscal 1960—in other words, $110 million.

It seems to me that this program should be strengthened. The enrollment in the schools increases each year, and the number of schools which participate in the program increases. The cost of the food supplies increases. Therefore, to maintain the program at the same level is, in effect, reducing it.

In other words, Mr. President, if you have in your family six children, and the average food budget for the six children is $150, that is $25 for each child. Then you add 2 more children, the average for the year is still $150. You may be able to say that you are providing the same amount of money for food as you used to provide, and, therefore, you are a good provider. But I am afraid that having two additional children at the table to be fed will cause a realization that the same amount of money or the same budget will not provide the same amount of food as would have been provided for a smaller number of children.

In this instance, the Nation has a growing school population. In 1961 the school population will be larger by well over a million children—almost 2 million more—than there are in fiscal 1960. Therefore, the school-lunch program, so far as the Federal contribution is concerned, should take into consideration an elementary fact—the census.

When we take into consideration the school census, it becomes obvious that to provide the same amount of money for the next year as was provided for the last year is not holding the line, but is, in fact, retreating.

I also note that the administration recommended a reduction in the transfer of section 32 funds to the school-lunch program for the purchase of additional high protein foods. I note also that the Committee on Appropriations, in its wisdom, increased this item by $5 million, instead of decreasing it, making

$45 million available for the purchase of turkeys, ground pork, dried eggs, and similar high protein foods.

I hope the words dried eggs, which are constantly bandied around, might also be expanded to include fresh eggs, because the dried egg diet is hardly one which is conducive to happy living. It is conducive to survival, but not to joyful living. I have seen the time when the purchase of a few fresh eggs would do much good for not only those who would eat them, but also for the market.

I commend the committee for rejecting the attitude of the administration to attempt to reduce the transfer of section 32 funds. By the way, there is more than $400 million in section 32 funds. I cannot, for the life of me understand why the administration would want to reduce that amount of money for transfer to the school lunch program. That money was collected from tariffs; it is not a taxpayers' fund. Surely, it should be made available to those who are in need. A short time ago I saw the need for the use of some of this money by hungry people in this country.

Mr. President, I ask for the favorable consideration of my amendment, which would increase the direct appropriation for the national school lunch program to $135 million for fiscal year 1961.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Minnesota probes me in a sensitive spot every time he offers one of these amendments. He places me in the position of a hard-hearted father, who resists the efforts of the country salesman who comes in and implores the husband to buy a dress for his wife.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I would not do that, because the Senator from Georgia is not that type of person.

All I am attempting to do is to state what I believe, according to my conviction and my conscience, is necessary. When I see the growth of the school population, and I see that we are holding to the same amount of funds, I merely want the RECORD to be clear concerning the views of HUBERT HUMPHREY, U.S. Senator from Minnesota. I will be accused of being a spender, and I am willing to spend when it is necessary. I will be accused in my home State of trying to raise this budget item by a substantial amount of money. I welcome the accusation, because as the father of four children I have found that it costs more to feed four children than it does three; more to feed three than it does two; more to feed two than it does one. I have lived with children long enough to know how hungry they can get.

When there will be about 2 million more children in the schools next year, I do not want anyone to kid me by saying that $2 million more for the school-lunch program is holding the line. It does not take into consideration the increase in the school population.

I am willing, however, to stand the public test by voting for additional funds for school lunches.

Mr. RUSSELL. As I have said, I have long been interested in the program. It was my distinct honor and privilege to be the first to introduce in Congress the bill which is substantially the existing school lunch law. I wrote that bill myself. I did not have the help of any drafting service or of anyone from the Department. With very slight changes, that bill is still on the statute books, although it carries a House number. So I have great pride in the school lunch program.

I confess that the school population is greatly increasing. But the $110 million provided in the bill is not all the money we have for the school lunch program. We have $45 million of section 32 funds, which really makes $155 million of direct appropriations.

As the Senator from Minnesota has said, that is about $5 million over and above what was appropriated for the current year. In addition to that program, there is the surplus commodity program. There have been very few years when that amount has fallen below $70 million. For the current year, it is estimated to be about $75 million. It will be at least that much, probably more, in my opinion, in the coming fiscal year.

One of the most important parts of the whole program is the special milk program, which is very helpful, indeed, to the schoolchildren, particularly those who come from underprivileged families. That program will be increased by some $7 million next year, to a total of $95 million.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. The first step-up of that program was for the present fiscal year, 1960. It was stepped up from $81 million to $85 million. The second step-up, in the bill which we recently passed, was to $95 million for fiscal 1961, which is the next fiscal year.

Mr. RUSSELL. If that figure is correct—and that legislation came from the Senator's committee—that is a total of around $330 million of Federal funds for the school lunch and school milk program. That is a rather substantial sum of money. Of course, more money could be spent. There is practically no limit to the amount of money which could be spent on the school lunch and school milk program. It depends, in the last analysis, upon the local administrator properly applying the program and properly choosing those who are to receive their milk and their lunches free, and fixing the proper charge upon the great majority of children who purchase their lunches each day.

This program runs into a tremendous sum of money—almost a billion dollars in total—when we consider the amount paid by the children who are purchasing their lunches.

More money could be justified, but we tried to have a balanced bill. I think the allowances we have made for the school lunch and the school milk programs are in keeping with the general distribution we have made throughout the bill.

I hope the amendment will be rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, first I may say that unless one had served with the Senator from Georgia on the subcommittee handling the Department of Agriculture appropriations, one could hardly understand the fairness with which the school lunch and school milk programs were handled. While these are only two of the programs handled by the subcommittee, I think they constitute a fair test of the generosity of the subcommittee this year.

I commend the Senator from Georgia for having done so many things which are not only reasonable, but also generous, in our attitude to the whole school lunch program, including not only that part which is under the statute which bears that name, but also the milk program, which, by the way, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] has supported, under the recent advance of that program, and the other programs which are included in the sum total of what makes up the program for the children of the Nation.

In the report, on page 7, will be found a new item added by the committee; namely, "$115,000 to initiate a pilot program of estimates for tomatoes and celery."

There is a particular reason why I mention this matter at this time; it is because the Department's report and recommendation, which really serve as a justification for this item, unfortunately arrived a day or two after the record had gone to the printer. So the able clerk of the committee had the report of the Department on this subject matter printed in the side slips; and therefore it will not appear in the permanent RECORD of this debate unless it is placed in the RECORD at this time, as a part of the debate.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask that that statement be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT SUBMITTED BY THE DEPARTMENT, MAY 11, 1960

COMMERCIAL VEGETABLES FOR FRESH MARKET: PILOT PHASE OF PROPOSED PROGRAM FOR REPORTS ON SHORT-TIME SUPPLIES

The present program of reports on vegetable acreage and production for the fresh market is not filling the needs for timely information to guide the planting and aid materially in the marketing of the important vegetable crops.

The broad objective of the proposed program is to provide, through periodic inventories of acreage planted and frequent checks on progress of harvest, reliable and quick information on the supply of each important vegetable available, for short periods of time (monthly, semimonthly, or weekly) in each competing area of the country. Considerable experimental work has been done along this line on Florida tomatoes. A limited amount of such information also has been collected for Florida celery and California carrots and lettuce.

Before attempting to launch a full scale program of this type for nearly 2 dozen vegetables in the 27 important producing States, it seems desirable to work with a limited program in a few States. Such a program would provide operational experience under the different sets of cultural and marketing conditions existing in different sections of the country, and also would test the feasibility of quickly exchanging information between States for fast dissemination to growers, shippers, and marketing factors. To this end it is proposed to start with a modest program comprising tomatoes in Florida and Texas and celery in California, Florida, and Arizona.

For tomatoes, it is proposed to issue weekly reports on Florida plantings and to include other information relating to progress of the crop, rate of harvest, shipments, weather, etc. Tomatoes were selected in Florida because growers are keenly conscious of the marketing problems confronting them and are attempting to do something about these problems. Florida produces fall, winter, and spring crops of tomatoes. For Texas, which also grows fall, winter, and spring tomatoes, it is proposed to inaugurate a weekly program of reports for the Lower Valley and monthly reports for other areas in the State. Because of the large number of small growers in the other areas (Laredo-Winter Garden-Eagle Pass and Coastal Bend-East Texas), it seems best to start with a program of monthly reports in these latter areas. In the development of monthly reports from these areas, methods will be explored to apportion plantings after they have been completed into weekly or biweekly groups according to age. Florida and Texas grow 37 percent of the country's total tomato acreage for the fresh market.

From the basic information obtained on acreage, workable procedures will be developed to determine more accurate indications on inventories and future supplies in the producing areas involved. The principal factors in developing this moving inventory of acreage and supply information will be the number of acres harvested to a given date, the acreage remaining for harvest, the condition and yield prospects on this acreage, the probable rate of harvest, and the volume of supplies indicated for the monthly period.

For celery, the plan is to inaugurate monthly reports on acreage planted during the past month in California, Florida, and Arizona.

As with the monthly tomato reports, methods will be explored to ascertain, at monthly intervals, the number of acres harvested, the number remaining for harvest, condition and yield prospects, and the probable supply for the market the following month. These 3 States grow about four-fifths of the country's annual celery acreage, accounting for all of the winter and spring acreage, 36 percent of the summer acreage, and 76 percent of the fall acreage.

Emphasis will be placed on the quick distribution of information to growers, shippers, and other marketing factors. A system of exchanging acreage and supply information by telephone and telegraph between State offices of the Crop Reporting Board will be tested so that this information will be available to everyone within 3 days of its collection instead of 10 to 12 days, as is now the case with crop reports. A summary of the information by States, also will be released from Washington at the same time.

The attached table shows pertinent data concerning acreage, value and number of growers for the two crops covered in the proposed pilot project. The proposed project would cover, for the 2 crops concerned, a total of about 105,000 acres grown by approximately 12,600 farmers. In 1959 production from this acreage had a value of $82.4 million.

Cost per year $115,000.

State and season	Acres harvested in 1959		Value of production, 1959 (thousand dollars)	Number of growers, 1954 census
	Number of acres	Percent of season's total		
	Celery			
Florida:				
Winter	8,100	60	6,161	
Spring	5,200	63	3,059	
Total	13,300		9,220	77
California:				
Winter	4,600	34	6,515	
Spring	3,100	37	6,008	
Summer	2,500	36	4,563	
Fall	7,100	76	11,466	
Total	17,300		28,552	489
Arizona: Winter	750	6	531	12
3-State total	31,350	[1] 82	38,303	578
	Tomatoes			
Florida:				
Winter	16,100	100	16,298	
Spring	14,700	21	16,174	
Fall	8,600	29	6,708	
Total	39,400		39,180	1,798
Texas:				
Spring	34,000	48	4,854	
Fall	600	2	90	
Total	34,600		4,944	10,266
2-State total	74,000	[1] 37	44,124	12,064

[1] Percent of U.S. annual total.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I wish to state, briefly, that the Florida Fruit & Vegetable Association, which is a very large organization in our State which represents the vegetable producers and others, but particularly the vegetable producers, has for some years been conducting experimental programs, helped by its own funds and by State funds and to some degree in the past, I believe, by small amounts of Federal funds, in order to ascertain what can be done in connection with the best handling of market reports to the producers of fresh vegetables, which not only are highly perishable and have a short season, but also compete with vegetables which come from offshore areas, such as Cuba and the Isle of Pines, as Senators know, and also with similar products from Texas, Arizona, and California.

We presented to the committee a request, on behalf of the Florida Fruit & Vegetable Association, which spoke not only for itself and its own members, but also was speaking for the producers in California, Texas, and Arizona, and covered the need to supply market information on these highly perishable crops.

According to the view of the Department at that time, as voiced by Secretary Peterson and Mr. S. R. Newell, the proposed program would have been too large; and they felt, as did we, that although all of us recognized the great need for such a program, it should be approached on a pilot program basis.

We therefore suggested that the Department's statement or justification be sent to the committee; and it has now been printed in the side slips.

I think it might be well for me to read two paragraphs from the statement. I now read from the Department's recommendation:

STATEMENT SUBMITTED BY THE DEPARTMENT MAY 11, 1960

COMMERCIAL VEGETABLES FOR FRESH MARKET: PILOT PHASE OF PROPOSED PROGRAM FOR REPORTS ON SHORT-TIME SUPPLIES

The present program of reports on vegetable acreage and production for the fresh market is not filling the needs for timely information to guide the planting and aid materially in the marketing of the important vegetable crops.

The broad objective of the proposed program is to provide, through periodic inventories of acreage planted and frequent checks on progress of harvest, reliable and quick information on the supply of each important vegetable available, for short periods of time (monthly, semimonthly, or weekly) in each competing area of the country. Considerable experimental work has been done along this line on Florida tomatoes. A limited amount of such information also has been collected for Florida celery and California carrots and lettuce.

Before attempting to launch a full scale program of this type for nearly 2 dozen vegetables in the 27 important producing States, it seems desirable to work with a limited program in a few States. Such a program would provide operational experience under the different sets of cultural and marketing conditions existing in different sections of the country, and also would test the feasibility of quickly exchanging information between States for fast dissemination to growers, shippers, and marketing factors. To this end it is proposed to start with a modest program comprising tomatoes in Florida and Texas and celery in California, Florida, and Arizona.

One of the two crops which the recommended program covers is tomatoes—that is to say, the winter, spring, and fall tomato crops in Florida and the spring and fall tomatoes in Texas, which, incidentally, supply 37 percent of the entire amount of table tomatoes that are used by the Nation.

As for celery, the program covers the year-round production in California, the winter and spring production in Florida, and the winter production in Arizona. The celery crop covered would be 82 percent of the national table supply of celery.

Senators will observe in the compilation which now has been placed in the RECORD how the program is broken down between the States of Florida, California, Texas, and Arizona.

I think this program is an exceedingly useful one. It is a pilot program which, supplementing the programs already carried out in part in Florida and in California, will give a general view of how much good can be accomplished in the case of these highly perishable and highly important crops, for which nothing as regards price supports or anything of the sort is being requested. But the program proposed may be of great use to the Nation as a whole, as well as to the growers in the particular States immediately concerned.

I wished to make this statement, because the hearings, as printed, unfortunately do not show what is involved in this program.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, before the vote on the bill is taken, I should like to refer to an item which many of the people of Kansas have called to my attention—namely, the importance of the conservation reserve and the necessity of providing adequate funds for it.

In connection with the conservation reserve and the 1,444,237 acres in Kansas which are used for it, it is interesting to note that 951,064 acres of the 1,447,237 acres comprise whole farms which have been taken out of production.

This matter is of concern to our people, first, because they are not able to take care of the applications for the program; and, second, because they feel that there are not sufficient funds to pay for the personnel needed in connection with the operation. So, first, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator whether he feels that sufficient funds are provided in order to take care of the applications for the acreage reserve.

Mr. RUSSELL. Does the Senator mean sufficient funds to pay the contractors the amounts due them?

Mr. CARLSON. Yes, and to take care of additional requests.

Mr. RUSSELL. There will be no funds to take care of additional requests, because no additional requests can be received. The program has ended, insofar as new applications are concerned. The only program now is to pay those who are operating under the old contracts.

Mr. President, I think the amount provided in the bill is adequate. As a matter of fact, the Department has consistently overestimated the amounts necessary, and from year to year there has been a carryover.

The Senate committee has increased by $25 million the amount recommended by the House; and it has developed that there will be a carryover of at least $20 million from the present year, and that it will be available.

We are within about $6 million of restoring the full amount requested by the Department of Agriculture; and I assure the Senator that we shall make good the amounts due under these contracts; and if it happens that not quite enough money is provided in this bill, the additional money needed will be the first money to be included in the supplemental bill.

The Senator knows there is also a question about the amount necessary for the contracts; and from year to year there is always a carryover.

Mr. CARLSON. Then, based on the statement made by the Senator from Georgia, I can assure the people of Kansas that their interests will be cared for.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator can assure them that so long as the Senator from Georgia is in the Senate——

Mr. HUMPHREY. And that will be a very long time, thank goodness.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Kansas can assure the people of his State that so long as the Senator from Georgia serves in the Senate, there will be sufficient funds to take care of what is due them under these contracts.

Mr. CARLSON. I thank the Senator from Georgia.

Let me ask whether I correctly understand that the $13,783,000 requested for the conservation reserve program, as recommended by the Bureau of the Budget, will be cut to $12 million?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes, from approximately $13 million to $12 million.

Mr. CARLSON. $13,783,000 was recommended for 1961; and the committee has cut it to $12 million; is that correct?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. CARLSON. Does the Senator from Georgia think that amount will be sufficient to carry on this program?

Mr. RUSSELL. I believe it will be adequate. Of course, that is a substantial reduction from the amount provided this year; and that reduction will be made because there will be no new contracts. The only question will be to police the existing contracts.

If the Senator from Kansas will read the language which appears at the bottom of page 21 of the bill, he will find that not less than $10 million of that amount will be available for local administration, and that is where the program is really administered.

We have undertaken, in the discussion with the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], today, to clear up the point that it was the intention of the committee that the county committees shall be first provided for, then the State committees, and that the principal reductions should be at the Washington level, because there are no more policies to be formulated, or matters of that kind. It is more a question of seeing that the contracts are complied with and also of conforming to the Government's share by seeing that these are paid.

I believe the agency will be able to function with this administrative fund.

Mr. CARLSON. The Senator from Kansas has such a high regard for the Senator from Georgia that he is going to go back to his people in Kansas and say they are taken care of.

Mr. RUSSELL. There may be a little pinching. There may not be the money they think they should have. But the agency should be able to administer the program with this money.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. I should like to direct the attention of the chairman of the subcommittee to the appropriation for the Extension Service. I notice that the committee recommended an appropriation of $57,715,000, which represents an increase of $2 million over the figure provided by the House, and $4 million over the amount provided for fiscal 1960.

Am I correct in assuming that the State land grant colleges and the extension services in each State can determine, within the scope of the program, the use to be made of these funds? For example, could they use these funds to bring the salaries of extension workers and home demonstration agents up to a level that would be more nearly equal to the salaries paid in other States?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes. We have assumed the money would be used largely for that purpose. However, of course, the needs vary as between the States. The State of Oregon, for example, pays its county agents a great deal more than any other State in the Union does. Oregon has a large State appropriation for that purpose. The State may desire to hire different specialists in some fields, such as for fruit production. However, generally throughout the United States, I think the funds will be used to increase the compensation of the county agents and home demonstration agents who work on the farm level.

Mr. COOPER. Recently the Kellogg Foundation made a grant of approximately $750,000 to the State of Kentucky, to be used under the supervision of the director of the State extension service, for research and activities toward the development of 30 counties in the eastern section of the State. Peculiarly enough, today we debated the depressed areas bill, which also was designed to give help to such areas. This $750,000 grant will be available to help build the agricultural and other resources of 30 counties in the depressed areas of Kentucky.

Under this appropriation for the cooperative extension work, would the extension service in Kentucky be empowered to use a part of those funds in the rural development program, or in the extension service program in those counties, to make it a more effective program?

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator means to use the Kellogg funds——

Mr. COOPER. No, not the Kellogg funds.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes, indeed. They could use the appropriated funds to increase personnel and, if necessary, select 20 counties in Kentucky and give them the rural development treatment. There is no question about it, if the State of Kentucky desired to do it. The only overriding requirment is that the States, or the local units thereof, shall match the appropriation dollar for dollar. As a matter of fact, most of the States spend a great deal more than they receive from the Federal Government; but that is the overriding requirement to obtain those funds.

Mr. COOPER. I know my State will be very appreciative of the fact that the committee retained the $250,000 item which had been placed in the bill in the House, and largely through the initiative of my colleague, Representative WILLIAM NATCHER, of Kentucky, to initiate a tobacco research center in Kentucky.

I wish to thank the committee and the Senator from Georgia for maintaining that appropriation.

Mr. RUSSELL. We hope and trust that the developments at that research station will not only be helpful to the

burley tobacco growers, but will also help the Flue-cured tobacco growers of Georgia.

Mr. COOPER. And the dark tobacco growers.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. COOPER. I appreciate, as I know all of us do, the great interest of the Senator from Georgia in the farm programs and the fine work of the subcommittee of which he is chairman. We are grateful to him and to the other members of the committee for their good work.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, may we have the third reading of the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

Mr. RUSSELL. 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. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call be dispensed with.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask that we have the yeas and nays on the passage of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the bill pass? On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA] are absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], the Senators from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE and Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senators from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA and Mr. HART], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent because of death in his immediate family.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG] is absent on official business as a member of the official delegation to attend the 150th celebration in Buenos Aires.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] are detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] is paired with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE]. If present and voting, the Senator from South Dakota would vote "yea," and the Senator from New Jersey would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 74, nays 1, as follows:

[No. 200]

YEAS—74

Aiken	Fulbright	Magnuson
Allott	Goldwater	Mansfield
Anderson	Gore	Martin
Beall	Green	Monroney
Bennett	Gruening	Morton
Bible	Hartke	Moss
Bridges	Hayden	Mundt
Brunsdale	Hickenlooper	Muskie
Butler	Hill	Pastore
Byrd, Va.	Holland	Prouty
Byrd, W. Va.	Hruska	Proxmire
Carlson	Humphrey	Robertson
Carroll	Jackson	Russell
Clark	Javits	Saltonstall
Cooper	Johnson, Tex.	Schoeppel
Cotton	Johnston, S.C.	Smith
Curtis	Keating	Sparkman
Dodd	Kefauver	Stennis
Douglas	Kerr	Thurmond
Dworshak	Kuchel	Wiley
Eastland	Lausche	Williams, Del.
Ellender	Long, La.	Yarborough
Engle	Lusk	Young, N. Dak.
Ervin	McCarthy	Young, Ohio.
Frear	McClellan	

NAYS—1

Bush

NOT VOTING—25

Bartlett	Hart	O'Mahoney
Cannon	Hennings	Randolph
Capehart	Jordan	Scott
Case, N.J.	Kennedy	Smathers
Case, S. Dak.	Long, Hawaii	Symington
Chavez	McGee	Talmadge
Church	McNamara	Williams, N.J.
Dirksen	Morse	
Fong	Murray	

So the bill (H.R. 12117) was passed.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendments and request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer (Mr. McCARTHY in the chair) appointed Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. HILL, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, Mr. MUNDT, and Mr. DWORSHAK conferees on the part of the Senate.

PERMIT NAVY TO SERVE OLEO

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 921, Senate bill 2168.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2168) to amend the Navy ration statute so as to provide for the serving of oleomargarine or margarine.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

RESOLUTION OF JOINT TEXAS LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE APPROVES PADRE ISLAND NATIONAL SEASHORE AREA

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the beach study committee of the Texas Legislature, a joint committee of both houses of the Texas Legislature, headed by two very able and experienced legislators, Senator Robert W. Baker, of Harris County, and Representative Ben A. Glusing, of Kleberg County, has adopted, on May 20, 1960, a resolution favoring creation of an 88-mile-long national seashore area on Padre Island.

This expression of cooperation and support by our Texas legislators of the project already recommended by President Eisenhower, Secretary of the Interior Fred Seaton, and supported by Senate Majority Leader LYNDON JOHNSON, should in my estimation assure establishment of Padre Island National Seashore Park for the pleasure and benefit of all Americans.

Action of the Texas legislative beach study committee shows that leaders at the State and National level are working in harmony on this project, which will permit the improvement of national seashore recreation facilities on the longest, southernmost natural beach left in America. With this legislative beach study committee favoring enabling legislation on the State level for an 88-mile national seashore park, it is virtually certain that the Texas Legislature will pass such a bill next session. In 1959 the Texas Legislature passed a resolution favoring a 50-mile park and it would be simply a matter of increasing the designated park area.

Mr. President, that was a forward step, because in 1958, when I first introduced the bill to authorize the Padre

Island project, it was said that the Texas Legislature would never give its consent to the creation of a Federal seashore area on Padre Island, and the local interests bitterly opposed the project in the Legislature of Texas. The forces of conservation scored one of their biggest victories in enacting a statute in 1959 providing for a 50-mile-long seashore area.

The Secretary of the Interior has recommended an 88-mile-long seashore area. My proposal was for 100 miles of the 117-mile-long island, but the joint committee of both Houses unanimously recommended the 88 miles, and we have agreed to attempt to have amended the Texas law, which now provides for a 50-mile seashore, and to provide for 88 miles. That is one of the most forward steps in the conservation of recreational resources in the history of my State.

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

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I wish to congratulate the Senator from Texas on achieving a much needed development of the shoreline of the United States for park purposes. We are rapidly losing our shorelines on the oceans, the gulf, and the lakes, and the Senator from Texas has with others been trying to develop a whole series of national parks to conserve the shoreline and to enable the people to have access to the sea and to the lakes. We have met with many discouragements. I congratulate the Senator from Texas upon obtaining this much needed park for Texas and for the country, and to congratulate him upon the progress which he has made.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Illinois for his very generous words. His interest in the conservation of our national resources and the recreational areas for the American people is long known. He worked at this project for many years before I reached the Senate. His fight for the Indiana Dunes is a national legend now. His great fight for the cleaning up of the pollution in our rivers and in every facet for the improvement of the habitat of the American people is well known. I wish to congratulate the Senator from Illinois for the leadership he has given to those of us who have come here since he laid out the pattern of work in that field.

The resolution passed by the Texas Legislature beach study committee is another vital and significant step toward establishment of Padre Island National Seashore Park. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the full text of this important resolution. I ask unanimous consent that the names of the State senators and State representatives who headed this legislative joint study committee and who signed the resolution be printed in the RECORD with the resolution.

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

Whereas the National Park Service, through its pioneer work has awakened our country to the urgency of the need to save our shoreline and has particularly urged the preservation of Padre Island, the longest unspoiled natural beach in the United States, as a national seashore area; and

Whereas Senate bill 4, introduced in the Congress of the United States by the Honorable RALPH W. YARBOROUGH, Senator from Texas, would authorize the acquisition by the Secretary of the Interior of the major portion of Padre Island, which legislation has the strong support of the Honorable LYNDON B. JOHNSON, Senator from Texas, and other members of the Texas congressional delegation; and

Whereas a lengthy public hearing held on this legislation in Corpus Christi, Tex., on December 14, 1959 by the Subcommittee on Public Lands of the U.S. Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, presided over by Senator FRANK E. MOSS, of Utah, indicated that the people of Texas are strongly in favor of the creation of a national seashore area on Padre Island; and

Whereas the Department of Interior has recently recommended to the Congress of the United States the creation of an 88-mile national seashore area on Padre Island; and

Whereas the Texas Legislature, at its last session, recognized the desirability of such a project and charged this committee with the responsibility of recommending to the next session of the legislature necessary legislation to implement the creation of a national seashore area on Padre Island: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Texas legislative beach study committee, That it endorse the recommendation of the Department of Interior and that it recommend to the next session of the legislature the approval of the creation of the 88-mile national seashore area on Padre Island as recommended by the Secretary of Interior; and be it further

Resolved, That said committee commend the Honorable RALPH W. YARBOROUGH, the Honorable LYNDON B. JOHNSON, the Honorable JOHN YOUNG, the Honorable JOE KILGORE, and all other members of the Texas delegation to the U.S. Congress for their efforts to secure for the people of Texas and of this country a national seashore area on Padre Island; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to each member of the Texas congressional delegation.

Passed at Galveston, Tex., on the 20th day of May 1960.

ROBERT W. BAKER,
State Senator, Harris County, Chairman of Texas Legislative Beach Study Committee.

BEN A. GLUSING,
Representative, Kleberg County, Vice Chairman of Texas Legislative Beach Study Committee.

THE CONNALLY RESERVATION

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, earlier today the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a discussion of the Connally reservation, as it appeared in the columns of the Christian Science Monitor.

I request unanimous consent to have inserted in the body of the RECORD two articles appearing in the May issue of the American Bar Association Journal, which I feel deserve the attention and consideration of every Member of the U.S. Senate.

These two articles present in eloquent yet dispassionate terms the pragmatic considerations which caused the Senate of the United States in 1946 to attach the six-word Connally amendment to the formal declaration of the United States accepting the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice. Both authors recognize that in the continuing ferment of international affairs caused by the clash of the democratic philosophy of the free world with the totalitarian philosophy of the Sino-Soviet bloc that the Connally reservation remains as a vital and indispensable protection to the domestic sovereignty of the United States.

I am, indeed, proud that the author of the first of these articles is a fellow South Dakotan, Roy E. Willy, a distinguished practitioner of the law in South Dakota for the past three decades and the former chairman of the American Bar Association's house of delegates. Roy Willy has courageously taken up the cudgel in defense of the Connally amendment and is currently campaigning within the house of delegates, urging repeal of action taken 13 years ago, at which time the house of delegates favored the elimination of the Connally reservation.

The second article is authored by a scholarly and highly respected member of the Minnesota bar, Charles W. Briggs, of St. Paul. In a most erudite presentation Mr. Briggs traces the historical development of our Anglo-American concepts of the law, and he ably focuses attention on the one irrefutable lesson of history, that "law is the command of a sovereign power."

Before any action is taken in this legislative body with respect to the Connally amendment, I sincerely hope that all of my colleagues will read and carefully reflect on the contents of these two pragmatic discussions of the immediate prospects for peace through law.

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

THE WORLD COURT AND THE CONNALLY RESERVATION

(By Roy E. Willy of the South Dakota Bar (Sioux Falls))

(References made for statistics quoted are largely taken from the report of a special committee of the House Judiciary Committee on the International Court of Justice and the International Criminal Police Organization made to the 1st sess. of the 86th Cong. on April 1959. (Reference to this report will be abbreviated H.J.C.).)

(Reference is also made to publication of the United Nations entitled "The International Court of Justice" in 1957, which is cited as "I.C.J.")

One of the principal purposes of the United Nations is stated to be: "To bring about by peaceful means and in conformity with the principles of justice and international law, adjustment or settlement of international disputes or situations which might lead to a breach of the peace."[1] This same object was also the purpose of the League of Nations. Peaceful settlement of international disputes which might, if not so disposed of, lead to the manifold horrors of war has long been the aim of many people and of many nations, including our own.

Unfortunately, in international affairs between nations, as in private transactions between individuals, it still requires two parties to make a bargain, and in the past it has not always been possible to secure the consent of the necessary parties to insure peaceful solution of international disputes. Certainly, in those cases in the not-

[1] ICJ, p. 1.

too-far distant past in which dictatorship has sought to enlarge its scope of influence by extending the territorial boundaries of its country, a peaceful solution could be secured only at the cost of abject and unconditional surrender.

Whether the United Nations can prove any more successful in preventing deliberate acts of aggression on the part of ruthless and predatory dictatorship than its predecessor, the League of Nations, still remains an open question. The issue was presented to the world in the recent Korean struggle where, although there was intervention by the United Nations, a major conflagration was avoided. Whether this same result would have been reached had the forces of the United Nations waged other than limited warfare was not determined.

As an adjunct to the League of Nations, there was created in 1920 a "Permanent Court of International Justice,"[2] under provisions contained in the League Covenant. Its jurisdiction depended solely upon the consent and voluntary participation of the parties to a dispute. Its activities were interrupted by the outbreak of hostilities in World War II and in 1946, its existence terminated with the dissolution of the League of Nations.[3]

Historically, the first serious effort to create machinery for the settlement of international disputes by other than armed hostilities occurred in 1899 in connection with the First Hague Conference, at which time the powers who participated in this conference signed the "Hague Convention for the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes."[4] In 1907 at the second Hague Conference, a Permanent Court of Arbitration was created, a body that still remains in existence.[5] The extinction of the League of Nations carried with it the Permanent Court of International Justice. This gap in the world judicial organization was filled by the creation of a new judicial structure provided for in the Charter of the United Nations. The form and judicial substance of this organization is almost identical with the old Permanent Court of International Justice and at the first meeting of the new body, it adopted, with few changes, the rules of court of its predecessor.[6]

The present International Court of Justice consists of 15 judges who, under the provisions of its Charter, are elected by the General Assembly and the Security Council of the United Nations. The judges are chosen from lists of persons submitted by the various national groups who, as members of the United Nations, also belong to the Permanent Court of Arbitration, and in the case of members of the United Nations who do not belong to this court, separate lists are submitted. The General Assembly and the Council each holds a separate election and the successful candidates must obtain a majority of votes from each of these two separate bodies. Judges of the International Court are elected for nine-year terms and are eligible for re-election. Their terms are staggered so that five judges are selected every 3 years. Provision is also made that in any case before the court in which there is a judge of the same nationality as one of the parties, the other party may choose a person to sit as judge ad hoc and if the court contains no judge of the nationality of any of the parties, each party may select a judge ad hoc who will serve in that case with the right of participation and vote. Under the Charter, not more than one judge from any member nation can be a member of the court at the same time.[7] The yearly compensation of the judges is $20,000 each and the cost of its administration since its creation in 1946 has been $8,457,000.[8]

Since its organization in 1946, the Court has entertained 20 contentious cases[9] and 11 advisory questions have been submitted to it by the United Nations for opinions.[10] However, of the 20 cases presented to the Court, in 7 the Court did not have power to consider because either it lacked jurisdiction or the cases were withdrawn. One was a reconsideration of an earlier case, and 2 are still pending, making a net of 10 cases in which the Court has actually rendered a decision on the merits in the 13 years of its existence.[11] Of the 11 advisory opinions which were submitted to the Court, none were concerned with peaceful settlement of disputes.[12] In this respect, its record does not approach that of the old Permanent Court of International Justice created by the League of Nations. In the 17 years of its active existence, the Court dealt with 79 cases, of which 51 were contentious cases referred to it by states either by special agreement or by unilateral application, and 28 arose from requests for advisory opinions submitted by the Council of the League of Nations.[13]

Under article 93 of its charter, all members of the United Nations are automatically members of the International Court of Justice. However, no member nation is bound by the compulsory jurisdiction of the court without a specific declaration accepting such jurisdiction. To date 39 member nations have by declaration accepted compulsory jurisdiction by the court in specific areas of international law.[14] None of the Communist block of nations, including the Soviet Union, have accepted the court's compulsory jurisdiction.[15]

In connection with the work of the court, much has been said and much more written about the Connally amendment, which came about in 1946 when the United States recognized and accepted the jurisdiction of the court.[16] This acceptance of the jurisdiction of the World Court is subject to a six-word amendment to subparagraph (b) which reads: "Disputes with regard to matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of the United States." To this phrase Senator Connally added the words "as determined by the United States." Of 39 nations which have accepted the jurisdiction of the International Court, many of them have likewise placed limitations on the court's power with regard to its jurisdiction. In addition to the domestic jurisdiction reservation, several countries, including the United States have likewise restricted the applicability of their declarations to "legal disputes hereafter arising." Others have excluded disputes which affect their national security and others disputes arising out of events occurring at a time when they were involved in hostilities.[17]

The cold war was waiting in the wings in 1946 and had not yet made its appearance on the stage. The House of Delegates had been represented by an official group of observers at the birth of the United Nations. As lawyers, we were well aware of the fact that a feeling existed in the world that the failure of the League of Nations to accomplish its mission of insuring world peace might, in a degree at least, have been due to the failure of the United States to ratify its covenant. Peace and harmony appeared to prevail throughout the world. There was a strong sentiment to the effect that the Connally reservation might jeopardize this situation and that the failure of the United States to accept the full jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice without reservation would have an adverse result on the rest of the world. This sentiment in the American Bar Association was responsible for the resolution introduced in the Assembly at the 71st annual meeting at Atlantic City in 1946. The resolution contained a recommendation to the effect "that the Senate of the United States should reconsider the subject of the declaration of compulsory jurisdiction, and should eliminate therefrom the right of determination by the United Nations as to what constitutes matters essentially within the domestic jurisdiction."[18] The resolution was brought before the House of Delegates and action on the resolution was postponed to the midyear meeting of 1947.[19] At the 1947 midyear meeting, the House of Delegates adopted a resolution embodying the context of the Assembly proposal and recommended that the Senate of the United States "authorize the filing of a further declaration which shall not contain the reservation or condition to which the foregoing resolutions relate."[20] This amended resolution was approved by the Assembly at its 1947 annual meeting.[21] The Senate of the United States took no action toward repealing the Connally reservation and the matter remained more or less dormant until it was brought to attention by a number of prominent individuals, including the present Attorney General.

On March 24, 1959, Senator HUMPHREY introduced Senate Resolution 94, which reenacts the resolution of August 1946, but deletes the six-word amendment proposed by Senator Connally and adopted by the Senate. The matter did not again come before the house of delegates until the midyear meeting at Chicago on February 22, 1960. At that time a resolution was introduced, signed by 11 members of the house of delegates, the purpose of which was to ask the house to rescind the action taken in 1947 and urge upon the U.S. Senate the retention of the Connally reservation. This resolution was not debated before the house on its merits but on motion was referred to a special committee on world peace through law.

A report of a special committee of the House Judiciary Committee on the International Court of Justice and the International Criminal Police Organization presented at the 1st session of the 86th Congress uses this language with reference to the Connally amendment: "The Connally amendment basically is of good purpose. It seeks to safeguard matters which are essentially of domestic concern to the United States. Under the United Nations Charter, the International Court has jurisdiction only over questions of international law—not domestic matters. It therefore does not seem unwise, in the absence of treaties and any developed principles of international law, that such items of immigration and certain aspects of our postal or atomic energy laws which are essentially domestic matters be reserved to the United States for a decision."[22]

This same report further calls attention to the fact that so far as the special committee could determine, there are no clear-cut rules recognized in international law as to

[2] I.C.J., p. 4.
[3] I.C.J., p. 4.
[4] I.C.J., p. 3.
[5] I.C.J., p. 3.
[6] I.C.J., p. 5.
[7] I.C.J., pp. 5 and 6.
[8] HJC, p. 9.
[9] HJC, p. 2.
[10] HJC, p. 2.
[11] HJC, p. 2.
[12] HJC, p. 6.
[13] HJC, p. 5.
[14] Vital Issues, vol. IX, No. 6.
[15] HJC, p. 3.
[16] S. Res. 196, Aug. 2, 1946.
[17] HJC, p. 7.
[18] 71 ABA Rep. 91.
[19] 71 ABA Rep. 148.
[20] 72 ABA Rep. 77.
[21] 72 ABA Rep. 82.
[22] HJC, p. 7.

what are and what are not domestic issues.[23] Therefore, the United States reserved to itself the right to decide this question in controversies in which it is involved. This possessed the advantage at least of preventing an encroachment on domestic jurisdiction. At the present time the United States is and for many years has been engaged in a worldwide relief program, under which billions of public funds have been expended in military aid, as well as in varied forms of economic assistance to less fortunate nations. Questions involving these voluntary gifts made by this country, made on an international scope, certainly involve questions of purely domestic policy which the United States would not wish to surrender to a Court of International Justice.

The future of the Panama Canal which is vital to the safety and security, as well as economic prosperity of the United States, might easily be determined to be a question of international law by an international court. Our security depends upon its remaining a domestic question, free from possible interference by a hostile international court.

Questions involving immigration have an international aspect but so far as this country is concerned, are purely domestic questions. The retention or discontinuation of the sugar subsidy which has bolstered the economy of Cuba for many years is, so far as the United States is concerned, purely a domestic problem and not one which should be submitted to an international court in the event this country should seek to change, alter, or discontinue the subsidies entirely.

The International Court as an instrumentality seeking to maintain world peace is deserving of the support of every lawyer and of every citizen not alone of this country but of the world. The consequences resulting from holocaust possible under an atomic war stagger the imagination. However, there are benefits and privileges which come to the citizens of the United States which we feel are worth retaining and should not be sacrificed as the price of membership in the present International Court. Less than 50 percent of the present members of the United Nations have accepted the compulsory jurisdiction of the World Court. Of those who have accepted, many have done so with one form of reservation or another. Neither Soviet Russia nor any of its satellites have accepted compulsory jurisdiction by the World Court. Until the world, or, at least, a substantial portion of it, including the principal great powers, have accepted compulsory jurisdiction of the World Court, the Court as such has but little influence in the settlement of disputes between powers, except as the powers themselves voluntarily consent to the Court's jurisdiction. If, as, and when circumstances should arise that would make it possible for a world court to be a true representative of a judicial structure as understood by the English-speaking world, the United States will be jeopardizing this domestic peace, tranquillity, and security by accepting without the reservation compulsory jurisdiction of the present International Court.

It is true that the scope of the Court's activities has been severely restricted by virtue of the fact that a majority of its members have never accepted its compulsory jurisdiction. It is doubtful if the Connally reservation and similar reservations by other complying members have had any material effect on the Court's activities. At least the United States and the 38 other nations which have accepted compulsory jurisdiction do submit their international disputes to the Court. However, there is no way of compelling noncomplying members to accept the Court's jurisdiction and no means exist other than by consent of the nonmembers to acquire jurisdiction over such nations. It is also worthy of note that even the General Assembly of the United Nations has made but small use of the facilities of the Court and in the 14 years of the Court's existence has referred but 11 questions to it for advisory opinions. It is unfortunate that the International Court does not have a wider recognition but certainly it is not the Connally reservation which has deprived it of the opportunity to be of service to the world.

The matter of the Connally reservation was again brought before the house of delegates at its midyear meeting because of the fact that the failure of the house to reverse the action taken in 1947 is continually cited by those who favor the repeal of the Connally reservation as representing the present sentiment of the American Bar Association. Those who favor the repeal of the Connally reservation continually use in their propaganda the fact that the American Bar Association has since 1947 favored its repeal.[24] It is self-evident that this attitude does not represent the unanimous sentiment of either the American bar or the house of delegates. The sponsors of the resolution which was presented at the midyear meeting and referred to the Committee on World Peace Through Law feel that the members of the house are entitled to an opportunity to consider again the matter fairly on its merits and are confident that this opportunity will be presented to the members at the Washington meeting.

THE CLOUDY PROSPECTS FOR "PEACE THROUGH LAW"

(By Charles W. Briggs, of the Minnesota bar (St. Paul))

There is danger that hopes for "peace and liberty under law" are being exaggerated.

From time to time great social and political explosions in the world produce strange philosophical fallouts upon the legal mind. One of these is the nature of law. Periodically fragments of strife descending upon men become so intense that they become notionate and wishful thinkers about peace on earth. There is a rush to the fetish of rules of law as manna from heaven, to the supreme disregard of practical matters involved. It is good that lawyers check their pragmatic bearings once in a while.

Today it is difficult for some skeptical and inquiring minds to avoid the conclusion that a close examination should be made of concepts back of such slogans as "the Rule of Law," "Peace Under Law," and "Liberty Under Law." Before we know it we are apt to become involved in occult revelations about the law after the manner of a spiritualistic medium.

Some such apprehension is created by an article entitled "Leader of the Few: A Royal Air Force Background of Law Day," appearing in the April 1959 issue of the American Bar Association Journal (45 ABAJ 355). The author, on page 370, quotes from Lord Dowding's "Leader of the Few" in part:

"The evidence for the conscious survival of death, and the possibility of intelligent communication between the quick and the dead is in my opinion quite convincing to the open mind * * * I confidently predict that all these ideas will be commonly accepted in a hundred years' time, when those who reject them will be classed with those who now believe that the earth is flat * * * the more we know the better are we qualified to cooperate with the unseen Forces of Light in helping distressed humanity on both sides of the Grave."

The author of the article goes on to say:

"To all skeptics Lord Dowding may well quote Hamlet: 'There are more things in heaven and earth, Horatio than are dreamt of in your philosophy,' and 'There's a divinity that shapes our ends, rough-hew them as we will.' "

Further this author says:

"The belief of Lord Dowding is not only significant and entitled to respect, but, as appears from the increasing number and variety of spiritual books in the Western World, has been spreading since the nuclear bombs appeared. Aside from the cynics, there appears to be a growing consciousness that the survival of the human race and the civilized part of it, depends on unseen spiritual forces. For all these reasons, if 'liberty under law' is the hope for a peaceful world, the 'Leader of the Few' deserve[s] for our sakes, to be known and remembered by the American bench and bar in connection with 'Law day' as a continuity."

The continuity here envisaged is with the school of natural law whose chosen votaries would extract the law from a supernatural authority.

Now, with what indemonstrable assumption is the "Rule of Law" concept to be associated? One answer comes in the May 1959 issue of the Journal (45 ABAJ 482). It is the dogma of natural law. In an article entitled "The Way of the Law" the author says:

"The question to be answered by philosophy is whether, on the one hand, law is only an accidental product of irrational forces. Or whether, on the other hand, law reflects and must seek to reflect a structure of justice established by the Creator of all things for the right relation of man to man and nation to nation.

"The classic phrase 'natural law' is a stumbling block for many thoughtful people. For others it has most satisfactory meanings, reflecting that structure of justice of which I have spoken."

Again:

"In American thought and feeling the rights of man are not derivable from physical nature nor from any Rousseauian theory of noble savage or social compact. The rights of man are derived from his Creator."

Also:

"What then is it, this rule of law? It is, as we have noted, a fundamental concept of political philosophy."

Then the author would wipe out the privilege of the United States to stay the compulsory jurisdiction of the World Court if in our judgment the matter in dispute involves domestic jurisdiction of the United States. He says:

"Meanwhile there is the World Court of the United Nations—the most unused court in history. This means that the Connally amendment must be repealed."

Within that jurisdiction as an adjunct of a world government we are supposed to attain liberty and peace under the law. And the law? It must be what to the judges is revealed as a structure of justice established by the Creator.

THE SLOGANS USED RAISE SEARCHING QUESTIONS

This business of the rule of law and peace under law raises very searching questions and points to some areas of serious misunderstandings. Some of these questions it is the purpose of this article in all candor to raise. But as a prologue let us lay down an approach. Most people favor peace as against war, but not peace at any price.

We are not too proud to fight for the defense of our land and the institutions liberty-loving men hold dear. We are not to be misled by emotionalism when we appraise a proposed method of attaining peace. We live in a hard world which gives little or no heed to weakness, humility, or unpro-

---

[23] HJC, p. 8.

[24] The American Bar Association has consistently opposed it since 1946: "Vital Issues." vol. IX, No. 6.

tected virtue. The practical aspects and workability of any formula for human happiness are always to be thoroughly explored.

First. What is meant by peace? Is peace freedom from war? Is it tranquillity enforced by war or the threat of military force? Does Hungary have peace? Do East Germany and the Balkan States? Does it concern civil wars? Do Cuba and Iraq have peace? Is Yugoslavia at peace? Is France? Were the Pax Romana and the Pax Brittania real conditions of peace, although made possible by legions and warships? Is there peace under law where the law is observed under compulsory processes? Very definitely peace to some does not mean the cessation of attempts at conquest nor the end of the class war.

Second. What is law? This is not a captious question as we shall see.

Mr. Webster says that law is a "rule of conduct which is prescribed or is formally recognized as binding and is enforced by the supreme governing authority," i.e., by a sovereign power.

Now this at first blush seems to be a rather simple matter. But it is that by no means. What is law has been the subject of violent controversy for centuries and centuries. Scholars, lawyers, clerics, philosophers, and even laymen with a flare for dialectics and scholastic mysticism, have divided themselves into two factions.

On the one hand, we have the school of natural law. On the other hand, we have the positivist school. These schools differ sharply and almost irreconcilably on the origin of law.

The naturalists teach that natural law signifies the laws for the direction of human conduct which proceed immediately and infallibly from the Deity. This law is asserted to be an essential and external code which the conscience and rational powers of man are capable of perceiving. We may well amplify the explanation of this concept by referring to the teachings of its devotees. St. Thomas Aquinas, a monk writing in the 13th century, founded his legal philosophy squarely and explicitly upon a theological basis. From there he proceeds to arrive at logical sequences and consequences in the field of law by the deductive method of scholastic logic. He taught that law operated throughout the universe as a complete and immutable system. In his system God is the supreme ruler; law is derived from Him, and that law is supreme in the state. Lord Chief Justice Coke lived in the 17th century. His philosophy of natural law is often referred to by the naturalists as an authority. He said:

The law of nature was before any judicial or municipal law and is immutable. The law of nature is that which God, at the time of creation of the nature of man, infused into his heart for his preservation and direction.

Blackstone belonged to the naturalists. He held this:

"When the Supreme Being formed the universe * * * He impressed certain principles upon that matter from which it can never depart. This, then is the general significance of law."

But he displayed feet of clay to them when he wrote:

"I know it is generally laid down more largely that acts of Parliament contrary to reason are void, but if the Parliament will positively enact a thing to be done which is unreasonable, I know of no power in the ordinary forms of the constitution that is vested with the authority to control it."

A quotation on the subject from the president of a modern university pretty well sums up the philosophy of the naturalists. He says:

"The natural law is not an ideal; it is a reality. It is not the product of men's minds; it is a product of God's will. It is as real and as binding as the statutes in the United States Code. It is not a mere ideal toward which all statutes and court decisions and systems of law should tend; the actuality is that any statute or court decision or system of law which does not conform to natural law simply has no valid, binding force; it is inherently vitiated. It lacks an element required for essential validity."

We find also in a report of the 1947 proceedings of the Natural Law Institute this statement:

"Nevertheless, all prescriptions of human reason can have force of law only inasmuch as they are the views and the interpreters of some higher power on which our reason and liberty necessarily depend."

Thus we have the dogma that all rules prescribed for the government of men must be derived from divinely revealed principles. This means interpretation by the human mind. Some Lord Coke is always ready to constitute himself the proper intermediator between divinity and the governed. If more than one Coke turns up, then there is the eternal conflict of lawgivers. No code of the natural law has ever been written; nor has anyone ever seen a treatise on how the vast body of modern rules of conduct can be traced to immutable principles of that law.

Mr. Felix Oppenheim, in the American Political Science Review (vol. 44, No. 4, December 1950), gives us this summation:

"The natural law doctrine is characterized by philosophical absolutism. This absolutism holds that there is such a thing as 'absolute reality' which can be communicated by or be understood by man through revelation, intuition, or 'right reason.' * * * Absolutism is not tolerant of competing ideas and opinions. So it would seem that the naturalist, being an absolutist, has a natural affinity for absolutist government, or totalitarianism."

Now let us take a look at the positivist school of law.

Inasmuch as Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes was one of the most illustrious and trenchant exponents of this point of view, we may present his views as typical. He stood at the end of a road surveyed by other positivists such as Francis Bacon, Thomas Hobbes, John Locke, Jeremy Bentham, Immanuel Kant, David Hume, John Austin, Hegel, James and Dewey.

In his book, "The Common Law," Justice Holmes drew the following conclusions:

"The life of the law has not been logic: it has been experience. The felt necessities of the time, the prevalent moral and political theories, intuitions of public policy, avowed or unconscious, even the prejudices which judges share with their fellow men, have had a good deal more to do than the syllogism in determining the rules by which men should be governed. The law embodies the story of the Nation's development through many centuries, and it cannot be dealt with as if it contained only the axioms and corollaries of a book of mathematics. In order to know what it is, we must know what it has been, and what it tends to become. We must alternatively consult history and existing theories of legislation. But the most difficult labor will be to understand the combination of the two into new products at every stage. The substance of the law at any given time pretty nearly corresponds, as far as it goes, with what is then understood to be convenient."

In this work he further says:

"A legal right is nothing but a permission to exercise certain natural powers, and upon certain conditions to obtain protection, restitution, or compensation by the aid of a public force. Just so far as the aid of a public force is given a man, he has a legal right, and this right is the same whether his claim is founded in righteousness or inequity."

THE POSITIVIST VIEW—MR. JUSTICE HOLMES

Holmes' positivist legal philosophy may be summed up briefly: He held that judges made law, as do legislators, for in substance the growth of the law is legislative. He never lost sight of the inductive method in declaring the common law. To him "the secret root from which the law draws all the juices of life" are views of what is salutary and feasible for the community concerned. He never questioned the privilege of men to indulge in legislative experimentation to regulate or improve their law. He believed that man, speaking collectively, made his own law; that law is a sovereign's command, and nothing else; that law in a democracy is necessarily the command of the majority of the social group. He maintained that force is the ultimate ratio of the law. Inalienable rights he never acknowledged.

In *Southern Pacific Company* v. *Jensen* (244 U.S. 205), Justice Holmes made the now famous remark:

"The common law is not a brooding omnipresence in the sky but the articulate voice of some sovereign or quasi-sovereign that can be identified."

In *Black & White Taxi Co.* v. *Brown & Yellow Taxicab & Transfer Co.* (276 U.S. 518), Justice Holmes said:

"'Law' is a word used with different meanings, but law in the sense in which courts speak of it today does not exist without some definite authority behind it."

Third. Which philosophy is apt to prevail in establishing rules of law, be they for peace or liberty or otherwise?

While we are still in the area of argument, it is pretty safe to conclude that the pragmatic approach of the positivists to the law will be accepted in preference to the approach of the naturalists.

The natural law is not meaningful nor useful in human society for evident reasons:

1. As a dogma it is purely subjective. Its truth can be tested by standards which can be applied only by the individual making the judgment. It can exist only in the individual mind. From it can be extracted all manner of rules of conduct to suit the interest of the interpreter.

2. The dogma is indemonstrable. It is a pure assumption and a double abstraction.

For most people the value and soundness of rules of conduct can be judged only in their operation as they concern actual facts. These rules are evolved by some sovereignty under whose power is the ultima ratio. A conclusion as to the propriety of a rule of law can be reached only by applying standards derived from the value of precedents and expected results.

3. The dogma is devoid of concreteness and determinateness, which are qualities found in the positive law.

It is used to characterize a set of rules of the most patent generality that are claimed to supersede manmade laws. The initial difficulty with the concept of natural law in respect of concreteness arises because (a) no lawgiver exists or is identifiable; (b) no organized power exists to enforce it; (c) it exists in a vacuum.

It is altogether inscrutable.

Fourth. Can we rely upon an assumption that there are absolute and immutable rules of law not dependent upon some sovereign power for promulgation and enforcement?

It would seem not.

If there are such rules they have never come to us except as formulated and expressed by a human mind acting as an interpreter. The question then arises: through what mind? Through a Moses, a Louis XIV, a James I, a Richelieu, or a Thomas Aquinas, proceeding, of course, on the basis of divine right or sanction? Or through multiple minds in a democracy?

If we assume that law must have supernatural sanction, then we cannot escape the conclusion that there have always been, and always will be, irreconcilable differences between interpreters of the divine will.

LAW PROCEEDS FROM THE FORCE OF THE SOVEREIGN

We are not at liberty to reject the teachings of history that rules of law have proceeded from the exercise of sovereign power. Such a power must evaluate, and pass judgment upon divergent human views. It must authoritatively decide what view shall prevail as a positive rule of conduct.

We must realize at the outset that there is no such thing as a choice between the rule of law and the rule of force. Force complements the law as the beginning and end of it—its ultimate sanction. So does history run.

The ancient Israelites put the sword back of the Torah. The judges of Israel never hesitated to use force when the commands of Jehovah were defied. The Ark of the Covenant was at home in an armed camp. In modern Israel, the rule of law as it is revealed there is maintained by military force. In ages past religious wars over interpretations of revealed law have drenched the earth with blood. The Crusades of the Middle Ages were hardly expeditions to establish peace under the rule of law alone. The prophets of Islam broadcast the rules of the Koran by fire and sword. Hindu and Mohammedan look to force to determine whose interpretation of the divine law shall prevail. When the Hindu philosophy crosses that of Islam, the next step is the crossing of swords and the arbitrament of war.

Today, all over the world, rules of conduct are laid down by sovereign power. The dove of peace once perched upon a spear; now she must ride in the atomic warhead of a ballistic missile.

The Nuremberg trials were a striking instance of positive law made for the occasion and administered ex post facto by sovereign powers to suit their convenience. Vengeance presided as law was improvised to accomplish "justice for the victors". Where is the peace that flowered from that rule of law?

The Founders of this Nation understood well that strife can arise over spiritual doctrines. Thus they erected in the first constitutional amendment in impenetrable barrier between theology and the law. They said: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." They learned well a sad lesson from endowing any man with power and authority to determine the law by the standards of his religious belief. They were in no mood to reestablish the "Divine Right of Kings" or any similar groundless abstraction. They had ample reason to mistrust judges who claimed to be vicegerents of God with assumed warrants from Him to declare the law. And they appreciated full well that these interpreters of the supernatural were always ready to invoke the desired amount of force to uphold the law they found to be natural.

Fifth. The question then arises: What sovereign power is going to decide what the law shall be and how and by whom it is to be enforced?

The choice is between a world sovereign and independent nations.

If a world government or federation is to discharge these sovereign functions, it must be vested with governmental powers, just as our national government is. If it meets our specifications, it must have a legislator, a court and a sheriff. If the United States becomes a party to such supranational authority, it makes itself subject to the compulsory jurisdiction of that legislator, that court and that sheriff. To the extent of the powers delegated, we should cease to be sovereign and self-governing. Think, if you will, of a world parliament to enact laws binding upon us against our will. Of a world court with compulsory jurisdiction to invade our domestic domain. Of police forces, including military components, to put us under the lash of rules of law, perhaps foreign to our concepts of justice and individual rights.

THE INSURMOUNTABLE PROBLEMS OF ESTABLISHING WORLD GOVERNMENT

Would it not be impossible to establish a supranational government? Impossible, because no one is able to formulate a workable structure for it. Right at the threshold we meet head on insurmountable problems:

1. How are the peoples of the world to be represented?
2. What powers are to be delegated?
3. How are military forces to be assembled, located and commanded?
4. What are to be the rules for immigration and citizenship qualifications?
5. What constitutional principles are to be established?
6. What is to be the philosophy and ideology behind such a government?

There are now and have been widely differing systems of national government throughout the world with equally divergent legal structures. We may enumerate just a few: Mohammedan, Chinese, Hindu, Slavic, Germanic, Anglican, Japanese and Romanesque. Before them came others: Egyptian, Mesopotamian, Hebrew, Greek, Maritime, Roman, and the Papal or Church. (See Wigmore's "The World's Legal Systems.") Now must be added the Soviet, or communistic. Each has or had its distinctive rules of law. From this welter how is a supranational legal system to evolve?

The roots of these systems differ. Ideas about moral and personal conduct are in conflict. Religious prejudices are insoluble. Racial backgrounds cannot be effaced. Traditional enmities persist.

Nationalism is ingrained in peoples. It has not lost but gained in fervor throughout the world. It has grown despite erasures of time and space, despite the improvements in transportation and communication. International rivalries have not been lessened. The swifter spread of knowledge concerning rival systems has served to intensify the struggle for national independence and supremacy. Our easier means of evangelism throughout the world have not brought converts to our system but belligerent enemies. Colony after colony has broken away from the mother country. National independence is a battlecry everywhere else. Why all of a sudden should it be feeble in the United States?

Attempts to codify international law have dismally failed. So have attempts at collective security. Plans for organizing, equipping, and commanding an international police force died aborning. NATO is a standing example of aversion to yielding sovereignty to a supergovernment. NATO, however, has been able to carry on through international agreements in pursuance of a common purpose. The signatories prefer to maintain their separate autonomies.

Engagements in armed conflicts since the great alliance of World War II have been carried on by individual sovereign nations, although on one side in the name of the U.N.

There is not even a faint hope that a world organization could be created with governmental power to declare or enforce the law.

There is little reason to expect that the nations of the world could establish a World Court with compulsory jurisdiction. How could it keep the peace? The longstanding and operative causes of war do not constitute justiciable controversies. Nations go to war over problems that no court can settle. Here are a few of them:

1. Expanding populations;
2. Commercial rivalries;
3. Unequal distribution of natural resources;
4. Conflicting ideologies;
5. Religious differences;
6. Traditional enmities;
7. Lust for power.

Most people prefer peace most of the time. At times they prefer war. They justify war where great principles are at stake. The issues involved in our Revolutionary and Civil Wars could not have been resolved by the peaceful processes of the law and judicial decision. In the Dred Scot decision and the hanging of John Brown the law was precisely followed; but they lit the flames of war nevertheless. Oftentimes the passions and prejudices of men are not to be subdued by a rule of law. The Boston Massacre was exonerated in a court of law but it aroused the people to a war for freedom. Recently the law as enunciated by our Supreme Court was enforced at bayonet point. What court could have decided the political issues involved in the outbreak of the First and Second World Wars? The law was silent. There is no international law to speak today effectively for peace.

National power ratings alone get a hearing. "How many divisions has he?" cynically asked the Russian dictator, when a great spiritual force for peace was mentioned.

LAW IS THE ORDER OF THE MASTER

Who is going to decide that there shall be peace under the rule of law? We may be sure that the wealthy, cultured and soft nation at its zenith will prefer peace and if it can will promulgate the law to attain it. Mature civilizations tend to wallow in pleasures and avoid the sterner virtues that raised them up. The urge to fight wanes. But the tough and growing nation is not averse to conquest in order to gratify its ambitions for wealth and power. The law rides with its armies. Law becomes the order of the master not the supplication of the conquered.

There is nothing in the natural law philosophy that guarantees peace or individual liberty. It can well be and has often been the concomitant of rule by force. This philosophy certainly is compatible with autocracy or the totalitarian state. Today we cannot safely rely upon a belief that liberty will not be lost and that peace will reign if only we hold to the assumption that natural rights to life, liberty, and property are inviolable. And surely democracy carries no absolute guarantee of individual liberty. We will preserve liberty only if the people in their sovereign capacity demand it.

The conflicts that array nation against nation today are not differences between systems of law. The controversies that disturb the peace of the world are not concerned with the law of property, of domestic relations, or estates, of tort liability. They are not concerned with the guilt or innocence of a few accused persons or with civil rights of individuals; not with procedural law. They are concerned with what sovereign power is to be paramount and supreme. We are skirting the borders of Armageddon while the real question at issue between nations is: Whose law is to be the law that governs? That law will not be established by good will, not by persuasions of justice, nor by purchase, nor by "right or reason"; but by predominant sovereign power. Did the Russians take their tanks into Hungary to protect a Hungarian rule of law? Are the Chinese Reds going to recognize the Tibetan rule of law? If Russia takes over in Iraq, does she intend to observe the

Iraqi rule of law? It ought to be clear that no communistic nation will ever yield to our system of law and its principles until the present ruling leadership is uprooted by force from within or without.

The plain fact is that the United Nations has been inefficient because it was not endowed with power to do anything either for the maintenance of peace or the conduct of war. Governmental power remains with the signatory nations. The U.N. must look to the exercise of sovereign power by these constituent nations. The sovereignty of each of these nations was left unimpaired. Nothing it does has the character or force of law. Unfortunately, there was created the impression that the U.N. was the perfect instrument for finding, interpreting and applying by moral force to all peoples that great body of immutable and absolute rules and principles of national and international law. Now the disclosure comes that law results from a meeting of minds. There is no concensus in the U.N.; and one independent nation scorns the legal system of the other and its principles. And then comes the imponderable and insoluble difficulty that the peace is broken by political, not judicial questions.

CONCLUSION

We must abide with independent sovereign nations. World government is only a dream, a fruitless venture into idealism. Think of giving power to a world government to make a declaration of war "to keep the peace" binding upon us and which might well be against our wishes and national interests. And how fantastic it is to think that the rising tide of human passions that break the peace can ever be resolved by a court of law.

Law is the command of a sovereign power. Force is its ultima ratio. Law is not a self-generating mechanism; nor is it self-enforcing, as the naturalists would have us believe. We are ruled by positive law which arises from considerations of public policy and social convenience.

Justice Learned Hand says this: "The law must have an authority supreme over the will of the individual, and such an authority can arise only from a background of social acquiescence * * *. In essence, law is the conduct which the government, whether it is a king, or a popular assembly, will compel individuals to conform to, or toward which it will at least provide forcible means for securing conformity."

Mr. Justice Holmes concludes: "Just so far as the aid of the public force is given a man he has a legal right, and this right is the same whether his claim is founded in righteousness or iniquity." And further: "The life of the law has not been logic: it has been experience. The substance of the law at any given time pretty nearly corresponds, as far as it goes, with what is then understood to be convenient."

Roscoe Pound epitomizes the philosophy of law as follows: "But I am skeptical as to the possibility of an absolute judgment. * * * Is the end of law anything less than to do whatever may be achieved thereby to satisfy human desires. * * * What I do say is, that if in any field of human conduct or in any human relation the law, with such machinery as it has, may satisfy a social want without a disproportionate sacrifice of other claims, there is no eternal limitation in the nature of things, there are no bounds imposed at creation to stand in the way of its doing so."

What Pound implies is that the hand of the supernatural cannot be discovered in the acts of legislatures, in the decisions of courts nor in the orders of administrative boards.

We may well quote here the trenchant words of Mr. Mortimer Adler used at the Notre Dame Law Institute in 1947:

"Nations, like individuals, who live together under natural law alone, are in a state of war, whether or not actual shooting is going on. However sound morally the precepts of international law may be as conclusions deduced from natural law they lack the coercive force of positive law. International law is not the kind of law which can keep peace. It is not sufficient to ask for a worldwide reign of law. It must be positive law. The doctrine of natural law does the human face a great disservice if it in any way obscures this fundamental truth by empty eloquence concerning international law as the foundation of international peace.

Our dire predicament today is due in no small measure to such eloquence and to advocating world government without even as much as blueprinting its framework and the code of positive laws under which it would be expected to operate among the heterogenous peoples of the earth.

Before any World Court can function in any area, common standards must be arrived at. What would be the source of its law? Is it to be of supernatural origin as the Justices see it? There must be an accepted language which will convey the meaning of the parties, one that will silence the communistic wordtwisting.

We must look to the will of the sovereign for the law, and in this country the people are sovereign and responsible. Tracing the rules of law to a supernatural authorship is a futile effort. There certainly is nothing celestial about a tax code, a tariff law, or a labor law, or in the legislative history, fostering inflation. What spark of divinity is observable in an order of the Interstate Commerce Commission, in an order of the Federal Trade Commission, or in a decision of a court at any level, for that matter? Is the Congress under the aegis of a brooding omnipresence in the sky? This whole business of the rule of law is unmistakably earthly and manmade. If we do not recognize it as such and instead restore a pallid faith in an automatic rule of law founded upon the absolutism of divine revelation, we shall repeat an old mistake. We shall again put on the shackles forged by theological assumptions from which we thought we had freed ourselves. We shall not save the peace and individual liberty, but again put them in jeopardy.

Peace and liberty under law will be with us only if we possess and are willing to exert the sovereign power to preserve them.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, May 24, 1960, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 2130) to authorize a payment to the Government of Japan.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 44 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 25, 1960, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 24, 1960:

U.S. COAST GUARD

The following-named officer who is serving as Commandant of the U.S. Coast Guard and whose term of office expires May 31, 1962, to be admiral in the U.S. Coast Guard, to be effective June 1, 1960.

Alfred C. Richmond.

The following-named officer who is serving as Assistant Commandant of the U.S. Coast Guard and whose term of office expires May 31, 1962, to be vice admiral in the U.S. Coast Guard, to be effective June 1, 1960.

James A. Hirshfield.

U.S. PATENT OFFICE

Hyman Freehof, of the District of Columbia, to be an Examiner in Chief, U.S. Patent Office.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of colonel:

William H. Junghans, Jr.
John L. Hopkins
Henry W. Seeley, Jr.
Henry G. Lawrence, Jr.
William C. Ward, Jr.
John T. Bradshaw
Robert E. Collier
Alexander A. Elder
Ward K. Schaub
Maurice L. Appleton, Jr.
Alvis H. Allen
Clifford F. Quilici
Victor R. Bisceglia
Nathaniel Morgenthal
Louis G. Ditta
John T. O'Neill
Arthur H. Haake
Oscar F. Peatross
Frank E. Garretson
Norman R. Nickerson
Norman Pozinsky
Stanley S. Nicolay
James K. Dill
Paul B. McNicol
George C. Axtell, Jr.
Charles Kimak
Louie N. Casey
John J. Wade, Jr.
Karl N. Smith
Horace C. Parks
Bernard W. McLean
Olin W. Jones, Jr.
Henry H. Reichner, Jr.
Edwin B. Wheeler
John B. Sweeney
Grant S. Baze
William T. Bray
George D. Webster
George F. Vaughan
Henry S. Campbell
David M. Danser
James P. Rathbun
Arthur J. Rauchle
Paul H. Millichap
Edward P. Dupras, Jr.
Louis C. Griffin
Houston Stiff
James E. Herbold, Jr.
John S. Hudson

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of lieutenant colonel:

Joseph C. Fegan, Jr.
Neely D. Butler, Jr.
Robert F. Foxworth
Theodore R. Boutwell
Emmett O. Anglin, Jr.
Earl P. Carey
Robert E. Brant
Emmett R. Hiller
Leo B. Shinn
Frederick C. Dodson
Russell E. Corey
David W. Banks
Richard C. Smith
Nels E. Anderson
William O. Cain, Jr.
Richard L. Moore
Leslie E. Brown
Jay W. Hubbard
William F. Lane
Richard C. Bryson
Bruce F. Williams
Walter E. Stuenkel
William J. Zaro
Rufus B. Thompson, Jr.
William M. Graham, Jr.
William P. Nesbit
Roland H. Makowski
Edward H. Greason
William H. Clark
Harry L. Givens, Jr.
Frank R. Berrar
Charles H. Greene, Jr.
Edward L. Fossum
Adolph J. Honeycutt
Gale B. Gibson
Claude R. La Plant
Albert M. Roebuck
Paul C. Trammell
Edson W. Card
Stephen Horton, Jr.
Fred E. Kiehle, Jr.
Raymond F. Garraty, Jr.
Leo V. R. Gross
William D. Porter
Bertram S. Ryder
Robert E. McClean
Edward R. McCarthy
Thomas B. Wood
Francis C. Hogan
Ephraim Kirby-Smith
Franklin J. Harte
Richard A. Brenneman
Gilbert D. Bradley
Robert M. Krippner
William K. White
William P. Vaughan
Clyde S. Stewart
Wesley W. Hazlett
Wiley A. Green
Anthony R. Nollet
Marion C. Dalby
John E. Cosgriff
Theodore J. Horner
Robert M. Ervin

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of major:

Lavern J. Oltmer
George A. Brigham
Francis C. Opeka
Raymond W. Mullane
William J. Hinson, Jr.
David P. Graf
Burneal E. Smith
John G. Theros
George A. Gibson
Russel H. Stoneman
Robert H. Emswiler
Gus Robinson

Herbert E. Mendenhall
Robert E. Luther
Forrest E. Caudle
Eugene S. Kane, Jr.
Arnold S. Baker, Jr.
Mark A. Rainer, Jr.
Robert W. Taylor
Harvey E. Spielman
Wilmer W. Hixson
John W. Collier, Jr.
Gene M. Hoover
Maurice A. David
Angelo J. Sammartino
James F. Williams
Edwin S. Schick, Jr.
Gordon H. Keller, Jr.
Eugene Millette
Hiel L. Van Campen
Robert Lewis, Jr.
Robert G. Scurrah
Howard A. Blancheri
Leo G. Lewis, Jr.
Adolph G. Schwenk
James Landrum, Jr.
Samuel Taub, Jr.
Richard F. Peterson
Earl K. Vickers, Jr.
Emil M. Misura
Lyle B. Matthews, Jr.
Raymond McArthur
John H. Maloney
Charles S. Wilder
Joseph B. Harrison
Frank P. Stivers, Jr.
Loren R. Smith
Miller M. Blue
Patrick J. Dayson
Francis E. Finch
Jack Glenn
Melvyn H. Kerr
Richard H. Mample
Charles A. Arneson
William R. Affleck, Jr.
Thomas P. O'Callaghan
Ernest R. Olson
Mildridge E. Mangum
Wallace W. Crompton
David W. Graybeal
Don D. Ezell
Robert Zeugner
Joseph T. Odenthal
Theodore D. Hess
Thomas J. Horgan, Jr.
George E. Smith
William B. Creel
Willie J. Mixson
Stewart C. Barber
Albert W. Snell
Walter L. Hill
John B. Wilson, Jr.
John L. Hamilton, Jr.
Almarion S. Bailey
Charles E. Wydner, Jr.
George B. Woodbury
Chester V. Farmer
Daniel R. Evans
William D. Pomeroy
Theodore J. Mildner
Henry A. F. von der Heyde, Jr.
William H. Lanagan, Jr.
Paul D. LaFond
Jay V. Poage
William F. Koehnlein
Amo F. Judd
John Craig
Donald E. Watterson
Victor Stoyanow
Harry G. Robinson, Jr.
Louis J. Sartor
Frank A. Eldracher, Jr.
Marvin D. Volkert
Donald McGuire
Ralph D. Cail
William J. Beer

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of captain:

William P. Haight
Donald L. Gaut
Joseph A. MacInnis
William D. Anderson
Lee M. Holmes
Raymond D. Fortmeyer
Richard A. Froncek
Henry C. Bergmann
John J. Metzko
Donald J. Fulham
James F. Helsel
Thomas M. Reedy
Clifford A. Lindell
Brue Berckmans, Jr.
Nicholas K. Bodnar
Douglas A. Wagner
George B. Crist
Justin Williams, Jr.
George H. Ripley
Frederick R. Weinert
Richard F. Harrison
Ralph F. Moody
Warren L. Ammentorp
Richard L. Critz
Hugh S. West
Rawley M. Gregory
David W. Howell
Sam M. Gipson, Jr.
Gerald H. Hyndman
Dwayne Gray
Earl W. Bailey
Eugene E. Crews
Lawrence W. Fisher
Clayton G. Herbert, Jr.
John A. Scott
Richard W. Coulter
William T. Macy
Nathaniel N. Reich
John R. Stanley
John R. Roche III
Edward J. Rochford, Jr.
Malcolm C. Gaffen
Bradley S. Snell
Harry M. Runkle
Eugene E. Shoults
Charles A. Folsom
Walter J. McManus
Owen J. Butler
William M. Keenan
Arthur L. Mullen, Jr.
Donald W. Wilson
James L. Shanahan
Milton T. Hefty
Samuel G. Faulk
Stanley G. Tribe, Jr.
Harold J. Keeling
Thomas S. Brown
Donald R. Berg
James R. Bowser, Jr.
John F. Gould, Jr.
Thomas P. Goggin
Billy F. Stewart
Horacio E. Perea
Bernard V. Gustitis
Francis Andriliunas
William E. Riley, Jr.
Harold H. Hutter, Jr.
Joseph E. Hennegan
Carl D. Peterson
Raymond H. Graham
George E. Otott
Milton J. Olson
Maurice A. Lebas
Ronald E. Luley
Robert M. Otteraaen
Thomas F. Gray
Glen S. Aspinwall
William H. Knobel
Joseph W. Stevens, Jr.
Philip F. Buran
Oliver K. Johnson, Jr.
Joseph H. Oliver, Jr.
Rhys J. Phillips, Jr.
Allan J. Spence
Melvin H. Sautter
Gerald H. Polakoff
Robert H. Smith
Richard O. Bruce
William F. Bethel
David R. McMillan, Jr.
Martin F. Manning, Jr.
Prentice A. Lindsay
William W. Rogers
Herbert F. Olney
Ronald P. Dunwell
Thomas R. Morgan
William C. Roberts, Jr.
Robert E. McCamey II
Charles R. Gibson
Vincent J. Gentile
James C. Click
Richard F. Daley
Theodore J. Lutz, Jr.
Hans G. Edebohls
Charles W. Henry, Jr.
Ray G. Kummerow
Homer L. Litzenberg III
William C. Wilson
James R. Plummer
Kenneth R. Price
Richard B. Arneson
Albert N. Allen
Robert L. Leathers
Dwain A. Colby
Raymond H. Kansier
Allen C. Shelton, Jr.
Harry E. Taylor
Howard L. Cook
William J. Geiger
Talman C. Budd II
Warren C. Ruthazer
Robert W. Whaling
Paul K. German, Jr.
Robert H. Dent
Ralph D. First
James H. Olds
Albert E. Brewster, Jr.
Richard D. Taber
George P. Lawler
David W. Morrill
Roger B. Neilson
William J. Madigan
John S. Kyle
Paul W. McGillicuddy
William E. Rudolph
Frank E. Pirman
Harold S. Lonergan
Edward J. Townsend
Duwain E. Bjerke
Evan L. Parker, Jr.
Herbert F. Olsen
Bobby R. Hall
Thomas M. Culligan
William E. Starbuck
James C. Klinedinst
Donald E. Gunther
Dan C. Alexander
Robert W. McInnis
Garnett R. Bailey
Everett L. Malmgren
Robert E. Elmwood
Thomas L. Griffin, Jr.
Joseph P. Gagliardo, Jr.
Arthur B. Shilan
Donald R. Chapell
Edward C. Johnson
John R. Braddon
John J. Flynn
Robert L. Milbrad
Francis J. Heath, Jr.
William K. Hayden III
Rodolfo R. Enderle
Laurence A. Campbell III
Bernard D. Grooms
Charles M. Bengele, Jr.
Walter F. Bowron
William J. Hallisey, Jr.
Colin D. Roach
John V. Bancroft
Kenneth W. Weir
Raymond F. Crist III
Genaro Huerta
Richard O. Gillick
William A. Blasko
John M. Dean
Harold L. Blanton, Jr.
Wendell P. C. Morgenthaler, Jr.
John R. McCandless
Darrell C. Danielson
Paul P. Pirhalla
Edward A. Laning
Raymond C. Shinkle

The following officer of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of first lieutenant, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Barker P. Germagian

The following officer of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of first lieutenant, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

James F. Knestis

The following-named officer for permanent appointment to the rank of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

John J. Salesses

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ALABAMA

Russell R. Sutley, Clanton, Ala., in place of L. P. Bean, retired.

ARKANSAS

Clarence E. LaCotts, De Witt, Ark., in place of F. E. Stephenson, retired.

Rex Hutchison, Evening Shade, Ark., in place of M. A. Graddy, retired.

Herman A. Tuck, Fayetteville, Ark., in place of A. D. McAllister, retired.

Clyde Byars, North Little Rock, Ark., in place of O. W. Neely, deceased.

Gus L. Sanders, Springdale, Ark., in place of R. O. Hannah, deceased.

Worrence Whitlow, Strawberry, Ark., in place of Marvin Taylor, retired.

CALIFORNIA

Walter H. Miller, Chino, Calif., in place of B. L. Phillips, retired.

John Pokorny, Jr., Clovis, Calif., in place of I. H. Arbuckle, retired.

William T. Sprague, Compton, Calif., in place of C. L. Veitch, deceased.

Alberta F. Kinne, Douglas City, Calif., in place of V. M. Davison, resigned.

Virginia M. Benedict, La Honda, Calif., in place of E. J. Willett, resigned.

Oral J. Potts, Ojai, Calif., in place of G. L. Busch, retired.

Jean F. Johnson, Proberta, Calif., in place of F. M. Mills, retired.

Keneth G. Drown, Ramona, Calif., in place of F. M. Raub, retired.

V. Earl Roberts, San Diego, Calif., in place of W. E. Krenning, removed.

Novel B. James, Santa Ana, Calif., in place of F. R. Harwood, deceased.

George G. Hollis, Jr., Sun Valley, Calif., in place of Fred Jacobsen, retired.

COLORADO

Joe Snepenger, U.S. Air Force Academy, Colo. Office established June 28, 1958.

CONNECTICUT

John J. Dilworth, Columbia, Conn., in place of L. W. Beck, retired.

Austin M. Ackerman, Jr., Durham Center, Conn., in place of A. M. Ackerman, retired.

FLORIDA

Harold E. Lyon, Hobe Sound, Fla., in place of P. E. Mahan, retired.

Ruth G. Long, Roseland, Fla., in place of D. C. Taylor, retired.

GEORGIA

Joseph W. Gardner, Patterson, Ga., in place of I. S. Walker, retired.

HAWAII

Phyllis Y. Takase, Kualapuu, Hawaii, in place of R. M. Shimizu, deceased.

IDAHO

Roy B. Fields, McCall, Idaho, in place of C. L. Burdett, retired.

ILLINOIS

Harold E. Ririe, Flanagan, Ill., in place of M. D. O'Brien, retired.

Robert V. Newell, Mattoon, Ill., in place of H. A. Lange, deceased.

Richard F. Moffitt, Reynolds, Ill., in place of B. W. Sharp, retired.

Beulah B. Reynolds, Russell, Ill., in place of E. V. Crittenden, resigned.

INDIANA

Arthur L. Meyer, Moores Hill, Ind., in place of L. H. Barkley, retired.

IOWA

Joseph N. Shaner, Glidden, Iowa, in place of F. W. Franzwa, deceased.

KANSAS

Eugene L. Foland, Almena, Kans., in place of J. H. Eckhart, retired.

Richard R. Simmons, Ashland, Kans., in place of J. E. Hardesty, resigned.

Ted W. Kyle, Erie, Kans., in place of C. E. Yockey, retired.

KENTUCKY

Billy G. Rose, Hazel Green, Ky., in place of D. C. Rose, retired.

Roscoe M. Bates, Sadieville, Ky., in place of R. F. Gillispie, transferred.

Randall C. Day, Jr., Whitesburg, Ky., in place of W. F. Gibson, retired.

MICHIGAN

Neva A. Dalton, Concord, Mich., in place of A. L. Hyliard, deceased.

Delia A. Bickham, Hessel, Mich., in place of Frances Lindberg, retired.

Turley N. Thompson, Ossineke, Mich., in place of H. E. Vredenburg, retired.

William W. Donaldson, Pontiac, Mich., in place of G. L Stockwell, retired.

MINNESOTA

Hugh O. Smith, Alexandria, Minn., in place of H. W. Long, deceased.

Clement F. Stromwall, Foreston, Minn., in place of A. E. Smith, retired.

Donald M. Lynch, Kasota, Minn., in place of J. O. Barklow, resigned.

MISSOURI

Beulah I. Wood, New Cambria, Mo., in place of J. M. Baker, retired.

MONTANA

Norman J. Wagner, Lewistown, Mont., in place of E. J. Coyle, retired.

NEW JERSEY

V. Edith Mixner, Goshen, N.J., in place of H. C. Shaw, deceased.

Calvin R. Patterson, Neptune, N.J. Office established November 16, 1959.

NEW YORK

Frank G. Shosenburg, Jamestown, N.Y., in place of O. K. Palm, deceased.

NORTH CAROLINA

Kelly M. Holmes, Bolton, N.C., in place of S. M. Blue, retired.

Charles W. Craig, Mount Holly, N.C., in place of J. W. Nantz, Sr., resigned.

Arthur C. Meares, Whiteville, N.C., in place of A. E. Powell, retired.

NORTH DAKOTA

Lester H. Paulson, La Moure, N. Dak., in place of A. F. Poehls, transferred.

OHIO

Harold E. Weikert, Covington, Ohio, in place of J. H. O'Roark, deceased.

Rolla L. Shoaf, Jr., London, Ohio, in place of G. G. Schlechty, retired.

OKLAHOMA

Jack M. Givens, Mangum, Okla., in place of R. K. Babb, transferred.

John L. Logsdon, Vici, Okla., in place of B. M. Skidmore, deceased.

OREGON

Lola F. Barclay, Crabtree, Oreg., in place of I. M. Brewster, retired.

PENNSYLVANIA

Adeline M. Waters, Gifford, Pa., in place of Elizabeth Shelley, deceased.

Francis J. Dillon, Glenside, Pa., in place of H. M. Ellis, retired.

Alice F. Burdick, Turtlepoint, Pa., in place of G. L. Carlson, retired.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Norman W. Helmer, Andover, S. Dak., in place of T. W. DeBilzan, retired.

TEXAS

Malcolm O. Daugherty, Cherokee, Tex., in place of Graves Burke, retired.

Norene G. Chaney, Ira, Tex., in place of M. S. Huddle, resigned.

Herman L. Almond, Kermit, Tex., in place of R. S. Marion, retired.

James E. Winder, Springlake, Tex., in place of W. C. White, retired.

Robert B. Richardson, Wylie, Tex., in place of Della Duncan, retired.

VERMONT

Myrtle V. Clemons, West Charleston, Vt., in place of J. E. Hunter, transferred.

VIRGINIA

M. Lester Agee, Floyd, Va., in place of Archa Vaughan, retired.

WEST VIRGINIA

Martha K. Hope, Hansford, W. Va., in place of O. G. Toney, retired.

WISCONSIN

Violet M. Taylor, Eau Galle, Wis., in place of H. T. Taylor, deceased.

Robert C. Fitzsimons, Ridgeway, Wis., in place of Celia Stapleton, retired.

WYOMING

Kenneth W. Birch, Cokeville, Wyo., in place of V. C. Bennion, resigned.

Alexandria C. Yokel, Wilson, Wyo., in place of Hazel Titus, retired.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, MAY 24, 1960

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Matthew 25: 40: *Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me.*

O Thou God of all grace, who alone can change and control the intractable hearts of men and nations, grant us an insight that is clear and calm as we seek to advance toward a new day of blessedness for our troubled world.

We earnestly beseech Thee that in striving to win the minds of men to a way of life that is more magnanimous and unselfish in spirit we may awaken them to the lofty principles of the Golden Rule and the Sermon on the Mount.

May there be a new beginning in our own hearts when those gracious words which came from the lips of the lowly Man of Galilee shall fill us with feelings of generosity and an eagerness to share our blessings with all who are living in misery and in want.

Hear us in the name of the Master who went about doing good. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills, joint resolutions, and concurrent resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 9818. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to the State of Florida;

H.J. Res. 502. Joint resolution authorizing the erection in the District of Columbia of a memorial to Mary McLeod Bethune;

H.J. Res. 546. Joint resolution authorizing the Architect of the Capitol to present to the Senators and Representative 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;

H. Con. Res. 558. Concurrent resolution providing for printing additional copies of the panel discussions entitled "Income Tax Revision";

H. Con. Res. 579. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of a Veterans' Benefits Calculator;

H. Con. Res. 586. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the hearings on civil rights; and

H. Con. Res. 607. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing as a House document of the pamphlet entitled "Our American Government. What Is It? How Does It Function?"

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and concurrent resolutions of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2681. An act for the relief of Yi Young An;

S. 3036. An act to authorize the distribution of copies of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to former Members of Congress requesting such copies;

S. Con. Res. 90. Concurrent resolution 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;

S. Con. Res. 91. Concurrent resolution 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;

S. Con. Res. 94. Concurrent resolution 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 on their water resources and problems;

S. Con. Res. 96. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of a revised edition of the Internal Security Manual as a Senate document, and providing for additional copies;

S. Con. Res. 97. Concurrent resolution authorizing the reprinting of 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 86th Congress, 1st session;

S. Con. Res. 99. Concurrent resolution to print as a Senate document a compilation of studies on United States-Latin American relations; and

S. Con. Res. 100. Concurrent resolution to print as a Senate document a compilation of studies on U.S. foreign policy.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees 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) entitled "An act 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 Vice President had appointed the Senator from Florida, Mr. HOLLAND, the Senator from Virginia, Mr. ROBERTSON, the Senator from Kansas, Mr. CARLSON, and the Senator from Utah, Mr. BENNETT, as members on the part of the Senate of the Commission To Formulate a Memorial to James Madison.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary may sit during general debate tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

QUESTIONS ABOUT THE SUMMIT

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, so much attention has lately been focused in the press on the eight questions released by several members of the Democratic Party in this body on last Friday that there is a growing impression in the country that those who propounded these questions are speaking for all of the Democratic Members of this body.

Mr. Speaker, I for one want to issue a disclaimer. I was profoundly disturbed by the timing of these questions. However great may be the need for a responsible investigation of the events that led up to the fiasco at Paris, I for one believe that it was most important that the world and particularly the Communists should have been informed last Friday that we were all united in this country when it came to resenting insults directed against the President of our own country.

And, Mr. Speaker, there is a further note that disturbs me greatly in these questions. They suggest somehow a belief that there is something wrong with a country trying to protect its borders against surprise attack and avoid a repetition of the disaster that once struck us at Pearl Harbor.

Mr. Speaker, I for one believe that we in the Democratic Party ought first of all to make it crystal clear—as I do not believe we have yet made it clear—that we do not think there is any future for our party in trying to outdo anyone else in not upsetting or disturbing or angering the man who ordered the brutal suppression of the Hungarian revolution, who keeps the brave people of Poland in subjection, and who insulted and humiliated our country last week when he insulted and humiliated our President in Paris. In my judgment, the issues involved in the collapse of the summit are far too serious to be made the subject for rhetorical questions propounded in an effort to gain a narrow, temporary, and tenuous partisan advantage.

SETTING OF FIRST COLUMN EXTENDED EAST CENTRAL FRONT OF CAPITOL

Mr. RAYBURN. As chairman of the Commission for Extension of the U.S. Capitol, I wish to invite the Members, officers, and employees of the House of Representatives to witness the setting in place of the first large marble column in the portico of the extended east central front of the Capitol, at 9:30 a.m., Thursday, May 26, 1960.

This is a historic occasion in which I feel each Member will be deeply interested. You are invited to enter the construction area at the door to the fenced enclosure just north of the entrance to the House wing, from where you will be directed to a safe and appropriate vantage point.

The old records indicate that the original sandstone columns were erected in 1824 and that the stonecutters at the Capitol participated in a procession and exhibit celebrating July 4, 1824.

The new columns are duplicates of the originals except that they are of Georgia white marble instead of sandstone. They are monolithic, weigh about 18 tons each, are 24 in number, and are 24 feet 9 inches high. The columns are of the Corinthian order and taper uniformly from a diameter of 3 feet at the base to 2 feet 6 inches at the top.

The original columns were designed by Charles Bulfinch in carrying out the overall plan for the east portico prepared by his predecessor, Benjamin H. Latrobe. Mr. Latrobe and Mr. Bulfinch were the second and third Architects of the Capitol, respectively.

The column to be set on Thursday, May 26, will be the one located immediately to the southeast of the main entrance leading to the rotunda.

PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1961

Mr. CANNON. 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. 12326) 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; and pending that I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to not to exceed 2 hours, one-half the time to be controlled by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] and one-half by myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion.

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. 12326, with Mr. BOGGS 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 unanimous-consent agreement, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] will be recognized for 1 hour, and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] will be recognized for 1 hour.

The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, the bill appropriates a total of $3,914,798,985. This is $86,217,195 below the budget estimates but $41,070,671 above appropriations for fiscal year 1960.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, we bring this bill to the floor of the House many million dollars under the budget. The budget request for the Civil Functions Department of the Army, that is, the functions under the Army Engineers, was $936,749,000. The committee reduced that figure by $45,550,000. We did that by reducing the number of projects to the point where we felt, after lengthy hearings that the amount of money left in the bill for those projects—most of them quite large projects—was all the Army Engineers could properly and judiciously use during the fiscal year 1961.

For the Interior Department, Bureau of Reclamation, the budget request was $301,314,000. The committee reduced that in the amount of $23,951,295, again, we had very lengthy hearings. We reduced the budget to where we felt it should properly be reduced.

The budget request for the Atomic Energy Commission was $2,675,300,000 which the committee reduced by $16,240,000 where it cannot possibly effect our national defense in the slightest degree.

Over 1,000 people appeared before our Public Works Committee this year, from every State in the Union, with few exceptions. Many of them asked for more money than was in the budget, all of them defended at least the amount that was in the bill for their respective projects. It is very natural they do that because the projects in their respective areas, of course, are very important to their people from the standpoint of flood control and from the standpoint of saving life and property. Harbor dredging, hydropower, irrigation, reclamation, and so forth.

Last winter, as we all know, was a very severe winter which extended over almost the entire United States.

The ground froze deeply; then came much snow, more snow than had fallen in many years. Then this spring came the fast thaws, the water from that heavy coat of snow did not soak into mother earth. Most of it ran off into the streams and tributaries, finally into the main rivers, causing much damage and much loss of property and great anxiety among the people who suffered from those floods, which overall were greater than ever before experienced.

The budget, of course, was made up early last fall. These great floods could not be anticipated at that time. So here before our committee came people from hundreds of areas of our Nation asking that we put survey funds and construction funds in this bill to control the floods that are bound to come in the future.

Our committee saw fit to include 39 of those new projects. I feel we were completely justified in doing so because certainly a devastating flood is damaging not only to the people of the respective areas but, in the final analysis, to all people of the Nation. So I feel that the committee was completely justified in including these 39 projects which it did in this bill. Please remember this is an American bill for America.

It must be said the President's budget for fiscal year 1961 included 32 new starts of every nature scattered over the United States of America for which I commend him. May I point out in closing that all the public works funds requested in this bill are less than 1½ percent of our total Federal budget.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATIONS

CLARENCE CANNON, Missouri, chairman.
LOUIS C. RABAUT, Michigan.
MICHAEL J. KIRWAN, Ohio.
JOHN E. FOGARTY, Rhode Island.
JOHN J. RILEY, South Carolina.
JOE L. EVINS, Tennessee.
EDWARD P. BOLAND, Massachusetts.
DON MAGNUSON, Washington.
BEN F. JENSEN, Iowa.
JOHN TABER, New York.
IVOR D. FENTON, Pennsylvania.
H. CARL ANDERSEN, Minnesota.
JOHN R. PILLION, New York.
Carson Culp, staff assistant to the subcommittee.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Seventy Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 100]

Alexander	Farbstein	Machrowicz
Alger	Flynn	Moeller
Anfuso	Fogarty	Nix
Ashley	Fulton	Pfost
Bailey	Garmatz	Powell
Barden	Gilbert	Preston
Belcher	Granahan	Reece, Tenn.
Bentley	Gray	Rostenkowski
Blatnik	Healey	Scott
Bonner	Hébert	Siler
Buckley	Inouye	Spence
Cahill	Jackson	Staggers
Cederberg	Jennings	Steed
Davis, Ga.	Kasem	Taylor
Davis, Tenn.	Kearns	Teller
Dawson	Keith	Wallhauser
Dooley	Kilburn	Watts
Dorn, N.Y.	King, Utah	Willis
Dowdy	Kluczynski	Winstead
Doyle	Lafore	
Durham	McDowell	

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BOGGS, 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. 12326, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 369 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa had consumed 8 minutes and the gentleman from Missouri 1 minute. Does the gentleman from Missouri require additional time?

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND].

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to answer a few questions that have been raised.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLAND. I yield.

Mr. BOLLING. The gentleman is familiar with the interest that I and other Members have had in flood control in the Missouri Basin. Particularly, I have reference to Milford Dam. I note that the committee changed the status of Milford Dam as recommended in the budget from $1 million for construction to $250,000 for completion of planning. I gather this is because the committee felt that the commitment made by certain beneficiaries of water supply storage was not adequate. I wonder if the gentleman would explain a little more fully the reason for the committee action.

Mr. BOLAND. What the gentleman says is true. This is part of a comprehensive flood control program for the Missouri River Basin. The committee did reduce the budget amount to $250,000 solely and only by reason of the fact that there were no local assurances for repayment of water supply. The Water Supply Act compels this committee to obtain assurance before construction is started. The construction has not gotten started. It would have been started had we had such assurances, and up to this time we have provided $522,000 for planning. The $250,000 which we have allowed in the budget will complete the planning.

Mr. BOLLING. I am sure the report goes into this matter rather fully. On page 18 it discusses Milford Dam specifically.

Mr. BOLAND. It might be well to include some of the language in the report. It states on page 18:

> The State of Kansas has requested the corps to include in the project a substantial storage for water supply. To meet this request, it is necessary to change the site of the previously contemplated project and substantially increase its capacity, with a resulting cost increase of something over $15 million.

Originally the cost was $45 million. Because of the change in site and request for water supply, the cost has increased to $60 million.

> There is no firm commitment on the part of the State or any of the possible local beneficiaries that the cost of providing this water supply storage will be reimbursed as is required under the Water Supply Act of 1958.

Mr. BOLLING. I thank the gentleman, and I want the gentleman and other members of the committee to know that we are most anxious to comply and move forward as rapidly as possible with this important flood-control program.

Mr. BOLAND. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLAND. I yield.

Mr. AVERY. I want to assure the gentleman from Massachusetts and the other members of the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee that the State of Kansas is not trying to escape its full responsibility for the cost of this supplemental storage. I can speak, I think, with force by saying that the Governor of Kansas and the Kansas Board of Water Resources have given full assurances to the Chief of Engineers; but since we are dealing in an area here where we have not had very much experience to go on, apparently the assurances that were given to the Chief were not considered sufficient by the committee. All the State of Kansas wants to know is what is wanted. We want to cooperate in every way possible to expedite the construction of this project.

Mr. BOLAND. The gentleman states the case exactly as it is.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLAND. I yield.

Mr. FASCELL. The committee recommended on page 20 of the report relating to the central and southern Florida flood control project, and I ask the gentleman: Is it the committee's intention in making this recommendation to approve and direct the proposed action of the Chief of Engineers on the project as expressed in his letter of April 25, 1960, to me, a copy of which was submitted to the committee for its consideration and in which the Chief proposes specified works in Dade County, Fla., to aid in the emergency which exists and which he proposes to finance out of his authority to transfer to a program up to 15 percent of the funds immediately available?

Mr. BOLAND. That is exactly right. There is $10 million provided in this budget for the central and southern Florida flood control project. That is one of the most important and one of the most expensive flood control projects in the Nation.

The gentleman from Florida made an excellent case when his office appeared before our committee.

There is an emergency down there. We think the committee has provided for it, and it was provided for at the request of the gentleman from Florida. There will be no objection if the Corps of Engineers finds it possible to transfer an additional $1,500,000 under the transfer authorization.

Mr. FASCELL. As I understand, it was not specifically appropriated but the transferability authorization can be taken advantage of.

Mr. BOLAND. That is exactly right. As a matter of fact the language in the bill is here because of the gentleman's amendment.

NEW ENGLAND GRATEFUL FOR ADEQUATE FLOOD CONTROL FUNDS

Mr. Chairman, this public works appropriation bill for fiscal year 1961 contains sufficient funds to enable the Army Engineers to carry on with an orderly program of flood control planning and construction in New England.

I want to take this opportunity to thank my colleagues of the Public Works Appropriations Subcommittee, on which I sit, for their sympathetic consideration of the flood control needs of the Connecticut Valley and all of New England. We in New England are grateful to members of the Public Works Legislative Committee and the Appropriations Committee for patiently hearing our pleas since 1955 when this region of the country suffered millions of dollars in damages as a result of the hurricane-floods of that year.

THIRTY-ONE PROJECTS CONSTRUCTED OR IN PLANNING SINCE 1955 HURRICANE FLOODS

Since that time the Public Works Appropriations Committee have been generous to New England. Brig. Gen. Alden K. Sibley, the New England division engineer, told the Subcommittee on Public Works in his testimony that since 1955 the Army Engineers have completed and now have under operation in New England 15 flood control dams at a cost of $35 million, have 11 under construction today at a cost of $90 million; and 5 more are in the design stage at an estimated cost of $42 million.

This is 31 flood-control projects at a total cost of $167 million in just over 4 years, whereas in all of New England's history before August of 1955 only 23 projects had been built. I am quite proud of this record, and I deem it an honor to have been serving on the Appropriations Public Works Subcommittee during the last 5 years when these sums of money were appropriated for these worthwhile and much needed flood-control projects. Members of the subcommittee have supported me in my efforts to have these New England projects planned and constructed as soon as possible, in the orderly manner recommended by the Army Engineers, so that the lives and property of the people of our region can be better protected from the ravages of floods in the future.

VITALLY NEEDED CHICOPEE RIVER BASIN PROJECTS RECOMMENDED

Mr. Chairman, there are more projects in the survey and planning stages, including Littleville Dam and Reservoir, and Conant Brook Reservoir, both affecting my congressional district in western Massachusetts. In the northern sector of the Connecticut River Valley four projects, Ball Mountain, North Hartland, Townshend and North Springfield Reservoirs in Vermont, will be completely or nearly finished with the funds appropriated in this bill.

The flood-control project recommendations for the Chicopee River Basin include the Conant Brook Dam and Reservoir in Monson, to be constructed at an estimated cost of $2 million, and the local protective works in Chicopee Falls, at an estimated construction cost of $1,860,000. My bill, H.R. 11470, incorporating these projects is now before the Public Works Committee. These projects have been approved by the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, let me again thank the members of the Public Works and Appropriations Committees for supporting my efforts to control New England's past flooding conditions.

Mr. FASCELL. I want to express my appreciation to the gentleman for his part in this matter and also to the other members of the subcommittee and to the full committee for their interest in helping us meet this problem.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLAND. I yield.

Mr. CARNAHAN. I want to express my appreciation to the gentleman and the subcommittee and especially to the distinguished chairman of the full committee, Mr. CANNON, for including in this bill the $50,000 for the Meramec Basin. Will the gentleman tell us briefly what the money will be used for?

Mr. BOLAND. This is for a resurvey of the Meramec Basin development.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLAND. I yield.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Chairman, the members of the House Committee on Appropriations have shown great foresight by recommending funds that not only will continue on schedule the complete modernization of the Warrior-Tombigbee Waterway, but will enable the full development of the Coosa-Alabama River system to proceed.

WARRIOR-TOMBIGBEE

Although the Warrior-Tombigbee is a historic artery of commerce and is now one of the busiest and fastest growing inland barge channels in the Southeast, its modernization did not actually begin until 1949. The system of 17 dams and 18 low-lift locks constructed on the waterway prior to that time were completed in the early part of the 20th century. The only major improvement on the river prior to 1949 came in 1940 with the completion of the William B. Oliver Lock and Dam—formerly the Tuscaloosa Lock and Dam—near Tuscaloosa, Ala. This installation eliminated locks and dams 10, 11, and 12.

By 1949 the existing installations that were constructed early in the 20th century had greatly deteriorated and, of course, had become progressively inadequate as commerce increased. Not only had these structures become obsolete, but in many cases they were extremely dangerous to navigation.

During the past 8 years it has been my privilege to work closely with congressional committees, with the Warrior-Tombigbee Development Association, with Alabama's two Senators, and with other members of the Alabama congressional delegation in efforts to carry out the phases of the modernization program recommended by the Corps of Engineers.

The first step in this modernization program involved the construction of the $19 million Demopolis Lock and Dam just below the confluence of the Warrior and Tombigbee Rivers. In 1949, Congress appropriated funds to begin the construction of this important installation which replaced four antiquated locks and dams. Additional funds were appropriated for the ensuing 5 fiscal years, and this new modern structure was dedicated in 1954.

During my second year as a Member of Congress, funds in the amount of $1,800,000 were appropriated to begin construction of the Warrior Lock and Dam located in Hale County. Additional appropriations for fiscal years 1956, 1957, and 1958 enabled construction of this facility to continue on schedule. This installation, which was built at a total approximate cost of $13,385,000 was opened to traffic in the fall of 1957. Its modern facilities replaced two outmoded structures and, in addition, the new installation effects a saving to navigation of approximately 5 miles.

For fiscal year 1957, Congress appropriated funds in the amount of $750,000 to begin construction of the third major replacement structure on the Warrior-Tombigbee—the Jackson Lock and Dam. The bill now before the House of Representatives includes an appropriation of $4,230,000 to enable completion by 1961 of this $21 million facility that will improve a 98-mile reach of the waterway below the Demopolis Lock and Dam.

The final replacement structure in the modernization of this great waterway is the Holt Lock and Dam that is to be constructed above Tuscaloosa to supplant four locks and dams that were built between 1905 and 1915. When in operation, this facility will greatly increase the operating speeds of barges and towboats above Tuscaloosa.

While construction of the Holt project is yet to begin, significant progress has been made toward its realization in a relatively short period of time. It was just 3½ years ago that the Army Engineers at my request made funds available for an authorization report on the proposed facility. That report, compiled by the Mobile District and South Atlantic division engineers, showed the improvement to be needed and economically justified. Their recommendation that it be built by the Government for navigation benefits was concurred in by the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors.

Seventeen months ago the Secretary of the Army authorized construction of the Holt installation under the River and Harbor Act of 1909. It was most fortunate that authorization could be obtained in that manner, for had it been necessary to submit the project to Congress for specific authorization, it could have been delayed by from 2 to as much as 4 years.

In spite of our best efforts, however, the Holt project was not authorized in time to be included in the budget which President Eisenhower sent to Congress last year. Because of the need for early construction of the Holt Lock and Dam, I was joined last year by members of the Alabama congressional delegation and officers of the Warrior-Tombigbee Development Association in an appeal to the Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate planning funds. Our request was answered when Congress appropriated $146,250 to enable the Corps of Engineers to initiate the advance planning.

Together with officers of the Warrior-Tombigbee Development Association, I appeared before representatives of the Bureau of the Budget last August to urge that adequate funds for the Holt project be included in the budget for fiscal year 1961. Further planning funds in the amount of $378,000 were incorporated in the President's budget that was submitted to Congress in January. An additional $171,000 was added by the Appropriations Committee.

If the $549,000 recommended by the House committee is approved by Congress, engineering and design work for the important Holt facility can be completed. Should the Senate earmark for construction purposes the amount added

by the House Appropriations Committee, actual construction could begin in calendar year 1961.

The Demopolis, Warrior, and Jackson locks and dams, replacing a total of nine obsolete structures, will create an efficient water artery between Mobile and Tuscaloosa. With the completion of the Holt Lock and Dam, the long-cherished dream of extending the benefits of a modern river channel above Tuscaloosa will be realized.

COOSA-ALABAMA SYSTEM

The other major river system in Alabama for which the Appropriations Committee has recommended funds is the Coosa-Alabama system. Second in size in the Southeast only to the Tennessee River, it is one of the greatest undeveloped waterways in the entire Nation.

For more than a century, efforts have been made to develop the Coosa River. As early as 1872 the Federal Government instituted the first improvement program that called for the development of navigation on the Coosa from Rome, Ga., to Gadsden, Ala., by the building of 31 low-lift locks and dams. However, only four locks were built on the upper end of the rapids below Rome, and in 1890 the Government abandoned its program.

Later the Alabama Power Co. obtained permission from the Government to build three dams—Mitchell, Lay, and Jordan—on the Coosa River. The last dam was completed in 1926, and the three of them have been operated as sources of hydroelectric power since their construction. They are the only dams on the Coosa River at the present time.

In 1945 Congress authorized the development of the Coosa-Alabama system for navigation, flood control, and power purposes. Overall planning by the Corps of Engineers was undertaken from 1945 through fiscal year 1952, but construction was not begun on any specific project.

With other members of the Alabama congressional delegation, I introduced legislation in 1954 to suspend the authorization previously granted by Congress for Federal development of the river system for hydroelectric purposes. The enactment of this legislation made it possible for the Alabama Power Co. to secure a license to construct four additional hydroelectric dams on the upper reaches of the Coosa River and to raise the level of one of its existing dams. The first of these, the Weiss Dam, is scheduled to be completed in 1961. With the construction of additional dams by private enterprise, the overall cost to the Federal Government for the development of the Coosa-Alabama for other purposes will be lessened considerably.

However, until the Government adds locks to the proposed and existing dams built by private interests and then constructs three additional locks and dams on the Alabama River, the Coosa-Alabama system cannot be used as a traffic artery.

With this in mind, I joined in 1955 with my colleagues from Alabama and Georgia and with the Coosa-Alabama River Improvement Association in urging that sufficient funds be made available for a traffic survey of the Coosa-Alabama River system. The sum of $180,000 was subsequently appropriated for that purpose. In 1957, the Corps of Engineers reported that the traffic survey of the Alabama River below Montgomery indicates that the three authorized structures on that river are economically justified. They recommended that the Millers Ferry lock and dam be constructed first.

Although the Senate for the past 2 years has designated $200,000 for planning the Millers Ferry facility, this amount has been eliminated from the public works appropriation bill each year by the House-Senate conference committee. We are very pleased, therefore, that this year the House Appropriations Committee has included $200,000 for planning and designing work on the recommended installation. If that amount is approved by Congress, 70 percent of the planning can then be concluded.

With the beginning of construction by the Alabama Power Co. of additional dams on the Coosa River, the development of this water artery has at last been resumed. To continue this orderly development, it is vital that the planning of the Millers Ferry installation also be recommenced as quickly as possible.

CONCLUSION

The improvements on the Warrior-Tombigbee and Coosa-Alabama River systems will be beneficial to the people of Alabama because they will provide increased employment, more and better products at a lower cost, new recreation facilities, and adequate hydroelectric power. At the same time, they will encourage the acquisition of industries through the abundance of water supply and power facilities. But the improvements will also extend benefits to the Nation as a whole, particularly in the form of water transportation, reservoirs, and hydroelectric power for national defense.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I commend the members of the Appropriations Committee for their foresight in recommending funds for the proper development of these two great river systems, and I respectfully urge the approval of these funds by the House of Representatives.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. PILLION], a member of the committee.

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Chairman, I would like to reinforce what has been said here by the ranking minority member of the committee, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] in support of this bill. No member of this committee considers the bill to be a perfect one and, of course, it is not subject to mathematical exactness. I suppose there are many projects here that should not have been placed here and perhaps some projects that should be here have not been included in the bill; but, nevertheless, overall, this bill is a sound bill, it is a good bill and a practical solution to our problems in this field for the next year.

Mr. Chairman, the bill contains well over 500 different items and projects throughout the country. The job of examining into these projects with their many complications and mathematics was a tedious job. I would like to commend the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], and the ranking member, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN], for their patience in considering and encouraging a most exhaustive examination into the merits of the various projects.

It has been a privilege to be associated on this committee with the members of the committee. They are a hardheaded, practical group of men, and I say that in a complimentary way; at the same time they are also somewhat softhearted because I know that when any Member of this House presented their case to the committee, their case not only received full consideration but the benefit of any reasonable doubt. I might add that the members of the staff are most competent and performed a very valuable service in helping the committee to arrive at this sound and practical solution of our problems.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to address myself at this time to a project contained in this bill which is a major one, the Kinzua project, in Pennsylvania. This project is a single purpose flood-control project. It proposes to construct a 180-foot dam at Kinzua for the purpose of protecting the communities in Pennsylvania from recurring floods, especially the city of Pittsburgh.

I sympathize with the communities and the people of Pennsylvania who have been subjected to these recurring floods, I realize their anxiety in obtaining a project of this sort to give them relief from serious damage that occasionally results from the floods. The bill here contains $4,530,000 for the construction of this dam. I would be one of the first to vote for this bill and support the project if I thought it were the proper solution to the problems faced by the communities in Pennsylvania; however, I believe the Kinzua dam project is a serious mistake. It is not the proper overall solution to the situation in Pennsylvania. An amendment will be offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL] to eliminate this item pending the study of an alternate site, the Conewango site, which we believe will be a much better solution to the flood control situation in Pennsylvania. Conewango is by far the most practical solution to this problem.

I would like to briefly explore and present a comparison of the different features of the Kinzua project and the Conewango project. First of all, the Kinzua project, as I said, is a one-dam project 180 feet high. It would form a reservoir for these flood waters, backing up to the city of Salamanca, about 20 miles away. The water level in that reservoir would fluctuate about 60 feet between high water and low water. On the other hand the Conewango Dam in New York State, draining the same area, would consist of a series of low dams covering lands that are today mostly swamp lands of very little value, and in that project the water level would only

fluctuate 10 feet between high and low water marks, and, of course, would furnish a better site and an area that could be used for recreation, whereas Kinzua would be of very little recreational value.

Now, let us examine the cost of these two projects. The Kinzua project is estimated to cost anywhere between $125 million to $150 million. On the other hand, the Conewango Dam is estimated to cost between $100 million and $125 million. So, right there, initially, the saving would be $25 million for the Conewango Dam over the Kinzua Dam.

But our prime interest is not a question of cost. Our prime interest is whether the benefits of one project exceed the benefits of another project. In the Kinzua Dam the floodwaters would be stored to the extent of about 600,000 acre-feet. In the Conewango Dam the floodwater storage would be triple that of the Kinzua Dam. The Conewango would store something like 1.7 million acre-feet of water and, of course, give three times the flood control benefits that we could expect out of the Kinzua Dam.

Mr. Chairman, the Kinzua Dam is not the solution to the serious damages that occur in Pittsburgh from these floods. Kinzua would reduce the high floodwater level at Pittsburgh by only 2½ feet and at Wheeling, W. Va., the reduction would only be 3 feet, and so on down the line, down the Ohio Valley. It is not a complete solution to the problem at all. It is a reduction, yes, in damages, but it does not do the complete job. It does not do the job that we in this Nation and in this House ought to expect from a job this large and from the amount to be invested in this project. The fight here is not between the State of New York and the State of Pennsylvania with respect to these two projects. This project is part of the Ohio Valley project, and the Conewango Dam would not only increase the benefits for the State of New York, it would greatly increase the job to be done for the State of Pennsylvania.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PILLION. Surely.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Chairman, would not the gentleman agree that the Kinzua Dam was first authorized in 1936 and that money was actually appropriated for construction work last year by the Congress?

Mr. PILLION. That is true.

Mr. MOORHEAD. And that actual physical work has already commenced at the site?

Mr. PILLION. That is true, except that I understand the physical work is very slight and that of the $3 million that has been appropriated, a great deal of it has not been expended and there would be no serious damage done by a stoppage of the construction at this time. Actually, this item today is the item that would really seriously start this construction.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PILLION. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. I just wanted to call to the attention of my distinguished friend that $625,000 has been spent on the project report. All phases of the Conewango Dam have been studied. I also want to call to his attention that this the third time that an attempt has been made to delete the money for his project. An additional report was to be prepared 2 years ago at the request of the chairman. Such a report was prepared at a cost of $75,000. So $700,000 has already been spent in the study of the project that the gentleman refers to. Let us not mislead by saying that adequate study of all phases has not been given to this proposed project.

Mr. PILLION. The gentleman knows that I have the highest regard and esteem for him. No one here is attempting to mislead anyone.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. PILLION] has expired.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS].

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, this is a big bill yet a very important one. As has been indicated, this bill carries appropriations for the civil works functions of the Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of Interior, and several power agencies, including the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Bonneville Power Administration, the Southeastern and Southwestern Administrations, the Atomic Energy Commission and funds for two new water study commissions; namely, the U.S. Study Commission for the Southeastern States and the U.S. Study Commission for the State of Texas.

The bill carries an appropriation of $3,914,798,985, and represents a reduction of $86,217,195 below the budget estimates.

Certainly this is a large amount—a big bill—but the funds appropriated are for capital investments in our own country.

Mr. Chairman, this bill properly should be called the National Resource Development appropriation bill because this is indeed a bill concerned with the development of our natural resources.

A great deal of the misunderstandings that sometimes arise about this bill comes from the failure to realize that appropriations for civil works of the Corps of Engineers and services of other allied agencies are indeed concerned with the development of our Nation's resources.

There are some who continue to think of this bill as a measure to provide employment. Others like to refer to the public works bill as a pork barrel bill. Nothing could be further from the truth.

Here we are dealing with investments—capital investments—for all our country. This is indeed an all-American bill.

I am sorry to say that the Bureau of the Budget and the President at times have tended to take a mistaken attitude about appropriations for the great programs of the Corps of Engineers. In preserving our resources we are building a foundation for the future growth and strength of our Nation. Such an investment is vital.

Any productive concern, whether it is a private business or a powerful nation, like our own, has to keep its productive capacity up to date.

This bill is concerned with keeping our productive capacity up to date, developing our natural resources and investing in the future of America.

Every region and area of our country wants to share equally with all the other regions in the growth of our Nation. However, it is impossible to develop all at once and simultaneously all of the water resources of our country.

Our committee has endeavored to reconcile the need of all areas and to maintain a balance between all the areas. The fact that this is a difficult task is evident from the printed hearings which this year filled five volumes.

Our committee has tried to effect a reasonable balance and as indicated appropriations are made for projects in all sections and all areas of our common country.

I want to pay a special tribute to our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], who personally carried on these hearings and labored with much of the details of this bill. His great knowledge and experience and his fairness and objectivity were, as usual, invaluable.

I deem it a great privilege to serve on this subcommittee with the gentleman from Missouri and the other distinguished members of our subcommittee—Hon. LOUIS C. RABAUT, of Michigan; Hon. MICHAEL J. KIRWAN, of Ohio; Hon. JOHN E. FOGARTY, of Rhode Island; Hon. JOHN J. RILEY, of South Carolina; Hon. EDWARD P. BOLAND, of Massachusetts; Hon. DON MAGNUSON, of Washington; Hon. BEN F. JENSEN, of Iowa; Hon. JOHN TABER, of New York; Hon. IVOR D. FENTON, of Pennsylvania; Hon. H. CARL ANDERSEN, of Minnesota; and Hon. JOHN R. PILLION, of New York.

The most significant thing about the national resource appropriations bill this year is the fact that at last the Budget Bureau and the administration have apparently realized that this is a national development program and that if it is to be effective and in the national interest it must be carried out on a coordinated, well-balanced, and continuing basis.

As we know, in the past few years the Budget Bureau and the administration have tried, shortsightedly in my view, to cut down this program of developing our water resources and particularly to eliminate the planning of future projects and the starting of projects already planned and scheduled. As we also know, this issue came to a head last year when the administration instituted its "no new starts policy." The Congress, taking the proper view that this is a program essential to our Nation's progress, refused to go along with the "no new starts policy" and, although it had to override a Presidential veto, the Congress did make it clear that this was in fact a continuing and orderly program for the development of our resources. It has been encouraging to note that in the budget presented this year the Budget Bureau and the administration has recognized

this fact and presented recommendations for continued construction of projects now under way and for 39 new starts.

Your committee has carefully studied the recommendations in the budget as well as recommendations made by Members of the Congress for projects throughout the Nation. In effect, the committee has accepted the recommendations in the budget for 32 of the starts, rejecting only 7 of them.

The committee also stopped two other projects which were not yet under actual construction. It added 5 additional unbudgeted construction starts and provided funds for initial planning on 15 new projects. It also provided a very small sum for the reevaluating of two other projects. The total amount recommended in this bill is approximately the same as the recommendation in the budget message.

The bill we are considering is a truly national bill. It provides funds for the development of our water resources in every section of the country—indeed in every State. The projects for which funds are provided will provide a good foundation for the future growth and progress of our Nation and will give every region and every section a fair opportunity to share in that progress and growth. The bill provides funds for continuing our water resource development program on schedule in an orderly and continuing program. Construction of projects already under way is being continued at an efficient rate; funds are provided for the start of new projects as others are completed; and funds are also provided for planning additional projects for future construction.

Included in the bill this year also are the funds for programs of the Atomic Energy Commission.

These include, among others, the production of raw materials, the special nuclear programs, weapons and reactor development, research, biology and medicine, education and information and other programs of the AEC. Our subcommittee and the full committee has given a great deal of time and attention to the proposed nuclear powered airplane. Certainly, a great deal of money has been expended on this program to date. A sum of $75 million is carried in the defense appropriations bill for the nuclear-powered airplane and our committee is recommending a limitation of $58 million in the amount of funds carried in this bill which may be used for the airplane propulsion reactor program. Thus a total of $133 million is to be used for this purpose.

Mr. Chairman, America was first in the development of atomic energy, the A-bomb, the H-bomb, atomic weapons for war and atomic energy for peaceful purposes.

Admiral Rickover and those associated with him have developed the atomic submarine and there is no reason why America should not be first in the development of atomic powered airplanes. We could have had such a plane in the air by 1956 if our Air Force standards had not been so rigid and specific as to require the highest speed and altitude standards. In other words, Mr. Chairman, our course has been set so high—let us say like a precision Elgin watch that we have delayed completing and putting into flight the first atomic airplane. Let us develop the plane now and perfect the refinements later as time may indicate. I believe there will be both a civil and military application for the atomic powered airplane and that our experts and scientists both in the AEC and the Department of Defense should get on with the job. Personally, I have been disappointed in the delays, slowdowns, and indirection of this program. I am supporting the committee on this instance because I believe our agency concerned with this program should reevaluate it and give the program new purpose and direction and emphasis. Also, Mr. Chairman, as indicated, there is $75 million in the Defense bill for this purpose and a carryover by reappropriations so that the program for next year will have a minimum of $100 million—a limit of $133 million in funds.

The committee is not stopping the program, it is rather directing that proper action should be given to this national effort. We have been assured that these funds will be sufficient for the present. By next year the AEC and the Defense Department will be able to tell us what they have decided to do in reorganizing the project and how much they will need to keep it going. We will be in a far better position to assess the practicability of this entire project and the funds we devote to it will be utilized more effectively.

In summary, Mr. Chairman, the atomic energy program, the work of the TVA, the Bonneville Power Administration and our other great power agencies, and the work of the Corps of Engineers are all important and must go forward.

This is a great bill and a very important measure—and although it is difficult and impossible to satisfy everyone on such a bill, the measure is worthy of approval as recommended by the Committee on Appropriations and I urge its passage.

Mr. JOHNSON of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVINS. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, as a Representative of the First Congressional District of Maryland, I would like to present my views on H.R. 12326. First, I wish to commend the Committee on Appropriations for their labors on the Public Works appropriation bill for 1961. With the great need for public works improvements in our country, I am aware of the difficult task that confronts this committee in drafting a bill that would meet the needs of the many meritorious projects necessary to our public welfare.

In my district, there are several approved resolutions for surveys. And I am sure many other Members of Congress have proposed projects in their districts in which they are vitally interested. The First Congressional District of Maryland and, I may add, the State of Maryland, is perhaps confronted with as many navigational problems as any State in the Union. Many of our people and a great segment of our economy are dependent upon our innumerable waterways.

I endeavored to call the attention of the House Committee on Public Works to the needs of various areas in my district, and I was gratified when the committee passed resolutions authorizing the study of five proposed projects. I am painfully aware that it is a long step from a resolution to survey to the appropriation of funds to proceed with same, but I do feel that there exist certain proposed projects presently in need of serious consideration.

For example, there is a greatly needed improvement in the existing facilities at Rock Hall, Kent County, Md. Some years ago the Federal Government spent a considerable sum of money to provide Rock Hall with channels 8 and 10 feet deep and 100 feet wide, anchorage areas of the same depths, and twin breakwaters at the harbor entrance. Now, apparently the breakwaters have either sunken or the water level has raised, rendering the Federal project there ineffectual and the expenditure of money in vain.

On May 8, 1959, Gen. J. L. Person, Assistant Chief of Engineers for Civil Works, stated:

> A study is warranted to determine if modifications of the project would result in a fuller utilization of the potential benefits.

The neglect of navigational improvements at Insley Cove, Wells Cove, Farm Creek, the Chester River, the Choptank River, St. Peters Creek, the North East River, and in the Smith Island area should be terminated and improvements made commensurate to their needs.

I am afraid that the amount appropriated for general investigations in H.R. 12326 falls short in providing the needs of a district so dependent upon its waterways for its economic livelihood.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CARNAHAN].

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the public works appropriation bill for 1961. I thank the committee for providing a sum of $50,000 for a general investigation and restudy of the Meramec River Basin. This Meramec Basin comprises a part of the Eighth Congressional District in my State of Missouri.

Meramec Basin Dams have long been under discussion and some studies have been made. However, it is felt necessary to update these studies and this sum is required by the Corps of Engineers in order to bring the study up to present-day requirements.

This Meramec Basin project has a long history. The construction of reservoirs in the Meramec River Basin was authorized in the Flood Control Act of June 28, 1938. It is a part of the general comprehensive plan for flood control and other purposes in the Upper Mississippi River Basin.

Based on studies completed in 1949, a plan for flood control and other purposes in the Meramec River Basin was developed. This provides for three reservoirs: The Meramec Park Reservoir with dam site about 4 miles east of Sullivan, Mo.; Cedar Hill Reservoir on the Big River which is a tributary of the Meramec, with dam site about 2½ miles above Cedar Hill, Mo.; and Union Reservoir, with dam site on the Bourbeuse River, another tributary of the Meramec, about 6 miles upstream from Union, Mo.

This request for funds to up-date the studies previously made is necessary if the Corps of Engineers is to cooperate with the State of Missouri in planning further development in the basin. If this program, after an up-dating study, meets basic requirements, together with the approval of the appropriate Missouri State authorities and is desired by local interests, then the project can be restored to the active list and become eligible for future funding and completion.

By holding back disastrous floods on the Bourbeuse, Big and Meramec Rivers, this system of reservoirs would reduce flood stages in the basin and also on the Mississippi River. These reservoirs would eliminate crop damage on over 40,000 acres of downstream bottom land, as well as extensive damage to beaches, communities and to private and public clubhouses and recreational facilities.

I am advised that about three-fourths of the 1957 flood damage could have been prevented if these proposed projects had been operational. Another long-range benefit of this proposal is the fact that controlled releases from these reservoirs would aid Mississippi River navigation during critical low-flow periods. Proponents of these projects point out other advantages that might well result: the reservoirs would provide for conservation storage of water supply, pollution abatement and fish and wildlife propagation in addition to creating large new areas for much needed recreational facilities.

I urge approval of this appropriation to up-date this study so that a decision can be made as to further definite plan or plans required to best serve the interests of the Meramec Basin.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KARTH].

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the legislation now before the body. First, let me commend the Subcommittee on Public Works for their diligent efforts, the many long hours of hard work necessitated by extensive and intensive hearings. Then may I commend the full committee and in both instances the able leadership of the chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]. He is one who I am sure we can all agree, is capable of getting committee members from both sides of the aisle working harmoniously together for constructive legislation. I thank the distinguished gentlemen from Minnesota, Mr. ANDERSON and Mr. MARSHALL, for their personal interest and help on my project affecting St. Paul and South St. Paul, Minn.

For the inclusion of that project, all Minnesotans, I know, joint in thanking the committee. Specifically I know this is true of the St. Paul, South St. Paul people. The workers, the chamber of commerce, the St. Paul Port Authority, and particularly those people in the flood area, are most grateful.

Mr. Chairman this is a bill that on an overall basis means much to millions of Americans. That is why it is good for America.

Undoubtedly, there are many projects of great merit that are not in the bill. However, it was the good judgment of the committee to be sure, that all projects, just could not be included.

However, I confidently predict that all will agree the bill is of great variety and magnitude, and because of this serves well all of our Nation.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL].

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise to commend the Subcommittee on Public Works Appropriations and the Appropriations Committee for bringing to the floor today a bill which I believe provides adequate programs for continued development and control of our Nation's water resources. I am particularly interested in title II which includes the Federal reclamation program. As chairman of the committee which authorizes the reclamation projects, I have appeared before the Public Works Subcommittee for the past several years in behalf of the overall reclamation program.

While I believe that an increase in our annual level of spending for reclamation is justified to keep this program in line with our overall Government spending, I recognize that this must be considered as a long-range goal. I am satisfied that the funds included in this bill are adequate to permit the efficient continuation of the projects that are now under way. I particularly congratulate the committee for again including several new starts for I believe that a few new starts each year are necessary for an orderly and progressive long-range program.

I want to personally thank the chairman of the subcommittee, who is also chairman of the full committee, and the members of the whole committee and subcommittee, for the courtesies extended me and for his and their cooperation and the cooperation of the staffs for their understanding of reclamation matters which are of mutual interest to all of us.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from California [Mr. HAGEN].

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Chairman, I am grateful for the opportunity to appear to urge appropriations for multipurpose irrigation and reclamation projects located in my congressional district in California.

I sincerely appreciate the cooperation which has been accorded me by the Appropriations Committee in past years and I appreciate the action taken by them this year.

The purpose of my appearance is to urge favorable House action on the following appropriations:

Terminus Dam on the Kaweah River, Tulare County, Calif.	$6,300,000
Success Dam on the Tule River, Tulare County, Calif.	2,588,000
Stone Corral Irrigation District	1,045,181
Teapot Dome Water District distribution system	925,427
East side unit, proposed extension of the Central Valley project, continued planning	566,257
Caliente Creek stream group, Kern County, Calif., completion of planning	15,000
Pine Flat Reservoir, Kings River	500,000

All of the above mentioned items are recommended in the President's budget in the amount which I have specified except the Caliente Creek stream group and this also has received the approval of Mr. CANNON's splendid committee.

I am sure that the Members of this Congress are well acquainted with the Terminus and Success projects and the urgency which dictated the appropriation of funds which have been expended thus far. The two dams are imperative to impound runoff waters from the Sierra Nevada Mountains which have caused an inestimable amount of damage in floods most recently in 1952, 1955, and 1956.

Both of these projects are currently under construction and, in fact, are rapidly nearing completion. The $2,588,000 recommended for Success Dam would be the final increment toward completion of the complete works at a total cost of $14,200,000. The appropriation of the recommended amount would permit this dam to be finished on the scheduled date of June 30, 1961.

The $6,300,000 contained in the bill for Terminus Dam would bring the project to a point of more than 80 percent completed and would leave $3,782,000 still to be appropriated.

I respectfully urge this House to appropriate adequate funds to permit these flood control projects to be completed as scheduled.

I will now comment on the request for funds for the Stone Corral Irrigation District and the Teapot Dome Water District, both located in Tulare County. In both instances irrigation distribution systems are in the process of construction by the Bureau of Reclamation under repayment contracts.

The estimated total cost of each project is $1,888,000. The $1,045,181 for Stone Corral would leave an additional $450,000 to be funded.

The $925,427 for Teapot Dome would complete the appropriations for this project.

With respect to the proposed east side project, feasibility studies have been under way for several years to ascertain ways and means of developing an additional water supply for the east side of the Southern San Joaquin Valley. The plans involve a proposed canal which would convey water from northern California along the east side of the valley into the water-deficient areas of Kern County and Tulare County.

I can assure you that there is a dire need for water in this area and that the situation worsens each year. The $566,257 which would be expended for planning surveys would be a continuation to extensive prior planning. Failure to continue such planning would nullify previous expenditures for this useful purpose.

Regarding the Caliente Creek Stream Group request, it is my understanding that estimates by the Corps of Army Engineers place the total cost of the remaining survey work at $30,000. I further understand that the Engineers have a capability of performing half of this work during fiscal year 1961 and the remainder during fiscal year 1962.

In view of this fact, I would respectfully urge concurrence in the committee's approving the sum of $15,000 for this undertaking.

Now I turn my attention to the $500,000 appropriation recommended for Pine Flat Dam and Reservoir on the Kings River. As the Committee is aware, the physical features of this dam have been completed for several years. Since that time, the construction of downstream channel and levee improvements has been delayed pending observation of changes in the streamflow as a result of the impoundment.

The channel clearance and levee work was authorized as a part of the project and I urge that the appropriation be approved in order that the work may be completed by 1962, as scheduled by the Corps of Army Engineers.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL].

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, at the proper time I will offer an amendment to eliminate $4,500,000 in this bill, which is scheduled to be spent for Kinzua Dam, the reservoir coming partially into my district in western New York. In the course of the discussions, you will hear a great deal of reference to Dr. Arthur Morgan. Let me give you a little bit of the background and the history of how this project developed. For some time there have been discussions of a project and actual authorizations by the Congress for a project in the Allegheny Valley in western New York and in western Pennsylvania to protect the downstream communities. These projects were actually designed to protect not only from flood, but from low water. The unfortunate thing was that the Kinzua project involved taking 9,077 acres right out of the best land of the Seneca Indians in western New York, and in essence destroying that nation and this in violation of the oldest treaty that this country has. I placed in the RECORD yesterday, and it is to be found on page 10849, a comparison of the Kinzua plan and the Conewango plan. I recommend it to you for your reading and to note particularly the language of Dr. Morgan in pointing out the advantages of the Conewango plan which would take no significant amount of Indian land as compared with the Kinzua plan, which would take an essential area right out of the middle of the Seneca land. Dr. Morgan is not a lightweight. He is a competent engineer of the highest professional standing. He was the chief engineer in the Miami Conservancy in 1913, working for the prevention of the recurrence of the Dayton, Ohio, flood. He was the chief engineer of the Pueblo Conservancy in Colorado. He has been the planner and supervisor of over 75 water control projects in this country. He was president of Antioch College for 16 years and was Chairman of the Tennessee Valley Authority from 1933 to 1938. I am told that he has worked in water control projects twice as long as the Army Corps of Engineers. In discussing Dr. Morgan's findings, let me say that he started 3 years ago to see if there was a way to protect Pittsburgh and the downstream communities and still save the Indian lands. In doing so, he made this comment as to his project. This is Dr. Morgan speaking:

> The oldest existing treaty of our Government should be treated seriously and with great respect, but so should other human interests be treated. If the health and safety of the great city of Pittsburgh can be protected in no other way then by taking the land of the Seneca Indians, then, it seems to me, the United States Government and the Seneca Nation should cooperate in protecting Pittsburgh.

Then he went on to say that he had witnessed at various times in his own experience, mistakes made by the Army Engineers in this field, and so he undertook the project. In doing so he found some very interesting situations that existed.

On page 10849 of yesterday's RECORD I inserted a full statement by Dr. Morgan including the following paragraph:

> 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.

There are two major purposes for an undertaking like this. One is flood control and the other is augmentation of low water. The Conewango will store more than three times the amount of water. It will, in addition, protect against what is called "the maximum probable flood" in the Ohio River Basin.

The Army Engineers concede that the Kinzua will protect only 43 percent of the "maximum probable floods," but Kinzua cannot be expanded. If they try to expand it any further they will eliminate the city of Salamanca, in my district. There will be arguments made that prior studies have already been made, because when Dr. Morgan came into this, he began to raise questions that needed answering. This committee ordered that a private study be made and a study was made 2 years ago. The result of that study was to confirm the feasibility of Dr. Morgan's Conewango plan. The main question they raised with his plan was that they feared it would cost more than Kinzua. In this connection I want to quote Dr. Morgan:

> The earlier field work and calculations for this study were largely made by my longtime friend and associate, Barton M. Jones. On his sudden death I located such of his papers as I could and have continued the study. He commented frequently that the project has such a variety of promising alternatives that when the possibilities and economies are fully worked out the plans may have little resemblance to the ones he has prepared. * * * It is hoped that as Tippetts-Abbett-McCarthy-Stratton make their study with more adequate resources they will not simply determine the feasibility of the elements we propose, but will be alert to see further possibilities and economies, as well as any weak spots in our proposals.

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODELL. I yield.

Mr. PILLION. The gentleman agrees that the greatest benefit we can obtain from these projects is the low water benefits, the use of water for human consumption; for industrial uses, for pollution along these rivers, down the Pittsburgh and down the Ohio Valley.

The Conewango will furnish three times the amount of water for these very essential needs that can possibly be furnished by the Kinzua.

Mr. GOODELL. I agree. I not only agree, but I am told that the Chief of Engineers in an address last October—speaking of this river basin said that by 1980 the demand for water will be 13 times greater than the dependable discharge into the lower Ohio River. This Conewango project, according to Dr. Morgan, and conceded by everyone now—would store three times more water than the Kinzua.

Quoting Dr. Morgan further. When he started these studies he said:

> I have only begun to look into the many possibilities of the Conewango. I continued my inquiry, and turned up other possibilities so 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.

Now, Dr. Morgan is a man over 80 years of age walking around the hills there making the surveys and explorations which are necessary to come up with a plan which would be feasible. He said he continued his inquiries and studies and the conclusions he came up with were so superior as to make his earlier observations obsolete.

When asked about the Tippetts study of the alternative Conewango, Dr. Morgan outlined and documented in detail the places where money could be cut out of what the Tippetts firm says is necessary to develop the Conewango program.

The Corps of Army Engineers, in replying to a question as to what would be

the benefit-cost ratio for this Conewango project in detail replied on last Friday, and I quote:

> Basic data are not available to the Corps of Engineers to support a reasonable estimate of cost for the Conewango-Cattaraugus alternative proposed by Dr. Morgan; and, accordingly, it has not been possible to determine the firm benefit-cost ratio for that plan. To develop accurate cost estimates for such a complex scheme, many explorations, tests, and surveys would be necessary.

In this connection the corps added that they considered no further refinement of costs necessary because the costs seemed obviously too high.

Mr. Chairman, this is a former Chairman of the Tennessee Valley Authority who has done these studies. I think the observations and recommendations he makes with regard to the Conewango project deserve a fair and impartial study, and so do the alternative proposals, before we appropriate $120 million of the taxpayers' money.

Dr. Morgan has claimed that this project would store three times as much water and would give full protection by an overflow outlet into Lake Erie against any possible floods, while the Kinzua would only protect against 40 percent of the "maximum probable flood" in this river basin.

Dr. Morgan has, in addition, contended that the Conewango would cost $105 million, while the Kinzua was estimated to cost $113 million and now it has grown to $119 million.

I am very much in favor of breaking down and analyzing all phases of these projects to determine which will be best for water augmentation and flood control, and to protect the people in the area. Remember, I have to sell this project to the people where this reservoir will be located. People are going to be severely injured as well as benefited by a project of this immensity. They deserve the assurance that all facts are known and evaluated impartially before they are asked to give up their lands. This applies equally to Indians and white residents of the Conewango Valley.

I ask your support of my amendment when presented.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD].

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to call the attention of the House to the fact that it was just 1 year ago today that Mr. John Foster Dulles lost his valiant fight against cancer, and our country and the world lost a valiant fighter for freedom for all men.

During his 6 years of service as Secretary of State there was strong disagreement with some of the firm policies and positions he advocated with respect to the never-changing drive of the Communists for world domination.

I, myself, think that history will vindicate those policies and positions and that the long shadow of Mr. Dulles will grow even longer with the passage of time. But I am perfectly willing to leave that to history.

Today we want to pay tribute to him as a great and noble man, a tireless and dedicated patriot, an intelligent and heroic crusader for justice and human liberty in the world as the only possible conditions upon which can be built a true and lasting, not an illusory peace.

America does not and will not forget Mr. Dulles and his services to our country and to mankind.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, a year ago today the United States lost one of its most consecrated public servants. I rise to add my little word of respect, my appreciation of a loyal servant of the country—he and I were not always in agreement, but we respected each other and worked as best we knew how for the fundamental principles upon which this great free land of ours was built.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON], a member of the committee.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, H.R. 12326, known as the public works appropriation bill for 1961, is a good bill. It has had thorough and complete hearings, and I hope the House will adopt it as presented.

Here we go again. It has been stated here that an amendment will be offered to make a further study of an alternative plan. I do not know how many more studies they want to make of the proposed Allegheny Dam.

I do not by any means pose as an expert on engineering, but I have listened to all of those who have spoken against the proposal of the engineers. Every Member of this body who has a project in his district must depend on the decisions of the Army Engineers and, certainly, on their truthfulness.

This Allegheny River Reservoir project is a part of the overall plan for water control in the Ohio River Basin. As I understand the project, it will reduce flood damages in important residential and industrial areas downstream, including the highly industrialized Pittsburgh area, and will maintain adequate flow during an extended drought period. It is a key project in the control plan for the Ohio. The plan for construction is the result of many studies, some prior to and others subsequent to the authorization.

Opposition has arisen to this project based on flooding of Indian land in the Seneca Reservation and the possibility of diversion of the floodflows on the Allegheny River to Lake Erie. The latter feature appears to have been offered particularly to eliminate the first.

In regard to the first objection, the President of the Seneca Nation of Indians stated in testimony before the subcommittee that—

> My people have steadily maintained the position that if the construction of this proposed Kinzua Dam was the only economic and engineering solution for the prevention of floods to downstream Allegheny, we would not oppose the taking of our lands.

Now, the Corps of Engineers have maintained that the construction as proposed is the most economical means of providing the benefits to accrue to the downstream area through flood protection and low waterflow augmentation.

I am informed that the Corps of Engineers consider the diversion of floodflows to Lake Erie as a feasible solution to the flood protection of the downstream Allegheny area, but that it is not the most economical. They have studied this approach to the flood problem as early as 1928 and have again recently considered the plan as proposed by the proponents of the diversion idea. Their recent conclusions are that the plan of diverting the floodflows to Lake Erie will cost the Federal Government about $200 million as compared to the $118 million which is the estimated cost of the Allegheny River Reservoir project.

Based on the testimony and information furnished me by the Corps of Engineers I am convinced that they have thoroughly investigated all alternative means of providing the control found to be necessary, and I am confident that their studies gave just appraisal to these alternative plans. I am therefore of the opinion that the recommended plan of the Army Engineers represents the most economical and desirable approach to meet the overall needs for development of water resources in this area.

Now, the chief reason for opposition to the Allegheny River Reservoir is that they have a treaty dating back to 1794 with the United States. Since the Supreme Court has decided in favor of the Army Engineers, this argument cannot prevail.

The following precedences are ample proof that the United States has treated the Indians fairly.

I had the Legislative Reference Service gather for me a list of the Indian tribes who have benefited from dam construction:

Flathead Indians of Montana. They received compensation from a private company for use of damsite and flooding of reservation land.

Warm Springs Indians of Oregon. They received compensation from a private company for use of damsite.

Fort Berthold Indians of North Dakota. They receive compensation from the Federal Government for flooding and other items, connected with dam construction.

Nez Perce Indians of Idaho, Warm Springs Indians of Oregon, Umatilla Indians of Oregon, Yakima Indians of Washington receive compensation from Federal Government for flooding of fishing sites at Celilo Falls on the Columbia and construction of Dalles Dam.

Wind River Indians of Wyoming receive compensation from Federal Government for inundation of reservation land, in connection with Boysen Dam.

Standing Rock Indians and Cheyenne River Indians of South Dakota receive compensation for Oahe Dam on the Missouri River.

Lower Brule and Crow Creek Indians of South Dakota receive compensation for Randall Dam on Missouri River.

Fort Peck Indians of Montana. Compensation for Fort Peck Dam on Missouri River.

Crow Indians of Montana. Projected Yellowtail Dam to carry compensation.

So, Mr. Chairman, without taking any more time at this particular moment, I want to say that I think the Army Engineers have given us a very fine evaluation of the various projects that they have looked into. When the amendment is offered, I certainly will oppose it, and I hope the House will stand back of the committee.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, this bill calls for $1,238 million overall for the budget estimates that were considered, and a bill which the committee has considered calling over all for $1,685,500,000 for civil functions of the War Department and reclamation. It calls for about $28 million for Bonneville Power, most of which is for operation and maintenance. It calls for over $2 billion of funds for the Atomic Energy Commission.

The projects included in this bill are enormous. Along with those that have already been started they will call for from $8 to $10 billion of expenditures. To my mind the worst part of it is that instead of its being something that will maintain the resources of America, the bill contains many projects which do not maintain the resources of America but sap them. In other words, they are projects without a benefit-cost ratio. If they are figured on the basis of the present money market, there is hardly a project in the whole bill that would qualify. In other words, there are 19 projects in the bill which call for large amounts of funds where the benefit-cost ratio is less than 1.1 to 1, figured on a 2½ percent interest rate.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BECKER. Is it not also the fact, that while this bill amounts to about $1 billion, we are actually committing the country to an expenditure of several billions of dollars, because many of these projects are only starts? The Kinzua Dam calls for an expenditure in the bill of $4,500,000, but actually the cost will be about $120 million, if it is started; is not that true?

Mr. TABER. There is no question about it. On top of that the benefit-cost ratio figured on a 2½ percent interest rate is only 1.3 to 1; and if it is figured on a 3½ percent to a 4 percent rate, it is a minus quantity—there is no benefit-cost ratio.

Mr. BECKER. Heretofore under policies of public works we have always disapproved that type of project, have we not?

Mr. TABER. That is what we used to do. The worst part about the Kinzua Dam is that it is not presented primarily as a flood control project but as a scheme to store up water to flush the sewage out of the Ohio River in the dry season.

Mr. BECKER. I agree with my colleague.

Mr. TABER. That represents the main cost of it, and with that kind of picture it ought to have a local contribution of a very substantial character; but it does not have it.

Mr. BECKER. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. TABER. On top of that, if you want to go up a couple of points, there are 51 projects, most of them new, in this bill without even a budget estimate, where the benefit-cost ratio on a 2½-percent interest rate is not better than 1.2 to 1 and where the benefit-cost ratio is a minus quantity if figured on an interest rate of 3½ to 4 percent.

I appreciate that a bill of this size could not come before the Congress because so many of the Members are getting the jitters and being ready to spend money that we do not have for a lot of projects that really cannot be justified at all. They are not projects to benefit and to maintain the status of the United States of America; they are projects put in to satisfy the greed of certain people in connection with so-called flood control.

For my own part I cannot go along with the bill. I cannot vote for it. I hope that when the time comes there will be a rollcall vote, so that I can go on record against it, even if I am the only one. I appreciate that mine is a voice crying in the wilderness, but it is a voice crying for something that the American people need, and that is, to put a brake on our expenditures where it is not absolutely necessary that we spend the money. I would feel that I was not doing my duty by the people of the United States if I did not say just what I have said. I have been very charitable in my approach to this bill. Maybe sometime we will wake up before it is too late and before the country is in such shape that we cannot withstand the deluge.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. MAY].

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Chairman, may I ask if the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations or another member of the committee will yield for a question? I see the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] has risen. May I ask a question of him?

On page 19 of the committee report it is noted with some concern on my part that the budget estimate for the John Day Lock and Dam on the Columbia River in the States of Washington and Oregon has been reduced by $3,655,700, part of a budgeted item, of course.

It is further noted in the report, correctly, that this reduction is the amount by which the Columbia Basin monetary authorization will be deficient in the fiscal year 1961 unless it is increased by the pending public works authorization bill which, as the gentleman knows, passed the House last July.

Inasmuch as the Senate Public Works Committee anticipates reporting this legislation in several days, my question is, Why could not the committee have included the full $37 million for this important project, budgeted, of course, contingent upon the raising of the Columbia Basin monetary authorization?

Mr. RABAUT. We could have, but we did not, because it has been committee policy to withhold funds until the monetary authorization was available.

Mrs. MAY. There was nothing that said you could not do this?

Mr. RABAUT. There was not.

Mrs. MAY. So the decision here was made on the basis that the monetary authorization had been reached.

Mr. RABAUT. That is right.

Mrs. MAY. It is my understanding that the members of the committee would look favorably upon the restoration of these funds for the John Day Lock and Dam and the raising of the monetary authorization by the other body; is that correct?

Mr. RABAUT. The gentlewoman is correct, the members of the committee would look favorably upon that.

Mrs. MAY. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is often spoken of as the bill which contains items that are not necessary. But we have a responsibility here as representatives of the people to do the best we can to see that life and property are not endangered. On all these Federal streams over which the Federal Government has jurisdiction, no State, no municipality, and no person dare under the law to stick a spade in that Federal stream or to try in any way to divert that Federal stream regardless of how small the stream might be. So in this great, huge country of ours, the Federal Government and this Congress has this responsibility to all the people. Our committee insists, however, that local people contribute their share of such expenses. This bill is a bill for America so far as all public works for all 50 States is concerned. The funds requested in this bill for all public works in America is less than 1.5 percent of the Federal budget for the fiscal year 1961.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. RIVERS].

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I speak of the item of $542,000 contained in the budget request for a small boat harbor at Homer on the Kenai Peninsula, Alaska. This harbor would provide safe moorage for fishing boats and other small vessels for this fast-growing community and constitute a constructive step toward the growth and development of Alaska. Fishing is an important segment of the economy of

Homer, Alaska, but boating for tourists in this scenic wonderland is also a promising potential.

On page 233 of the hearings before the subcommittee the justification for this project under the head of local cooperation shows that there has been some discussion as to the exact location of this harbor. On page 234 Gen. Allen Clark of the Corps of Engineers stated that the corps had recommended a location on the north side of the peninsula, and local people feel it should be on the south side. In speaking of the "peninsula," General Clark was referring to the Homer Spit, a long narrow finger of land which projects a mile or more out toward the center of Katchemak Bay. Although the discussions mentioned had to do with the question of which side of the spit to utilize for the harbor, some members of the committee apparently thought that the word peninsula referred to the whole Kenai Peninsula, so in all good conscience declined to go along with the project until the site was determined. They also thought there was a substantial controversy which there is not. In a wire received today from the Homer Chamber of Commerce I am told that there is now 100 percent backing of the Corps of Engineers in regard to location of the harbor. Since the people of Homer are extremely disturbed about the deletion of the item for their long desired and needed harbor, they are sending a petition for reinstatement of the Homer boat harbor funds. I am also advised that in the very near future the Corps of Engineers will receive a field report from a representative at Homer confirming the complete accord which now exists in accordance with the above referenced telegram. By the time said petition and field report arrive H.R. 12326 will be in the hands of the Senate, and upon the strength of said documents I would expect the Homer boat harbor item to be restored by the other body. Likewise, I would surmise that the objections of our own committee would by then have been met and the cloud removed from the justification for this project. It is my ardent hope that the expected restoration will prove acceptable to our House conferees at the ensuing conference, and prove acceptable to all of my other colleagues when the time comes to act upon the conference report.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from California [Mr. Moss].

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, I was shocked to discover in the public works appropriations bill that our Committee on Appropriations had reduced the budget estimate for continuation of construction on the Sacramento River deepwater ship channel project in my district from $8 million to $5 million. This is the second year in a row that the committee has pared the administration's minimal recommendations for this project. Last year it cut $1 million from the budget estimate of $7.5 million.

On page 16 of its report—House Report No. 1634—the committee made the following statement with respect to its action:

Sacramento deepwater ship channel, California: The budget estimate of $8 million for this project has been reduced to $5 million. Estimates of the total direct Federal cost have increased approximately $5 million in the last 4 years. The total estimated project cost is now $47,255,000, of which the direct contribution by the local beneficiaries is only $3,515,000. The committee continues to hold the opinion on projects such as this where a very high percentage of the total benefits are obviously local in nature, that there should be a higher local contribution to the direct cost. No effort has been made to increase the local beneficiaries' share of the increased direct project costs. As stated last year in its report, the committee feels that it would be wholly appropriate for the local interests to increase their contribution if they wish to achieve the advantages of a speedup in the construction schedule.

The committee notes that the effect of its $1 million reduction in this item last year was completely nullified by transfer of funds to the project from other projects under the 15 percent transfer latitude which the committee has granted to the Corps of Engineers. The latitude in the transfer of funds between projects is not for the purpose of offsetting positive actions taken by the committee on specific projects. No funds, over and above the amount being provided, are to be transferred to this project during the fiscal year 1961.

Thus it appears the committee's action was aimed at the local interests and the Corps of Engineers. To the former it said, in effect, that their share in the cost of the project is insufficient; that if the project is to proceed at an economic and timely rate of construction a higher local contribution to direct costs will have to be made. To the Corps of Engineers the committee levels the accusation that it thwarted the will of the committee by transferring $962,000 to the project after the budget estimate had been reduced by $1 million.

I should like to examine the two grounds set forth as the basis for the committee's action. Before doing so I will set forth some background information on the project.

DESCRIPTION

Mr. Chairman, the Sacramento River deepwater ship channel projects consist of a ship channel from deep water in Suisun Bay, near San Francisco, to Lake Washington on the outskirts of California's State capitol at Sacramento, a harbor and turning basin at Lake Washington, and a 1½-mile shallow draft barge canal connecting the harbor and the Sacramento River. The project will open a tributary area embracing 24 California counties, 4 southern Oregon counties, and 13 northern Nevada counties to worldwide markets.

The project was authorized in the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1946, and received its first appropriation in the bill covering the fiscal year 1949. Appropriations followed in the 2 ensuing years. Along with many other public works projects, work was suspended on the channel in 1951 because of the Korean war. It was resumed in 1956 and construction has continued uninterrupted since. At the time of authorization the corps estimated a reasonable construction period of 3 years. The project has now been under way for nearly 11 years.

COMMITTEE ACTION UNFAIR

Mr. Chairman, I feel very strongly that, first, the committee action in conditioning a timely construction schedule on increased local contribution constitutes a complete repudiation of an agreement with the local people covering division of costs; and second, that the Corps of Engineers was completely justified in transferring funds to the project during the current fiscal year under the 15 percent transfer allowance. I will discuss these two points in order:

1. LOCAL CONTRIBUTION AGREEMENT

The act which authorized this project required that responsible local interests provide satisfactory assurance to the Secretary of the Army that they would:

1. Furnish without cost to the United States, all lands, easements, rights-of-way, and spoil disposal areas for the initial work and subsequent maintenance when and as required and make all essential utility changes necessary for the construction of the project.

2. Construct, operate, and maintain at the Lake Washington Basin an adequate public terminal with necessary utilities and rail and highway connections open to all on equal terms.

3. Hold and save the United States free from any damages which may arise from construction, operation, and maintenance of the improvement.

Mr. Chairman, immediately upon approval of the authorizing act, the local people established the Sacramento-Yolo Port District as the responsible local agency. Under date of December 24, 1947, the district executed "Agreement of Assurance to the Secretary of the Army" in the exact terms of the requirements as set forth in the preceding paragraph. On February 3, 1948, the Secretary of the Army approved the agreement of assurance.

I think that there can be no doubt that the establishment of conditions by the United States and their acceptance without any qualifications or reservations by the local people constitutes a solemn agreement. If the agreement was not a firm one at that point in the relationship, it certainly was when the local interests undertook to comply with the promises they made to the United States. At any rate, the people of my district felt and still feel that they had entered into a binding agreement. Based on the commitment they made they formulated their fiscal plans.

Almost immediately the voters of my district approved a $3,750,000 bond issue for local financing. The State of California approved the project and appropriated $750,000 to the port district for use in the acquisition of rights-of-way, easements, and so forth. In addition, the port district collected annual taxes from the property owners which collections to date have aggregated over $2 million.

The extent of local interests' compliance with the agreement with the United States is nowhere better documented than in the capital account of the port district. Among the items listed therein are the following:

Rights-of-way and real estate	$2,458,547.93
Channels (includes $75,000 construction advancement to Corps of Engineers)	336,751.00
Belt railroad	226,847.67
Highway pavement	58,690.25
Domestic water system	6,192.56
Fire protection system	26,611.43
Engineering and design	36,078.83
Sanitary sewer	40,513.20
Automotive and general office equipment	24,078.53
Port district capital investment	3,214,311.40

Not only has the port district proceeded in good faith to meet its responsibilities, but the State of California has diligently aided the project in every possible way. Already mentioned was the $750,000 it appropriated for rights-of-way acquisitions. The California Division of Highways provided an overpass across a recently constructed east-west freeway, thereby providing direct truck access to the port terminal area. The cost of this improvement was $288,000. In constructing this freeway the division of highways removed approximately 500,000 cubic yards of material from the channel at a savings to the United States of $150,000. The State is currently expending over $3 million in rebuilding its bridge across the channel at Rio Vista in order to permit free passage of deep-draft water carriers serving the port.

Thus, it is clear that any comparison of the requirements of local interests with their accomplishments shows that they have met and exceeded every obligation they assumed.

Mr. Chairman, I am disturbed also by the clear implication in the committee report that the local interest costs have remained static while the Federal costs have increased. The fact is that the local interest costs have increased at approximately the same rate as those of the Federal Government. The report mentions only the cost of rights-of-way borne by the local interests. Pursuant to the agreement of assurance the local people are required to furnish various terminal facilities such as wharves, transit sheds, and so forth. Had this project been completed in accordance with the initial plans, these terminal facilities plus the rights-of-way, easements, and utility relocations could have been completed by the port district for slightly over $4 million. Because of the delay in completion of the project, these facilities and easements, and so forth, will cost over $13 million. Thus, had the project been prosecuted to completion on a timely schedule the initial bond issue plus the amount appropriated to the port district by the State of California would have been sufficient to cover all local costs. Because of this situation the port district must go before the voters in a few months for approval of a new bond issue of between $10 and $11 million. I might add parenthetically that these same voters will be called upon to approve a State water bond issue of $1.75 billion, plus other bonds for local financing for schools, improvements, and so forth.

Needless to say, the delay in the completion of the port project, with the consequent increase in the Federal and local costs, was in no way caused by the people of my district. Time after time they have begged to have the project placed on an economic and realistic construction schedule. They have been more than diligent in supplying everything required of them well in advance of the corps' need. As a result of the stretch-out of this project they have been forced to bear a heavy burden of taxation to meet the costs of bond servicing, operation and maintenance, and other expenses. After 11 years they still have not realized any of the benefits of a deep-water port.

Not only would a revision of the apportionment of costs be unfair at this late date, but it would cause fiscal havoc. I know of no way in which the people could make an additional contribution. Neither do I know how the United States could accept an additional contribution even if it could be made.

Lastly, the requirements of local contribution established for this project are no different than those on any other navigation project of the same kind. If the Congress wishes to establish new standards of local contribution, it should do so at the outset instead of waiting until a particular project is nearing completion, and long after the fiscal patterns have been established.

TRANSFER BY THE CORPS OF ENGINEERS

Mr. Chairman, I feel just as strongly that censure of the corps for transferring $962,000 to the project during the current fiscal year was not justified.

I am convinced that the corps officials would have been remiss in their duties if they failed to make the transfer. The transfer was necessary to keep two extremely advantageous contracts under way. To curtail or shut down either of these contracts would not only have meant a dollar loss to the United States, but would also have made it difficult for the corps to secure favorable bids on future work. One of these contracts covered a 9-mile stretch of the channel. I doubt that the engineers have secured a dredging contract anywhere in the United States on as favorable terms, as may be seen from the following:

Corps of Engineers estimate	$5,896,700
Highest bid	8,530,500
Lowest bid	4,145,800

The low bid was, of course, accepted. It represented a saving of $1,750,900 to the United States. The cost per cubic yard of material under the agreement is 16 cents per cubic yard as compared to 27¼ cents as had obtained previously. Can there be any doubt that the corps acted prudently in transferring funds in order to save this contract?

CONCLUSION

Mr. Chairman, it would grieve me if my remarks today were to be construed as a criticism of the Committee on Appropriations, or of any of its able and conscientious members. I have always found them to be fair and reasonable men. Certainly, they have been most understanding in treating with the problems of our growing State of California.

I do feel, however, that it is unfair to call upon the people of my district to make an additional contribution to this project when they have already exceeded every possible part of their agreement. There can be no doubt that the costs to the United States have increased because of the unreasonably long construction period. But my people, although they were in no way responsible for that delay, have likewise paid dearly because of it. What they originally thought would cost them $4 million will, in fact, cost them over $13 million.

For the reasons I have stated, Mr. Chairman, I take strong exception to the language in the committee report calling on the people of my district to make a greater contribution to the port project.

Further, I feel that the Corps of Engineers should be commended rather than chastized for employing the 15 percent transfer allowance when by so doing they served the economic interest of the United States.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Iowa for yielding me this time.

I should like to ask the chairman of the committee for an interpretation of the language on page 4, beginning in line 16, as follows:

Provided, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for projects not authorized by law or which are authorized by a law limiting the amount to be appropriated therefor, except as may be within the limits of the amount now or hereafter authorized to be appropriated.

What is the meaning of that language?

Mr. RABAUT. This language goes to the basic mandatory limitation.

Mr. GROSS. Is this language designed to provide appropriations for projects not authorized?

Mr. RABAUT. No.

Mr. GROSS. Are there any projects in this bill not authorized by law?

Mr. RABAUT. There are some.

Mr. GROSS. Could the gentleman tell me what they are?

Mr. RABAUT. I would have to look them up. I would have to make a survey of the several projects.

Mr. GROSS. I would like to know what they are so that perhaps I could lodge a point of order against them.

Mr. RABAUT. The language says the money cannot be spent until——

Mr. GROSS. What language?

Mr. RABAUT. This language.

Mr. GROSS. I do not find that kind of limitation.

Mr. RABAUT. Let me give you a different interpretation.

Mr. GROSS. This language could be subject to a lot of interpretations. I do

not know that I ever saw more confusing language in an appropriation bill in my time here.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York who has had so many years of service on the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. TABER. This language was not used in the old rivers and harbors and flood control bills, but it has been used lately. It is a subterfuge to get around the limitation that the appropriation must be authorized by law. It provides that if it is subsequently authorized by law they can go ahead and spend the money.

Mr. GROSS. In other words, what the gentleman is saying—and I appreciate his fair and frank statement—is that this is a subterfuge to get around the provision which requires that projects must be authorized by law before appropriations are made for such projects.

Mr. RABAUT. And the money cannot be spent until they are authorized. So what is wrong about it?

Mr. GROSS. But the rules of the House prohibit an appropriation until the project is authorized by law.

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. PILLION. I believe the language is intended to take care of a number of projects that are in an authorization bill that passed the House and is now pending in the Senate.

Mr. GROSS. And the rules of the House strictly prohibit that procedure.

Mr. PILLION. I appreciate that very much, but I wanted to explain the situation.

Mr. GROSS. I would still like to know how many unauthorized projects there are in this bill, the purpose of these projects and their cost.

Mr. RABAUT. Without getting too personal in the matter, would you want to strike this language out so that the money could be spent for unauthorized projects?

Mr. GROSS. No; but I will say to the gentleman that on the basis of the statement by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] I intend to offer an amendment to strike out the language beginning with "which are authorized by a law limiting the amount to be appropriated for, except as may be within the limits of the amount now or hereafter authorized to be appropriated."

I would leave in the language:

No part of this appropriation may be used for projects not authorized by law.

That is the fair way to legislate, and the right way to legislate.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Chairman, I need not express my great pleasure at the House approval of $2,500,000 to begin work on Yellowtail Dam. I am sure it is very evident. It has been a long uphill fight and I am confident that the Senate will concur in the appropriation of these funds.

While actual construction of any proportions will not be noticeable for about a year, I know that it will mean a great deal to the employment situation in eastern Montana. Yellowtail Dam will need a large laboring force during construction and the new industries, which we believe will follow the installation of the hydroelectric generating plants, will contribute to a stabilized employment situation.

Large projects financed with Federal funds often are governed by policies which protect the local market. Federal agencies have found it desirable to make local purchases and use local products whenever practicable. They also prefer to make use of the local labor market.

Montana has an abundance of skilled and unskilled laborers and I am hopeful that the contractors who will be constructing this multipurpose project will make use of this labor market. There are two Indian reservations close to Billings—the Crow and the Northern Cheyennes. These people are constantly plagued with unemployment. These people need work. I am sure that they can do the job if the opportunity is made available to them.

At the appropriate time I intend to propose to the Secretary of the Interior that he issue a policy statement setting forth preferential status for Indians from these two reservations whenever they can fulfill the qualifications of the individual jobs.

The Indians have received such treatment in other projects, both private and Federal, and I feel that I would be remiss if I did not endeavor to see that the Crow and Northern Cheyenne Indians got a break in this instance.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the bill be read.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Iowa have any further requests for time?

Mr. JENSEN. No further requests for time, Mr. Chairman.

The Clerk read as follows:

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

For expenses necessary for the collection and study of basic information pertaining to river and harbor, flood control, shore protection, and related projects, and when authorized by law, surveys, and studies (including cooperative beach erosion studies as authorized in Public Law 520, approved July 3, 1930, as amended and supplemented), of projects prior to authorization for construction, $10,895,800, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That $50,000 of this appropriation shall be transferred to the United States Fish and Wildlife Service for studies, investigations, and reports thereon as required by the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 563–565) to provide that wildlife conservation shall receive equal consideration and be coordinated with other features of water-resource development programs of the Department of the Army.

Mr. JOHNSON of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JOHNSON of Maryland: On page 3, lines 20 and 21, strike out "$10,895,800" and insert in lieu thereof "$10,913,000."

Mr. JOHNSON of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I hope I may have the attention of the Members of the House as I present my views concerning the amendment I have offered to H.R. 12326.

While I wish to commend the committee for adding funds for 33 surveys, of which 26 are unbudgeted, I am deeply concerned by their failure to include for survey what I consider to be one of the most needed and most worthy projects in my district. One has only to study the map of the State of Maryland and the First Congressional District of our State to know that we are confronted by innumerable navigational problems. One only has to study the reports to Congress over the past few years to ascertain the fact that our harbor and channel improvements in the district have been seriously neglected.

In the amendment I have offered, the sum of $18,000 is added for a survey of the project known as the Honga River and Tar Bay project. Approximately 1,000 people dwelling in this immediate area, commonly known as Hoopers Island in my district, derive their livelihood from the two tributaries mentioned, which flow into the Chesapeake Bay. These residents own hundreds of boats valued at several hundred thousand dollars. Engaged in the seafood industry, these industrious, seafaring groups pour approximately one and a third million dollars annually into the economy of Dorchester County.

Gen. J. L. Person, Assistant Chief of Engineers for Civil Works, in his report to the chairman of the Committee on Public Works, stated, and, I quote:

This region is one of the most highly productive hard-crab areas in the Chesapeake Bay. * * * Water-borne commerce statistics for 1957 show that 21,640 vessel-trips were made over the Honga River and Tar Bay. * * * This is a 50-percent increase in traffic within the last 10 years. * * * It is considered that a review to determine the advisability of improvements for navigation on the Honga River is advisable at this time. * * * The estimated cost of this survey is $18,000.

Last year, I personally visited the proposed project with Col. Stanley T. B. Johnson, district engineer. Colonel Johnson concurred with me that it was deplorable that this area, which possesses such a large number of boats and does so much for the economy of our district, does not have one decent anchorage basin.

The colonel agreed that an adequate basin facility was sorely needed and that the dredge material from the harbor area could be used to build up the tenuous land strip connecting the two islands—a needy protection against possible human suffering and loss of lives. These residents have been extremely patient to obtain this essential improvement. Their patience over the years has been rewarded by damaged boats and the constant threat of inundation by the Honga and Tar Bay Rivers. Gentlemen, the health and welfare of these people are paramount. It is obvious to me that the growth of this area will not only be impeded by the reluctance of this Congress to grant the sum needed to initiate this project, but their very lives may be at stake as well, without prompt action.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the committee had very, very many of these requests for unbudgeted investigations and surveys. The committee selected the 26 which in their mind were the most warranted at this time, of which this was not one.

The request of the gentleman from Maryland is for $18,000. However, the total estimate of cost set forth by the Corps of Engineers is only $10,000.

It is in the category of the type of surveys that are authorized in the districts of many of the Members of this House. There is no reason why it should have been placed in any different category than it is in. There is a limit to the number of projects which the committee can make provision for and it has done its best to select those which appeared most justified at this time.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that the amendment be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. JOHNSON].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I intend to support this bill because I personally feel it is a good one. The committee is to be complimented on a magnificent job in its report on an appropriation bill which is extremely complex, and the effect on millions of Americans will be tremendous. However, I do believe there are a few instances where the actual need is greater than is provided for by the bill as reported. Fishtrap Dam, I firmly believe, is one such instance.

Each year the good citizens of the Big Sandy River Basin, at great personal sacrifice, come to Washington to plead with the Congress for relief. Only in the most recent years has there been any progress. A review survey of the Big Sandy was completed last year which gave final recommendation for a system of flood control dams providing complete protection to the basin. This included the John W. Flanagan, Fishtrap, and Haysi Dams.

We have in this bill sufficient funds to complete the planning of Fishtrap Reservoir in the amount of $349,000. This was the amount that was in the budget. We do not have any construction funds in the budget, but the Army Engineers state they can efficiently utilize the sum of $301,000 for construction during the next fiscal year.

In different sections of the country, of course, everyone thinks their reservoir perhaps is the most important one and, naturally, the committee has to weigh the feasibility, the economic advantages, and so forth. But in this particular area I want to state to the committee that there is not a section in the United States of America, and the records of the Army Engineers will bear out this statement, that has suffered to the extent that the Big Sandy region in eastern Kentucky has suffered from lack of flood control. The 1957 flood alone caused property damages to this area in excess of $40 million.

When I came to Congress 11 years ago I had in excess of 25,000 coal miners mining in excess of 25 million tons of coal annually. Today, instead of having 25,000 coal miners I have about 9,000 or less mining approximately 19 million tons annually, 6 million tons less than 11 years ago.

In this same area we have the highest insured unemployment rate in the Nation, and have had one of the highest unemployment rates in the Nation since 1952, particularly in Floyd and Pike Counties. Unless we do something to protect these people from floods, we are going to just prolong this high rate of unemployment that we have in the eastern coalfields today.

Now, not only did the 1957 flood cause considerable damage, but we have had these recurring floods that take place practically every year that do millions and millions of dollars worth of damage in this particular section. We cannot hope to ever diversify the economy of this area, until we do get some flood control in eastern Kentucky.

Mr. Chairman, I felt that I would be derelict in my duty if I failed to call the importance of early construction of this particular reservoir to the attention of the committee on this occasion. At the present time, much of a highly flood-prone area has no protection at all. Freedom from floods and a conserved, dependable water supply are vital to the security and economy of the basin.

In February 1958 we had a schoolbus accident in Floyd County, Ky., where a schoolbus carrying 50 youngsters left Highway 23 near Prestonsburg, Ky., and plunged into the stream swollen by floodwaters. The Levisa Fork of the Big Sandy was a raging torrent, in some places 30 feet or more deep. The schoolbus was traveling in the direction of Prestonsburg, Ky., and when the accident occurred the bus went over an embankment without turning over. On the edge of the river, several of the schoolchildren escaped through the rear door, catching onto some willow bushes and wading through the water up the bank onto the road. Shortly the entire bus went under and the remaining 26 children were unable to escape. This accident happened on Friday morning when the children were being driven to school in Prestonsburg. The bus was not found until Sunday at noon and had only floated down the river a short distance, but was completely on the other side of the river next to the bank when discovered.

The true tragedy of this disaster is that few, if any, lives need have been lost. Let me explain this. After the 1937 flood, to be exact, a comprehensive survey of the Ohio River Basin was made and four reservoirs were authorized to give the people in the Big Sandy section flood control protection.

I refer to the Dewey Reservoir which gives the city of Paintsville and downstream communities some flood control protection, but gives no flood control protection to the cities of Prestonsburg and Pikeville, Ky., and communities in between. At the same time, Fishtrap and Pound Reservoirs were authorized. If the Fishtrap Reservoir, along with the other reservoirs on the Big Sandy had been constructed before the accident took place, no doubt the river at this point at the scene of the accident would have been much lower. This is an area with between 40 and 50 inches of precipitation annually, much of which falls in severe showers and storms in the winter and early spring, similar to that in late February 1958, the time of the schoolbus disaster, which caused serious and severely damaging floods almost every year. Year after year our people drearily rouse themselves from the mud and wreckage, only to suffer the pangs of drought during the summer and fall.

In the event the Senate was to approve much needed construction funds in the amount of $301,000, I want to take this opportunity to request the conferees to go along. Not only do I believe this project has tremendous support in the Senate, but I feel this worthwhile project has much support among the membership of the House Public Works Subcommittee. Initiation of construction of Fishtrap Dam this year would be a fitting memorial to the unfortunate victims of the bus disaster of 2 years ago.

The Clerk read as follows:

CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

For the prosecution of river and harbor, flood control, shore protection, and related projects authorized by law; detailed studies, and plans and specifications, of projects (including those for development with participation or under consideration for participation by States, local governments, or private groups) authorized or made eligible for selection by law (but such studies shall not constitute a commitment of the Government to construction); and not to exceed $1,400,000 for transfer to the Secretary of the Interior for conservation of fish and wildlife as authorized by law; $662,622,300, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for projects not authorized by law or which are authorized by a law limiting the amount to be appropriated therefor, except as may be within the limits of the amount now or hereafter authorized to be appropriated: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated for "Construction, General", in this Act shall be used on the project "Missouri River, Kansas City to mouth", for any purpose other than bank stabilization work: *Provided further*, That $500,000 of this appropriation shall be transferred to the United States Fish and Wildlife Service for studies, investigations, and reports thereon as required by the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 563–565) to provide that wildlife conservation shall receive equal consideration and be coordinated with other features of water-resource development programs of the Department of the Army.

Mr. WAMPLER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WAMPLER: On page 4, line 16, strike the amount "$662,622,300" and insert in lieu thereof the amount "$662,807,300".

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GROSS. I have a point of order against the language to be found on this

page. Will the discussion of this amendment abrogate my right to make a point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct, it would. If the gentleman has a point of order, it would have to be urged at this point.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman is trying to obtain recognition from the Chair to make a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman to make the point of order.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the language to be found on page 4, beginning on line 18 and into line 21, "or which are authorized by a law limiting the amount to be appropriated therefor, except as may be within the limits of the amount now or hereafter authorized to be appropriated."

Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against that language on the ground that it is legislation on an appropriation bill. I make the further point of order that this is authorizing appropriations for projects not authorized by law.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to quote briefly from "Cannon's Precedents," page 63:

> As a general proposition whenever a limitation is accompanied by the words "unless," "except," "until," "if," "however," there is ground to view the so-called limitation with suspicion, and in case of doubt as to its ultimate effect the doubt should be resolved on the conservative side. By doing so appropriation bills will be relieved of much of the legislation which is being constantly grafted upon them and a check given a practice which seems to the Chair both unwise and in violation of the spirit, as well as the substance, of our rules.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] care to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I wish to explain the language. The legislative committee has placed outside limits on the amount of money which can be spent in a given river basin. Such basin may have a number of dams or projects in it. Without the language these monetary limits could be exceeded by action on an appropriation bill, thus setting aside the action of the legislative committee.

This is strictly a limitation.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard further?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I should like to point out to the Chair that more than one member of the committee has admitted that there are appropriations not authorized by law, that this is a subterfuge, and I say, Mr. Chairman, designed to controvert the rule of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Iowa care to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. JENSEN. I do, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I have been on the Committee on Appropriations for the past 18 years. I cannot recall when a point of order has ever been raised against similar language in an appropriation bill. The language is simply limiting an appropriation expenditure, providing that the expenditure shall not be made until such project is authorized by law. I fail to see, Mr. Chairman, where a point of order could lie against this language because it is purely a simple limitation of expenditure on an appropriation bill; nothing more, nothing less.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. BOGGS). The Chair is prepared to rule.

It so happens that almost an identical point of order to an identical paragraph was raised on June 18, 1958, by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]. It also happens that the present occupant of the chair was in the chair at that time. The Chair ruled then that the language was specific, that there was no question about its referring to the controlling phrase "authorized by law," and none of the appropriation can be expended unless authorized by law.

The Chair overrules the point of order and sustains the ruling made on June 18, 1958.

Mr. WAMPLER. Mr. Chairman, I speak to this body at a time when the lives of many are in danger and the agricultural farmlands in the heart of the Wabash Valley are constantly being destroyed.

Mr. Chairman, the purpose of my amendment is quite clear, and I might add quite clearly needed.

In essence, the amendment would provide an additional $85,000, during fiscal year 1961, to begin construction on the Sugar Creek, Ind., levee. The amendment also would provide for the appropriation of $100,000 for the construction start of the West Terre Haute, Ind., local protection project.

I have been assured, Mr. Chairman, by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers that the corps has the engineering capability to utilize, during fiscal year 1961, the sum of $85,000 for the Sugar Creek, Ind., levee and $100,000 for the West Terre Haute local protection project which my amendment seeks to have included in the appropriations measure presently before the committee.

There is included in this bill $15,000 which has been budgeted for the completion of advanced planning and design on the Sugar Creek levee.

Mr. Chairman, last year, that is, for fiscal year 1960, the Congress appropriated and thereby invested approximately $45,000 in preconstruction and advanced planning and design for the Sugar Creek and West Terre Haute flood control projects. Approximately $15,000 was invested in the Sugar Creek levee and approximately $30,000 in the West Terre Haute levee.

It would be, I think, Mr. Chairman, only wise and judicious financial procedure to appropriate the additional $185,000 which my amendment would provide for these two vitally necessary flood control units, thereby insuring that last year's appropriation of $45,000 for the two units would not be wasted or, in other words, unsoundly invested.

Although last year there was some doubt that the necessary local cooperation arrangements could be obtained by the Army Corps of Engineers for construction start on the Sugar Creek and the West Terre Haute units, that potential obstacle has now been thoroughly removed.

With the legally constituted formation of the West Vigo Levee Association, the Army Corps of Engineers has received full assurances of local cooperation for the Sugar Creek levee as of January 27, 1960, and for the West Terre Haute projects as of March 3, 1960. The association and the city of Terre Haute is ready, willing and able to fulfill all local cooperation requirements including the assignment to the Army Engineer Corps, without cost, of all necessary lands, easements and rights of way necessary for project construction.

Preliminary studies of the West Terre Haute local protection project were begun in November 1959 and will be continued now that the Federal Government has received full local cooperation assurances.

Project study of the Sugar Creek levee was begun in November 1959, and field mapping commenced in January 1960.

The Sugar Creek levee is located on the right bank of the Wabash River, south and east of the town of West Terre Haute in Vigo County, Ind. The project would consist of the enlargement and improvement of earth levee and the provision of necessary drainage structures.

The Sugar Creek levee, authorized by the 1938 Flood Control Act, would provide protection for about 1,500 acres of agricultural land, of which approximately 1,330 acres in the Sugar Creek area were inundated by the flood of February 1959.

The West Terre Haute local protection flood control project is located along the northern, eastern, and southern edges of the town of West Terre Haute in Vigo County, Ind., and would consist of approximately 2.6 miles of earth levee and the necessary interior drainage facilities. The West Terre Haute local protection project, also authorized by the 1938 Flood Control Act, would provide protection to the town of West Terre Haute which was totally inundated to the depth of 4 feet in the flood which occurred in 1913. The amount of $100,000, provided for in my amendment, would be used to initiate construction.

The Army Corps of Engineers advises me that upon project completion the West Terre Haute levee unit would be approximately 8 feet high and that the Sugar Creek unit would be about 12 feet high; however, because of the higher elevation of the Sugar Creek levee the West Terre Haute unit would be slightly lower than the Sugar Creek project and contained within the Sugar Creek project, thereby affording protection both to the town of West Terre Haute and the area agricultural acreage.

Mr. Chairman, agricultural, private property damage and loss of life due to the consistently flooding Wabash River is now a matter of such common knowledge that I hesitate to restate many of the recorded statistics which would portray such widespread and lamentable devastation.

However, for purposes of the record I would recall to the Committee that the town of West Terre Haute has been flooded out for 3 consecutive years. Flood crestings are so frequent and so severe that Terre Haute no longer records flood levels at the 14-foot mark; the 20-foot mark now is the only recorded level. In February of last year floods along the Wabash caused 60 Indiana major highways to become literally impassable thereby totally isolating entire communities.

During the February 1959 flood, expenses and losses both in agriculture and property cost the people of the State of Indiana a computed total of approximately $1,663,000; a total of more than one-half million dollars was spent and lost in the immediate area in and around West Terre Haute, Ind.

Mr. Chairman, this rather staggering tally of expenses and losses describes only those incurred during the February 1959 flood. The 1959 flood has been preceded by 22 major Wabash River floodings, 9 within the last 13 years.

As I stated before the distinguished Subcommittee on Public Works of the House Committee on Appropriations on April 6, 1960, the spring floods have already begun and presumably Indiana again will be visited, as it has so many times in the past, by a wave of uncontrollable water waste, filth, disease, destruction, and loss of life. An interesting, although tragic fact, Mr. Chairman, is that losses in Hoosier property, agriculture, commerce, transportation, and other economic segments have amounted to over $65 million, over the years, just along the lower reaches of the Wabash.

Mr. Chairman, I urge in the strongest possible terms that the Members of the Committee adopt this amendment for the benefit of that vast number of people who live and work along the lower reaches of the Wabash River and for the benefit of the entire State of Indiana.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, on the Sugar Creek levee, I would say to the gentleman from Indiana, we allowed the request of the engineers for $15,000 for advanced planning. The West Terre Haute project, which by the way was given priority No. 12 by the State flood control land water resources commission, was not budgeted. Indiana has done pretty well in this bill. We allowed 19 budgeted projects in Indiana for a total of about $14 million. We added the Whitewater River study and planning for the Cannelton lock and dam, both of which were unbudgeted and were higher on the State's priority list. So, Mr. Chairman, I rest my case and ask for a vote on the gentleman's amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WAMPLER].

The question was taken, and on a division (demanded by Mr. WAMPLER), there were—ayes 17, noes 50.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GOODELL: On page 4, line 16, strike out "$662,622,300" and insert in lieu thereof "$658,092,300" and on page 5, line 8, insert *"Provided further,* That none of the funds in this paragraph appropriated shall be used for the construction of the Allegheny River Reservoir in Pennsylvania and New York."

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment on the ground that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. BOGGS). The Chair has looked at the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York, which reads as follows:

On page 4, line 16, strike out "$662,622,300" and insert in lieu thereof "$658,092,300" and on page 5, line 8, insert *"Provided further,* "That none of the funds in this paragraph appropriated shall be used for the construction of the Allegheny River Reservoir in Pennsylvania and New York.

The proviso is, obviously, a limitation on an appropriation bill. The point of order, therefore, is overruled.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, at the outset let me make clear that I am not opposed to a flood control project on the Allegheny River. That issue is not involved in this controversy. This issue has revolved for a long time between the Kinzua Dam being constructed here or nothing at all.

Three years ago Dr. Arthur Morgan, former TVA chairman, and former chief engineer of the Pueblo project in Colorado, and of the Miami Ohio conservancy project, began a study of this area because the Kinzua project would confiscate the heartland of the Seneca Nation. His objective was to determine if there was another feasible way of doing this for the same or less money. As he progressed in his studies the Congress became interested. They ultimately became so interested and he had so many good points to present that they ordered that there be a study to see if his proposal was feasible. This is the study that these gentleman talk about when they say that this project has been studied to death. The result of that study confirmed that the Conewango project was feasible; that it was a good project as far as the program of flood control was concerned and water augmentation. There are two main purposes of this project. One is flood control in seasons of high water. In that respect Dr. Morgan contends that his program would do a complete job. It would protect against any floodwaters 100 percent of the maximum probable floods. The other objective is low water augmentation. Conewango would clearly store three times as much water for this purpose as Kinzua.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODELL. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I appreciate very much the remarks the gentleman has made on this situation, because Dr. Morgan, to whom he refers, is one of the outstanding and distinguished citizens of my district. The gentleman made reference to the fine work he did as engineer in what has been recognized as the most effective flood control project in existence; that is, the Miami conservancy, which protected the great Miami Valley from floods. The doctor originated those plans. We have great respect for him, and I have great respect for the gentleman in backing up his position and I shall vote for the gentleman's proposition.

Mr. GOODELL. I thank the gentleman and I might say that I was told by a prominent authority in the flood control field, with reference to the project the gentleman mentioned, the Miami project, that when Dr. Morgan planned it the Army engineer in charge of the Ohio River division issued a special publication condemning flood control reservoirs in general and the Miami system in particular.

Dr. Morgan's plan was adopted eventually and it is, I understand, a model system for the entire country today. I thank the gentleman for his support.

The main purposes are flood control and low water augmentation. The study made by TAMS confirmed that Dr. Morgan's program was feasible. It would guarantee 100 percent flood control. The Army Engineers' plan would protect only 43 percent. The study confirmed Dr. Morgan's contention that Conewango would store three times the amount of water. They contend that this whole TAMS report has condemned the Conewango project. In fact, the report confirms the feasibility of the project. I am not an expert. I do not know whether what Dr. Morgan says is correct or not, but to say that his contentions have been studied is false. I quote Dr. Morgan when he was told by TAMS that they would not look into his particular project to run water through the Cattaraugus Creek. He stated:

I continued my inquiry and turned up other possibilities so much superior to make my earlier studies obsolete. When I asked fhe Tippetts engineers to look into it further, they replied that they did not have time to do so. They never made a general study of the situation, never qualified themselves to pass on the major limitation.

In connection with this water storage, the Chief of Army Engineers last fall himself said that there was going to be a critical water shortage in this Ohio River Basin by 1980, but we are choosing at this time to construct a project which will store only one-third what the Conewango project would store if what Dr. Morgan says is true. And Dr. Morgan has documented his conviction that the Conewango would cost $105 million as compared to Kinzua's more than $120 million.

It is not my contention to say that Dr. Morgan is right and the Corps is wrong; I simply say that with the public interest that is involved here Dr. Morgan deserves to have his claims studied; the residents of the Conewango Valley deserve an impartial study; and the Seneca Indians deserve such a study. The Congress should order such a study. Last year the House of Representatives and this great committee ordered such a study. It was the feeling after looking over these reports, that it was necessary, that there should be a further study; and the committee prevailed in that respect. Then the Senate eliminated that particular proviso. The project continued, but the project is in its very infancy, its preliminary stages; it has not gotten into any construction which cannot be essentially reversed for a small amount of money.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODELL. The gentleman can get time in his own right. I cannot yield at the moment.

With reference to the Indian question, and this is critical: We owe it to these Indians to make a fair, a full study before we take the heart out of their land. It is bad enough in this age of materialism for our people to lose faith to the degree that they put a price tag on honor, that because it costs a little more or because it is a little more expedient we will not do it to save the honor of George Washington, to save our own honor in our commitments to these Indians. Are we now to mortify the memory of the Father of our Country with a dark deed, born not of dollars but of impatience? We ought to study this alternative proposal. A competent professional engineer tells us there is a better and cheaper way than Kinzua to protect our people from floods. The Corps of Engineers has confirmed that there is a feasible way and that it does do more than the Kinzua; they contend only that it will cost more and the increased cost is not worth it. In this connection, the Chief of the Corps of Army Engineers sent to me in writing last Friday a full comment which, among other things, answered my question about the benefit-cost ratio of Conewango, as follows:

> Basic data are not available to the Corps of Engineers to support a reasonable estimate of costs for the Conewango alternative proposed by Dr. Morgan, and it has not been possible to determine a firm benefit-cost ratio.

They said last Friday there is no sufficient data to say precisely how much the Conewango will cost.

To proceed with the Kinzua project will destroy the whole heartland of the Seneca Indians. It will, I am told, destroy their nation.

Listen to the words of George Washington spoken directly to the Senecas in 1790:

> Your great object seems to be the security of your remaining lands; and I have, therefore, upon this point, meant to be sufficiently strong and clear, that, in future, you cannot be defrauded of your lands; that you possess the right to sell, and the right of refusing to sell, your lands; that, therefore the sale of your lands, in future, will depend entirely upon yourselves.
>
> Remember my words, Senecas.

This is George Washington speaking as President of the United States:

> Continue to be strong in your friendship with the United States and you may rely upon their kindness and protection. If any man bring you evil reports of the intentions of the United States, mark that man as your enemy; for he will deceive you and lead you into trouble. The United States will be true and faithful to their agreement.

Now, there is no contention here that we should refuse to construct a flood control project because of the Indians; if it is necessary and if it is most economical, why, yes, build. But today the decision is in your hands as to whether we should order a study which will give the Indians and the residents of the Conewango Valley a fair deal on the matter. The contention that there has been a previous study which covers the matter is not true.

We today are the sovereign representatives of George Washington in 1960.

We cannot at this stage salve our consciences by saying that it is necessary to break a treaty to protect our own people from floods. In the face of such clear, clean words of honor, spoken by our first President to the proud and stalwart Senecas 170 years ago, can any of us wash our hands and hearts, like Pontius Pilate, with easy rationalizations?

I ask for a favorable vote on my amendment.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL], and ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FENTON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I want to call the attention of the Members of the House that this case has gone to the U.S. district court on January 11, 1957, the U.S. Court of Appeals on January 21, 1957, the U.S. district court on April 14, 1958, the U.S. Court of Appeals on November 25, 1958, and the Supreme Court of the United States on June 15, 1959. The Supreme Court refused to hear the case. So let us have the record clear as far as whether or not the Seneca Indians have had their opportunity in court.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, I regret, more than you can possibly know, that it becomes necessary for me to oppose this proposed amendment. However, I must do so because of the preponderance of testimony developed in our hearings in favor of this reservoir.

I have attended all of the hearings on this particular project.

I listened to many hundreds of witnesses on this bill. I, therefore, believe I am fair in stating that the testimony of the proponents for the Allegheny River Reservoir greatly outweighs the evidence of those opposed.

Now, the chief reasons for opposition to this reservoir is because the Seneca Indians have a treaty dating back to, I believe, 1794, with the United States, and they felt that this treaty should not be broken.

As a matter of fact they have resisted for years the construction of this dam and would not grant the Engineers permission to make a survey. So much so that the Engineers had to go to the Federal court for a decision in the matter.

Now I am sure that no one who is familiar with me will accuse me of not being willing to help our Indians.

Those of you who have served with me on the Interior Subcommittee will attest to what I have at least tried to accomplish for them in their health programs and particularly in tuberculosis.

So I was not one of those who was determined to break a treaty.

Many treaties with Indians from all sections of our country have been changed, some of them having more at stake, if that were possible, than the Seneca Tribe in this instance.

I have already given you a résumé of a study I have had prepared by the Library of Congress.

I had the Library of Congress check on this for me and this is what they say:

> INDIAN TRIBES WHO HAVE BENEFITED FROM DAM CONSTRUCTION
>
> Flathead Indians of Montana: Receive compensation from a private company for use of damsite and flooding of reservation land.
>
> Warmsprings Indians of Oregon: Receive compensation from a private company for use of damsite.
>
> Fort Berthold Indians of North Dakota: Receive compensation from the Federal Government for flooding and other items connected with dam construction.
>
> Nez Perce Indians of Idaho, Warm Spring Indians of Oregon, Umatilla Indians of Oregon, Yakima Indians of Washington: Receive compensation from Federal Government for flooding of fishing sites at Celilo Falls on the Columbia and construction of Dalles Dam.
>
> Wind River Indians of Wyoming: Receive compensation from Federal Government for inundation of reservation land, in connection with Boysen Dam.
>
> Standing Rock Indians and Cheyenne River Indians of South Dakota: Compensation for Oahe Dam on Missouri River.
>
> Lower Brule and Crow Creek Indians of South Dakota: Compensation for Randall Dam on Missouri River.
>
> Fort Peck Indians of Montana: Compensation of Fort Peck Dam on Missouri River.
>
> Crow Indians of Montana: Projected Yellowtail Dam to carry compensation.

The source of the information given by the Library of Congress is taken from the Office of Indian Affairs, Federal Power Commission, and Army Engineers.

I am interested in saving life and preventing property damage.

The people of Pennsylvania towns below the proposed site of the Allegheny Reservoir have had many experiences from recurrent floods.

Surely we must recognize the rights of other Americans in those localities especially when our Indian friends can be recompensed by our Government.

This reservoir project is a unit of the comprehensive plan for flood control and other purposes in the Ohio River Basin and is the key unit in the reservoir system for the protection of the Allegheny Valley, the metropolitan area of Pittsburgh and the upper Ohio Valley.

Now my interest stems from the fact that this comprehensive plan was authorized by Congress in the Flood Control Act of June 22, 1936, again in June 1938, and modified by the Flood Control Act of August 18, 1941.

Over 20 years of recurrent floods has seen, according to the testimony given us, the loss of 36 lives in 1936 and damages of $231,492,000 based on values at the time of flood occurrences—that is 1936 through 1956.

These damages and deaths occurred in the Allegheny Valley below the Allegheny Dam and in the Ohio Valley to the vicinity of Wheeling, W. Va. At least $25 million damage occurred from the last flood. So that over $250 million damages have occurred from 1936 to 1960.

It is estimated that on a basis of present day values the damages would exceed $750 million.

With the construction of this reservoir it is estimated that the city of Warren would have a 100-percent protection. In the 1956 flood Warren had a $4.5 million damage. It would also give substantial protection to Oil City and Franklin because it would control the upstream drainage from those towns.

This is one of a series of dams, to prevent a repetition of the 1936 disaster in the Allegheny and Ohio Valleys, of which 10 have already been constructed and which no opposition was encountered.

Every phase of this project has been explored and studied and its economic justification has been proven.

For over 20 years the Corps of Engineers have been studying this project and alternative plans.

Every one of us concerned with projects in our own districts have to depend upon the Army Engineers recommendations for those projects. They are the ones who, in my opinion, are best qualified to pass on the merits or demerits of a plan. Who are we to pass on a technical problem of engineering?

The opposition would have us believe that the witnesses they brought forth during our hearings in favor of diverting the waters of the Allegheny into Lake Erie were original and the best method. Why bless your hearts that was proposed in 1928—almost 32 years ago—and was considered by the Army Engineers in their early studies of the Allegheny Basin and was discussed in an unpublished report prepared by the Pittsburgh district at that time.

The findings of that report and subsequent reports may be briefed as follows: Diversion for flood-control purposes only is not economically justified; diversion for water power development would be of marginal justification; a major reservoir on the Allegheny River would be required in connection with any effective plan of diversion for flood control or power development; and the Allegheny Reservoir would not preclude the later development of water power by diversion.

So you can see that the diversion to Lake Erie proposition was given a great deal of study 32 years ago and many times since.

Now what other plan was considered? The Army Engineers in their studies of this reservoir considered the construction of smaller reservoirs at the selected site and smaller alternative tributary reservoirs. Comparison of the cost of developing a large volume of storage capacity in the Allegheny Reservoir with smaller volumes located in several tributary reservoirs is illustrated by the present-day costs of existing projects such as Tionesta Creek and East Branch Clarion River Reservoirs, constructed by the Corps of Engineers on tributaries of the Allegheny River. Based on an analysis made last year, storage capacity for the Allegheny Reservoir was indicated to cost $87 per acre-foot, as compared with $106 and $115 for the Tionesta Creek and East Branch Clarion, respectively. To substitute storage capacity equivalent to that in the Allegheny Reservoir in a number of small reservoirs would be more costly and result in substantially less effective control of the floods.

The analyses I just gave you were given me by Gen. J. L. Person, the former Assistant Chief of Engineers for Civil Works, now retired.

General Person is very well qualified to give us his opinion on this reservoir. Before being promoted to Assistant Chief of Engineers he was Chief Engineer for the Ohio Basin and is intimately familiar with all phases of flood protection in that area.

As far as I am concerned I shall take the advice of this fine engineer.

General Person said in summary:

> Based on our studies of possible alternative measures, it appears that the Allegheny Reservoir as now planned provides the most practical solution of the flood problem in the Allegheny Basin. You may be assured that we are attempting to work closely with the Indians in order to arrive at mutually acceptable arrangements.

Mr. Chairman, I sincerely hope that this amendment will be defeated.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 5 minutes, and I ask for recognition.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. ALBERT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I take this time simply to indicate my support of the amendment. It seems to me that a matter of honor involving a treaty of the U.S. Government entered into in 1790 should not be set aside for reasons that are primarily matters of financial consideration. The honor of the United States is, indeed, at stake. More than that, I think the problem of flood control can be met by other means. I am advised—I am not able to evaluate this with precision—that at least one of the defenses of this is that it provides a device for flushing industrial sewage down the rivers. We are involved in a larger program of attempting to clean up the rivers of the Nation. I think we should attack those problems frontally and not defend dams which are located with that in mind, rather than with the larger issues of the public health and safety in mind. Most especially I think the question of honoring a treaty with another nation should be observed at all costs.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, in closing debate on this amendment, I want to refer to page 822 of the hearings, part IV, where we pay tribute to Dr. Morgan. Everybody realizes what a great man he is, what a fine engineer, and what wonderful work he did in the Tennessee Valley. But after all, we must be guided by the Corps of Engineers that are assigned to us in connection with these works. It is from them we gain the knowledge on which we make our decisions.

As late as the 18th of this month we had an official statement from the Chief of Engineers on the testimony of Dr. Morgan. It reads as follows:

STATEMENT BY CHIEF OF ENGINEERS ON STATEMENT AND TESTIMONY BY DR. ARTHUR E. MORGAN CONCERNING ALLEGHENY RESERVOIR AND ALTERNATE PROPOSALS

In a statement, published in the fiscal year 1960 hearings on the public works appropriation bill, I presented to this committee an analysis of the major factors involved in my determination that the Allegheny Reservoir should be built in preference to the alternate proposals advanced by Dr. Morgan. The fact that I did not reply point by point to Dr. Morgan's voluminous argumentative statements, many of which are matters of judgment or opinions, which cannot be positively proven or disproven without expenditure of time and money far in excess of that necessary to arrive at a valid determination in this matter, seems to be taken by Dr. Morgan as verification that his arguments are sound and factual. I cannot, however, agree with his conclusions.

Let me say at the outset that every one of the points raised by Dr. Morgan has been carefully analyzed by members of my staff, and by me personally, and that I have conscientiously weighed all the arguments, both pro and con, before arriving at my decision. I respect Dr. Morgan's professional prestige and, of course, his right to express his opinions. The charges he has made on the competence and integrity of the Corps of Engineers, as well as the engineering firm employed by us to study alternate plans, are without foundation.

The record is so clouded by charges and countercharges, many of which are of small moment, that I would like to clarify the situation by citing a few basic principles that are followed by engineers in arriving at a solution to an engineering problem. The judgment factor is basic in such determinations.

(1) First, it is essential to establish what the project is intended to accomplish. In the case at hand, the primary objectives of the project are to provide flood protection to cities and towns along the lower Allegheny River, and to augment low flows on the river during dry periods. Design requirements are then tentatively established on the basis of examination of all available records, as well as hypothetical determinations of possible storm intensities.

(2) The next step is the examination of available sites which are capable of meeting the design requirements. The various possible sites are only studied to the extent necessary to determine which will accomplish the established objectives at the least cost. It does not follow that every possible site and various combinations thereof must be studied in complete detail to arrive at this determination. For a basin the size of the Allegheny, it would be a most time-consuming, costly, and wasteful procedure. It is in this area that the judgment factor must govern.

(3) Once the relative advantage of a site is established, further efforts are devoted to finalizing design requirements and to extensive investigation of the site selected to develop fully the engineering plans for the project, its estimated cost, and economic justification.

The general principles I have enumerated were followed in our studies of the Allegheny Basin and our initial selection of the Kinzua site. I might add that as early as 1928 the corps considered a plan involving diversion of water into the Conewango Basin and into Lake Erie but found the plan to be of marginal justification. Because of the intensive interest that was generated when Dr. Morgan revived the diversion proposal in 1957, I decided to have an independent appraisal of the relative merits of various possible diversion plans and the authorized Allegheny Reservoir. The firm of Tippetts-Abbett-McCarthy-Stratton was engaged to make the necessary studies. The engineering firm consulted freely with Dr. Morgan during the course of their studies, and studied five plans which they considered would cover the principal possibilities for storage in the Conewango Basin and for diversion into Lake Erie. The results of those studies have been furnished to this committee. In brief, the alternative plans were estimated by the engineering firm to cost from 25 to 38 percent more than the authorized project, would require the taking of from 51 to 108 percent more land, and require the dislocation of from 150 to 180 percent more people.

In my opinion, those studies were accomplished in sufficient detail to establish reasonable estimates of cost for the various plans considered and an adequate basis for comparing their relative merits. This does not mean that these plans were developed with the same degree of detail that is available for the Allegheny Reservoir. For Allegheny Reservoir, complete field investigations and surveys have been made, and essentially all major elements of the project are designed. The cost of developing the project to this stage is in the order of $1.3 million. Obviously five alternate plans, covering a much larger area and involving several major structures, diversion channels necessary to handle vast quantities of water, and many many more dislocations, could not be developed to the same degree of detail that was already available for the authorized project. Such was not possible within the limits of time and money. However, the engineering firm made subsurface investigations to the extent considered necessary for the design of structures and channels and for estimating unit costs, established highway relocations as determined necessary in consultation with State and county highway officials, reviewed land sales in the Conewango Valley as a basis for establishing land costs, and with those data on hand, developed five workable engineering plans.

After this study was completed, Dr. Morgan wrote me a letter in which he stated that in his opinion the cost estimates for the alternate plans were overstated, particularly with respect to highway relocations and unit costs for excavation. I met with Dr. Morgan in the office of the Assistant Secretary of the Army, Mr. Dewey Short, in July 1958 and at that time asked him to give me any facts he might have to support his opinions, which he agreed to do. In October 1958, some 6 months after the engineering firm completed its report, Dr. Morgan came to my office and gave me copies of a memorandum in which he advanced still another proposal, which he called plan 6. This was the first time Dr. Morgan proposed the Conewango-Cattaraugus plan.

In his own words, this was the same plan as the engineering firm's plan 1, except for the outlet into Lake Erie. In effect, he took the engineering design for plan 1, deducted items pertaining to the Silver Creek outlet, and substituted the Cattaraugus Creek outlet which he claimed was superior in all respects. He also deducted certain highway relocation items, which by his standards were not necessary. He then reestimated this combination plan by applying unit costs which were materially lower than those developed by the engineering firm to arrive at his estimated cost for plan 6.

I might add that apparently all this was done on the basis of Dr. Morgan's observations, without the benefit of detailed field investigations and surveys, and even more importantly, without developing a fully coordinated engineering plan. For example, Dr. Morgan established the maximum capacity of the outlet works and the channel from the reservoir to Cattaraugus Creek at 60,000 cubic feet per second and indicated that such a flow or an even greater flow could be carried down that valley with little difficulty. Our studies of Cattaraugus Creek in 1946 showed that the maximum flood of record at Gowanda, N.Y., was 35,900 cubic feet per second on March 17, 1942, when flood damages were experienced at Irving, Sunset Bay, Gowanda, and in the Zoar Valley. Lesser floods also caused damages at these locations in 1956 and 1957. It seems obvious, therefore, that the 60,000 cubic feet per second discharge from the Conewango Reservoir as proposed by Dr. Morgan, combined with postflood flows on Cattaraugus Creek would create a serious flood problem in the Cattaraugus Valley.

After careful review of all of Dr. Morgan's arguments, I could only conclude that his plan 6 could not be constructed at a materially less cost than the engineering firm's plan 1, which was estimated to cost about $142.3 million, or over $31 million more than the authorized project. Accordingly, I see no purpose in spending time and a substantial amount of money to study that proposal in detail as has been suggested by Dr. Morgan.

I have gone to considerable lengths to explain why I have taken my position with respect to Dr. Morgan's plan 6. Unless sufficient additional benefits can be uncovered to justifiy the added cost involved, it is obvious that the cheapest plan which will accomplish the desired objectives should be built. In my opinion, the authorized Allegheny Reservoir is the most economic solution by a wide margin.

On the matter of benefits, Dr. Morgan tells about protecting Pittsburgh from a flood three times as great as would Allegheny (Kinzua) Reservoir and storing three times as much water for flow regulation. However, his plan makes no provision for storing or discharging that amount of water. In my statement to this committee last year, I discussed fully the adequacy of Allegheny Reservoir for flood control and flow regulation. The small amount of annual benefits that can be evaluated by increasing storage capacities for flood control and flow regulation would not justify the added cost involved.

In conclusion, I consider that the matter of alternative plans has been adequately studied, and that the results obtained conclusively established the desirability of proceeding with the authorized project, on which construction has been initiated. I recommend that it be allowed to continue. No useful purpose could be served by further study of Dr. Morgan's plan.

With that I rest my case, Mr. Chairman, and ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GOODELL) there were—ayes 48, noes 74.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the inclusion of funds in this bill for the Dillon Reservoir project is a great personal satisfaction to me, but, more importantly, it is a demonstration on the part of the Appropriations Committee and the President of their interest in this project to provide flood protection in southeastern Ohio. The bill includes the full $4,223,000 recommended by the President for the completion of this $30 million project during the next fiscal year.

For more than 20 years, the Dillon project has been anxiously awaited by the people of Zanesville and the Muskingum River Valley. Each year, as floods have occurred or threatened this populous area, the hope for the completion of the dam has been renewed. At such ominous times, the specter of an uncompleted dam has seemed ironic to families who have witnessed the destruction of their homes and possessions by the raging waters of the uncontrolled Licking River. The recommendation for these funds this year can best be translated into terms which, in fact, recommend the future alleviation of fear, misery, and destruction. These funds will assure the completion of the dam and vast human benefits which it will bring to southeastern Ohio. Our action here today also is a major step in assuring the last project in the flood control envisioned many years ago for the Muskingum Conservancy District, a system of protective dams that has become an internationally admired model for flood control and its byproducts of human betterment through effective land conservation and recreation uses.

I wish to express today the gratitude of the people of southeastern Ohio to the Congress and the President as well as to the many others whose continuing faith in this project over the past two decades has brought it to the verge of reality.

I wish, too, to urge the House to approve this bill containing, in addition to appropriations for the Dillon Reservoir, $15,000 in funds for the initiation of a review by the Corps of Engineers of flood control estimates in the Licking River Valley. In view of the new protection the Dillon Dam offers, previous estimates for this valley are obsolete. The review, estimated to cost $40,000 to complete during the next several years, is, in my opinion, a proper expenditure which will consider the need for long-contemplated local protection plans and other flood control measures.

This bill also contains a recommendation for $250,000 in additional planning funds for the Belleville locks and dam

on the Ohio River. The modernization of the navigation dams on the Ohio is important to the maintenance of progress of the Nation's industry and commerce. This proposed replacement structure at Belleville is part of that vital process and, I believe, fully justifies the expenditure which this bill recommends.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GROSS: On page 4, line 18, after the word "law" strike the remainder of the line and all of lines 19 and 20 and strike the following language in line 21 "hereafter authorized to be appropriated."

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I must respectfully dissent and vigorously dissent from the ruling of the Chair that this language which I sought to have stricken on a point of order, is not as the Chair ruled legislation on an appropriation bill. I insist that it is legislation on an appropriation bill, and the words very clearly show that it is legislation. It is language which authorizes appropriations not previously authorized by law. I ask you to read this language again, which is found on page 4, lines 18 to 21. I will reread it; "which are authorized by a law limiting the amount to be appropriated therefor, except as may be within the limits of the amount now or hereafter"—note the word "hereafter"—and the language continues, "authorized to be appropriated."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. GROSS. I am delighted to yield to my friend, the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Does not that language mean that somebody can come in 25 years from now and proceed to use money out of this fund?

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman is eminently correct.

Mr. TABER. That is what it says.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Does the gentleman from New York or the gentleman from Iowa believe that any money that is appropriated now would not be spent before 20 years? More likely it would be spent in 20 days.

Mr. GROSS. As I was pointing out, the language reads, "hereafter authorized to be appropriated." In other words, somebody at some later time is going to have to determine how the money is to be spent and where it is to be spent. Who is going to make the decision? This is strictly legislation on an appropriation bill and it ought to be stricken. Let me say in closing, Mr. Chairman, if the Members sustain this kind of language in this appropriation bill, they can be prepared for the worst when other appropriation bills come along.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, as previously explained on the gentleman's point of order, the legislative committees in Public Works authorization bills set a monetary limitation on certain river basins within which a number of projects are individually authorized. The purpose of the language in question is to prevent the possibility of appropriating in such a fashion as to set aside these monetary limitations established by the legislative committees. I, therefore, recommend that the amendment be defeated as retention of this language is a desirable control in the appropriations process.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GROSS) there were—ayes 21, noes 76.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

For expenses necessary for the preservation, operation, maintenance, and care of existing river and harbor, flood control, and related works, including such sums as may be necessary for the maintenance of harbor channels provided by a State, municipality, or other public agency, outside of harbor lines, and serving essential needs of general commerce and navigation; financing the United States share of the cost of operation and maintenance of remedial works in the Niagara River; activities of the California Debris Commission; administration of laws pertaining to preservation of navigable waters; surveys and charting of northern and northwestern lakes and connecting waters; clearing and straightening channels; removal of obstructions to navigation; rescue work, and repair, or restoration of flood control projects threatened or destroyed by flood; and not to exceed $1,915,000 for transfer to the Secretary of the Interior for conservation of fish and wildlife as authorized by law; $126,420,000, to remain available until expended.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it is apparent that the Members are not of a mind to approve amendments offered on the floor to add projects to the bill under consideration. I recognize that there is all but an unwritten rule to that effect with respect to the public works appropriation bill.

However, I feel compelled at least to call the Members' attention to a project in my district which has particular merit and which, I hope, will be added to the bill when it is considered by the appropriate committees in the other body.

I speak of the Manistee River and Harbor project. In a report dated December 15, 1959, the Corps of Engineers recommended the following improvements: First, dredging to a depth of 25 feet over the full width of the entrance channel in Lake Michigan, and to a depth of 23 feet in the Manistee River channel; and second, Federal participation in the cost of replacing the Maple Street Bridge over the Manistee River, with local participation.

The Corps of Engineers recommended that local interests participate in the cost of replacing the bridge—under section 6, Public Law 647, 76th Congress, as amended—to the extent of $154,100.

Mr. Chairman, I am glad to say that the people of Manistee have already evidenced their determination and willingness to bear their share of the cost by voting, on April 4, 1960, to authorize the issuance of bonds for that purpose.

Although this project has been recommended by the Corps of Engineers and approved for authorization by the Bureau of the Budget, unfortunately, it has not yet been authorized by the Congress. There is good reason to hope and expect, however, that the project will be included in the authorization bill soon to be reported from the Public Works Committee of the other body.

Mr. Chairman, the improvements recommended in connection with the Manistee River and Harbor project are urgently needed and are already long overdue. Request has been made for planning funds for the project in the amount of $75,000.

I express the hope that appropriate action will be taken in the other body to fulfill that request before the end of this session of Congress.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 12326, the bill pending before the House today, includes a number of projects of considerable importance to the first district, as well as the central west-coast areas of Florida.

A number of these projects have been worked on diligently by local public officials as well as interested citizens and by myself, as Representatives of the First District embracing the counties of Pinellas, Hillsborough, Pasco, and Hernando.

I call attention of the House to those proposed appropriations at this time, which include:

CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS

Tampa Harbor project, $117,000.

Construction of the Intracoastal Waterway, Caloosahatchee to Anclote River, Fla.—continuing, $2 million.

SURVEY FUNDS

Little Manatee River—restudy survey, $12,000.

Ybor and Port Sutton Channels, $6,700—improvements to Tampa Harbor.

Flood control survey, Four-River Basin study—Hillsborough, Withlacoochee, Oklawaha, and Peace River Basins, $100,000.

TAMPA HARBOR PROJECT

The Tampa Harbor project has already been physically completed as of February of this year, and the $117,000 item referred to above is for reimbursement for funds advanced to complete the project, bringing the total Federal appropriation for the Tampa Harbor project, including the $334,000 for the Hillsborough River clearance project to $14,530,000. This means that approximately 50 miles of channel from the Gulf of Mexico to Tampa and Port Tampa involved in this project has been completed to the authorized depth of 34 feet, and width of 400 feet, together with improved turning basins and channel bends. Already the tremendous benefits to the community are being realized in that the 1959 tonnage will approximate 14 million tons with 3,500 vessels entering the port and with anticipated further study growth foreseen. In the last 5 years since the project started, since 1954, the volume of port tonnage has increased over 4 million tons—an increase of approximately 40 percent. In this connection, I am happy to report also that the Examiner for the Interstate Commerce Commission, in his report on the

Tampa import-export rate case recommended that the railroad rate for import-export commodities to the port of Tampa should be reduced and should be at a rate comparable to other gulf ports and we are hoping for favorable action on this matter.

In 1959 the House Public Works Committee, of which I am a member, adopted an appropriate resolution directing the Board of Engineers to review the reports of the Chief Engineer on the Tampa Harbor project with the view of determining the feasibility of modifying the existing project to include Ybor and Port Sutton Channels improvement. Congress appropriated the sum of $27,000 for this survey report and a request of $6,700 was made this year to complete these surveys. Industrial development already resulting from harbor improvements, in that the industries require the availability of adequate shipping facilities, is estimated at over $160 million during the last 5½ years.

There is also under way, as the result of authorization by the Public Works Committee, a survey study on the McKay Bay, Tampa Harbor expansion proposal which would have the effect of doubling the port facilities and survey funds in the amount of some $70,000 which was appropriated for this purpose in fiscal year 1960. This survey is expected to be completed in the near future. Thus, Tampa Harbor promises to be one of the largest and finest ports on the gulf coast.

INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY

The $2 million appropriations for the Intracoastal Waterway, Caloosahatchee to Anclote, Fla., provides for a channel 9 feet deep and 100 feet wide and about 150 miles long, starting south at Ft. Myers and going to the Anclote River at Tarpon Springs, along a series of protected inside waters, bordering on the gulf coast of Florida. The total estimated Federal cost of the project is $8,800,000 for which appropriation was made in the amount of $389,000 for completion of engineering studies in 1959 and $546,000 in 1960 for commencement of construction. This year's appropriation recommended by the President of $2 million will complete four additional segments of this important waterway. The requested $2 million will be applied to the following:

Initiate dredging Alligator Creek to Dona Bay	$800,000
Initiate dredging Dona Bay to Tampa Bay	225,000
Continue dredging between Charlotte Harbor and Alligator Creek	740,000
Engineering and design	100,000
Supervision and administration	135,000
Total	2,000,000

FOUR-RIVER BASIN STUDY

Concerning the Four-River Basin study, Hillsborough, Withlacoochee, Oklawaha, and Peace Rivers, the Army Engineers recommended, in their supplemental budgetary requests, this survey based largely upon the 1959–60 flood disaster, the latter causing an estimated $40 million in damages.

The President, of course, declared the area involved as a national disaster relief area by proclamation on March 23, 1960, and all governing authorities are apparently unanimous in their support of this $100,000 Four-River Basin flood control survey approach.

This survey involves some 14 counties in Florida and my personal visitation of the area thoroughly convinces me of the necessity of proceeding with this matter expeditiously in order to establish a flood control plan to prevent such future disasters to the extent that it is possible.

The Hillsborough River survey resolution was passed on my request by the House Public Works Committee, dated August 14, 1959, and likewise, the Withlacoochee River resolution was passed on the same date, incorporating the 4 prior authorizations.

It is our understanding that the Oklawaha Authority, the Peace River Board, and the governing authorities in the Withlacoochee and Hillsborough areas are wholly in accord with this Four-River Basin study request and likewise have emphasized the absolute necessity for the commencement of this survey. Planning and programing by local, State, and Federal authorities for the control of overflowing water in the area is dependent upon the development of this comprehensive study.

I have requested that the flood control survey be all inclusive and in connection with this have asked that the Senate Public Works Committee include in the omnibus public works bill, which has passed the House, an authorization for inclusion of the following areas as a part of the Four-River Basin study to be included in the $100,000 appropriation made by this pending bill. Those areas include Brooksville, Masaryktown, Cote River, Anclote River, and Lake Tarpon, all of which suffered severe flooding conditions during the 1960 flood disaster.

LITTLE MANATEE

This project was authorized by the 1945 Rivers and Harbors Act and provides for a channel 6 feet deep and 100 feet wide from Tampa Bay to a point 2,700 feet above the railroad bridge at Ruskin, and 75 feet wide in the Marsh Branch with a turning basin 6 feet deep in the Little Manatee River at U.S. Highway 541 and Bridge Ruskin for a total length of 5.4 miles.

The Army Engineers report, as a result of my request that the matter be reconsidered in that the project had been put on the deferred list, that a restudy is justified due to the changes in prospective waterway movements and since the last study in 1952 found the project to lack economic justification. The corps further found that recent evidence of increased use and benefits to be realized from the improvement of the waterway justified the requested funds for this year in the amount of $12,000 to accomplish a restudy of the project to determine its current economic feasibility under present conditions. I am glad that this restudy has been included in this year's appropriations and am hopeful that the restudy will find the project economically feasible so it can be considered for construction money.

The Clerk read as follows:

FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES

For expenses necessary for prosecuting work of flood control, and rescue work, repair, restoration, or maintenance of flood control projects threatened or destroyed by flood, as authorized by law (33 U.S.C. 702a, 702g–1), $69,560,000, of which $171,300 shall be available for development of recreation facilities at existing reservoirs, to remain available until expended.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan: On page 6, line 16, strike out lines 16, 17 and 18.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I know that the general membership of the House recognizes the value of flood control projects and the necessity for flood control projects in this county; certainly I do, for it was my motion which saved many projects last year. However, frequently the membership, I am afraid, overlooks the fact that when you build big dams you greatly help the territory below the dams. Those below get the benefit; the people and counties above the dams have their richest lands taken away and off the tax rolls. Without exception it is their richest lands they lose.

When I first came to Congress, four huge reservoirs had been authorized as one project, for construction in my area, with all the ill effects in my district and the benefits going to a small part of my district, but the major part to adjacent areas. Two of these dams had been built when I came here and of course, the Congress built the other two, against the wishes of the people above the dam.

Now when the Corps of Engineers got these authorizations through and when funds were appropriated, the people at the damsite and above the dams were assured that the Federal Government would help protect the watersheds and would develop the area around the dams, thus inviting use by the general public and partially offsetting the economic loss to the people and to the counties affected.

The dams were built in short order. The damage to areas above the dams was immediate; however, the other part, that which was promised to the people above the dams, has been slow indeed to come as the following statement from the testimony of the Corps of Engineers will show:

Status (Jan. 1, 1960)

	Percent	Completion schedule
Sardis Reservoir	94	June 1970.
Features for primary use	100	
Recreation facilities	37	Do.
Arkabutla Reservoir	90	Indefinite.
Features for primary use	100	
Relocations	77	Do.
Recreation facilities	17	June 1970.
Enid Reservoir	93	Do.
Features for primary use	100	
Recreation facilities	11	Do.
Grenada Reservoir	98	Do.
Features for primary use	100	
Recreation facilities	27	Do.

Now what was recommended this year by the Corps of Engineers and approved by the Bureau of the Budget is no great amount, nor is it for any fancy facilities.

Let us see what would be knocked out if this amendment were adopted.

Sardis Reservoir: Requested funds—$50,000—will be applied to:

Initiate and complete:	
Bituminous road surfacing (damsite)	$19,500
Roads, construction, and bituminous surfacing (damsite)	2,900
Parking areas, construction, and bituminous surfacing (damsite)	7,600
Comfort station (damsite)	12,000
Family camping facilities (various locations)	800
Engineering and design	3,000
Supervision and administration	4,200
Total	50,000

Visitation at Sardis Reservoir amounted to 922,500 visitor-days in 1958 which is an increase of 109,500 over 1957. Public use areas and facilities in vicinity of dam are extremely overcrowded and wholly inadequate, necessitating continued expansion. Requested funds are to continue the established program designed to meet demonstrated needs. Attendance for first 10 months of 1959 was 1,229,000. Total for fiscal year 1961 is expected to reach 1,500,000.

Arkabutla Reservoir: Requested funds—$70,000—will be applied to:

Initiate and complete:	
Parking areas and roads, bituminous surfacing (damsite)	$38,600
Parking area construction, and gravel surfacing (damsite)	600
Road construction and gravel surfacing (damsite)	600
Site preparation (various locations)	1,000
Guardrail (damsite)	1,000
Launching ramp (damsite)	11,400
Family camping facilities (various locations)	3,700
Comfort station (damsite)	3,100
Engineering and design	4,100
Supervision and administration	5,900
Total	70,000

Visitation at Arkabutla Reservoir amounted to 261,300 visitor-days in 1958, which is an increase of 7,300 over 1957. Public use areas and facilities in vicinity of dam are extremely overcrowded and wholly inadequate, necessitating continued expansion. Requested funds are to continue the established program designed to meet demonstrated needs. Attendance for first 10 months of 1959 was 276,000. Total for fiscal year 1961 is expected to reach 400,000.

Enid Reservoir: Requested funds will be applied to:

Initiate and complete:	
Bituminous road surfacing (Persimmon Hill)	$13,700
Comfort station (includes water and power) (damsite)	10,000
Tent and trailer campground (damsite)	5,000
Well (hand pump) (damsite)	500
Family camping facilities (various locations)	4,200
Ski ramp (damsite)	2,000
Parking areas, construction and gravel surfacing (damsite and Persimmon Hill)	1,600
Initiate and complete—Continued	
Parking areas, bituminous surfacing (damsite and Persimmon Hill)	$1,200
Site preparation (various locations)	4,600
Engineering and design	3,000
Supervision and administration	4,200
Total	50,000

Visitation at Enid Reservoir amounted to 426,100 visitor-days in 1958. Public use areas and facilities in vicinity of dam are extremely overcrowded and wholly inadequate, necessitating continued expansion. Requested funds are to continue the established program designed to meet demonstrated needs. Attendance for first 10 months of 1959 was 379,000. Total for fiscal year 1961 is expected to reach 600,000.

Grenada Reservoir: Requested funds—$30,000—will be applied to:

Initiate and complete:	
Road construction and bituminous surfacing (damsite)	$15,900
Parking areas, construction and bituminous surfacing (damsite and Grenada Landing)	8,100
Family camping facilities (various locations)	1,700
Engineering and design	1,800
Supervision and administration	2,500
Total	30,000

Visitation at Grenada Reservoir amounted to 1,248,300 visitor-days in 1958, which is an increase of 146,300 over 1957. Public use areas and facilities in vicinity of dam are extremely overcrowded and wholly inadequate, necessitating continued expansion. Requested funds are to continue the established program designed to meet demonstrated needs. Attendance for first 10 months of 1959 was 1,241,000. Total for fiscal year 1961 expected to reach 1,375,000.

Now I have pointed out that this amendment would break faith with the people and counties in the area. Also may I add, we would be failing to provide a minimum of convenience to these 3½ million visitors, including protection of public health.

If this amendment were adopted it would not save a dollar. This amendment would merely make this money available for further flood projects or more expensive flood projects. Then we would have to make further expenditures to alleviate the conditions adjacent to the dams and above them.

What is involved here in this section of the country where you do not have park services like you have in other areas? Where you do not have forestry park service? Such national parks as exist in this area have to be provided by the Corps of Engineers. All that is here involved are merely short stretches of road and comfort stations for the people who visit the area. Last year we had some 3½ million people who visited this area. To not provide in this section the same type of comfort for American citizens who visit these areas would not be in keeping with what is done in other areas.

Again, if the amendment were accepted the Corps would have the money available for further flood control works. However, remember there is already $69-million plus for worthwhile flood control projects. It should be remembered that when these reservoirs were established the people in these areas were assured that the Government would try to make the project one with which we could live; that the Government would try to offset some of the ill effects. I remind you these items have had the approval of the Corps of Engineers, the President, Budget Bureau, and the committee.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. The gentleman from Mississippi is correct, as always. Years ago the people in these areas where these great lakes were established were assured they would be protected to some degree. I believe that the language we have in the bill is proper for it simply gives to the people in Mississippi an assurance by the Government of what was promised to them years back, and I certainly hope that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan is not agreed to.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. There is a lot of logic to what the gentleman says, is there not? He says they were given assurances years ago they were going to be protected, and now we are going to dump 3 million visitors on them.

Mr. WHITTEN. They are there now.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. All well and good, but in my section of the country we like to let them be cared for by private enterprise.

Mr. WHITTEN. May I say that the attracting of private enterprise into these areas to ease the people's ills will largely depend on the very things we want to do here in affording these minimum facilities in these projects, and any commercial enterprise that might develop would pay the Government for use of Government land.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Your people down there are enterprising, they are thrifty, they are forward looking; the gentleman knows they can make a mint of money out of the resort business.

Mr. WHITTEN. Well, it has been over 10 years, and the Government is still trying to lease most of the area. This development will help the Government to make money by lease.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The Government has been monkeying with it, that is the reason. If you will let your own people do it you will get somewhere.

Mr. WHITTEN. Well, this is only a small part of what was originally promised.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. I have looked into this matter and after quite some study I must say I agree with the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] who, as we all know, is not liberal with the taxpayers' money. He has asked very

little for his district, but he generally gets what he asks for because he is conservative.

Mr. WHITTEN. I thank my friend from Iowa. I trust the amendment will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

For engineering and economic investigations of proposed Federal reclamation projects and studies of water conservation and development plans and activities preliminary to the reconstruction, rehabilitation and betterment, financial adjustment, or extension of existing projects, to remain available until expended, $4,575,000, of which $3,375,000 shall be derived from the reclamation fund and $500,000 shall be derived from the Colorado River development fund: *Provided,* That none of this appropriation shall be used for more than one-half of the cost of an investigation requested by a State, municipality, or other interest: *Provided further,* That $200,000 of this appropriation shall be transferred to the United States Fish and Wildlife Service for studies, investigations, and reports thereon as required by the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 563–565) to provide that wildlife conservation shall receive equal consideration and be coordinated with other features of water-resource development programs of the Bureau of Reclamation.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, upon reading the report I gather the impression that no budgeted investigation project for the Bureau of Reclamation has been disallowed; the only cut has been the $50,000 in the foreign currency fund?

Mr. RABAUT. That is right.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, as a member of the legislative committee which authorizes these public works projects, I have been studying the list of projects set forth in the report on this bill on which funds are appropriated. One of these projects is Decatur Bend cutoff, Iowa, and $155,000 is allocated in construction funds.

I understand that this project is not authorized, and furthermore, it has not been cleared through the regular channels. I also understand that the regular survey report, which is the normal method of submitting such a project to the Congress as in all other civil works projects, has never been made by the Corps of Engineers, which is the procedure other Members have to follow to secure appropriations.

To emphasize the inconsistency in this whole matter, I would like to call attention to remarks in the committee report—page 3—stating that the Appropriations Committee has consistently refused to appropriate "for purely recreational undertakings with no benefits to others than small boat users." The Decatur Bend project is in this category.

I want the RECORD to show, Mr. Chairman, that as a member of the Committee on Public Works, I strongly oppose appropriations for projects which have not been considered by our committee and on which no regular reports have been made by the Corps of Engineers. This committee refused to allow funds for the completion of Devils Kitchen Dam in the Crab Orchard National Wildlife Refuge although the Government has spent over $4 million to date. Over 1½ million persons visited the Crab Orchard Refuge last year and we need the facilities of Devils Kitchen very badly in order to accommodate the millions of visitors, yet we find this committee appropriating money for projects not even authorized by law and denying money for needed projects such as Devils Kitchen. I am calling this matter to the attention of the House in an effort to urge the committee to be a little more consistent and fair to all of us. Thank you very much.

The Clerk read as follows:

CONSTRUCTION AND REHABILITATION

For construction and rehabilitation of authorized reclamation projects or parts thereof (including power transmission facilities) and for other related activities, as authorized by law, to remain available until expended, $166,444,880, of which $90 million shall be derived from the reclamation fund: *Provided,* That no part of this appropriation shall be used to initiate the construction of transmission facilities within those areas covered by power wheeling service contracts which include provision for service to Federal establishments and preferred customers, except those transmission facilities for which construction funds have been heretofore appropriated, those facilities which are necessary to carry out the terms of such contracts or those facilities for which the Secretary of the Interior finds the wheeling agency is unable or unwilling to provide for the integration of Federal projects or for service to a Federal establishment or preferred customer.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Appropriations of the House has recommended a reduction of $1,494,000 in the Interior Department budget as proposed for the fiscal year 1961 in connection with the Columbia Basin project in Washington. On page 27 of the report it is stated that the reason for this action is that at the moment there is no alternative to bringing new construction work on this project to a close until satisfactory amended repayment contracts have been executed.

I had intended at this time to offer an amendment to restore this cut in budgeted funds, but I have been sitting here today watching the fate of similar amendments and, therefore, feel that such action is futile. My only hope is that when this bill goes to the other body it will see fit to make the necessary restoration of funds urgently needed for construction work on the Columbia Basin project and that if it does the House conferees will look favorably on their action for the reasons I would like to place before you at this time.

These reductions, as applied by the committee, and the report bears this out, would stop all work not now under way except for minor activities at Grand Coulee Dam.

The Columbia Basin project is in a critical stage of development. The proposed construction work is entirely within the $281 million expenditure ceiling established by the existing repayment contracts for construction of irrigation works. Certain work, although not at this time under way, is badly needed in order to complete significant facilities important to efficient operation of the project. In light of the irrigation expenditure ceiling and making maximum use of constructed facilities, the Bureau of Reclamation revised its fiscal year 1960 program to reduce the project area from an initially planned 1,029,000 to 479,000 acres. The work scheduled under the fiscal year 1961 budget proposal includes only that development which would utilize canal capacity already existing. A cut of $1.5 million now would further cripple project construction, reduce the project area below 479,000 acres and result in a needless waste of funds already invested.

Now, I believe it is important that these cuts be restored for the following reasons:

First. East High Canal studies: By the end of fiscal year 1960, a total of approximately $900,000 will already have been invested in this work. The necessary studies are nearly one-half completed. Therefore, to suspend activity there at the beginning of fiscal year 1961 would result in the loss of many of the accomplishments to date. Furthermore, a technical nucleus of 25 experienced and carefully trained staff members would be lost. It has taken years to prepare these people for the work they are now doing on East High Canal. Resumption of the work at a later date, even within a year after its cessation, would require expensive reorganization and reacquisition of personnel. In addition, data being developed in the East High studies are essential to completion of amendatory repayment contracts with the three Columbia Basin irrigation districts.

Second. Irrigation Block 23: Development of this block in the South Columbia Basin Irrigation District is covered by the existing repayment contracts with those already in existence. Basic water supply works to serve it are already constructed. Only the lateral system remains to be built. The block is an integral part of the project area and is favorably located with respect to the project's largest city and principal shipping center. This is the only irrigation block scheduled for start of construction in fiscal year 1961 and contains 8,800 acres.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. MAY] has expired.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. MAY] may proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Iowa.

I was speaking on the enlargement of Potholes Canal.

Third. Enlargement of Potholes Canal: Provision for emergency wasteway facilities from Potholes Reservoir is urgent. The proposed work represents a continuation of that already begun. Return flows to the reservoir from project irrigation have been increasing each year with the result that the reservoir may have insufficient storage capacity in event of a major flood. This could result in extensive damage to improvements in or near Moses Lake and Westlake. Restoration of the funds deleted from the program would allow for an additional contract enabling enlargement of an important segment of Potholes Canal in order to provide for carriage of water to serve lands already under development.

Fourth. Operators' quarters, irrigation block 80: Construction of facilities to serve block 80 is now under way. Completion is scheduled for June 1961. Without these proposed dwellings, personnel needed to provide ditchrider service to the area and to insure maximum protection for the Hope Valley and Frenchman Hills pumping plants will not be able to operate.

Fifth. O'Sullivan Dam and Potholes Reservoir rights-of-way: In event of a major emergency, the entire flow of East Low Canal would be routed to Potholes Reservoir. This procedure would result in flooding beyond presently acquired rights-of-way. It is extremely critical that the proposed funds for this purpose be retained.

I urge appropriation of the entire amount of funds requested by the Bureau of Reclamation for the Columbia Basin project in fiscal year 1961.

I again emphasize that what has been cut out here is a budget request of the Department of the Interior.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. MAY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, may I state to the gentlewoman from Washington that I think her statement today is very impressive. She is a very able advocate.

Mrs. MAY. I thank the gentleman.

We have just completed excellent hearings on the Columbia Basin project contract dispute before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs under the able chairmanship of the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL]. As a result it is felt we are soon going to get some place in agreeing on an amendatory repayment contract. Therefore, I urge that you give consideration when the proper time comes to the restoration of this cut.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the position of the gentlewoman from Washington.

Mr. Chairman, as a member of the subcommittee, I wish to point out that the crux of this situation is a tremendous miscalculation on the part of the Bureau of Reclamation in figuring the drainage costs when this project was set up. The project was set up on the assumption that the drainage cost would be a little more than $8 million. Now new estimates put the drainage cost at something more than $44 million. The reason this project is in trouble at this point and the money has been cut out is that new repayment contracts have not been signed. The Bureau of Reclamation is asking that the settlers absorb this additional $36 million in drainage costs. I think you can hardly blame the settlers for not accepting casually such an increase in the cost of their land. I share the hope of the gentlewoman from Washington that this money in the course of the legislative procedure here will be restored.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the bill be dispensed with and that amendments and points of order to the remainder of the bill be now in order.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Does that prevent us offering amendments?

Mr. CANNON. All amendments to the remainder of the bill or points of order to the remainder of the bill now will be in order.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I have an amendment on page 20 and another one over on page 21.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendments will be in order.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, may I ask the chairman of the committee what is the hurry in passing this $4 billion bill?

Mr. CANNON. We are not in a hurry to pass it, but we are reaching the latter part of the afternoon. If we can pass it in a little less time without unnecessary delay, why not do so?

Mr. GROSS. I am not opposed to that, but I think there ought to be adequate time to discuss any phase of any $4 billion bill that comes into the House.

Mr. CANNON. There will be.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, in the discussion of this public works appropriation measure, I cannot let this opportunity pass without calling to your attention the serious flood condition which exists at Great Bend, Kans., the largest city in the western half of the State, located near the point where Wet and Dry Walnut Creeks converge and empty into the Arkansas River. The city of Great Bend has suffered severe floods since the year 1915.

Great Bend has attempted to solve its own problem, and large sums of money have been expended to provide all the protection possible in the form of diking, channel cleaning, and straightening of these three systems. This protection has proven to be inadequate.

Mr. Chairman, authority is available for an investigation of the flood and related water problems along the Arkansas River in Kansas from Great Bend to the Colorado State line, though the President did not include an item in the budget which he presented to the Congress this year for this survey.

Only last fall, there was a most serious flood in the vicinity of Great Bend, leaving many families destitute. The city of Great Bend has been subjected to serious flooding from the Arkansas River and its tributaries for the past several years. I hope and pray that this same condition will not repeat itself in the immediate future.

I have urged that the sum of $30,000 be set aside to be utilized for this study. The Corps of Engineers has stated that from an engineering standpoint, considering this study by itself, without reference to an overall program, it could utilize this amount on this study in the fiscal year 1961.

I urge that this item of $30,000 be included in the public works appropriation measure as passed in the House in order that this work can proceed.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, I would like to compliment the Committee on Appropriations, and support H.R. 12326, which appropriates funds for the Atomic Energy Commission under title III, at pages 20–24 of the bill. The bill contains funds vitally necessary to keep our atomic energy program moving ahead.

However, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Research and Development of the Joint Committee, I would like to speak in favor of two important research projects added by our committee.

I understand that there are no funds in this bill for these two projects, but primarily because time did not permit them to be included in the budget after final action on the AEC Authorization Act.

Project 61–f–8, which was added to the AEC authorization bill by the Joint Committee, and included in Public Law 86–457 as approved by the President on May 13, 1960, authorizes $5,600,000 for construction of a materials research laboratory at the University of Illinois. This laboratory would make possible new research in the critical area of materials, which has been a roadblock in the atomic energy program. Special new materials and alloys are needed, capable of withstanding radiation, to meet special requirements in new atomic energy machines and equipment. The University of Illinois has been doing outstanding work in this field, but a new laboratory is needed in order to bring together the various scientists in different participating departments and make it possible for them to work together. The laboratory would permit increased materials research in the following areas: Solid state physics, theoretical studies, diffusion effects, solid state chemistry, magnetic resonance studies, theory of alloys, physical metallurgy, fundamental diffusion studies, and ceramics, and refractories.

The University of Illinois is eminently qualified to conduct additional work in

this field. The university has on its staff scientists who are leaders in the field of materials research, one of whom is a Nobel Prize winner. Scientists and engineers from a number of departments at the university are available to direct the theoretical and experimental work in this critical field.

The Research Division of the Atomic Energy Commission has repeatedly proposed the University of Illinois materials research facility. Each time the project was eliminated in the Commission's budget review process.

It is estimated that the laboratory would be able to double its output of Ph. D.'s in this critical area where more qualified scientists are urgently needed.

Project 61-f-9, also added by the Joint Committee, but not included in this bill because of shortage of time in the budget process, authorizes $2,200,000 for construction of a radiation laboratory at the University of Notre Dame.

This project has also been proposed several times by the Research Division of the Atomic Energy Commission. Each time it also was eliminated in the Commission's budget review process.

The group presently at Notre Dame has been engaged in basic research in the field of radiation chemistry for over 10 years. The radiation chemistry project at Notre Dame is the largest offsite chemistry project in the Commission's program. The laboratory is recognized as one of the most outstanding in the field, both as a research center and as a training center for graduate students.

The basic work conducted by the Notre Dame group on the effects of nuclear radiation on chemical reactions has had wide applications in many of the Commission's programs. The data developed already has been applied to the solution of problems in the field of power reactors. It has also been used in Commission studies of new applications of radioisotopes and nuclear radiation in the chemical engineering field. The basic research being conducted is also applicable to many fields in the biological sciences and in the study of radiation effects on biological systems.

In order to carry out this research, use will be made of a 2 million electron volt Van de Graaff electrical generator, two cobalt 60 irradiators consisting of 1,200 curies each, X-ray equipment, special research spectrometers, and many pieces of scientific and electronic equipment.

The construction of this laboratory would permit increased research efforts into the effects of radiation, including radioactive fallout, which has been of special concern to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, the Congress, and the public.

In summary, funds for these two projects would permit increased research in the critical areas of atomic materials and radiation effects. The Joint Committee believes them necessary and they have been approved in the Authorization Act, Public Law 86-457, approved by the President on May 13.

It is understandable that time did not permit these two worthy projects to be included in the budget after final action on the Authorization Act, but I am hopeful that funds may be added in the Senate, and agreed to in conference.

AIRCRAFT NUCLEAR PROPULSION PROJECT

I also wish to commend the Appropriations Committee for its decision to support the Atomic Energy Commission's nuclear-propelled-aircraft development program.

Since my last statement here on the atomic aircraft on May 5, 1960, international developments have accented the importance of proceeding with this project. The irascible Khrushchev made it quite clear to us last week that our competition with the Soviets is far from being on a peacetime basis. My conversation with Emelyanov, the man in charge of the Soviets' atomic energy program, during my visit to the Soviet Union last September, made it quite clear to me that one of the important fields of competition we are engaged in is the development of an atomic aircraft. Emelyanov was quite explicit in his statements to me on the importance the Soviets attach to the development of a nuclear aircraft engine.

I would like to invite your attention to some of the realities of the job of developing a nuclear aircraft engine. My purpose in doing this is to allay any thoughts that this job can be completed in a short time. The project is technically extremely difficult. It probably ranks in complexity with the most difficult technical problems we have ever attacked. An understanding of this is important and vital to the successful completion of this work. Accordingly, this work requires stability in the level of its support by the Congress and, foremost, a minimum of administrative interference of the type which has plagued this work in the past.

On May 5, 1960, the Research and Development Subcommittee of which I am chairman, of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, in executive session reviewed the progress of work on the atomic aircraft with the Atomic Energy Commission. Although many of the subjects covered were classified I can report to you that important progress has been made. Many problems remain to be solved but the work thus far performed has relegated most of them from the realm of basic feasibility questions to straightforward engineering problems amenable to direct attack.

As you know, the development of a nuclear aircraft engine is presently proceeding on two engine cycles. One is the direct air cycle which is being developed by General Electric. The other is the indirect cycle, which is based on the use of a liquid metal coolant to transfer the heat energy to the air and which is under development by Pratt & Whitney. The important thing to keep in mind relative to this two-pronged attack is the necessity of proceeding with both phases of the work until sound technical data based on real hardware is available to permit a choice between the two on a sound basis. This decision, I must also caution you, cannot be made on the basis of sound technical data in a matter of a few months. This decision, if it is to be sound, must wait the development of the technical data I referred to which may not be available for a couple of years.

All of these points bring out the importance of recognizing the magnitude of the problems involved in this project and the need for providing the support required for their solution.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, title III at pages 20 to 24 of H.R. 12326 appropriates the funds necessary to keep our atomic energy program in a position of world leadership, both with respect to military and peaceful uses of atomic energy. I would like to commend the distinguished chairman of the committee, Congressman CANNON, and the other members of the committee for their careful consideration and well balanced judgment in the appropriations for the AEC.

There are several projects which the Joint Committee included in the AEC Authorization Act for the coming fiscal year, approved by the President as Public Law 86-457 on May 13, 1960, which are not funded in this bill. I believe the primary reason for the omissions was the short time interval between final approval of the Authorization Act and the consideration of this appropriations bill. But I would like to describe briefly two of the projects considered worthwhile by the Joint Committee and obtain the comments of the Appropriations Committee chairman as to his position on these projects.

The principal project added by the Joint Committee to Public Law 86-457 was project 61-d-10, $13 million for power reactor plants for the Antarctic. During the hearings before the Joint Committee, representatives of the Navy and AEC testified that replacement and supplemental heat and power sources will be needed at our scientific bases in the Antarctic in the near future. Statistics furnished the committee indicated the extremely high costs of transporting diesel fuel to our bases at McMurdo Sound, Byrd, and Pole stations. In addition, the Navy stated that 17 lives, and equipment valued at $10,500,000, including planes, have been lost in logistic operations in support of these sites in the past 3 years.

AEC has had under development for several years compact and reliable atomic powerplants which could be ready for shipment to the Antarctic by November 1961, the beginning of the short construction season in the Antarctic. Data furnished the committee indicated that the capital costs of the atomic powerplants would be higher, but that the operating costs would be substantially lower, so that total expenditures would be equalized after 1 to 8

years, depending on the site, and thereafter savings would accrue to the Government.

Based on the data presented, the committee concluded that three to five plants, depending on operational requirements, are needed in the immediate future to support our Antarctic operations. The committee believed that the actual number and location of reactors to be constructed under the authorization of Public Law 86-457 should be left to the determination of the Commission, based upon the technical aspects of the reactor plants selected, procurement economics and, in consultation with the Department of Defense, the requirements schedule. Three reactors are contemplated, but more may be possible under the $13 million authorization.

As a result of the hearings, the Joint Committee concluded that construction of atomic powerplants in the Antarctic would result in an immediate savings in lives and equipment, a saving in spending after several years, and would enhance our national prestige by developing the peaceful uses of atomic energy in the Antarctic, where the United States is participating in scientific work with 11 other nations.

Since the hearings by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy on the subject of atomic powerplants for Antarctica, the Joint Committee has received a letter from Mr. Stans, Director of the Bureau of the Budget. This letter indicates that the Bureau has reaffirmed its belief that the Department of Defense should fund these atomic powerplants and has requested the Secretary of Defense to undertake a review of the advantages, economic and otherwise, of atomic powerplants in the Antarctic.

I believe that the Secretary of Defense can readily determine these advantages by reviewing the record of the hearings before the Joint Committee, and by means of technical data from his own staff responsible for support of the Antarctic projects, including Captain Coxe of the Navy, and Dr. Mooney, Deputy Director of the Special Office of Antarctic Projects.

If necessary, I think it should be possible to work out some method of transferring the funds between the two agencies. Since this bill is now before the Congress, I would hope, when it reaches the Senate, that the $13 million recommended by the Joint Committee for the Antarctic atomic powerplants might be added, and later agreed to in conference.

I would like to say a few words also about project 61-h-1, which the committee increased from $4 million to $5 million, a net increase of $1 million for installations for support of biomedical research in atomic energy. In 1957, and again in 1959, the Special Subcommittee on Radiation, of which I am chairman, held full and detailed hearings on the nature of radioactive fallout and its effect on man. These hearings demonstrated that more effort was needed in the biology and medicine program of the AEC to investigate fully and to understand the nature and biological effects of fallout.

For these reason, the Joint Committee recommended adding $1 million additional construction authority for facilities in the biomedical research field. Included in this project are such items as a nuclear reactor to furnish bursts of radiation for the study of the effects of radiation on animals, radio-biological laboratory facilities, animal quarters to study the effects of chronic radiation, and modification of existing facilities in this field.

Because of the short interval of time, it was not possible to include these items in the budget after the action of the Joint Committee, but I hope that this modest increase of $1 million in this important field of vital interest to the public can be added in the Senate and agreed to in conference.

As I stated at the outset, Mr. Chairman, I believe that the Appropriations Committee has fulfilled its duties conscientiously and I support the bill. I hope that these two minor additions can be made in the Senate, as well as the two which Congressman PRICE will discuss, and which I support. If made in the Senate, I hope that these additional construction projects, considered very important by the Joint Committee, may subsequently be agreed to in conference.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan: On page 20, line 14, strike out "official entertainment expenses (not to exceed $30,000)".

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I offer a further amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan: On page 20, line 20, strike out "$4,000 each" and insert "$3,000 each".

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The amendment proposes to reduce the amount that may be paid for two automobiles from $4,000 to $3,000. All other automobiles will be purchased within the regular limitation of $1,500. These two cars are not additions but for necessary replacement of two of the automobiles furnished the Commissioners.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I would like to invite the attention of the Committee to the report accompanying bill, H.R. 12326, the public works appropriations bill for 1961. On page 19, under the heading: "Freeport Harbor, Tex.," I note that the Appropriations Committee recommended deletion of $899,000 budgeted for improvement of that harbor. The report states that the benefits from it are uniquely local in character and the Corps of Engineers has testified that it is likely that the beneficiaries would dredge the harbor themselves if the Federal Government does not do it.

I invite the attention of the Appropriations Committee to the seriously crippling effect of this deletion. The project is not uniquely local any more than are the ports of Texas City, Galveston, Houston, Port Arthur, Brownsville, or Corpus Christi; and to require the citizens of that community to pay for improvements which traditionally have been made by the Federal Government is exceedingly unfair.

I have read the testimony before the committee, and I can understand the committee's conclusion that perhaps local interests would furnish the money if the Federal Government did not. However, I have checked with the witness who gave that impression and he has assured me that he intended no such conclusion to be drawn from his remarks. He points out that the Government has kept competing ports on a competitive basis. It has done so in the cases which I have just mentioned.

Traditionally, the Appropriations Committee has looked with favor on community enterprises in which the local interests do spend some of their own money. I invite to your attention the fact that the navigation district which is concerned with the Freeport Harbor has, in recent years, invested $4 million in dredging the turning basin and in constructing two large docks and transit sheds and in purchasing the necessary equipment to operate them. They did not ask for one cent of Federal aid and now they ask only that they not be penalized in their relationship to competing ports.

This port, incidentally, handled in 1959, 88 foreign and 41 American large cargo ships. Just as is the case in the port of Houston, or Texas City, or Port Arthur, there is a considerable tonnage of oil which is moved in tankers. These vessels have, in recent years, been built larger and with greater draft.

Should the other body see fit to include this budgeted item in the Senate version of the bill now under consideration, I trust that the conference committee will take a careful look at facts which can be furnished to refute the committee's previous conclusions as evidenced by the paragraph on Freeport Harbor in the report.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend members of the committee for directing in their report that up to $2,100 of the funds recommended in the bill for cemeterial expenses be allocated for maintenance of the Federal graves in the Congressional Cemetery, which is located in Southeast Washington, D.C. The budget recommended allocation of only $750 for fiscal year 1961 for the maintenance of the 806 Government burial sites which are scattered throughout nine burial sections in the cemetery.

The Congressional Cemetery was established on April 4, 1807. The cemetery is under the ownership and control of the Washington Parish, Christ Church. From the beginning it was intended that this cemetery would be used in part as a burial ground for Members of Congress

and other officials of the U.S. Government. At the beginning of the 19th century, it was, of course, not feasible to transport human remains long distances for burial. Thus, it was essential that there be a burial ground in the Federal Capital which would be appropriate to receive the remains of Government officials.

The church made a gift of a large number of burial sites to the Federal Government. Three Presidents—John Quincy Adams, William Henry Harrison, and Zachary Taylor—all died in Washington and their remains were taken to, and briefly interred in the Congressional Cemetery pending removal to their home cemeteries. Most of the Senators and Representatives and other high-ranking Government officials who died in Washington prior to the establishment of the Arlington National Cemetery were buried in the Congressional Cemetery. Many of these were later removed to their home cemeteries. There are now in the Congressional Cemetery the remains of about 14 Senators and 42 Members of the House of Representatives.

The establishment of Arlington National Cemetery in 1864 and the development of improved methods to ship remains over long distances terminated the necessity for Government burials to be made at the Congressional Cemetery. No interments have been made in any of the Government-owned lots since 1902. As a result of this situation Congress has tended to lose interest in the Congressional Cemetery. For a time, the Army Memorial Division sent its own personnel into Congressional Cemetery to care for the Government-owned graves. The transportation of these men to and from the Congressional Cemetery obviously made this work expensive, and several years ago, the Army contracted with the superintendent of the Congressional Cemetery for the cutting and trimming of the grass on the Government-owned lots and the filling of any sunken graves. The superintendent of the Alexandria National Cemetery was delegated to straighten and clean and replace headstones when such work was necessary and will continue to do so.

I feel that we are taking appropriate action in making better provisions for the upkeep of the historic Congressional Cemetery and I have inserted the foregoing information with the thought that many Members would be interested in it.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, recent events have made it more evident than ever before that we cannot rely on diplomacy alone to maintain our position of eminence as a world power. It has become more obvious than ever that the only way to negotiate with the Kremlin is from a position of unquestioned strength. The President has stressed the fact time and again that our defenses are based on the maintenance of a balanced military potential. One of the integral factors in such a balanced military system, we have been told by the experts, is the existence of a strong manned aircraft program, and it is becoming ever clearer that the need for such a program will be with us for years to come. We have heard convincing arguments made for the advantages of manned planes which can be projected far into the future—antisubmarine patrol, airborne alert, super high level reconnaissance are only a few.

Our decision must be whether or not to continue in full force a program which will have a direct and important bearing on the future success of our manned aircraft arm and which may well have a tremendous significance in areas of military technology not yet even imaginable. Only last week Deputy Chief of Staff, Lt. Gen. Mark E. Bradley, told an Armed Forces Day audience in Hartford, Conn.:

> The primary reason for the continued use of the bomber is, of course, their capability for launch and recall, as well as their capability for airborne alert.

Noting that he was not directing his remarks to any specific type of aircraft, he said:

> It could be a nuclear type of plane, a mark III type such as the B-70 or something else—if something else is feasible. But whatever its shape and performance, the case for the next generation-manned bomber is obvious. This Nation simply cannot abandon the development of military aircraft.

For Congress to take a chance on anything less than a wholehearted effort in the direction of operational nuclear powered aircraft would have been unthinkable.

I have no doubt that those who opposed continuation of this project were convinced that their action to strike these funds was in the best interests of the Nation's taxpayers. I feel that we have a strong responsibility to look hard at this program to evaluate its efficiency, but I also feel we have been unrealistic in our insistence on demanding to know exactly where and in exactly what fashion the nuclear plane will be used.

General Bradley, you will notice, admittedly said:

> A nuclear type of plane—or something else.

It may be the something else will be more feasible. But if the nuclear type of plane does prove to be the one on which we must depend I would not dare to be on record as having held up the program to develop that plane for one day.

The record shows that this program has been one of starts and stops, of concentrations and cancellations, and Congress has not been blameless in this regard. This may have been unavoidable, but it also seems unavoidable to me now that we must maintain this project. It has been said often before, but it seems to me to have never been more appropriate, that if we must err, at least let us err on the side of strength.

In closing I would like to cite statements made by three eminent authorities on the subject of the nuclear powered aircraft.

Gen. Thomas D. White in a recent issue of the Air University Quarterly stated:

> The military exploitation of airborne nuclear propulsion will provide a significant increase in our future deterrent capability, an increase which must be realized if this capability is to remain effective.

In the same issue of the Air University Quarterly, Lt. Gen. Roscoe C. Wilson, Deputy Chief of Staff, Development, USAF, in writing on aircraft nuclear propulsion, stated:

> The possibility of missions of several days duration permits the effective utilization of as high as 50 percent of the force on air alert. The use of the manned nuclear bomber in a high-endurance weapons system on air alert permits flexible and positive timing, control and target assignment.

Lt. Gen. Robert M. Lee, vice commander of the Air Defense Command, in a speech before the American Ordnance Association on December 2, 1959, in New York City stated:

> Long-range aircraft with great endurance are a needed element of our diversified aerospace force. Many continuing and new roles for manned aircraft can be foreseen. They may be based on airborne missile launching techniques; attack against previously unlocated, hard to locate and movable targets, reconnaissance requirements, and possible participation in local wars.

From an address from General Thomas D. White, before the Institutional USAF Conference on Air Force ROTC Affairs at Maxwell Air Force Base December 9, 1959. Speaking on the Hound Dog and other modern air-launched missiles, General White stated:

> Perhaps of more importance, such weapons when carried by our present bombers and someday by nuclear-powered aircraft of practically unlimited range and endurance will provide our country with the highest degree of flexible and mobile striking power ever achieved. Far-ranging aircraft armed with these weapons will be able to conduct patrols at hundreds of miles per hour. They would be comparable in air coverage to that of a police squad car as measured against a cop on the beat. Such forces would be virtually invulnerable to surprise attack.

From remarks by Lt. Gen. Roscoe C. Wilson, Deputy Chief of Staff, Development, USAF, before the American Ordnance Association meeting in New York City, December 2, 1959. In speaking of the atomic-powered aircraft, General Wilson stated:

> This airplane is still some years in the future, but the promise of unlimited range and resulting operational flexibility keeps us extremely interested in obtaining a capability with this type of propulsion.

General Wilson in a speech before the Aviation Writers Association convention in Washington, D.C., on May 15, 1959, stated:

> Nuclear power will enable us to penetrate enemy territory at low altitudes and high speeds undetected by long-range radars and thus relatively secure from interception by enemy fighters.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair Mr. BOGGS, 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. 12326) 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, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

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.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. GOODELL. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. GOODELL moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back with the following amendment: On page 4, line 16, strike out "$662,622,300" and insert in lieu thereof "$658,092,300"; and on page 5, line 8, insert *"Provided, further,* That none of the funds in this paragraph appropriated shall be used for the construction of the Allegheny River Reservoir in Pennsylvania and New York."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. We cannot have the yeas and nays today.

Mr. PILLION. I am sorry, Mr. Speaker. I withdraw the request.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RABAUT) there were ayes 22, noes 90.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that there is no quorum present, and I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. By unanimous consent, the vote will go over then until tomorrow.

Does the gentleman withdraw his point of order of no quorum?

Mr. GOODELL. Yes, Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the point of order of no quorum.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives has passed the 1961 public works appropriation bill. The bill includes a $1,500,000 appropriation to begin work on the widening and deepening of the Baltimore channel. It also contains the sum of $103,000 for additional studies and planning for improving the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal. Both of these sums are grossly inadequate, if we consider the importance of the projects to which they are assigned.

The urgent necessity for deepening and widening the Baltimore channel and the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal has long been recognized. The increased use of large, deep-draft vessels in world trade makes the improvement of these two vital arteries imperative. The depth of the present Baltimore channel is 39 feet, with a general width of some 600 feet. The Chesapeake and Delaware Canal is presently 27 feet deep, with an average width of 250 feet. The volume of traffic in the canal exceeds the safe capacity of that waterway, and there has been an unfortunate record of long delays, groundings, and collisions.

The U.S. Corps of Engineers, after extensive studies and surveys, has strongly recommended that Baltimore's channel be deepened to 42 feet and widened to 800 feet. The Corps of Engineers has also recommended that the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal be widened to 450 feet and deepened to 35 feet. These improvements would mean tremendous savings to ship operators, and would benefit not only the port of Baltimore, but also the port of Philadelphia, and all others using these waterways.

Congress recognized the need for the improvement of the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal in 1954, when it authorized the deepening of the canal from its present 27-foot depth to a depth of 35 feet, and its widening from 250 to 450 feet. In 1958, Congress also authorized the deepening of the main channel in the Chesapeake Bay and Baltimore Harbor proper from 39 to 42 feet, and the widening of the channels from 600 to 800 feet.

Sufficient funds, however, have never been appropriated for these projects. The Baltimore Harbor project has the highest benefit-to-cost ratio, almost five to one, of any such project in the United States. In addition, the Maryland Port Authority and Maryland industries are spending millions of dollars to improve the facilities of the port. This tremendous expenditure of money and effort will be of limited benefit unless the channel is improved to allow the full range of modern vessels to enter the port and use its facilities.

The world seaport of Baltimore is the largest bulk cargo port in the United States. It is the second largest seaport in the United States in terms of total tonnage of shipping using the port. Baltimore Harbor has the largest combined deep-draft ore carrier and tanker traffic in the United States.

Baltimore's facilities for the handling of bulk cargoes is unequaled in any other port in the United States. The port area contains four huge modern ore piers, three large coalbins, three waterfront grain elevators with more than a 13-million-bushel total capacity and extensive modern facilities for the handling of fertilizer, chemicals, produce, and similar commodities.

The Locust Point Marine Terminal of the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad is the largest privately operated marine terminal in the United States. The terminal yard has a capacity of 3,500 freight cars. There are 10 piers, a grain elevator with storage capacity of 3,800,000 bushels, a latex storage and receiving plant with a capacity of 1,750,000 gallons, and many other facilities. The Sparrows Point plant of the Bethlehem Steel Co. is the largest steel plant in America and the largest tidewater steel plant in the world. This huge plant requires over 30,000 tons of iron ore per day in order to fulfill its annual capacity of over 8 million tons of steel ingots. The list of similar and related port facilities and industrial plants is almost endless. In addition, Baltimore offers the finest facility on the east coast for the repair and servicing of merchant ships. The plants of the Maryland Shipbuilding & Drydock Co. and the Bethlehem Sparrows Point Shipyard make Baltimore one of the major shipbuilding and ship repair centers of the world.

Baltimore's port is unique among North American seaports in that it has two deepwater routes to the sea. The northernmost route is through the upper Chesapeake Bay and thence through the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal to the Delaware Bay. The other route is the southerly course down the Chesapeake Bay to the open ocean at Hampton Roads, Va.

The port of Baltimore, with its maritime and related commercial activities, is the dominant factor in the economy of the entire State of Maryland. The maintenance and expansion of the port is vitally important to the job security of some 600,000 persons employed in the Baltimore metropolitan area. Over one-third of Baltimore's industrial employment of 200,000 is direct port-connected employment. These waterfront industries employ over 65,000 persons who annually earn over $350 million in wages and salaries. Less directly, Baltimore's harbor is responsible for the employment of thousands upon thousands of people in inland areas of our country who work for freight forwarding and handling concerns and the countless industries who depend upon Baltimore as a source of vitally needed raw material.

In the 250 years of its existence, well over a billion tons of cargo from all over the world have flowed through this port in a constant stream, feeding the insatiable raw-material appetite of America's industrial complex. Each year some 6,000 ships carrying over 30 million tons of export-import cargoes serve this inland port. Baltimore has achieved worldwide recognition for its use of modern methods and facilities in cargo handling and its impressive record for safe and speedy servicing of vessels at its piers. The port of Baltimore can berth over 90 cargo-carrying vessels at the same time.

Baltimore offers special handling for specialized cargoes. The bulk sugar pier of the American Sugar Refining Co. has made possible the import of bulk sugar

where previously all sugar had to be shipped in in bags. The new $4 million fruit pier, owned by the Maryland Port Authority, can accommodate 50 freight cars and handle over 4 million bunches of bananas a year. All areas of the port offer integrated rail-to-ship and truck-to-ship piers for fast, efficient handling of cargo.

Maryland's congressional delegation has vigorously urged the adequate financing of port improvements. Last year the needed appropriation was denied because of the President's announced policy of opposing any "new starts" in public works projects.

This year the President's budget recommended $1,500,000 for the Baltimore Channel project, and $103,000 for the C. & D. Canal project. These requests are shortsighted, unrealistic, and woefully inadequate. Experts agree that at least $7 million is needed this year to even begin to ease the Baltimore Channel problem.

The administration's request for $103,000 for the C. & D. Canal project makes even less sense. This amount will only be for some additional planning studies; no construction work will be begun this year. The time has come to stop studying the problem and come to grips with it. The district engineer has stated that $1,200,000 can be effectively used at once to start work on improving the canal.

In addition to their tremendous economic importance, both the canal and the harbor project have particular significance from the standpoint of national defense. Use of the canal saves 286 nautical miles on the trip from Baltimore to Philadelphia. It also provides a protected inland route between the naval bases at Philadelphia and Hampton Roads, Va.

During World War II and the Korean conflict the port of Baltimore was extensively used for the shipment of equipment and munitions to our troops overseas. Our country becomes increasingly more dependent on foreign sources for strategic raw materials—particularly iron ore and petroleum. It is surely in the interest of national security that these materials continue to flow freely through this port.

In 1958, the Public Works Committee authorized $28,161,000 for improvement of the Baltimore Harbor channel. To date not one penny of this money has been spent. It we proceed at the snail's pace indicated by the President's request, it will take 18 years to complete the work.

In April of this year, the Maryland delegation, the chairman of the Maryland Port Authority, and representatives of Maryland industrial and maritime interests, appeared before the Appropriation Committee's Subcommittee on Public Works and testified in detail as to the value and vital importance of these projects, and the need for increased funds.

In spite of the longstanding support of the Corps of Engineers and the overwhelming evidence in support of the request for increased appropriations, the committee did not see fit to grant the increases so earnestly sought. I am sure the committee's decision was strongly influenced by the impending threat of another "no progress is allowed" veto. This opinion is borne out by the fact that the bill, as passed, contains no increases over Presidential recommendations for construction work.

Last year this Congress overrode the President's veto of the 1960 public works appropriation bill. My State received almost nothing from that bill, but I voted to override because I was convinced that the country's best interest would be served by a passage of the bill.

I intend to ask Maryland's Senators to urge their Senate colleagues to increase the appropriation for the port of Baltimore. If they are successful, I believe my colleagues in the House will recognize our need and approve the increased appropriation.

PEACE IS TOO IMPORTANT TO BE LEFT TO THE PRESIDENT AND THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Mr. PORTER. Mr. SPEAKER, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the body of the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, Otto von Bismarck said war was too important to be left to the generals. We in the non-Communist world are presently painfully aware that peace is too important to be left to the generals.

Under the Constitution the conduct of foreign affairs is assigned the President. Peace, however, includes more than foreign affairs. It is an ever-changing totality of relationships, an atmosphere, a climate, and always with a direction. Peace is too important to be left to the President and the Department of State.

Adlai Stevenson said last week that it was "the duty of all thoughtful concerned citizens to help retrieve the situation and to face the hard, inescapable facts."

Last week on the floor of the other body three Members of the minority party expressed their displeasure at the activities of a thoughtful concerned citizen of Cleveland, Ohio, Cyrus Eaton.

Mr. Eaton had just conferred with Khrushchev in Paris following the breakdown of the summit conference. He was accused of meddling in the conduct of American foreign policy through personal meetings with officials of foreign governments.

One member of the other body directed the attention of the Attorney General to Mr. Eaton's activities for possible prosecution under the Logan Act.

I have never met Cyrus Eaton but I wish there were more citizens like him. His five famous Pugwash conferences have brought together scientists and scholars from all over the world. Of lesser magnitude but of more personal importance, Mr. Eaton paid my expenses to an unofficial foothills disarmament conference of parliamentarians from 15 nations in London last February—see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, February 10, 1960, page 2382.

On June 4 and 5 in Stockholm I shall attend another such conference, also at his expense. Mr. Eaton attaches no strings. He wants to help the cause of peace. So do I as best I can. I am not sure that my presence at these conferences will make much difference but I believe, as does Mr. Eaton, that every citizen ought to do whatever he can to prevent the war nobody wants and everybody has reason to fear.

ONE-THIRD OF MY TIME FOR PEACE

When I first campaigned for Congress, I made but one promise. I said I would spend at least one-third of my time doing whatever I could, however little, in the interests of peace. I have kept this pledge and I intend to renew it to my constituents in the campaign this fall.

For the minority members in the other body to suggest prosecution of Cyrus Eaton under the Logan Act is preposterous. Nobody has ever been prosecuted under that legislation since it was enacted in 1799.

The Logan Act provides that any U.S. citizen who, without authority, directly or indirectly has any intercourse with a foreign government or any officer or agent thereof, with intent to influence the conduct of the foreign government in relation to any disputes or controversies with the United States, shall be fined up to $5,000 and/or imprisoned for not more than 3 years.

The only constitutional application, in my opinion, would be where an unauthorized citizen attempted to negotiate with a foreign government with respect to a particular dispute or controversy. It is difficult to conceive of circumstances where any foreign government would undertake to negotiate with an unauthorized citizen with respect to such matters.

The gentlemen in the other body raising this issue, I suspect, are looking to the Logan Act as a means of restricting the efforts of citizens like Cyrus Eaton who believe that peace is too important to be left to the President, the State Department, the generals or anybody else.

The gentlemen in the other body, of course, have a right to differ with the opinions of Cyrus Eaton and to criticize his conduct. I do object, however, to their invoking the Logan Act as a reason for denying Mr. Eaton the right to express his opinions and to meet with whomever he likes.

HOW FAR DOES THE LOGAN ACT GO?

Perhaps these gentlemen would also contend that Adlai Stevenson and several of their colleagues on both sides of the Capitol have violated the Logan Act by meeting with heads of various nations.

Is it their hope that no private citizen and no public officer except from the executive branch will meet with the leaders of other nations and discuss common problems, especially those relating to freedom and peace? If this is their hope, and it seems to be, they should recognize their dream for the fatuous fantasy it is.

Because these gentlemen showed a lack of factual knowledge about Cyrus Eaton,

his opinions, and his career, I am appending to these remarks certain articles about Mr. Eaton. I also refer them to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 105, part 3, page 3014, where the late Senator Langer inserted an article from the Nation of January 31, 1959, about Cyrus Eaton and entitled "Cyrus Eaton: Merchant of Peace."

Communication among nations must increase, not decrease, if we are to attain peace and avoid war. We can disagree profitably. We should not seek a legal pretext for denying others the right to speak and act. In our crusade for peace we need all the help we can get. We have too few thoughtful and concerned citizens like Cyrus Eaton spending their talents, time, and money for world peace.

The following articles make it clear why we should encourage, not discourage, a man like Cyrus Eaton:

[From the Cleveland Plain Dealer, Mar. 6, 1960]

THE EATONS APPRAISE THEIR PEACE CRUSADE—WILL HISTORY NOTE THEIR MISSION?

(By Ted Princiotto)

Cyrus Eaton has been rich at least two or three times in his life but never richer than today.

His personal fortune, running into many millions of dollars, is the largest accumulated in a lifetime of assembling empires of corporate wealth.

He is married to a young, talented and vivacious woman half his age. She has given him zest for the most peculiar of the many controversial roles he has undertaken in his career.

His health is remarkable for a man of 76. He still enjoys horseback riding and skiing and romps through the woods. Not even his multitude of financial activities seems slowed.

With Anne Eaton, the attractive bride he took December 20, 1957, shortly before he became 74, Eaton has still another rich prize—the easing somewhat of world tensions in recent months.

Both he and his wife, who has become a full partner in his peace crusade, believe that the cold war is a little colder and that, to some degree, their crusade for friendlier relations with Soviet Russia has begun to pay off in world dividends.

What will history say of the self-proclaimed mission of the rich man and his pretty, young wife confined to a wheelchair who, like him, is engaged in sweeping intellectual debate?

Will it take note of the efforts of the philosophers of Acadia Farms, the Eaton farm estate in Northfield, Ohio, where, steeped in books and fireside reflections, they concern themselves with world problems?

Will history credit the Eatons as influential patrons of world peace?

Contemporary critics can only speculate.

In the last few years the slowly emerging image of Eaton, the capitalist, embracing the Russian bear, confused many Americans, not to mention the bear.

Eaton's pronouncements, widely publicized, were bound also to stir up dissent. He had two generally unpopular tenets: (1) Russia meant well and could be trusted; (2) the United States was the aggressor in the cold war.

He also praised Communist Russia, its leaders and the people and sharply criticized such popular American institutions as the FBI. Singled out for special attacks was John Foster Dulles, the late Secretary of State.

Such high officials as FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover and former U.S. Attorney General Herbert Brownell were among officials who, in turn, criticized Eaton, House un-American activities probers nipped at his heels with a subpena, which never was served.

A great volume of letters to the editor kept the controversy stirred up in public print.

Then, after returning from their trip to Russia in 1958, both Eaton and his wife took to the stump, making speeches in this country before clubs—controversial speeches.

If little else, this intellectual onslaught from Acadia Farms had many Americans talking about the Eatons and about Russia, world relations, and the danger of war.

Within more recent months some background events of history seem also to have been made. There is meat for history, no doubt, in the largest single enterprise Eaton has undertaken, the world-famous gathering of nuclear scientists in Pugwash, Nova Scotia, the fishing village where Eaton was born.

And it would be difficult to disassociate from the Eaton controversy the visit to the United States last summer by Soviet Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev and the visit President Eisenhower will make to Russia in June.

FAMILIAR SETTING

At snowscaped Acadia Farms, where visits from a bold little chipmunk outside the library window these winter days delight the Eatons and their household staff, the Eatons were asked in an interview to appraise their work to date.

The setting was, the same as when such famous personages as Sir Charles Darwin, grandson of the British naturalist, and Anastas I. Mikoyan, the Deputy Soviet Premier, chatted with the Eatons on visits to Acadia—a comfortable library where, among Eaton's treasures, is a shelf of Darwin won by Eaton as a prize in his youth.

"President Eisenhower's visit to Russia," said Eaton, sitting near the fireplace, "will be a crowning event for our efforts. It will be the great climax.

"He will receive a warm welcome and will be impressed, I am sure, by their great progress."

Eaton first suggested that the American and Soviet leaders exchange visits in an interview with Khrushchev in Moscow on September 1, 1958, on the Eatons' Russian trip. Khrushchev had cut short a vacation to return to Moscow to see the Eatons.

Eaton said he believed the interview and his suggestion to the Soviet Premier were a large factor in events that led to Khrushchev's visit.

"You ought to see the United States," Eaton said he told the Premier. "And he said, 'I would like to see it.' "

Was his suggestion, so far as he knew, the first ever made for Khrushchev to come to this country?

"Yes, I think so—the very first time," Eaton replied.

Correspondents in Moscow cabled back stories of the interview, with mention of Eaton's suggestion. Both the New York Times and the Plain Dealer commented editorially on the Khrushchev-Eaton talks, but neither thought enough of the visit suggestion to explore it in print then.

On other aspects of the interview, the Times commented editorially: "To most of us it will seem a hopeless task that Mr. Eaton attempted in Moscow; to convince the Soviet leader that capitalists really do not want war."

Eaton himself believes he not only planted the seed for the visit but also had succeeded in doing what the Times considered his hopeless task.

"I believe I persuaded him it was untrue that the American economy was geared solely to expenditures for armament," Eaton related in the Plain Dealer interview at his home. "I told him what a tremendous burden in taxes it meant and that Americans do not like taxes."

On one aspect there is no dispute: President Eisenhower, himself, at his August 3, 1959, news conference made it plain it was his own idea to invite the Russian leader.

But the President noted that the idea was not entirely or uniquely his own.

ON ONE POINT CONFIDENT

But on another point the Eatons were confident of results. The nuclear scientists who gathered at Pugwash, they believe, made great contributions to the cause of nuclear disarmament and the temporary ban on nuclear tests.

"The Pugwash conferences for the first time assembled world nuclear scientists and led to world realization of the great destruction that a nuclear war could bring," Eaton said.

It was on December 27, 1954, his 71st birthday, that Eaton announced he was turning his ancestral home at Pugwash into a "Thinkers' Lodge," where at his expense scholars and other thinking men could gather to meditate in rustic quiet.

Pugwash, a hamlet of 500 inhabitants, is a tiny lobster and lumber-shipping village at the mouth of the Pugwash River. The white, frame lodge overlooks the Northumberland Strait. Eaton has made it quite famous. For a number of years it has been a gathering place for business, education and other leading men.

It was in 1957 that the first group of nuclear scientists, from both sides of the Iron and Bamboo Curtains, first met there.

"For several years before," Eaton explained, "we had been host to Pugwash gatherings of scholars."

FIRST INVITATION

He recalled that when the Russians were invited to send a scholar to a 1956 meeting "they sent a very distinguished metallurgist."

He was Alexander M. Samarin, a member of the Academy of Sciences of the U.S.S.R. and assistant director of the academy's institute of metallurgy.

(Jokingly, the Russian advised Americans trying to pronounce his name to say "Submarine.")

"For a Communist," Mrs. Eaton said, "he was a revelation to the rest of us. He didn't have the slightest interest in political ideology. The Russians apparently thought we were going to talk about steel."

Eaton denies the Soviets had anything to do with starting the nuclear conferences, although it was believed by many that Russian propaganda had most to gain by such a gathering.

"Einstein was responsible," Eaton said. "Einstein and Bertrand Russell, the British mathematician and philosopher."

A brief London news item in the New York Times, July 10, 1955, gave Eaton the idea of sponsoring such a conference.

The story told of an appeal by nine eminent scientists, including the late Albert Einstein, calling on nations to forswear was because the hydrogen bomb threatened the existence of mankind.

RUSSELL WAS LEADER

Russell, a Nobel Prize winner, was the leader of the group. Einstein's letter joining in the appeal reached London the day he died in this country in 1955.

The appeal called on scientists from the Communist and free world to join together to drive home to the average man the very real danger of extermination of the human race.

Eaton promptly wrote to Russell, offering to finance such a gathering at Pugwash.

"We couldn't hold it in the United States because they wouldn't permit the Soviets to come," Eaton said. "India, too, had been suggested."

Eaton won out on his suggestion of Pugwash, where on July 6, 1957, the first Pugwash Conference of Nuclear Scientists was assembled with a score of leading scientists present.

The Canadian Government, according to Eaton, had agreed to allow the meetings with the understanding that it relied on me not to have the meeting turn into a platform for anti-West propaganda.

FOUR RUSSIANS IN GROUP

There were four Russians in the group. Among the American physicists was Dr. Leo Szilard, of the University of Chicago, who worked with the late Dr. Enrico Fermi in producing the first nuclear reaction at the university on December 2, 1942.

Communists and non-Communists were a little ill at ease to begin with. The Russians, said Eaton, seemed suspicious.

"They apparently felt, 'Here is a capitalist,' and seemed reluctant," Eaton recalled. "They seemed very wary.

"But Anne, who was there that year," he recounted with a grin, "broke the Iron Curtain."

"Before dinner," Mrs. Eaton related, "one of the Russians offered to wheel me down to the lodge. Later Mr. Eaton and I played croquet with two of them, although neither of them spoke English and at the time neither of us spoke any Russian.

"By the time we were through trying to explain croquet, being helpful to each other, the ice was broken."

UNFORGETTABLE EXPERIENCE

For her the meeting was an unforgettable experience, Mrs. Eaton said.

"Here were many of the men who had to do with the creation of the bomb, sitting together to prevent its use," she observed.

In a formal statement, given worldwide publicity, the scientists said they came to the "unquestioned conclusion" that unrestricted nuclear war would be a disaster of "unprecedented magnitude."

They also held the time had come for scientists to consider "the implications of their own work," in creating the bomb and new nuclear weapons.

Inspired to rhetoric, Eaton said of the first conference: "The moral chain reaction touched off hopefully may affect the future of mankind as profoundly as that first nuclear chain reaction of 15 years ago in the laboratories of the University of Chicago."

The second Eaton-sponsored conference of the scientists was held at Lac Beauport, a ski resort near Quebec City, because the Pugwash lodge lacked central heating. The session was held from March 31 through April 11, 1958.

ANOTHER WARNING

Out of it came another warning of the consequences of a nuclear conflict and agreement that fallout from nuclear tests, in which the United States and Russia had been engaged for 6 years would be responsible for an increase of about 1 percent over the natural incidence of leukemia and bone cancer in the next few decades.

In a period of 30 years, they computed, there would be 100,000 additional cases of these diseases.

In a general war, the group held, "hundreds of millions of people would be killed outright by the blast of heat and by the ionizing radiation at the instant of explosion," whether clean or dirty bombs were used.

Pointed out also was the danger that intervention by a nuclear power into a small war might lead to use of nuclear weapons.

"It was before and after the 1958 conference," Mrs. Eaton said, "that all the good things began to happen."

REDS STOPPED TESTS

"Just before it was when the Russians stopped nuclear testing. Then, later the same year at the Geneva conferences, there was a general understanding on the reliability of methods to detect atomic explosions, a step forward in the negotiations to end tests."

The third Pugwash conference was held in Vienna in September 1958, under the auspices of the Austrian Government. Eaton a cosponsor, on his way home from his Russian trip, addressed the group of 82 men from 22 nations. The fourth conference, still retaining the Pugwash tag, also was held in Austria.

For the fifth, held last August, the scientists, their memberships not always the same, met at Pugwash to begin to point a new finger of danger.

This session assessed the dangers of chemical and biological warfare. The world was told:

"In agreement with the third Pugwash conference in Vienna, we repeat that, in the end, only the absolute prevention of war will preserve human life and civilization in the face of the chemical and biological as well as nuclear weapons.

"No ban on a single type of weapon, no agreement that leaves the general threat of war in existence, can protect mankind sufficiently. We therefore must look forward to a day when the preservation of peace will transcend the ambitions of individual nations."

HISTORY WILL JUDGE

History, too, will assess the value of these warnings.

The Eatons believe their peace mission possibly has been more impressive upon Russians than Americans. They spoke to millions while in Moscow via television.

"I'm sure the Russian people loved her," Eaton said of his wife.

In his native Canada, Eaton long has appeared to be a man of great influence, although he many years ago became an American citizen.

In the volumes of data accumulated by Eaton's aids on the peace program, one of the most recent is gratifying to Eaton.

It is a clipping from the New York Herald Tribune of February 21, headed: "Canada for Red-Style Test Ban." The subhead ran: "Ignores Controls Sought by West."

The story quoted a House of Commons speech by External Affairs Secretary Howard C. Green, in which he said the Canadian Government was opposed to further nuclear tests, period.

The implication was strong that Canada had broken with the U.S. position that, before any test ban, acceptable inspection systems must be agreed upon.

WHY CONTROVERSY?

With the comforts and pleasures of millionaires that are theirs, why have the Eatons troubled to invite controversy by their peace moves?

"I was active in business in both wars," Eaton said. "My only brother, a Canadian, died of wounds in World War I. My son, Cyrus, was a prisoner of war in the last war.

"I saw we did not accomplish what we thought we were accomplishing. I saw the terrible waste."

Another factor, he went on, has been his long association with the University of Chicago, which his benefactor as a youth, John D. Rockefeller, founded with gifts of some $75 million. As a trustee since 1930, Eaton indicated he was close to the university's work in development of the first atomic reaction and also came to know well Dr. Fermi and the other scientists.

His interest in Russia also backtracks to the university and to Samuel N. Harper, son of the university's first president. The son studied Russia and the Russians for 40 years and was a leading scholar on their modern history.

MRS. EATON'S INTEREST

For her part, Mrs. Eaton said her interest stemmed from the writings of Russell and other philosophers and, later, from reading the "Bulletin of Atomic Scientists," circulated among leading men in the field.

From 1948 to 1952, because of an attack of polio, she lived at Warm Springs, Ga. On her return to Cleveland, she resumed an acquaintance with Eaton, whom she had known as a small girl—"the only grownup I knew who was interested in poetry."

Out of their renewed friendship came the marriage that has made a world-famous team of the Eatons.

"Anne and I have been—shall I say, fellow students?—since she was 8 or 9 years old," Eaton said. "We have a great deal in common in books. She is a writer of poetry and possesses literary talent. She was interested in the meetings we were having."

Mrs. Eaton added: "I finally asked him how much of a thinker you had to be to be invited to one of the scholars' meetings at Pugwash. I was invited."

At these meetings she makes people feel at home, Eaton said.

Together, they keep busy in the continuing battle for changes in American policies.

NO BRIDGE, MOVIES, TV

"We have no time for bridge, movies, or television," Eaton said.

Eaton arrives home from his Terminal Tower office with the newspapers of the day early in the evening. By the time they chat, and perhaps have tea, have a late dinner and have read "everything we want to read for the night," it is 11 p.m. and time to retire.

During the day Mrs. Eaton keeps busy answering peace correspondence, with a secretary, and with household affairs. In recent months she has also been speechmaking.

"Both of us, fortunately, enjoy fighting for a cause. Too often, though, only the bad things we say about this country are printed. Mr. Eaton believes in our country and our system, and so do I."

At Acadia Farms, at least, there are two minds of one accord.

[From Current Biography, 1948]

EATON, CYRUS STEPHEN, DECEMBER 27, 1883- ——, FINANCIER

Address: Business, Terminal Tower, Cleveland, Ohio; home, Acadia Farm, Northfield, Ohio.

As one of the partners in the Cleveland (Ohio) investment banking firm of Otis & Co., Cyrus S. Eaton has been a prime mover in the efforts of midwestern financiers to divert U.S. financial power from Wall Street. A holder of utilities, coal, steel, and ore interests, Eaton was among the country's outstanding financial operators until the depression, when he lost most of his assets. Gradually he reintegrated his holdings, and by 1947 was again known as sponsor of the Steep Rock Mines in Ontario, organizer of the compromise which formed the Cleveland Cliffs Corp. Eaton was one of the principals in the SEC investigation of the breach-of-contract suit brought in 1948 by Kaiser-Frazer against Otis & Co., following the withdrawal of the latter from sponsoring a new Kaiser-Frazer stock issue.

Cyrus Eaton's ancestry can be traced to a John Eaton who came from Wiltshire, England, to Salisbury, Mass., about 1640. In 1760, David Eaton, of the fifth generation, left New England to settle in Nova Scotia, there to found the Canadian branch of a family which includes many well-known individuals in the United States and Canada.

Cyrus Stephen Eaton was born in Pugwash, Cumberland County, Nova Scotia, on December 27, 1883, to Joseph Howe and Mary Adelle (MacPherson) Eaton. Originally planning to enter the Baptist ministry, young Eaton studied at Amherst Academy and Woodstock College. When he was 17, he visited his uncle, the Reverend Charles A. Eaton (subsequently, a U.S. Congressman and a U.N. delegate to the San Francisco Conference in 1945), in Cleveland, Ohio. The Reverend Eaton obtained a clerical job for his nephew on the estate of a parishioner, John D. Rockefeller. Eaton later returned to Canada to study and to receive a B.A. degree from McMaster University, Toronto (1905).

The following year Eaton was back in Ohio, where he started to work as an adjuster for the East Ohio Gas Co., "pacifying citizens who objected to having their lawns torn up for gas mains." Later, while he was buying up franchises in the Canadian Northwest for a utilities company, the panic of 1907 wiped out his employers' holdings. Young Eaton, taking up one of the canceled franchises, raised capital and built a powerplant. This marked his entry into the utilities field. In 1912 he began extensive consolidation activities among electric and gas companies in the United States and Canada, eventually amalgamating them into the Continental Gas & Electric Co. He was admitted to partnership in Otis & Co., the Cleveland investment bank, in 1916.

The consolidation of the Lake Shore and Garfield banks with the Cleveland Trust Co. in 1919 was accomplished by Eaton. A subsequent merger of four utilities firms (including the Continental Gas & Electric, of which Eaton was chairman of the board of directors) resulted in the formation of the United Light & Power Co. in 1923, a corporation registered in Maryland, serving 12 Midwestern States, and attaining, by 1929, assets of more than $557 million. The 13 subsidiaries of United Light & Power, as well as various rubber and steel interests of Eaton's, came into the orbit of Continental Shares, Inc., in 1926, when Eaton organized the latter corporation for the issuance of shares. Continental Shares, under the leadership of Eaton as chairman of the board of directors, held assets of more than a hundred million dollars 3 years later.

Against the opposition of eastern steel interests, Eaton gained a toehold in the steel industry in 1925 when he invested $18 million in the financially weakened Trumbull Steel Co. and was gradually able to expand his control. With this firm and other affiliates, such as United Alloy, Corrigan McKinney, and Youngstown Sheet & Tube, Eaton was instrumental in forming the Republic Steel Corp. (later the third largest steel company in the United States) having assets which amounted to $331 million in 1930, the year of its establishment. In the meantime, in 1929, he and W. G. Mather, another Cleveland financier, formed the Cliffs Iron Corp., which had controlling interests in six iron and steel companies. The following year Eaton also acquired important interests in the Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co., as well as large interests in the Firestone and the U.S. Rubber companies. Eaton's original interest, utilities, was not neglected at this time, as he entered into a series of negotiations with Samuel Insull which resulted in the sale of Eaton's shares in Insull's utilities to the latter, who was anxious to hold control of his organization.

An attempt by the Bethlehem Steel Co. to merge with Youngstown Sheet & Tube was bitterly contested by Eaton and his associates, but the moral victory attained when the courts, in 1931, declared the merger illegal, cost Eaton his private fortune, then estimated at a figure between $80 and $100 million. The collateral pledged by Eaton to the Chase National Bank was auctioned off in 1933, with the result that Eaton was left (in Time's words) with "little except his Cleveland securities house, Otis & Co." Through Otis, Eaton began, in the next few years, to reestablish his financial equilibrium.

By 1942 Eaton was able to purchase the Steep Rock Iron Mines, Ltd., in Ontario, the proven ore of which lay under a deep lake, for $20,000. With iron needed for war purposes, Eaton successfully negotiated a $5 million loan through the RFC, while the Canadian Government contributed an equivalent amount for docks, roads, and a railway spur line. Steep Rock ore was marketed by the Cliffs Corp., with the Premium Iron Co., Ltd. (organized by Eaton) acting as middleman and agreeing to purchase all Steep Rock ore for a 10-year period. Under Eaton's direction, a compromise was worked out early in 1947, when the representative of Robert R. Young's Pittston Co. on the board of directors of Cliffs Corp. challenged the management of the latter corporation. The Eaton solution resulted in the Otis banking firm buying Pittston's 34,500 shares in the Cliffs Corp., while the lawsuits challenging the valuation on Cleveland-Cliffs common stock were dropped. The Cliffs Corp., holding about $25 million worth of steel stocks, and the Cleveland-Cliffs Iron Co., with its shipping, ore, and coal interests, were merged to form Cleveland Cliffs Corp., an operating and holding company organized with assets of about $90 million. Eaton was also associated with Young in an attempt to buy the Pullman Co.'s sleeping-car interests in 1945, but their bid was rejected.

Shortly afterward, Otis & Co. sponsored most of the $17 million worth of common stock for the Kaiser-Frazer Automobile Co., and, in 1946, underwrote more than a million shares of the Portsmouth Steel Corp., set up by Eaton to supply Kaiser-Frazer with part of the steel requirements for their automobile production. Eaton, however, withdrew Otis & Co. from further financing of a subsequent Kaiser-Frazer stock issue in February 1948, several hours after a suit had been instituted against the automobile company by one of its stockholders, James F. Masterson. The brief characterized the stock offering as likely to impair the equity of the existent common stock, to remit overly high profits to the underwriters (Otis), and to "dilute" the corporation's capital by the process of stabilizing the market. (The latter statement was in reference to K-F's purchase of more than $10 million worth of the issue on the day before it was placed on the open market.) When a breach of contract suit was entered against Otis & Co. by Kaiser-Frazer, the SEC began an investigation of the entire negotiation. Charges by the various companies involved brought in other firms concerned with the deal, as well as the role of the SEC. Kaiser's assertion that the Masterson suit had been arranged by Eaton was denied by the Cleveland financier. By June the matter had been drawn to the attention of the Senate Banking Committee, which voiced its intention of investigating the conduct of the SEC. "When a chief participant in a transaction (namely the SEC) is pushed into the position of chief investigator of that transaction," said Eaton in reference to the SEC official conducting the inquiry, "it is time for Congress to act."

When a Federal district court ruled in October that the lawyers representing Otis & Co. and its underwriting partners were not obliged to testify in the case, the SEC abandoned its plan to bring proceedings against Eaton. The agency, however, continued its investigation of the stock transaction. Early in November the Eaton firm requested the Federal district court to enjoin the SEC from continuing these hearings, which Otis & Co. contended would be prejudicial to its case in the pending damage suits brought by Kaiser-Frazer.

Eaton, who describes himself as a "humanist," numbers among his friends Professor John Dewey of Columbia University and Dr. A. E. Haydon of the University of Chicago (Haydon dedicated his book, Biography of the Gods, to Cyrus Eaton). The financier has written several pamphlets and magazine articles which explore political and economic issues in the United States. These include "The Third-Term Tradition," in 1940 (although a Republican, Eaton supported the Roosevelt administration); "Investment Banking Competition or Decadence?" (1944); "A New Plan to Reopen the United States Capital Market" (1945). Eaton has been sharply critical of many of the practices of American capitalism. He has fought for open and competitive bidding in utility and railroad financing; he renewed his attack against New York City investment groups, charging that they were preventing Cleveland firms from financing that city's utilities. In the April 1947 issue of the University of Chicago Law Review, Eaton wrote: "The casualness with which we capitalists seem willing, nay, even eager, to invite the collapse of our economic system in almost every industrial dispute for the sole purpose of thwarting labor is utterly incomprehensible * * * capitalism cannot survive without the support of labor." During the coal strike in the winter of 1946 Eaton was active as a behind-the-scenes conciliator. According to news dispatches, he conferred privately with John L. Lewis and with the mine operators in an effort to effect arbitration.

The directorates held by Eaton in the past were on the boards of Republic Steel, Inland Steel, Youngstown Sheet & Tube, the Cleveland Trust Co., and the National Acme Co.; in 1948 he was chairman of the board of directors of the Steep Rock Iron Mines, Ltd., and a director of the Chesapeake & Ohio Railway Co., the Cliffs Corp., Sherwin-Williams Co., the National Refining Co., and the Arlington Mills.

Among Eaton's other posts are trusteeships for Denison University, Chicago University, the Case School of Applied Science, Fenn College, the Cleveland Museum of Natural History, and the Cleveland YMCA. Fond of fine saddle horses and yachting, Eaton belongs to the Chagrin Valley and Summit Hunt Clubs, the Royal Nova Scotia Yacht Squadron, the Glenelg Fishing (Nova Scotia), the Chester and the Liverpool Yacht Clubs. He is also a member of the Union and Mayfield Clubs of Cleveland, and the Metropolitan of New York. Eaton was married to Margaret House in 1907 and is the father of seven children: Margaret Grace, Mary Adelle (Mrs. Fay A. Le Fevre), Elizabeth Ann (Mrs. Lyman H. Butterfield), Anna Bishop, Cyrus Stephen, Augusta Farlee (Mrs. David Hume), and MacPherson. According to P. J. Phelan-Rand, of the New York Sun, the strictly reared Eaton "to this day doesn't smoke, drink, swear, or wear jewelry."

[From Time magazine, Sept. 15, 1958]

TYCOONS—CAPITALIST AND COMMISSAR

Moscow's reddest carpet rolled out last week, not for a visiting Communist, but for a Homburged, blue-suited visitor who looked like what he is: A capitalist tycoon. On hand to greet the TU-104 jet that brought Cleveland industrialist Cyrus S. Eaton (Chesapeake & Ohio Railway, Steep Rock Iron Mines) were crowds of children bearing flowers, and Soviet Minister of Agriculture Vladimir Matskevich bearing official greetings. Three years ago Eaton gave

Matskevich's department a prize Shorthorn bull, which had nobly performed to improve the quality of Russia's herds.

The Russians had another reason to welcome Eaton: As a self-starting elder (74) statesman on a personal campaign for world peace, Eaton had been corresponding with Premier Khrushchev, had been recently praised by Khrushchev for his efforts to soften U.S. policy toward Russia. The Reds were plainly grateful for such help—especially from such a prize specimen of capitalist. At an agricultural fair, Eaton was presented with a gold medal for his great contribution to Russian agriculture. Later he was escorted to the Kremlin for a 1½-hour talk with Khrushchev, whom Eaton found a clean-desk man.

"I have heard," Eaton told the Premier, "the Soviet impression that American industry is in favor of war so that war orders will continue to flow. Speaking solely as a capitalist, we industrialists are not at all happy about spending $40 billion a year for implements of war that, if they had to be used, would mean the destruction of all our property, and our annihilation at the same time. Don't forget that this arms race places a crushing burden of taxation on industry." Khrushchev understood, "because of the expense to us of our own defense effort," but said: "We are being driven most reluctantly to these expenditures." To illustrate the U.S. desire for peace, Eaton told Khrushchev about Industrialist Andrew Carnegie, who amassed a fortune of $500 million, gave a great deal of it away to promote peace. To make this more meaningful, Eaton paused and asked the translator to convert the $500 million into rubles. Added Eaton: "I would like you to think of a man like Andrew Carnegie as being representative of American industrialists."

Later, Capitalist Eaton gave his impression of the Communist leader: "He is a man who is not to be pushed around. You get the idea when you're with him that he's the boss. I have spent most of my life persuading myself that I can read men and their minds. Of Khrushchev I am convinced that he wants peace. For Mind-reader Eaton, the Red boss seemed to have an equally high opinion. As a farewell present, he gave Eaton a troika, an old-fashioned open carriage, and three matched horses, plus a trainer's services for 2 months.

[From Time magazine, Jan. 19, 1959]

KHRUSHCHEV'S FAVORITE CAPITALIST: CYRUS EATON

While junketing around the United States last week, Russia's Deputy Premier Anastas Mikoyan put one courtesy call at the top of his list—a special visit to Cyrus Stephen Eaton, 75, Cleveland multimillionaire and Red Boss Khrushchev's favorite capitalist. Greeting Eaton, Mikoyan cooed, "When Mr. Khrushchev talked about you, his whole face was beaming."

Now in his twilight years, Cyrus Eaton is the archetype of the fading dog-eat-dog capitalist. Tall and slim (5 feet 11 inches, 175 pounds) with frosty blue eyes and arctic white hair, he dresses like Daddy Warbucks (blue suits, gray Homburg) and resides in manorial splendor on huge farms (champion Shorthorn beef cattle) in Ohio and Nova Scotia. His personal wealth is estimated at something like $100 million, and his hard-knuckled grip on U.S. industry extends over a $2 billion empire of iron and steel, railroads, shipping, coal, and paint. Cy Eaton picked up his empire by lone-wolf feats of financial derring-do that have brought him more bitter court fights, proxy wars and Government investigations than almost any businessman of his time.

The son of a Nova Scotia farmer from the herring-heavy shores of Pugwash (population 950), Eaton first thought of entering the ministry but soon changed his mind after a visit to his uncle, who was pastor of Cleveland's Euclid Avenue Baptist Church. One of the parishioners was Standard Oil Tycoon John D. Rockefeller, who gave the 17-year-old youth a job as a clerk on his estate outside Cleveland. Later, he got Eaton a position in a utility company. Eaton learned the business so fast that he was able to build a powerplant in Canada a few years later. By mergers and purchases, he shortly controlled a utilities complex in which $2 billion was invested. By 1925 he was so rich that when he decided to refinance a small steelmaker called Trumbull Steel Co., he could say: "Gentlemen, if you have any doubt about my ability to underwrite the financing, just call the Cleveland Trust Co. and ask whether my check for $20 million will be honored."

Five years later, with Trumbull and other small companies as a base, he founded Republic Steel Corp. as the Nation's third biggest producer. That year he also won control of Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co. Operating from his Cleveland-based Otis & Co., a securities firm, and a maze of holding companies, Eaton's deals were faster than the eye—or most financial experts—could follow. He helped topple Utilityman Samuel Insull by outfoxing him in a deal that cost Insull companies $56 million.

The depression clipped Eaton's wings but not his tongue. Railing at Wall Street and the "New York money ring," he became a New Dealer and prounion, as well as a violent enemy of Ohio's Senator Robert A. Taft because Taft's early isolationism was "a policy as fantastic in theory as it is impossible in practice." Eaton prevented the Taft family from merging Cincinnati's Enquirer with their successful Times-Star by lending the employees $7,600,000 to buy the paper from the management.

During the 1930's and 1940's, Eaton was busy parlaying what he salvaged from the depression into a second fortune even bigger than the first. With the financial help of RFC, Eaton diverted an Ontario river and drained a lake to get his huge Steep Rock iron-ore mine working, went back into steel by forming Portsmouth Steel Corp. with holdings in Detroit Steel and Cleveland-Cliffs Iron, helped that other great RFC beneficiary, Henry J. Kaiser, bankroll his ill-fated auto venture. Then, at a critical moment, Eaton backed out of a deal to underwrite $11.7 million worth of new Kaiser stock. (The court fight lasted four years; characteristically, Cy Eaton won.) One of his biggest deals: helping the late Robert R. Young win control of the New York Central Railroad in return for control of the profitable, coal-hauling Chesapeake & Ohio.

Eaton maintains that "what the world pays most attention to is success," and as a financial success he thinks the world should also listen to his political opinions. Perhaps the world is a little skeptical of them, but there is every reason why Khrushchev should agree. According to Eaton, Secretary of State John Foster Dulles is preaching "insane fanaticism," West German rearmament is "begging for trouble," recognition of Red China is "only common sense," and the U.S. position on Hungary is "stark hypocrisy." Says Eaton: "A truculent trinity of politicians, generals, and journalists are relentlessly driving us to war. * * * The only people in the United States who believe that communism is a menace are the boys on the payroll of the FBI."

POPULATION EXPLOSION

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, in the course of extensive studies undertaken by the Committee on the Judiciary in the field of international migration and immigration into the United States we are paying particular attention to the worldwide problem of natural increase of population.

A foremost authority on that subject, Prof. Philip M. Hauser, chairman of the department of sociology, University of Chicago, has recently made a comprehensive presentation of the population problem when he addressed the Conference on World Population Emergency Campaign held at Princeton, N.J.

I believe that my colleagues in the House will find Professor Hauser's presentation worthy of their attention, and I therefore ask unanimous consent to have his remarks inserted in the RECORD at this point.

POPULATION AND WORLD POLITICS

(By Philip M. Hauser, chairman, department of sociology, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill., presented at the founding Conference of the World Population Emergency Campaign, Princeton, N.J., March 20, 1960)

Population is today receiving more attention than at any time since the publication by Malthus of his famous "An Essay on Population" in 1798. Population problems have become of increasing concern to the United Nations and the specialized agencies, to national governments, to a wide spectrum of public and private organizations, and to the public at large. Some aspects of the problem have received great publicity in the national and international press. Especially is this true of the controversy about birth control, which invokes emotional reaction because moral and religious values are involved. Of all the implications of rapidly growing populations which are under consideration, none is more important than the world political implications. For present and prospective explosive rates of population increase have world political implications which may determine the future way of life, and the very existence, of mankind.

The political implications of world population growth may be considered in two categories: first, the global, and second, the international.

THE GLOBAL

By "the global" is meant the kind of problems that transcend national boundaries—the kinds of problems with which world government, if we had one, would be concerned. A good example of this type of problem is that posed by fallout in nuclear explosions.

The global political problems created by contemporary rates of population increase may be considered in their long-run and short-run aspects.

In the long run the limiting factor to population growth is, without question, the limit of space on this finite planet. Of the some 200 million square miles of surface on this globe, approximately one-fourth is land. Of the land surface, approximately a tenth is arable and another tenth is potentially arable. The population that can be supported on this earth is necessarily a finite one, limited by the approximately 50 million square miles of land surface on the globe.

Since the end of World War II, world population has been increasing at the rate of about 1.7 percent per year. At this rate of growth, let alone the higher rates that are

projected by the United Nations, a population of 1 person for every square foot of land surface on the globe would be reached in less than 800 years.

If in addition to the problem of space alone, is introduced the idea of the capacity of the earth to carry population, that is the capacity as measured by ability of the world to provide food, fibers and other requisites for human life, the longer run implications of present rates of growth become even more compelling. The highest estimate of the population carrying capacity of the globe ever published by a responsible scholar is 50 billion. This calculation, by Harrison Brown, is based on two extreme assumptions. The first is that enough control of solar and nuclear energy could be achieved so that every "thing" needed for human life could economically be captured from the sea, the atmosphere or rock. The second assumption is that mankind would be content to use algae or manufactured yeast as his major foodstuffs. At the present rate of world population increase, this maximum population of 50 billion could be reached well within 200 years.

Projections of this type, of course, do not indicate what will actually come to pass. They are merely arithmetic exercises. But they do serve a useful function. They indicate that the present rate of world population increase cannot possibly be sustained for long. For the less than 800 years which would result in one person per square foot of land surface on the globe, while a long time as measured by an individual life span, is but a mere instant in the time perspective of the evolutionary development of man. And the less than 200 years during which the population would reach the maximum number the earth could support is but a fraction of human history—a time equivalent to that which has elapsed since the drafting of the Constitution of the United States—a period of less than six human generations.

Without question, however, the more urgent problems associated with world population growth are the short run ones. In the short run, the political implications of present global population growth center largely around economic factors, and particularly the world level of living. This is recognized even by those who tend to minimize the problems arising from explosive population growth and who affirm that what is required to deal with present population increase is a more equitable distribution of world resources. A brief analysis of the facts, however, point to a quite different conclusion.

In 1950, drawing on United Nations statistics, the world had an aggregate production of goods and services which permitted a per capita income of $223 per year (adjusted for revised population estimates). The per capita income of North America was $1,100, and that for Europe (excluding the USSR) $380. The hopelessness of effecting an appreciable increase in the average world level of living by means of a more equitable distribution of the world product, is apparent in the answer to the following question: How many people would the aggregate income of the world in 1950 support at the North American or European levels of living?

The total world product of goods and services in 1950 could have supported approximately 500 million persons at the North American level of living; and some 1.5 billion at the European level. The actual world population in 1950 was 2.5 billion. Although this is admittedly an oversimplification of the problem, the difference between these figures may be taken as indicating either world overpopulation in 1950, or of world shortage in the production of goods and services. This kind of arithmetic, rough as it is, adds up to a very significant conclusion: Although a completely equitable distribution of the world's product would raise the level of living of the underprivileged peoples, it would produce a world average living level less than three-fifths that of Europe and only one-fifth that of the United States. An appreciable increase in the level of living of the underdeveloped nations cannot be achieved merely by means of a more equitable distribution of the world's product. On the contrary, what is required, is a tremendous increase in the productivity of most of mankind. But as we shall see, contemporary rates of population growth, make the prospect of raising world productivity, and thereby average world level of living, a dim one indeed. The relationship between population increase and levels of living may be better perceived by an examination of the international implications of population growth.

THE INTERNATIONAL

The international implications of population growth may also be thought of in their long-run and short-run aspects. The long-run problems of individual continents or nations is essentially the same as that of the globe as a whole. At any of the rates of population growth that now exist, or are in prospect on a continental basis, space becomes the ultimate limiting factor. The time required for individual continent or nations to exhaust their living space, will, of course, vary. But in the perspective of either man's development or history, it would in each instance be a relatively short period of time.

Of much more immediate concern than this long-run factor, however, are the short-run international implications of the population increase. The major short-run problems arise from the interplay of the following four factors:

1. The differences in levels of living among the peoples of the world have, in our generation for the first time in the history of man, become felt differences. There are no areas left on the face of the globe that do not feel the differences in levels of living that exist between the have and have-not nations; and that are not insisting on attaining higher living levels plus independence, where independence has not yet been achieved.

2. The limited evidence that is available indicates that the gaps that exist between the have and have-not nations of the world are probably increasing rather than decreasing.

3. The world is experiencing a phenomenally rapid urbanization of population. Moreover, the rate of urbanization during the course of this century, has been, and will continue to be, much more rapid in the economically underdeveloped areas of the world than in the economically advanced areas.

4. We live in a politically bipolar world. The two largest and most powerful combination of nations ever assembled in the history of man—the free bloc led by the United States and the Communist bloc led by the U.S.S.R.—are engaged in an awesome competition on ideological, economic, social, and political fronts. This gigantic struggle is being witnessed by a third group of neutral or uncommitted nations, the allegiance of which is being sought by the two competing blocs.

The interrelationships of these factors help to explain the significant international political implications of contemporary population increases. Let us proceed to an analysis of the play of these factors.

In 1950, North America and Europe combined, with about a fourth of the world's population, had over 70 percent of the world's total income. At the other extreme, Asia, with 53 percent of the world's population had less than 11 percent of the world's income. Per capita annual income in the United States today is well above $2,000, in contrast with India or China where it is well below $100. These great differences in levels of living underline many of present day world tensions that threaten peace.

The gap in levels of living between the have and have-not areas of the world, moreover, is probably increasing. The economically advanced nations have the savings, the technology and the skill relatively rapidly to effect even further increases in productivity and, therefore, in average levels of living. The economically underdeveloped nations, with an inadequate base of savings, technology and skill, if they can increase productivity at all can do so only at much slower rates. The gap between the advantaged and disadvantaged peoples of the world is, therefore, likely to increase rather than decrease during the decades which lie ahead.

This general outlook is further darkened by a consideration of differences in population increase, and the role of population growth in economic development. For the projections of population increase made by the United Nations for the remainder of the century, when considered in relation to differences in levels of living, indicate a remarkable inverse relationship. The lower the level of living, the greater is the prospect of rapid population growth during the remainder of the century. During the fourth quarter of the century, for example, while population in Latin America is estimated to increase by 3.8 percent per year, Asia by 3 percent, and Africa by 2.8 percent, Northern America is slated to increase by only 1.2 percent and Europe (including the U.S.S.R.) by 1 percent per year.

The burden which rapid population increase imposes on the efforts of the economically underdeveloped areas to raise their levels of living may be seen by analyzing prospective population increases in relation to present and prospective national income.

The world as a whole, according to the United Nations "medium" population projections, will increase by 2.1 percent per year in the third quarter of the century, and by 2.6 percent per year in the fourth quarter. That is, world population will increase about 2½-fold during the second half of this century to reach a total of 6.3 billion by 2000. With this population increase, world aggregate income to match the 1950 per capita income of North America must by the year 2000 be increased twelvefold. To match the more modest per capita income of Europe in 1950, world aggregate income by the end of the century must be increased fourfold. A decrease in world population growth to 0.5 percent per year, the rate experienced between 1800 and 1850, would decrease the task of raising the aggregate product of goods and services by 75 to 80 percent.

A similar type of analysis shows that Latin America, with a population increase projected for the remainder of the century at 3.4 percent between 1950 and 1975, and 3.8 percent in the last quarter of the century, would have to increase her product eightfold to match the 1950 European level of living by the year 2000; and 23-fold to match the North American level of living. The projected rates of increase for Africa would require a 13-fold increase in continental income to match the 1950 European level of living by the year 2000, and something like a 38-fold increase to match the North American level of living. Asia, to match the 1950 European level of living by 2000, would, with her prospective rates of population increase, have to increase her 1950 aggregate income by a factor of 21; to match the North American level she would have to increase aggregate income by a factor of 62.

Calculations of this type, rough and oversimplified as they are, nevertheless demonstrate that contemporary and projected rates

of population increase in the economically underdeveloped areas impose impossible burdens upon them in their efforts to raise their levels of living.

This conclusion has a special significance in the context of the politically bipolar world. There is an intense competition between the free and Communist blocs of nations to win the allegiance, or the neutrality, of the uncommitted nations of the world which in large measure are also economically underdeveloped nations. Curiously enough, the world political situation has an interesting population dimension in that about a third of the world's peoples are to be found in each of the groups of nations—the free bloc, the Communist bloc and the neutral bloc, respectively. Since most of the uncommitted peoples are in south and southeast Asia, this area has, in the postwar world situation, assumed major strategic importance.

In the intense struggle, each side is employing powerful weapons. The weapons of the Communist bloc have combined aggression, remarkably effective propaganda (as I have witnessed in Asia) and more recently, and on an increasing scale, economic assistance to the underdeveloped areas. The weapons of the free bloc have been resistance to aggression (this is put differently in the Moscow and Peiping press), counterpropaganda (not too effective as I have also witnessed), and economic aid.

The Communists exploit the wide gap between the levels of living of the have and have-not nations and attribute the blame for the misery of the underprivileged peoples of the world on the "imperialistic," "colonial," and "capitalistic" practices of the have nations. Simultaneously, they insist that the Communist way constitutes the more effective road to higher levels of living. Needless to say the effectiveness of the Communist line is enhanced by the frustration experienced by the underdeveloped peoples in their efforts quickly to raise their levels of living.

The most important contest in the world today, much more important than the annual race for the world baseball championship in the United States, is the race between the free enterprise and the Communist systems to determine which is the more effective way to achieve economic growth. This race is under way on two levels. First, is the contest in economic growth between the United States and the U.S.S.R.—a race which Khrushchev had warned will be won by the U.S.S.R. because of the superiority of the Communist over the free enterprise system. The other is the race between India and China, the most populous nations in the world. Between 1955 and 1975, China may add to her population of about 600 million, some 300 million people; and India may add to her population of 375 million, almost 200 million. Each of these nations is aspiring to raise her level of living, one using the totalitarian Communist method, the other relatively free, democratic methods.

The outcome of these contests will be intently observed by all the underdeveloped nations of the world, including those in Latin America now aligned with the free bloc of nations. Needless to say the results will profoundly affect the ideology, the economic organization and the way of life of all of the underdeveloped nations in the world.

The increasing rate of urbanization, particularly in the economically underdeveloped areas, is also a significant element in the world political situation. For the concentration of population in great urban centers provides an effective base for the expression of discontent and mass frustration. Although urbanism as a way of life is generally associated with the industrialized and wealthier nations, the fact is there are more large cities and more people living in them in Asia, than in either Europe or North America; and that the rate of urbanization, the rate at which the total population is becoming increasingly concentrated in cities, is now greater in the underdeveloped than in the developed areas of the globe. The reason for this, of course, lies in the fact that the developed areas are already reaching maximum levels of urbanization, whereas the underdeveloped areas are in a relatively early stage of the process.

In the economically advanced nations, urbanization is both an antecedent and a consequence of high levels of living. It both makes possible and embodies great increases in technology, skill, and productivity. In the economically underdeveloped areas this is not the case. Large concentrations of urban population are not nearly to the same extent, symbols of man's mastery over nature. They represent more the transfer of poverty from an overpopulated rural countryside to an urban setting. They result more from the push of peoples from low levels of living or internal disorder, than from the pull of the city by reason of economic opportunity and higher living standards. In the 25 years between 1950 and 1975, projections I have made, tied to the United Nations total population projections, indicate that the city populations in Asia could increase by a minimum of two-thirds by reason of total population increase alone; and could triple through the combined effects of total population increase and the continuation of the observed rate of urbanization.

Thus, while the nations of the underdeveloped areas of the world are attempting to improve their miserable urban living conditions, urban populations will continue explosively to increase at rates exceeding that of total population increase. This is a setting conducive to political instability, unrest, and explosive political action—of a type already evident in the politically unstable areas of the globe—in Latin America, in sub-Saharan Africa, in the Near East, and through much of Asia.

It is scarcely necessary to mention that domestic unrest and political instability will not necessarily be contained within national boundaries. In the interdependent and shrinking world in which we live, there are few places left where domestic turmoil may not also constitute serious threats to world peace.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Present and prospective rates of population growth point to crisis possibilities for mankind, both in the long and short runs.

In the long run, neither the more equitable distribution of the world's product, nor the ability of food production to maintain pace with population increase, can resolve the problems created by contemporary and prospective rates of population increase. In the long run, the limiting factor on this finite planet is space.

In the short run, the more equitable distribution of the world's product would merely effect great reductions in the average level of living of the economically advanced nations, while doing little to raise the level of the impoverished peoples of the world. In the short run, the fact that increase in food supply may keep up with increase in population, also fails to resolve the crucial problems. The crises ahead, lie not in possible failure to maintain the present levels of nutrition but, rather, in the prospect of failure to increase this level and other elements in the level of living of the great mass of mankind. The maintenance of present international differentials in levels of living will not prevent domestic governmental instabilities, ease world tensions, nor eliminate the lure of Communism to the impoverished, disillusioned, and frustrated majority of peoples in the world. Only substantial increase in the levels of living of the underprivileged peoples, accompanied by diminution of the gap between the have and have-not nations, can ease the critical international problems with which the world is confronted.

The ability of the economically underdeveloped areas of the world to raise their levels of living will, in large measure, depend on their ability to dampen their rates of population increase. But present and projected rates of population growth in these areas impose impossible burdens upon them in their efforts to achieve higher living standards; and failure to dampen population growth may mean catastrophe, not only to the underdeveloped nations but, also, to the world as a whole.

How is the rate of population increase to be dampened? The answer to this question is readily apparent, particularly in light of the reason for present and prospective explosive rates of population growth.

The population explosion is the result of the great increase in "natural" increase, that is in the excess of births over deaths. The increase in natural increase is the result largely of death control, the great declines in death rates achieved either as byproducts, or the direct result, of technological advance, increased productivity, environmental sanitation, personal hygiene, and modern medicine.

Explosive population growth can be brought under control only by effecting a decrease in natural increase. This is true for the world as a whole, and with differences in phasing, for various individual nations. Solutions to the problems generated by rapid population increase, either in the long run or the short run, must include provision for decrease in the rate of natural increase. Other proposed solutions to the problems posed by rapid population growth, including increased international migration, foreign trade, redistribution of wealth, and the like, hold forth little promise—if any, even in the short run.

There are only three ways to decrease the rate of natural increase: one, by halting rates of decline in the death rate or actually increasing the death rate; two, by decreasing the birth rate; or three, by some combination of both.

It will be readily agreed that a deliberate policy to increase the death rate or to prevent its further decrease, is universally unacceptable. This being the case the first and the third alternatives of decreasing the rate of natural increase, are eliminated. There remains, therefore, as the only means of dampening the rate of population increase, decreasing the birth rate. In brief, to retain, or to continue to experience death control, it becomes necessary to practice birth control.

This conclusion, although it flows directly from the demographic facts of life, has provoked heated debate of the type recently manifest in the press.

There are two internationally wide value systems identified with opposition to the restriction of population growth. One is the Marxist—both the Communist and the non-Communist varieties—which holds that overpopulation is but a manifestation of the imperfections of, and maldistribution of product in, the capitalist order. The other is that of the Roman Catholic Church whose position is often misunderstood. Enlightened leaders of the Roman Catholic Church, including Pope Pius XII, have recognized the need to control population growth not only for biological but, also, for social and economic reasons. Family limitation is condoned by the Roman Catholic Church as an act of "responsible parenthood." But to achieve responsible parenthood the church

approves only methods consistent with her interpretation of the "natural law of God."

The controversy about the acceptable means of birth control has obscured the crucial problem involved that affects global and international policy. The most important thing to be realized about present methods of birth control is, that it is yet to be demonstrated that they are adequate to the task of controlling the birth rate in the economically underdeveloped areas of the globe. The great masses of impoverished mankind have uncontrolled birth rates, not because of the factors at issue in the birth control controversy we are witnessing in this country, but because they have neither the desire, the know-how nor the means to control their birth rate. But the economically underdeveloped nations are becoming increasingly aware of the relation between explosive rates of population increase and their levels of living. India has, for some time, and recently Pakistan, also, has adopted national policies designed to dampen rates of population increase. China has given evidence of concern with the problem, as has also Egypt. Other underdeveloped areas will without question come to grips with the relation between population growth and economic development in the coming years.

The major consideration, then, about birth control in the present world situation is the fact that even if the mass populations of the world had the desire to control their fertility, no really effective methods of accomplishing this objective are yet available. There has been, however, a considerable increase in research and experimentation with improved methods, including the oral contraceptive; and it is likely, on the basis of results achieved to date, that a breakthrough in obtaining birth control means adequate to the task of controlling population increase in the underdeveloped areas, may not be too far off into the future—may perhaps be achieved in less than a decade.

The policy of the Government of the United States on birth control has recently become a matter of national attention. The President has been drawn into the discussion, and he has made the statement that "birth control is no business of the U.S. Government."

This position makes policy sense to the extent that it is interpreted to mean that we have no business forcing our values upon other people. However, it is a position open to serious question when one takes into consideration the fact that the U.S. Government has made "death control" a matter of its business. That is, the U.S. Government maintains and directs very efficient health agencies, including the U.S. Public Health Service, which have contributed materially to effect decreases in the death rates throughout the world. It is doubtful that U.S. governmental policy can for long continue to make its business to export death control without becoming concerned about the problem of birth control. In this connection it is of some interest that Vice President NIXON has recently been quoted as stating that the U.S. Government should help nations, which request it, to obtain means of birth control.

In indicating that birth control was not the business of the U.S. Government, the President expressed the belief that it was a matter for private agencies. Whatever the official position of the U.S. Government on birth control may be, or become, it is clear that voluntary agencies are, and will continue to be, free to contribute what they can to the solution of the serious problems associated with contemporary explosive population increase. A major effort to mobilize private resources to help nations which request birth control aid is under way in the world population emergency campaign. Few opportunities exist to be of as much service to mankind as that represented by support given to this campaign.

Explosive population increase is the product of man's culture-building activities which have directly and indirectly reduced the death rate. It seems reasonable to assume that the mind of man which has achieved remarkable methods of death control will be able to devise effective methods of birth control consistent with his diverse value systems.

THE LATE DR. EDWIN E. WITTE

Mr. KASTENMEIER. 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 Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep regret that I rise to call the attention of the House and the Nation to the passing of Dr. Edwin E. Witte, humanitarian, teacher, and economist on Friday last, May 20, 1960.

His long productive life spent in public service and his many personal contributions to his State and Nation have molded in large measure our present way of life and will serve as a memorial to him. As a teacher at the University of Wisconsin, Dr. Witte was a rare example of humble humanity striving for practical answers to man's problems and pointing out the alternatives to young minds. In joining the scholar's knowledge of economics to the humanitarian's understanding of the needs of the people, he helped bring about approval of the social security system.

Though he frequently disclaimed the appellation "father of social security" which was widely associated with his name, his work as executive director of the President's Committee on Economic Security, under appointment in 1934 by President Franklin D. Roosevelt, was of paramount importance in the development of the Social Security Act. In fact, he is generally credited with having virtually written the Social Security Act.

On March 27, 1957, shortly after Dr. Witte retired as a full-time university professor at Wisconsin, more than 300 persons attended a dinner honoring him. Former Secretary of Labor, Frances Perkins, described how Witte "drove a team of wild horses" in fashioning the Social Security Act. "Those who have watched Witte serve his country and State as well as his university want to tell him in what esteem they hold him," she said.

Dr. Witte had served at various times on the former Wisconsin Labor Relations Board, the Defense Mediation Board, National War Labor Board, Atomic Energy Labor Relations Board, and had assisted innumerable Government agencies, including the State Department, congressional committees and Presidential commissions.

He was a graduate of Watertown High School in my hometown. From 1912 until 1913, he served as a statistician for the State Industrial Commission. Until 1914, he was secretary to Representative John M. Nelson of Madison and in 1917, he became secretary of the Wisconsin Industrial Commission where he remained for 5 years.

In 1922, he was appointed head of Wisconsin's legislative reference library, a post he held until 1933. He originally became associated with the University of Wisconsin as a teaching assistant in the history department in 1919. By 1920, he had become a lecturer in the department of economics and remained at that rank, on a part-time basis, until 1933 when he resigned from his library post to become a full professor of economics.

Besides his Government work, Dr. Witte served as a visiting professor at such universities as Harvard, Washington, California, Hawaii, and the American University of Beirut, Lebanon.

Of the more than 30 Government positions he held during his life, 9 of them full time, he described his activities in Washington heading the Committee on Economic Security as "the most rewarding experience of my life." He also wrote a staggering number of books, booklets, and articles on a wide variety of subjects.

Dr. Witte's career spanned the great years of social turmoil. His contributions not only to the humanitarian legislation developed during his time, but also to the understanding of this legislation, is deeply appreciated by all Americans.

I am sure that the Members of the House and all Americans join me in extending heartfelt sympathy to his wife and family in this bereavement.

A BILL TO GIVE THE PRESIDENT DISCRETIONARY AUTHORITY TO RAISE OR LOWER INCOME TAX RATES FOR PURPOSES OF ECONOMIC STABILIZATION AND TO REDUCE THE FEDERAL DEBT; TO DECLARE A NATIONAL POLICY THAT THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT SHALL INCREASE TAX RATES AS A MEANS OF CHECKING BUSINESS BOOMS AND CURBING INFLATION INSTEAD OF IMPOSING HIGH INTEREST RATES

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill which would give the President discretionary authority to make temporary increases in Federal income taxes in periods of prosperity. The bill would also give the President authority to make temporary reductions in income taxes in recessions or when a recession threatens.

The main purpose of the bill is to do away with the Federal Government's present method of trying to curb economic booms and busts, and check inflation, and to provide a better method for accomplishing these objectives.

ADMINISTRATION IS ASKING FOR A FURTHER INCREASE IN THE DEBT LIMIT

This bill has been prompted at this particular time because the Ways and Means Committee of the House is now considering a new request from the administration to raise the Federal debt limit again. I have proposed this legislation as an alternative. If the bill is passed, it will make a further increase in the Federal debt unnecessary, because it will reduce the Federal debt. It will reduce the Federal debt without costing 98 percent of the American people any more money; actually, in both the long run and the short run, it will cost 98 percent of the American people less money, and it will do a better job of accomplishing the objectives which the present high interest policy is supposed to accomplish.

At the present time, the Federal Government uses what is called monetary controls for these purposes. Specifically, in periods of business expansion, the Federal Government tightens the money supply and raises interest rates in the hope of dampening the expansion. Conversely, when recessions occur, the Government increases the money supply and lowers interest rates in the hope of stimulating business expansion.

RAISING INTEREST RATES IS THE SAME AS INCREASING TAXES, EXCEPT THE REVENUES GO INTO THE POCKETS OF THE WEALTHY FEW INSTEAD OF INTO THE TREASURY

Raising interest rates is precisely the same as raising taxes on all income groups—except that there are at least two notable differences in the final effect of this kind of tax as compared to a regular income tax.

First, the increased revenues from the high interest tax do not go into the Treasury where they can be used to pay the Government's operating expenses and reduce the Federal debt. The revenues go into increased profits for the banks and other financial institutions and into increased incomes for the small minority of very wealthy families. Furthermore, the high interest tax applies to the Treasury itself. It increases the Treasury's cost burden, and thus results in more Federal debt.

The second notable difference between raising interest rates and raising taxes in the normal sense is that the high interest tax effectuates an enormous redistribution of the income. It takes purchasing power out of the pockets of the many and diverts it into the vaults of the few.

To illustrate, the latest Department of Commerce report on personal income, which is for April, shows that personal income from interest has now reached the staggering total of $24.9 billion per year. This represents a jump of $3.8 billion within the last year alone. It is more than double the personal income from interest in 1952, when the Government was pursuing a policy of more reasonable interest rates.

PERSONAL INTEREST INCOME NOW MORE THAN TWICE THE FARM INCOME

To illustrate just what a staggering figure $24.9 billion of personal interest income is, I might point out that this is well over twice the total farm income of the country. We can be sure, however, that far fewer families benefit from personal interest income than benefit from farming. To illustrate, a Federal Reserve survey last year showed that 73 percent of the American families owned not so much as one U.S. savings bond; and 5 percent of the families owned 87 percent of all the U.S. savings bonds. Yet surely U.S. savings bonds are the most widely held of any kind of interest-bearing paper. It would be reasonable to assume, as to the total personal income from interest, that no more than 1 or 2 percent of the families at most benefit, on balance, from an increase in interest rates.

HIGH INTEREST ADDS TO THE PROBLEMS WHICH HIGH INTEREST IS INVOKED TO SOLVE

Assuming that the Government's objectives are good, that it is sincerely trying to aid in economic stability, and trying to prevent inflation in periods of business expansion—there is a question of morality involved when it chooses a method of pursuing these objectives which inevitably taxes the poor to fatten the rich. I will not elaborate this point, however, but will simply call attention to the fact that the method which has been used in recent years, and is now being used, is bad for other reasons. The method of raising interest rates adds to and compounds the very problem which the high interest rates are invoked to meet. In each of the past several so-called boom cycles, the Federal Government has, of course, raised interest rates all along the line. It has raised interest rates on all money for all uses anywhere in the economy. Yet its specific objective has been, not to curb and restrict all economic activity, but to curb and restrict the level of investment in new business capacity. It has sought to restrain investment simply for the reason that the Federal Reserve officials thought that business capacity was expanding at a more rapid rate than consumer demand, and consequently would lead to a greater bust later if not restrained sooner.

So, obviously, the problem which has been met by high interest has two possible solutions. One is to slow down the rate of business expansion, as has been done. The other is to increase consumer demand. But certainly the solution does not lie in reducing consumer demand. Yet that is precisely what the high interest policy has done and will continue to do. By taking purchasing power out of the pockets of 98 percent of the people and putting it into the pockets of 2 percent of the wealthy few, who already have more income than they would spend, the Government is most certainly reducing effective consumer demand.

On every count the high interest policy is a bad policy.

The bill I have introduced would, therefore, declare it to be the public policy of the United States that tax increases shall be made instead of interest rate increases, whenever in the judgment of the President high interest rates would otherwise be necessary. The President would exercise his discretion on the question whether some kind of action is needed. But if he decides some kind of action is needed, he could not choose between the two methods and still comply with the public policy. He would have to raise the tax rates.

The bill applies to both individual income taxes and corporate income taxes. The President could increase, or decrease, the tax rates only within limits, however. He could increase the rates by any amount up to an amount equal to 10 percent of the statutory rates. And he could reduce the rates by any amount up to an amount equal to 10 percent of the statutory rates.

POLITICAL ASPECTS OF THE BILL

The reason for the bill is manifestly in part political, but in larger part, sound management.

The bill is, in part, political in the sense that it is offered as a counterproposal to the administration's new proposal to further increase the Federal debt. Interest rates have now been raised to fantastic heights, and they are near their record peak, even for this administration. If there is enough prosperity and expansionary tendency in the economy to justify the imposition of any such interest rates as we now have, then these things justify paying off a substantial amount of the Federal debt. As I have pointed out, personal income alone from interest has jumped by $3.8 billion within the past 12 months. So, if interest rates were returned only to the level of a year ago, and the people paid the same amount of taxes in regular taxes, instead of the hidden high-interest tax, this would be a minimum of $3.8 billion that could go to debt reduction. Further, I have not even counted the amount of the increased interest income going to the finance companies and the industrial corporations.

The bill is also political in the sense that it would impose an alternative method whereby the administration would execute its political judgment. In passing this bill, Congress would not necessarily agree that it is a good thing for the Federal Government to put the damper on each period of business expansion. That is a judgment which has been made by the administration, and judgment which would continue to be made by the administration. In passing this bill, Congress would, in effect, be saying to the administration that if it wishes to put a damper and a restraint on economic expansion, it must put on the kind of restraint which will benefit all of the people and not just tax the poor for the benefit of the rich. And we would also be saying to the President that he must use a method which will really work—which will really accomplish the purposes which the high interest policy is supposed to accomplish.

REGULAR TAXES WILL HELP IN ECONOMIC STABILIZATION; THE HIGH-INTEREST TAX ONLY TAXES THE POOR TO FATTEN THE RICH AND CAUSES INSTABILITY.

Most of all, however, the bill is a good bill on its merits, and would provide a

much better means for economic stabilization. Why give the President the authority to raise or lower the tax rates? In addition to the political reasons I have mentioned, this is the only effective way that adjustments in the tax rates could be made quickly enough to accomplish their purposes. Obviously, the Congress could not go through the legislative processes to change tax rates quickly enough to meet the administration's rapidly changing estimates as to the economic outlook. The bill would, therefore, give the administration the flexibility it needed to meet rapidly changing situations in the business picture. The President could raise or lower the rates of the current tax year instantly, whenever in his judgment a runaway boom is in the offing, or a business recession is about to develop.

COPY OF THE BILL AND STATEMENT COVERING OTHER MATTERS WHICH CAUSE A DRAIN ON THE TREASURY AND INCREASE THE FEDERAL DEBT

Mr. Speaker, for the consideration of the Members I will insert a copy of the bill and also my statement to the Ways and Means Committee today. This statement deals with matters other than my bill which should be considered in connection with the proposal to further increase the debt limit. In fact, it deals with matters which are causing a terrific drain on the Treasury and causing a constant increase in the Federal debt. So these matters should receive the wide attention of the Congress without respect to any question of raising the debt limit.

The bill and statement follow:

H.R. 12360

A bill to provide for increases and decreases in income tax if the President determines and proclaims that economic conditions require such increases or decreases

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. DECLARATION OF POLICY.—In order to keep the debt of the United States at the lowest level consistent with the provision of an adequate national defense and a reasonably sufficient civilian Government, and to make reductions in the debt of the United States in periods of prosperity, the public policy of the United States shall be to make temporary increases in the rates of Federal taxes as an alternative to, and a substitute for, any policy of the Federal Government to impose high interest rates on the economy as a means of curbing economic expansion or restraining inflation.

SEC. 2. ADJUSTMENT OF INCOME TAX RATES.—Subchapter A of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to determination of tax liability) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new part:

"PART V—ADJUSTMENT OF RATES OF TAX TO REFLECT ECONOMIC CONDITIONS

"SEC. 51. INCREASE OR DECREASE IN TAX.—

"(a) Proclamation by President.—

"(1) Determination that increase is required.—If, during any year, the President determies that an increase in income taxes is necessary to balance the national budget and to provide for a decrease in the public debt and that economic conditions are such that an increase in such taxes is in the national interest, he shall proclaim such determination and the percentage increase in tax which he determines is necessary or desirable by reason of such conditions.

"(2) Determination that decrease is required.—If, during any calendar year, the President determines that a decrease in income taxes is necessary to prevent, or to assist in preventing or counteracting, an economic depression or recession, he shall proclaim such determination and the percentage decrease in tax which he determines is necessary or desirable for such purpose.

"(b) Increase or Decrease in Tax.—

"(1) In general.—If a proclamation is made under this subsection, then (subject to the provisions of this part) the tax imposed by this chapter (other than subchapter G, relating to additional taxes in cases of corporations used to avoid income tax on shareholders) for the taxable year during which such proclamation is made is hereby increased or decreased, as the case may be, by the percentage determined and proclaimed by the President.

"(2) Limitation.—The increase or decrease in tax for any taxable year under this subpart shall not exceed an amount equal to 10 percent of such tax as computed without regard to this subpart.

"(3) Application of change.—Any increase or decrease in tax under this subpart shall apply only with respect to taxable years during which the proclamation under subsection (a) is made."

STATEMENT OF WRIGHT PATMAN BEFORE THE WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE, MAY 24, 1960

Mr. Chairman, it is very kind of the committee to hear me.

I learned for the first time yesterday that the committee might consider legislation in this Congress to increase the debt limit. Yesterday afternoon I wrote you a letter, requesting to be heard in opposition, and my request was accepted for today. This means that I have had less than a half a day to prepare and organize the thoughts and facts which I felt the committee might wish to consider. I regret that there is such haste and urgency to dispose of this matter that I am unable to do the kind of job of preparation which the committee deserves, and I think the subject matter deserves. However, with the committee's patience, I will try to cover my points in abbreviated form.

THIS IS THE TIME TO REDUCE THE FEDERAL DEBT

First, I wish to call the committee's attention to a proposed bill which I plan to introduce today. I believe that this bill provides an alternative to the proposal to increase the debt limit, because it provides an alternative to increasing the debt itself. Further, I believe that the committee may decide that it is a bill which should be passed on its own merits, even though it decides that the debt limit should not be increased in any case.

Let me put the problem in perspective and then show how it relates to the level of the Federal debt.

There are, of course, several ways that our Government, and any other government, might execute a policy of trying to keep reasonable stability in the economy—avoid booms and busts—and also avoid inflation.

For several years past our Government has been trying to accomplish these things through monetary actions. The President's announced policy is to rely upon the Federal Reserve to accomplish these things. The Federal Reserve's method, in brief, is to tighten money and raise interest rates in periods of economic exuberance, then increase the money supply and reduce interest rates in recessionary periods.

In the last several so-called boom cycles, the specific reason for tightening money and raising interest rates has been to try to dampen investment and prevent there taking place an expansion of business capacity greater than that needed to meet what the Federal Reserve people thought was a foreseeable level of consumer demand. Without examining the correctness of these officials' judgment, nor appraising their success, let me point out the direct price paid for their success, if there was any success.

The price paid when the Federal Government raises interest rates is this: The Government is taking an action which, in effect, imposes a tax on all income groups. When the Government raises the price of money, it is raising the price of what is called the universal commodity. Everybody uses it, and everybody pays an increased price for its use.

But the revenues from this tax are not coming into the Treasury and are not being used to meet the Government's operating expenses or to reduce the Federal debt. The increased revenues resulting from this action on the part of the Federal Government are going into increased bank profits, increased insurance company profits, increased profits for all the other financial institutions, and for increased incomes for the small minority of wealthy families who receive more income from interest than they pay out in interest charges.

Department of Commerce figures, which were just made available in the "Economic Indicators" released yesterday, show that personal income from interest is now up to a rate of $24.9 billion per year. Think of this. Personal income from interest, which was considerably less than the farm income of the country only 8 years ago, is now well over twice the total farm income of the country. This represents a wholesale redistribution of the income in favor of the wealthy few.

For an indication of how few families benefit, on balance, from an increase in interest income, I would suggest that the committee note the distribution of U.S. Savings Bonds. Surely these savings bonds are more widely held by the American people than any other kind of interest-bearing paper. Yet, according to a Federal Reserve survey made last year, 73 percent of the American families own not so much as one savings bond; 5 percent of the families own 87 percent of all of these bonds outstanding. Manifestly, if we had information on the concentration of all personal income from interest, we would find it much more highly concentrated than the ownership of savings bonds.

Why not find a better method for checking economic expansion and checking inflation, if there is a better method?

Last year, as you know, the Joint Economic Committee made a year-long study of this matter. The committee reached the conclusion that monetary actions and so-called monetary controls provide an extremely poor way of trying to accomplish the objectives for which this method is used. It is a poor method because it has many other bad effects other than income redistribution, which I have mentioned. The committee recommended very strongly that the Government should employ its fiscal policies as a principal means of economic stabilization, rather than monetary policies. In general, the minority members of that committee agreed with this conclusion, even though the minority members disagreed on other matters.

Now I assume that all of us in Congress agree that the Federal debt should be kept to a minium consistent with the needs of Government, and that we agree, also, that in periods of prosperity the Federal debt should be reduced.

This is manifestly a time to reduce the Federal debt. The Federal Reserve authorities judge the expansionary tendencies in the

economy to be so strong and to be so in need of restraint that the Federal Reserve is maintaining short-term interest rates at a near record level. The American people are having to pay a fabulous tax as a price for restraining the economy. Why not let the revenues from this tax flow into the Federal Treasury and have it used to reduce the Federal debt, rather than approve an increase in the Federal debt?

That is the policy my bill would adopt. More specifically, the bill would give the President the authority to raise, by uniform percentages on a temporary basis, all Federal income tax rates—individual and corporate. The bill would give the President authority to raise these rates up to a specified maximum of 10 percent of the statutory rates. Further, the bill would declare the national policy to be that the President shall use this means of curbing economic expansion and checking inflation as an alternative to the policy of imposing high interest rates, whenever the policy of the Federal Government would otherwise be to impose high interest rates.

Under the bill, the President could raise tax rates promptly for the current tax year, at any time he should decide that high interest rates would otherwise be necessary to meet the economic problems of the day. Conversely, in recessionary periods, the President could also reduce tax rates by as much as 10 percent below the rate specified in the statute.

The reason for giving the President discretionary authority to amend the rates is to provide the flexibility needed to meet quickly changing situations. The Congress could not go through the legislative processes for this purpose, any more than it could legislate the level of interest rates the Federal Reserve is to maintain for this purpose.

I hope the committee will give serious consideration to this proposal. If the present level of prosperity and the present expansionary forces in the economy are such as to justify the level of interest rates which the Federal Reserve is imposing on the economy, then these things are sufficient to justify a quite substantial reduction in the Federal debt during the remainder of this calendar year.

Let me emphasize that I am not proposing that the American people pay both the high interest rates and increased taxes. I am proposing that they pay increased taxes instead of the high interest rates, and I have no doubt that shifting the revenues from the money-lenders into the Treasury will mean that the American people will pay less in total for the same amount of economic stabilization and inflation control.

STEPS TO CORRECT PRESENT FEDERAL RESERVE PRACTICES WHICH CAUSE AN UNNECESSARY DRAIN ON THE TREASURY

Mr. Chairman, a second suggestion made in my letter of yesterday is that the committee give careful consideration to taking some steps to reduce the drain which the Federal Reserve is placing on the Treasury. If these steps are taken, the Federal debt will be reduced, and there will be no need to increase the debt limit and allow more debt to be incurred.

As the committee knows, the Federal Reserve authorities have at their discretion two methods for increasing the money supply. One method is for the Federal Reserve to buy more Government securities from the open market. This extends more Federal Reserve bank credit to the private banks in the form of reserves. This means that the private banks may then create several dollars of new money for each new dollar of bank reserves. Under present regulations promulgated by the Federal Reserve Board, the banks are privileged to create between $6 and $7 of money for each dollar of reserves extended them.

The second way in which the Federal Reserve may bring about an increase in the money supply is to change its regulations so as to permit the private banks to create a greater number of dollars for each dollar of Federal Reserve credit extended them in the form of bank reserves.

Either of the two methods produce the same effect on the economy. A given amount of credit may be made available to business and consumers by any number of combinations of bank reserves and regulations prescribing the rate at which the banks may create money on each dollar of reserves.

Government securities bought by the Federal Reserve System are paid for in precisely the same way Government securities bought by the private banks are paid for. They are paid for on created money. Consequently, when the Government buys some of its own debt obligations, this would, in normal circumstances, reduce the Government's debt. In the peculiar circumstances under which the Federal Reserve operates, however, there is a threat at all times that the Federal Reserve may put these securities back in the market—in effect giving them away. The threat is that the Federal Reserve may sell some of these securities while simultaneously promulgating regulations which permit the private banks to create the money with which to buy the securities. Recently the Federal Reserve authorities have been leaning strongly in the direction of this threat. The Federal Reserve Board itself has recommended a systematic program of this kind in connection with the so-called vault-cash bill which was enacted last year.

Actually, the Federal Reserve's leanings toward giving away Government securities are much more than a threat. It is constantly leaning against the wind of more Federal Reserve ownership of Government securities and leaning with the wind of banker pressures and banker favoritism.

Let me point out three ways in which the Federal Reserve recently has been shifting the advantages in favor of the private bankers and away from the Treasury and the general taxpayers.

First, over the years, the Federal Reserve must, of course, permit a growth in the money supply. In the past 2 years, it has permitted the money supply to grow by 4.4 percent. As I have pointed out, in providing for this growth, the Federal Reserve could have acquired more Government securities and thus returned the interest payments to the Treasury. Or, it could permit the private banks to create a large share of the new money and thus acquire and hold a larger share of the Government securities. It has done the latter.

A second way in which the Federal Reserve might have acquired more Government securities during these past 2 years—and without inconveniencing the private banks—arose because of the gold outflow. When gold leaves the country, bank reserves are reduced on a dollar-for-dollar basis, just as is the case when the Federal Reserve "sells" Government securities. Consequently, the Federal Reserve had to take some action to offset the effects on the money supply of this outflow of gold, which has amounted to several billions of dollars. Here again, it has either of two ways for meeting the problem. It can buy Government securities in an amount equal to the gold outflow, and thus restore the reserves, or it can amend its regulations so as to permit the private banks to create more money on the lesser amount of reserves. It has done the latter.

A third adjustment which the Federal Reserve has to make arises because of the increasing amount of currency in circulation. In the past 2 years, the amount of currency in circulation has increased by more than $1 billion. When more currency goes into circulation, this reduces the amount of reserves the banks have to their credit, just as is the case when there is a gold outflow or when the Federal Reserve sells Government securities. Here again, the Federal Reserve can make up for the reduction in reserve credits by buying more Government securities, or it can give the banks a windfall by changing its regulations so the banks can create more money in relation to the lesser amount of reserve credits. It has done the latter. It has taken actions which result in the private banks' acquiring, without cost, relatively more Government securities, and the Federal Reserve's having relatively less Government securities.

What have these actions amounted to over the past 24 months? In this period, the Federal Reserve has brought about a 4.4-percent increase in the money supply. If it had increased reserve credits proportionately, so that the public and the private banks would have shared in the money creating process in the same way they shared the benefits 2 years ago, the Federal Reserve would today have $3 billion plus $6 million more Government securities than it does have, and the private banks would have $3 billion plus $6 million less. In other words, the real public debt of the Federal Government would be $3 billion and $6 million less than it is today by reason of the fact that the Federal Government itself would have owned its own debt obligations in this amount.

It seems to me completely unjustifiable for the committee to recommend to the House that it permit further increases in the Federal debt while making no recommendations to stop the Federal Reserve's giving away Federal debt obligations.

THE TREASURY IS GOING INTO DERT UNNECESSARILY AND PAYING UNNECESSARY INTEREST CHARGES

Finally, Mr. Chairman, as I pointed out in my letter, the Treasury has, within recent weeks, been issuing more obligations than it needed to. It has consciously and deliberately borrowed money in the past few weeks which it will not need until next July, if at all. This means that the Treasury is paying interest, and a very high rate of interest, on funds it does not need, while it leaves the funds on deposit with the private banks, and these pay the Treasury no interest for the use of the funds.

May I again suggest that the committee give consideration to the fact that the Treasury is at all times carrying a debt of no less than $3.5 billion more than it needs in order to maintain a surplus on deposit for the private commercial banks.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I regret that I felt compelled to seek an opportunity to impose these suggestions upon the Committee, but as you know, I do have some strong feelings about these matters, and I hope that my suggestions may be of some assistance to the committee in its deliberations.

Thank you again.

MORE BIDDING AND USE OF CENTRAL PURCHASING AGENT COULD SAVE BILLIONS OF DOLLARS FOR TAXPAYERS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, the United States is the biggest buyer in the world. Last year for our civil and military procurement we spent or obligated ourselves to spend the vast sum of about $26 billion. This is more than the total cost of running our Government from 1789 through 1917, or from the time of George Washington until Woodrow Wilson; it is almost double the present cost of running the Government of Great Britain.

And yet this tremendous buying power is not hedged about by rigorous safeguards necessary to assure the most efficient and economical purchasing procedures. Our laws state that as far as possible purchases shall be made only after advertising and competitive bids. Faithfully following such practices should enable our Government to buy at the lowest available prices.

Yet, as a matter of fact, according to the best figures I can obtain for last year, only about $5 billion out of the $26 billion was spent pursuant to advertising and bidding. The other approximately $21 billion was negotiated. Ordinarily this means that there is little or no competition. Where there is the color of competition, every bidder may know what the lowest price is and only have to beat that price although it may be much too high. Also, this practice of negotiation favors the big contractor and tends to put small manufacturers, who are forced to be subcontractors, at the mercy of the big, prime contractor. It often means the additional cost of another layer of management and profits added to the Government cost.

Recently the Comptroller General testified that a failure to negotiate close prices had, in 16 cases he had reported to Congress, shown excessive costs aggregating about $27,800,000. This is only a small fraction of the cases involved, and many estimate that excessive costs total billions of dollars.

The idea of a central purchasing agent who can coordinate purchases and have employees specialize in purchasing fields has long been recognized as the most efficient and economical procedure both for industry and government. Great Britain has long used a central civilian purchasing agent for military supplies and thus avoided the undesirable concentration of power and abuses by professional military officials. Laws passed in the late 1940's were designed to incorporate the needed reforms, but, of course, there are exceptions to the general rule. A list of circumstances where the exception to the rule would apply where incorporated into the law; but the exceptions have now become the general rule. One exception to the requirement is where the President says an emergency exists. This seems innocent enough on its face, but the signing of forms stating that an emergency exists and that bidding should be waived have in recent years become so commonplace that the vast majority of buying is now outside the bidding protection.

There is a wide variance from agency to agency in the use of advertised procurement. Some, like TVA, the largest civil buyer, advertised for 99.1 percent of its purchases; the Bureau of the Budget for 100 percent and General Services for 84.5 percent. On the other hand some of the defense services advertised for only 14 percent; the Labor Department for 16.1 percent and the State Department for 7.8 percent.

Our procurement laws list 15 civil and 17 military excuses which justify negotiating in place of advertising and competitive bidding. One excuse is that a public exigency will not permit the delay incident to advertising; another that competition is impracticable. Such standards are so vague and indeterminate as to lay open the way to, if not to invite, abuse.

The Government Operations Committee, of which I am a member, is charged with the authority to investigate lack of efficiency and economy in the Government, and it is the committee which recommended the original Federal Property and Administrative Services Act setting up a central purchasing agency. It is altogether appropriate that we now try to improve the act and reduce the area of abuse of its provisions. Any possible amendment is so technical and far-reaching that a great deal of study is necessary. I have been working for almost a year on some amendments.

Meanwhile, the GAO made a report for us which gives an excellent background to the problem. Jack Wilson, an able reporter for Cowles Publications, has written an excellent series of articles which incorporate, in summary form, important parts of the GAO report and expand upon the surrounding circumstances. I believe it is such an excellent series of articles that I ask your indulgence to relate them to you at this time. The articles by Mr. Wilson are as follows:

PROVIDE LESS DEFENSE THAN UNITED STATES PAYS FOR—BUYING PLAN BRINGS WASTE, CONFUSION

(First of a series)

(By Jack Wilson)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Uncle Sam is widely known as the world's No. 1 hoarder, who never throws anything away and seldom sells it.

What is less generally realized is that the Department of Agriculture, which has $7 billion worth of surplus farm stuff squirreled away, is a piker in this line.

The Defense Department has surplus odds and ends adding up to nearly 4 times as much as Agriculture's little nest egg.

At the latest count, military surplus and excess stocks (there's a difference that we don't have to go into at the moment) had a book value of $26.7 billion.

At the same time, the armed services are in the process of buying $23 billion worth of new materials—some of it identical to the surplus supplies that are being stored or prepared for sale.

STORAGE COST

Aside from the fact that it is costing $134 million a year to store this stuff and keep track of it and try to figure out what to do with it, there are some other features of the military buying and selling operation that are important.

A lot of the material is useful to civilians—but the Government can't unload it without the risk of kicking the bottom out of the commercial market.

The average return when military surplus is sold is about 2 cents on the dollar, minus the cost of getting it ready for sale and selling it.

LOSS DEFENSE

Some of it is being transferred to the foreign aid program at the original book value, although today it's worth far less. The result is that the aid program, already under congressional fire, is paying for value it is not getting.

And what is more important, the Pentagon confusion in buying and hoarding and selling means that the country is getting less defense than it is paying for.

The picture has been brought into focus for the first time in a report prepared for the Joint Congressional Committee on Economics by two staff specialists, Ray Ward and Richard J. Newman, who have spent months analyzing military procurement practices.

NO ONE OFFICE

They found that there is no office in the Pentagon that has general supervision of the sprawling procurement activity, that it is difficult for one military service to find out what another is doing, and that in most cases they don't want to find out.

That is why, for example, the Army about a year ago was trying to buy $3 million worth of spare parts for helicopters, while the Air Force was wondering what to do with $6 million worth of identical parts in its excess stock.

It also contributes to the fact that the military needs more than 585 million square feet of warehouse space (that's roughly 21 square miles) to house its inventory of paper clips, office chairs, spare tires, gas masks, fire bombs, gents and ladies underwear, electric motors, machineguns, and what have you.

A committee staffer estimated the warehouse space cost around $4 per square foot.

STIRS OPPOSITION

The report recommended creation of a separate Pentagon service to handle procurement, a proposal that arouses nothing but bitter opposition among the Armed Forces.

The military argument is that supplies have to come along immediately, when needed, and that the only way to assure this is to keep the buying procedures under control of each service.

There is some joint procurement now. The Army, for example, buys food for all the services. The Navy buys medical supplies and petroleum products for everybody.

The whole thing represents a small fraction of the total procurement, and there is no serious effort being made to broaden the system.

Meanwhile, the surpluses are piling up. When a service finds it has more of something than it needs, the extra amount is declared excess. That means it's available for any of the other services if they need it.

If nobody needs it, it is declared surplus, and can be sold or distributed to schools or other public institutions.

This year the military is planning to sell $10 billion worth of surplus material, for which it expects to receive about $260 million. It will cost about $75 million to prepare it for sale and dispose of it.

It's only fair to note that the difference between the book value and the selling price doesn't accurately reflect the Government's loss.

Under the Federal bookkeeping system, everything is carried on the books at its original cost, until it falls apart or molders into dust.

NOT ALL JUNK

Some of the surplus property is old, and valuable only as junk. Not all of it is.

The list includes a lot of wholly new materials, such as metal sheets and pipes bought for some mysterious purpose, never used, and now headed for the cut-rate market.

It's the end product of the biggest business in the country, the weirdly complicated process of keeping the Armed Forces supplied. How big and how complicated the process is will be told in a later story.

AN ECONOMIC OCTOPUS: U.S. DEFENSE BILL—$24 BILLION SPENT IN 1959 FOR SUPPLIES

(Second of a series)

(By Jack Wilson)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—The Department of Defense last year spent $24 billion for supplies and equipment. That is more than twice as much as the Nation's total net farm income.

It's nearly twice as much as the whole country spent for public education, and 45 percent more than the total revenue from Federal corporation income taxes.

And that doesn't include $11 billion paid out for salaries of civilians and military personnel on the Defense payroll.

That payroll is one and a half times as large as the combined payrolls of the iron and steel industry and all other basic metal producers.

AUTO, PLANE INDUSTRY

It's more than double the payroll of the automobile industry. In California, where the aircraft industry is the biggest private business, the defense payroll is just as large.

The Defense Department owns $150 billion worth of property, in the form of military bases, arsenals, guns, rockets, typewriters, shoelaces, tanks, carbon paper, and almost literally anything else you can think of. The total represents about 10 percent of the Nation's wealth.

This economic octopus reaches into every State—and every pocketbook.

AFFECTS ALL

In one way or another, the management of the defense buying and selling program affects every businessman in the country, sending prices up or down, causing sudden shortages or market gluts.

Yet there is no centralized control over it. The Army and Navy try to control their buying through central organizations, while the Air Force gives its assorted commanders wide latitude in buying supplies independently from local producers.

Some of the facts about Defense Department spending were rounded up by Ray Ward and Richard J. Newman in a special study they made for the Joint Economic Committee of Congress.

SPENDING IN IOWA

Their report showed Defense spent $155,423,000 in Iowa last year for supplies, services, and construction.

Defense spent $238,400,000 in Minnesota, $17,416,000 in North Dakota, $12,315,000 in South Dakota, and $168,221,000 in Wisconsin.

These figures do not include salaries of civilians and military people in the States. For instance: The military payroll in Iowa was $8,045,000 for 1,987 persons on active duty there, plus $2,807,000 for 522 civilians.

The payroll in Minnesota was $19,123,000 for 4,756 persons on active duty, plus $9,423,000 for 1,752 civilians.

South Dakota had 7,050 military personnel drawing $29,139,000, and 1,519 defense civilians earning $8,168,000. For North Dakota, the payrolls added up to $12,364,000 for 2,960 military persons, and $3,634,000 for 675 civilians.

In Wisconsin, Defense paid $20,196,000 to 5,079 military personnel, and $10,979,000 to 2,043 civilians.

ADDITIONAL SPENDING

Nobody, including the economics committee or the Pentagon, professes to know how much additional money is being poured into the several States in the form of subcontracts.

As you would expect, the biggest contracts are going to builders of aircraft and missiles, with electronics equipment, petroleum products, and services—mostly research and development—trailing closely.

The 25 companies that hold the biggest prime contracts include most of the big and medium-size aircraft companies and all the major automobile producers.

SMALL BUSINESSES

Small business's share of the defense spending dollar has been declining in recent years, so far as prime contracts are concerned. There are no meaningful figures available to show how much small concerns get in the way of subcontracts.

Last year, small business contracts with the Defense Department totaled $3,782 million, or about 16 percent of the $23 billion that the Pentagon spent for goods and services.

The previous year the small-business share was 17 percent, and the year before that nearly 20 percent.

Small business's best opportunity to sell to the Defense Department was in the fields of textiles, construction, and food. More than 70 percent of all military textiles and clothing was purchased from small concerns.

The small companies have complained that in many cases they are in a better position to bid for military contracts than some of the big outfits are, but they don't get the chance.

BILLIONS ARE SPENT ON DEFENSE, WITHOUT BIDS

(Third of a series)

(By Jack Wilson)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—It's an old established Yankee business theory that the best way to get a good price when you're buying something is to get a batch of eager sellers bidding against each other.

Yet the Pentagon, which will spend about $23 billion of your money buying things this year, will buy most of them without ever calling for competitive bids.

PROFIT GUARANTEE

And beyond that for many of the most expensive items, it won't know what the price is going to be until the bill comes in. It offers the seller a guaranteed profit, regardless of his expenses, and if he charges too much it may be years, if ever, before he has to repay the excess.

Last year the Defense Department spent roughly $23 billion on goods and services. It asked for competitive bids on only $3 billion worth of these items, or 14 percent of the total.

The rest, over $19 billion or 86 percent, was purchased through negotiated contracts.

That 86-percent figure is about standard now. Since the Korean war began in 1950, there has been only 1 year when purchases by neogtiated contracts amounted to as little as 82 percent of the total.

Negotiated contracts have been common in wartime, when it's important to get immediate delivery and the quickest way to get started is to call in a likely producer, tell him what you need, and put him to work.

The process never before has been so extensively used in peacetime.

COST-PLUS

The cost-plus system, used during World War II as an emergency measure, is gaining ground steadily. In 1951, defense bought 87 percent of its materials on fixed-price contracts, which obligated the seller to produce the stuff at a price specified beforehand.

Last year only 59 percent of the Pentagon's purchases were on fixed-price agreements.

The other 41 percent, representing over $9 billion, involved contracts under which the producer was guaranteed a profit, either a fixed amount or a percentage of costs, after he had finished the job and figured out how much it cost him to do it.

GOOD REASON

There is good reason for both negotiated and cost-plus contracts in many cases. If you're buying big equipment, a fleet of heavy airplanes or a submarine, for instance, there may be only one company available to handle the job, and you have no choice but to negotiate the best deal possible.

If you're buying something that nobody has ever built, like a new missile or a nuclear engine for an aircraft carrier, it's impossible to predict costs in advance and you have to go to the cost-plus system.

But, as a study prepared for the joint economic committee of Congress put it, an important reason for the wide use of the freewheeling contract procedures seems to be that it's easier.

CONGRESS INTENT

"The Defense Department appears not to be employing competitive bidding to the fullest extent possible," the report said, "but rather to be assigning conditions applicable to complex and urgent requirements to other procurements in order to contravene the intent of Congress."

Congress's intent is to require use of advertised, competitive bids whenever it is possible.

One of the big objections to the procedure, from the public's point of view, is that the manufacturer holds most of the trump cards when the negotiation game begins.

WEAK POINTS

The Comptroller General, the Government's head auditor, has listed some of the weak points in the Government's position:

The agency contract man doesn't have access to all the information needed to determine whether the manufacturer's cost estimates are reasonable, he can't know much about costs of items the manufacturer gets from subcontractors, and where only one concern quotes prices, there's little chance of making sure the prices are right.

All the contracts are subject to renegotiation if it turns out there are unreasonable charges, but the process is long and slow and before it can be completed the manufacturer may have been awarded a second contract based on the provisions of the first one.

ONE EXAMPLE

The General Accounting Office cited one example in which a prime contractor included in his cost estimates the list price of important components he was to buy from a subcontractor.

He used the list price although he had obtained the components at less than that in previous jobs, and could reasonably expect to get the same discount again. The Government paid the list price.

One solution suggested by the economic committee staffers is separate procurement of standard items used in specialized products.

IN SOME CASES

A rocket airplane or a nuclear submarine is a specialized item that may have to be produced by a specially qualified manufacturer. But the nuts and bolts and toggle switches and transistors, the steel tubing and copper wires and sheet metal that go into them are available in any hardware store.

The proposal is that the Government buy these shelf items under competitive bidding and turn them over to the prime contractor. It's done in some cases, but not in nearly enough of them, the staff members believe.

There are other factors that increase the cost of defense purchases, including duplication, wasteful distribution, and just plain overbuying.

Our strategic stockpiles, for instance, are now twice as big as even the stockpilers think they need to be. And they're still growing.

HOW WE SPEND OUR DEFENSE DOLLARS—DUPLICATION EATS TAX MONEY

(By Jack Wilson)

WASHINGTON.—The Defense Department is by far the biggest business in the United States.

The trouble is, it's a good deal bigger than it needs to be. The excess is what you are paying for military protection you are not getting.

There's no way to put an exact figure on the unnecessary spending, but there are plenty of examples to show that the total is worth worrying about. Some of them were rounded up in a staff report prepared for the Joint Economics Committee of Congress. For example:

Each of the armed services, despite all the talk about unification, insists on building and operating its own hospital system. This is a reflection of the subconscious feeling in each service that it has to be prepared to win a war all by itself, regardless of cost.

Together, the Army, Navy and Air Force are spending about $400 million a year to run their separate hospitals, of which there are 185 in the United States and 90 overseas. Less than 40 percent of the hospital beds are being used.

At Langley Air Force Base, Va., the Air Force has a 217-bed hospital, with only 62 patients on the average. Six miles away, at Fort Monroe, Va., the Army has a 141-bed hospital, with an average of 20 patients. At Carlisle barracks, near Harrisburg, Pa., the Army has a 73-bed hospital caring for 21 patients. The Olmstead Air Force Base hospital, near Harrisburg, has 23 beds and only 15 patients.

In California's San Francisco Bay area there are four military hospitals, two operated by the Army and one each by the Navy and Air Force. Total capacity is 5,235 beds, of which less than 2,850 are in regular use.

And the Navy and Army are proposing to abandon 2 of the present hospitals, replacing them with new ones with a total capacity of 2,500 beds—although there is an excellent 775-bed hospital presently not being used, at Mare Island Navy Yard.

There are many other examples of the same sort of expensive duplication, which extends, of course, to separate training schools for doctors and nurses for each of the services.

The services have been forced, by congressional pressure, to set up some joint procurement operations. The Army buys food and clothing for all the services, the Navy buys medical supplies and fuel and lubricants and the General Services Administration (GSA) buys office supplies.

There also has been some effort to standardize items so they could be purchased jointly and used by all the services. This is on the theory that, for instance, a bass drum or a catcher's mitt or a typewriter that is good enough for the Army is also usable by the Navy or Air Force.

The Armed Forces supply support center, which is concerned with this problem, has made a study of 25,116 separate items used in military administration and housekeeping.

The list includes furniture, food equipment, musical instruments, athletic equipment, toiletries, paper, and the like. It found that only 3,601 of the 25,116 items were used by 2 or more services.

Of 832 types of musical instruments, only 308 are used by more than 1 service—and that is the highest percentage of joint use of anything on the list.

There are 3,400,000 items in the Federal supply catalog from which the services are supposed to order their routine equipment.

The joint committee staff report said that a recent Defense Department study showed that about 52 percent of these items were usable by more than one service, although only about 14 percent had the same catalog stock numbers.

"Thus about 38 percent, or 1,300,000 items, while having similar fabrication or manufacture, differ among the services in such relatively minor respects as color, finish, markings, or only in terminology," the staff report said.

That means that the Defense Department is carrying some hundreds of thousands of duplicate items in its catalog, and buying and distributing them separately.

"The Department of Defense estimates that about $1 million a year in management expenses are saved for every 100 items eliminated from its supply system," the economic committee staff reported.

Or take the matter of separate warehousing.

Each of the armed services maintains its own supply depots—despite the fact that the other services may have similar depots handling identical items in the same area.

"In the southeastern area, Army's Atlanta (Ga.) general depot and Memphis (Tenn.) general depot, the Air Force's Mobile (Ala.) depot, the Marine Corps supply center in Albany, Ga., and four Navy primary stock points supply the needs of their respective services with the same supplies," the report said.

The situation is typical of that in other parts of the country. It is aggravated by the fact that one of the services may haul supplies hundreds or thousands of miles from its warehouses to the base that needs them, instead of getting them from one of the other services with a depot close at hand.

The Nation's strategic materials stockpile is administered by the GSA, but it's part of the defense structure and suffers from the prevailing defense ailment—excessive corpulence.

The stockpile program was established after World War II, to make sure that there would be enough vital materials to keep the defense industry going in another war. Originally it was planned to accumulate a 5 years supply of strategic materials.

In 1958 the plan was cut to 3 years.

At present, the stockpile program calls for accumulating $4 billion worth of critical materials. That's the goal. It has been reached, and surpassed.

The stockpile now contains materials valued at more than $8 billion, a little more than twice as much as the estimates say we need.

But GSA is still stockpiling. It has firm contracts to acquire $718 million worth of additional stockpile materials between now and 1965.

During the past year, GSA has been getting rid of some of the surplus by selling it to industry, but the process is slow and difficult because sudden large dumpings might seriously depress the market.

And then there's rubber. The stockpile contains somewhere around $350 million worth of natural rubber in excess of its needs.

Rubber deteriorates in storage, and the stock has to be rotated. It costs the Government more than $5 million a year just to sell old rubber and buy new rubber for the stockpile, considering the low selling price and the high cost of the replacement.

On top of all that, natural rubber is becoming less important as a strategic material as synthetic rubber is improved.

But no one, the committee staffers said, has yet gone up to Congress with any proposal to reduce the size of the rubber stockpile or get rid of the excess.

None of these conditions is new. The Government's penchant for overbuying, duplication, and costly hoarding have been repeatedly called to the attention of Congress and the Defense Department.

The Hoover Commission made extensive recommendations and criticisms. Neither Congress nor the Pentagon has taken them seriously to heart.

Meanwhile, we continue spending national defense money by the millions of dollars every year to buy things of which we already have more than we need.

Mr. Speaker, the need for legislation is abundantly apparent, and, accordingly, I have introduced two bills designed to produce better control of procurement procedures. The purpose is to prescribe uniform practices as to civil and military procurement so far as the legislation is concerned. The regulations promulgated by the respective agencies would reflect their special and peculiar requirements.

The bills are H.R. 12344 and H.R. 12345 and provide for a certificate of reasons for negotiations in instances such as "competition is impracticable" or "public exigency" and a report of these certificates to Congress. In clear-cut cases no certificate would be required. The present law makes negotiation possible when necessary in the public interest during a national emergency declared by Congress or the President. These bills would eliminate "or the President" and thus put an end to negotiating under a national emergency dating back to the Korean conflict.

The measures also provide for the negotiation of procurement from concerns in area of labor surplus or where there is a major disaster program. These exceptions have been provided with safeguards against abuse by means of regulations and reports to Congress.

Another added feature is a requirement of a report to the Attorney General in instances where there might be an antitrust violation. Specifically, where the claim is made that competition is impracticable or where the prices after advertising are not reasonable or have been independently arrived at.

A more technical discussion of each bill may be desirable, and therefore, I would like to set forth the objectives of H.R. 12344, which are:

First. To require each agency head, in invoking specific exceptions contained in section 302 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 authorizing the use of negotiated contracts, to make his determinations in conformity with standards established by regulations prescribed by the Administrator of General Services.

Second. To require those standards, to (a) provide for uniform practices to be followed in the making of contracts by negotiation, and (b) make effective provision for the use of competitive bidding in the procurement of property and services to the maximum practicable extent consistent with the policy declared by said section 302 which declares that "a fair proportion of the total purchases and contracts for supplies and services for the Government be placed with small business concerns."

Third. To require agency heads, in each instance in which a contract is negotiated under clause (10) or clause (14) of section 302(c) on the ground that effective competition cannot be procured, to report the facts and circumstances justifying such action to the Attorney General, who would be required (a) to determine whether any violation of law has contributed to such failure to obtain competition and (b) make an annual report to the Congress concerning the results of such investigations and recommending any proposed legislation he may consider advisable to prevent the impairment of procurement activities of the Armed Forces by unlawful restraints and monopolies.

Fourth. To require agency heads to keep for 6 years records concerning contracts negotiated under clause (2) of section 302(c) in addition to records required by present law to be preserved for that period as to contracts negotiated under other specified clauses of that subsection.

Fifth. To require agency heads, in making semiannual reports to the Congress with respect to certain categories of negotiated contracts, to include in addition thereto similar reports with respect to negotiated contracts made under additional clauses (1), (2), (10), and (14), of subsection 302(c).

Sixth. To make the declaration of a national emergency in clause (1) of section 302(c)(1) be declared by Congress and eliminate such declaration by the President.

Seventh. To provide for the possible negotiation of contracts in labor surplus areas or major disaster areas which, under the present law, would be negotiated in the public interest during the pendency of a national emergency.

Eighth. To require a certification of the nature of the public exigency under clause (2) and the certification of the conditions which make competition impracticable under clause (10) of section 302(c).

Ninth. To defer the effective date of the amendments made by the bill to provide a period of not less than 3 months within which the Secretary of Defense may make necessary studies for the purpose of formulating the regulations which he would be required to promulgate.

The objectives sought to be accomplished by H.R. 12345 are:

First. To require each agency head, in invoking specific exceptions contained in section 2304(a) authorizing the use of negotiated contracts, to make his determinations in conformity with standards established by regulations which the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, after joint consultation, shall severally prescribe for their respective agencies.

Second. To require the officials promulgating those standards, to (a) provide for uniform practices to be followed by all Armed Forces in the making of contracts by negotiation and (b) make effective provision for the use of competitive bidding in the procurement of property and services to the maximum practicable extent consistent with the policy declared by section 2301 of title 10, which declares that "a fair proportion of the purchases and contracts made under this chapter" shall be "placed with small business concerns."

Third. To require agency heads, in each instance in which a contract is negotiated under clause (10) or clause (15) of section 2304(a) on the ground that effective competition cannot be procured, to report the facts and circumstances justifying such action to the Attorney General, who would be required (a) to determine whether any violation of law has contributed to such failure to obtain competition, and (b) make an annual report to the Congress concerning the results of such investigations and recommending any proposed legislation he may consider advisable to prevent the impairment of procurement activities of the Armed Forces by unlawful restraints and monopolies.

Fourth. To require agency heads to keep for 6 years records concerning contracts negotiated under clause (2) of section 2304(a) in addition to records required by present law to be preserved for that period as to contracts negotiated under other specified clauses of that subsection.

Fifth. To require agency heads, in making semiannual reports to the Congress with respect to certain categories of negotiated contracts, to include in addition thereto similar reports with respect to negotiated contracts made under additional clauses (1), (2), (10), and (15), of subsection 2304(a).

Sixth. To make the declaration of a national emergency in clause (1) of section 2304(a) be one declared by Congress and eliminate such declaration by the President.

Seventh. To make clauses (14) and (17) of section 2304(a) somewhat more restricted in scope.

Eighth. To provide for the possible negotiation of contracts in labor surplus areas or major disaster areas, which under the present law would be negotiated in the public interest during the pendency of a national emergency.

Ninth. To require a certification of the nature of the public exigency under clause (2) and the certification of the conditions which make competition impracticable under clause (10) of section 2304(a).

Tenth. To defer the effective date of the amendments made by the bill to provide a period of not less than 3 months within which the Secretary of Defense may make necessary studies for the purpose of formulating the regulations which he would be required to promulgate.

I cannot imagine anyone opposing these bills except those who want to continue receiving unjust enrichment at the taxpayers' expense or who for some selfish reason do not want to reduce waste in government. This should not be considered a partisan matter either. In fact, these bills are in line with recommendations of the Hoover-Acheson Commission, which was a bipartisan Commission composed of many Members who are still in Congress.

Due to the separation of committee jurisdiction in the Congress, it is necessary to divide this subject matter into two bills. I hope both will be acted upon promptly, but I realize that it may not be possible to have sufficient hearings on both this late in the session. However, I have been assured of early consideration of H.R. 12344, and it could also provide the pilot model for better procurement in purchases covered by the provisions of H.R. 12345.

I offer these bills because I know of no single area where the opportunity for saving is as great. Some have estimated that waste in procurement may run as high as $8 to $10 billion per year. I believe the enactment of these bills would save the American taxpayer billions of dollars while giving smaller businesses a fair chance to compete for Government business rather than having to be contented with a discounted subcontract. The support of every Member is respectfully solicited.

VARYING STATE AND LOCAL TAXES

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter and tables.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, last week I placed in the RECORD a preliminary comparison of the taxes paid by an individual to his local and State governments in various parts of the country. Since then, I have refined these figures to eliminate entirely the influence of corporate and commercial taxes and I have extended the chart to include 48 States. Figures for Hawaii and Alaska are not readily available at this time.

This is a comparison of taxes paid by an individual. He is the head of a family, with a wife and two children. He makes $5,000 a year. He owns and drives an automobile 10,000 miles a year and

gets 15 miles to a gallon. He and his family together smoke a pack of cigarettes a day. His house belongs to him and has a true value of $10,000. He makes $800 worth of purchases a year which are subject to various State and local sales taxes.

It is my object to compare the amount of taxes that this man would pay to his local and State governments in Arkansas, Mississippi, Nevada, Connecticut, New York, and so forth. This becomes a true measure of the burden which the individual taxpayer is carrying to support his local and State governments. When we ask the Federal Government to move in and take up some of this burden, let us remember that the same families with identical circumstances in different parts of the country pay the following varying taxes to their State and local governments:

$5,000 per year

	Sales	Tobacco	Gasoline	Tangible property	State income	Real property	Total
Alabama	$24.00	$21.90	$46.62	$6.50	$27.00	$71.82	$197.84
Arizona	24.00	7.30	33.30		22.00	142.60	229.20
Arkansas	24.00	21.90	43.29		17.00	61.72	167.91
California	24.00	10.95	29.96		8.00	153.02	235.93
Colorado	16.00	None	39.96		30.00	169.73	255.69
Connecticut	24.00	10.95	39.96		None	172.07	246.98
Delaware	None	10.95	33.30		53.00	84.80	182.05
District of Columbia	16.00	7.30	39.96		40.00	116.72	219.98
Florida	24.00	18.25	46.62		None	149.14	238.01
Georgia	24.00	18.25	43.29	2.50	8.00	151.07	239.94
Idaho	None	18.25	39.96		119.00	120.90	298.11
Illinois	24.00	14.60	33.30		None	144.65	216.55
Indiana	None	10.95	39.96		60.00	170.75	281.66
Iowa	16.00	14.60	39.96		67.50	156.66	294.72
Kansas	20.00	14.60	33.30		45.00	131.58	244.48
Kentucky	None	10.95	46.62		28.00	111.20	206.77
Louisiana	16.00	29.20	46.62	5.75	Exempt	105.51	203.08
Maine	24.00	18.25	46.62		None	336.17	425.04
Maryland	24.00	10.95	39.96	1.34	54.00	173.04	303.29
Massachusetts	None	21.90	36.63		Exempt	319.50	448.75
Michigan	24.00	18.25	39.96		None	166.33	248.54
Minnesota	None	20.07	33.30		114.50	312.31	480.18
Mississippi	24.00	21.90	46.62		Exempt	139.63	232.14
Missouri	16.00	7.30	19.98		17.00	125.04	185.32
Montana	None	29.20	39.96		48.00	231.45	348.61
Nebraska	None	$14.60	$46.62		None	$173.78	$235.00
Nevada	$16.00	10.95	39.96		None	90.13	157.04
New Hampshire	None	10.95	46.62		None	297.15	354.72
New Jersey	None	18.25	33.30		None	335.07	386.62
New Mexico	16.00	21.90	39.96		$21.00	72.22	171.08
New York	None	18.25	39.96		88.00	259.26	405.47
North Carolina	24.00	None	46.62		76.00	91.19	237.81
North Dakota	16.00	21.90	39.96		23.00	164.17	265.03
Ohio	24.00	18.25	46.62	$6.00	None	135.55	230.42
Oklahoma	16.00	18.25	43.82		25.00	104.43	207.50
Oregon	None	None	39.96		132.00	186.68	358.64
Pennsylvania	32.00	21.90	33.30		None	230.19	318.39
Rhode Island	24.00	18.25	39.96		None	204.23	286.44
South Carolina	24.00	18.25	46.62		46.00	52.57	187.44
South Dakota	16.00	18.25	39.96		None	199.80	274.01
Tennessee	16.00	18.25	46.62		Exempt	161.83	242.70
Texas	None	29.20	33.30		None	131.59	194.09
Utah	16.00	14.60	39.96		48.00	85.02	203.58
Vermont	None	25.55	43.29		100.00	288.32	457.16
Virginia	None	None	39.96		52.00	160.71	252.67
Washington	32.00	21.90	43.29		None	98.67	195.86
West Virginia	16.00	18.25	46.62		None	58.16	139.03
Wisconsin	None	18.25	39.96		64.50	237.54	360.25
Wyoming	16.00	14.60	33.30		None	94.92	158.82

$4,000 per year

	Sales	Tobacco	Gasoline	Tangible property	State income	Real property	Total
Alabama	$24.00	$21.90	$46.62	$6.50	$6.00	$71.82	$176.84
Arizona	24.00	7.30	33.30		8.00	142.60	215.20
Arkansas	24.00	21.90	43.29		3.00	61.72	153.91
California	24.00	20.95	29.96		Exempt	153.02	235.93
Colorado	16.00	None	39.96		30.00	169.73	255.69
Connecticut	24.00	10.95	39.96		None	172.07	246.98
Delaware	None	10.95	33.30		27.00	84.80	156.05
District of Columbia	16.00	7.30	39.96		25.00	116.72	204.98
Florida	24.00	18.25	46.62		None	149.14	238.01
Georgia	24.00	18.25	43.29	2.50	Exempt	151.07	239.94
Idaho	None	18.25	39.96		60.00	120.90	239.11
Illinois	24.00	14.60	33.30		None	144.65	216.55
Indiana	None	10.95	39.96		45.00	170.75	266.66
Iowa	16.00	14.60	39.96		30.00	156.66	257.72
Kansas	20.00	14.60	33.30		24.00	131.58	223.48
Kentucky	None	10.95	46.62		38.00	111.20	206.77
Louisiana	16.00	29.20	46.62	5.75	Exempt	105.51	203.08
Maine	24.00	18.25	46.62		None	336.17	425.04
Maryland	24.00	10.95	39.96	1.34	24.00	173.04	273.29
Massachusetts	None	21.90	36.63		Exempt	319.50	448.75
Michigan	24.00	18.25	39.96		None	166.33	248.54
Minnesota	None	20.07	33.30		59.50	312.31	425.18
Mississippi	24.00	21.90	46.62		Exempt	139.63	232.14
Missouri	16.00	7.30	19.98		8.00	125.04	176.32
Montana	None	29.20	39.96		22.00	231.45	324.61
Nebraska	None	$14.60	$46.62		None	$173.78	$235.00
Nevada	$16.00	10.95	39.96		None	90.13	157.04
New Hampshire	None	10.95	46.62		None	297.15	354.72
New Jersey	None	18.25	33.30		None	335.107	386.62
New Mexico	16.00	21.90	39.96		$11.00	72.22	161.08
New York	None	18.25	39.96		14.00	259.26	331.47
North Carolina	24.00	None	46.62		42.00	91.19	205.81
North Dakota	16.00	21.90	39.96		13.00	164.17	255.03
Ohio	24.00	18.25	46.62	$6.00	None	135.55	230.42
Oklahoma	16.00	18.25	43.82		10.00	104.43	192.50
Oregon	None	None	39.96		66.00	186.68	292.64
Pennsylvania	32.00	21.90	33.30		None	230.19	318.39
Rhode Island	24.00	18.25	39.96		None	204.23	286.44
South Carolina	24.00	18.25	46.62		24.00	52.57	165.44
South Dakota	16.00	18.25	39.96		None	199.80	274.01
Tennessee	16.00	18.25	46.62		Exempt	161.83	242.70
Texas	None	29.20	33.30		None	131.59	194.09
Utah	16.00	14.60	39.96		22.00	85.02	177.58
Vermont	None	25.55	43.29		60.00	288.32	417.16
Virginia	None	None	39.96		32.00	160.71	232.67
Washington	32.00	21.90	43.29		None	98.67	195.86
West Virginia	16.00	18.25	46.62		None	58.16	139.03
Wisconsin	None	18.25	39.96		34.50	237.54	330.25
Wyoming	16.00	14.60	33.30		None	94.92	158.82

The following represents an explanation for the method at arriving at the above figures:

Sales: This figure represents the State sales tax levied and collected by the States and does not include local sales taxes. It is presumed the individual spends $800 per year on goods subject to this sales tax.

Tobacco: This represents the State tax on cigarettes. We presume the family consumes 1 pack of cigarettes per day.

Gasoline: This figure represents the State tax on gasoline gallonage. We presume the family drives 10,000 miles a year, getting 15 miles to the gallon, thus using 666 gallons of gasoline each year.

Tangible property: This figure represents the State tax on tangible personal property, which we presume to have a value of $1,000.

State income tax: This is the income tax on a yearly salary of $5,000, using the short form in each case of computation. The individual has a wife and two children whom he claims as dependents.

The rates for the above taxes were derived from a study made by the editors of Changing Times, the Kiplinger magazine, as published in the November 1959 edition of NADA, published by the National Automobile Dealers Association.

Real property tax: This figure was arrived at by dividing the total property taxes collected in each State by the total assessed value in each State to reach the rate. We presume the individual's house has a sale value of $10,000. The assessed value was reached by multiplying the sales value by the average sales based assessment ratio provided by the 1957 Census of Governments of the Bureau of the Census. The real property tax figure, therefore, represents real property taxes paid to State and local governments for the year 1957. Later figures are not now available.

Not included in the tax tables are local intangible taxes which are levied in some areas, Federal taxes, and special and temporary State taxes which might be levied from time to time in various States.

Estimated allocations to States in 1960–61 and 1961–62 under H.R. 12316 and estimated amount of State matching funds required [1]

State	Estimated allocations, 1960–61	Estimated allocations, 1961–62	Total estimated allocations, 1960–61 and 1961–62	Amount of State matching funds required [2]
Total, United States	$458,300,000	$469,730,000	$928,030,000	$229,150,000
Alabama	8,990,000	8,990,000	17,980,000	4,495,000
Alaska	600,000	660,000	1,260,000	300,000
Arizona	3,390,000	3,580,000	6,970,000	1,695,000
Arkansas	4,630,000	4,520,000	9,150,000	2,315,000
California	37,120,000	38,900,000	76,020,000	18,560,000
Colorado	4,660,000	4,860,000	9,520,000	2,330,000
Connecticut	5,630,000	5,780,000	11,410,000	2,815,000
Delaware	1,170,000	1,240,000	2,410,000	585,000
District of Columbia	1,690,000	1,730,000	3,420,000	845,000
Florida	11,360,000	12,070,000	23,430,000	5,680,000
Georgia	10,950,000	11,140,000	22,090,000	5,475,000
Hawaii	1,720,000	1,770,000	3,490,000	860,000
Idaho	1,850,000	1,880,000	3,730,000	925,000
Illinois	24,040,000	24,740,000	48,780,000	12,020,000
Indiana	12,150,000	12,510,000	24,660,000	6,075,000
Iowa	7,050,000	7,160,000	14,210,000	3,525,000
Kansas	5,500,000	5,660,000	11,160,000	2,750,000
Kentucky	8,280,000	8,300,000	16,580,000	4,140,000
Louisiana	9,120,000	9,380,000	18,500,000	4,560,000
Maine	2,370,000	2,380,000	4,750,000	1,185,000
Maryland	7,940,000	8,210,000	16,150,000	3,970,000
Massachusetts	11,050,000	11,170,000	22,220,000	5,525,000
Michigan	21,490,000	22,320,000	43,810,000	10,745,000
Minnesota	8,900,000	9,110,000	18,010,000	4,450,000
Mississippi	6,290,000	6,280,000	12,570,000	3,145,000
Missouri	10,240,000	10,450,000	20,690,000	5,120,000
Montana	$1,870,000	$1,930,000	$3,800,000	$935,000
Nebraska	3,670,000	3,760,000	7,430,000	1,835,000
Nevada	760,000	820,000	1,580,000	380,000
New Hampshire	1,400,000	1,430,000	2,830,000	700,000
New Jersey	13,850,000	14,270,000	28,120,000	6,925,000
New Mexico	2,630,000	2,730,000	5,360,000	1,315,000
New York	37,290,000	38,040,000	75,330,000	18,645,000
North Carolina	12,780,000	12,950,000	25,730,000	6,390,000
North Dakota	1,800,000	1,820,000	3,620,000	900,000
Ohio	24,460,000	25,310,000	49,770,000	12,230,000
Oklahoma	5,600,000	5,600,000	11,200,000	2,800,000
Oregon	4,640,000	4,740,000	9,380,000	2,320,000
Pennsylvania	26,580,000	26,920,000	53,500,000	13,290,000
Rhode Island	2,010,000	2,040,000	4,050,000	1,005,000
South Carolina	7,340,000	7,440,000	14,780,000	3,670,000
South Dakota	1,890,000	1,930,000	3,820,000	945,000
Tennessee	9,300,000	9,340,000	18,640,000	4,650,000
Texas	26,590,000	27,530,000	54,120,000	13,295,000
Utah	2,670,000	2,750,000	5,420,000	1,335,000
Vermont	940,000	940,000	1,880,000	470,000
Virginia	10,510,000	10,750,000	21,260,000	5,255,000
Washington	7,320,000	7,500,000	14,820,000	3,660,000
West Virginia	5,250,000	5,170,000	10,420,000	2,625,000
Wisconsin	10,210,000	10,470,000	20,680,000	5,105,000
Wyoming	900,000	920,000	1,820,000	450,000
Guam	190,000	190,000	380,000	95,000
Puerto Rico	7,590,000	7,570,000	15,160,000	3,795,000
Virgin Islands	80,000	80,000	160,000	40,000

[1] Allocations under H.R. 12316 are $10 per child of school age (5–17 years) in each State. The estimates of allocations were computed by using population projections for July 1, 1960, and July 1, 1961, based upon assumption of migration at 1950–57 levels, U.S. Bureau of the Census, "Projections of the School-Age Population, by States, 1959 to 1963," "Current Population Reports." Series P-25, No. 201, June 1, 1959.

[2] The matching provision in H.R. 12316 requires that in order for a State to receive its full allotment in the school year 1961–62 a State must increase its expenditures for public elementary and secondary education in 1960–61 above the amount it spent in the base school year, 1959–60, by an amount equal to 50 percent of the amount of Federal funds the State was allotted in 1960–61.

INCREASE IN PAY OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. 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 Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, this issue I answered at the annual convention of the Michigan State Association of Letter Carriers on May 21, 1960, at Benton Harbor, Mich.

Permit me here to express my views. Few, if any, would oppose progress. I personally know of no one who is content with what he has. Ambition within reason is desirable. No one would be content to travel on thickened and calloused feet. But progress must be made with caution. A jet sometimes does not reach its destination. Let the dead past bury its dead, but let us profit by the experiences, sometimes bitter, of other people, of other nations.

With all our achievements, among them those which enable us to see, to hear, to talk with friends, whether miles above the earth in space which seemingly knows no limits, or on the other side of the world, let us remember there are still some natural and supreme laws which we cannot, with safety, violate.

Among them is one which proclaims that, before he may enjoy advantages, man must, through his own efforts, first create them.

Unless he is the beneficiary of charity or an inheritance, if he would have health, food, and clothing, man must work. This has been true since Adam and Eve were kicked out of the Garden of Eden—allegedly because they disobeyed a supreme command.

Many of nature's laws, like that of gravity which Newton discovered when he watched the apple drop from the tree, we have circumvented, as, for example, by our travels into space.

It may be that man will, in the future, find some way of avoiding all obstacles, but that day has not yet arrived and we have as yet been unable to substitute something for nothing.

As of today, if we would spend, we must first earn.

Unfortunately, many believe, or at least pretend to believe, that the Federal Government can provide for each and all whatever he may desire.

When first I came to Washington, I thought the Federal Government would soon be bankrupt, but have learned that the Federal Government will be bankrupt only when the people individually are bankrupt. But continued spending beyond our earnings will bring all of us into bankruptcy.

Uncle Sam has no income other than what he takes direct from you and me—there are no exceptions other than insignificant sums which he receives from duty on imports or other small items.

Nevertheless, from the people who must eventually in some way pay the cost, to the Congress, as to other legislative bodies, come continuous requests for ever-increasing appropriations for additional special benefits.

To increase these special benefits to special groups, the Congress has created 10 departments. We have the Department of Labor, which is charged with the duty, and I quote:

> The Department of Labor is charged, among other things, with administering and enforcing statutes designed to advance the public interest by promoting the welfare of wage earners of the United States, improving their working conditions, and advancing their opportunities for profitable employment.

We have the Department of Commerce which is charged with the duty, and I quote:

> The statutory functions of the Department of Commerce are to foster, promote, and develop the foreign and domestic commerce, the manufacturing and shipping industries, and the transportation facilities of the United States.

And so on down throughout the whole list, but that is not the end.

Seldom a session goes by that the Congress is not asked to create a new or additional department, agency, group, or committee, and always, there is a committee of some kind studying and charged with reporting what can or should be done to benefit either all of us, or unfortunately all too often, just a few of us.

Having in mind the principles which are ever operative, that we cannot spend without producing, it is apparent by the existence of our national debt, the annual interest on which is more than $9½ billion, that the Congress cannot provide the means of complying with all the requests which come to it. We must evaluate and select.

To mention just a few, the veterans, for whose special benefits we spend many millions a year, who are entitled to and receive Federal aid because of special service rendered, are now asking for additional special benefits. One, for example, is that certain groups insist upon aid for dependents and relatives.

Another group demands legislation fixing minimum wages and special fringe benefits.

There are many requests for special tax exemptions, the granting of which would lessen the national income.

Among others, we have the present strenuous drive for the payment of additional wages by the Federal Government to teachers, to its employees, and demands for money to construct and maintain school buildings.

We have thrust upon the Federal Government the demands that it care for the aged and physically handicapped; that is, find the means to end the ravages caused by certain diseases. Certainly we can never let one starve or avoidably suffer hardship.

Oh, there are many, many more, all desirable, all have merit, but many of which, while attractive, are not absolutely necessary to our comfortable existence, and some of which should be taken care of by either individuals or the local communities or organizations.

Permit me to again remind you of what you obviously know—that there is not, there will not be, unless taxes are enormously increased and collected, sufficient funds to comply with all of these requests.

We must choose and there lies the difficulty. We must first determine whether we will curtail our efforts to help everybody, or increase the burden of taxation. Whichever we do, we have the monumental—and almost impossible to accomplish—job of justly, equitably distributing and apportioning the funds available.

But greatest of all, should the American citizen and taxpayer take upon himself the obligation of aiding the rest of the world, some of which it is claimed, is less fortunate, less prosperous than are we?

Since the inception of the Marshall plan to June 30, 1959, the foreign aid program has cost us upward of $82,566,200,000, in addition to the civil and military services rendered by Americans and which have cost us billions of additional dollars; a program which has not brought about its objective and which apparently is to be permanent; a program which apparently has not accomplished its purpose and which Walter Reuther at one time in writing advised President Truman calls for $13 billion a year for 100 years from the American taxpayers.

All of which brings me to your official demand, as voiced by your executives. Briefly stated, it in substance is that we increase the compensation of the letter carriers and of Federal employees—get this, our own employees—all Federal employees, practically all of whom have job security and retirement.

From the press I note that other speakers on this program are Governor Williams and Senator PAT MCNAMARA. It is assumed that, this being an election year, we will all acknowledge the justice of your demands, promise at least some degree of acquiescence.

The gentlemen to whom reference is made are fully capable of speaking for themselves. For myself, in view of the record I have made, in justice to all the people of the District, having in mind the truism that this is a government for all the people, that it is my duty to promote the welfare of all the people rather than that of a special group, I can only say that I cannot, unless a source of additional revenue is found, vote for your bill calling for something like a 9-percent increase.

Naturally, you will want to know my reasons.

The overall reason is that, as a nation, we do not have sufficient income to meet all the demands which must be met. I have not, nor will I, until the welfare of our own citizens is better protected, vote for foreign aid. At present, the demanded outlay is something more than $4 billion a year.

The most reliable information which comes to me is that the present bill, if passed, will be vetoed by the President, and that there are not sufficient votes to override a veto. Complying with your demands to support this bill, it is obvious, would be futile.

In 1958 and again in 1959, President Eisenhower expressly and earnestly asked the Congress to make a comparative study of the pay and special benefits given Federal employees as compared with those provided by industry.

Later, finally, the Congress did appropriate $500,000 to make a comprehensive study of wages and salaries, and that report, which should come up with the facts and some recommendations as to how all may be treated equitably, will be sent in in September.

Can we not afford to wait until we have that unbiased study and the conclusions for which we have appropriated so much?

For a moment, let me digress by a short statement which has to do with the Post Office Department's operations.

I realize that the Post Office Department is not supposed to be operated as a business, that it has educational and other duties which are a Federal advantage—duties which I am sure, under the proper management, will be carried out.

The Department's deficit for this year, without any further pay increases, will be around $603 million.

The overall accumulated deficit—since July 1, 1946, through 1959—from all sources—$15,300 million.

Put it this way, since July 1, 1946, through 1959, we have added to our national debt $15,300 million.

Of that deficit, $6,800 million is the postal deficit for that same period.

The interest on the Post Office Department's share of that national deficit—the $15,300 million—is $200 million a year, which you taxpayers must pay through added taxes.

So, $6,800,000,000 is the sum the taxpayers have dug up as a postal subsidy since July 1, 1946.

It would seem that the interest of the postal employees might be better served if some of their leaders in Washington would look at the facts, try to do something for the postal department—help the Department get rate increases and eliminate subsidies, which would make it possible for the Department to do more for the employees.

Are you asking that postal rates be increased? And, if so, what particular rates?

If the increase in pay goes into effect—as voted by the House—without a postal rate increase, the deficits for this year will be almost a billion dollars—instead of the $603 million, which it will be without the salary increase.

Postal employees have had more benefits from the Eisenhower administration than in any other administration in history.

Applicants for postal carrier jobs must know what the job pays when they apply for a job. Does it not follow in this, the Fourth Congressional District, that they are either adequately paid in one way or another, or that they lack intelligence? Why so many applicants for an undesirable job? I do not, and I cannot personally know whether carriers applying for jobs are or are not taking everything into consideration. I can only assume, from what I know of the average degree of intelligence possessed by our people, that there would not be so many applicants if the job was not, for some reason, desirable.

My attention is frequently called to the fact that a Congressman gets far more in salary and fringe benefits than do postal employees. That is undoubtedly true, though on the tables which I have seen, a few officials are getting or asking for $19,500.

There is, however, one drastic difference in our jobs. A Federal employee, certainly a postal employee, is under civil service. He has job security if he gives reasonable service. He continues in that job at least until he reaches the age of retirement. Members of Congress have no job security. They must go out every 2 years and beg for reelection.

In the 1958 primary, I spent personally something around $4,700 and an additional sum in the general election. Some spend more. Most of us maintain two homes. We have additional requirements which we must meet. If you suggest to me (as I have to some of you) if I am dissatisfied with the job I should get another, I can only reply that when I came here, retiring from law practice which was more remunerative than this job—and I was 59—that I actually was conceited enough to think that I might do something to lessen the waste, add to the efficiency and economy of our service here. I am satisfied with the job; I like the controversy, I think I owe it to the people to use my experience for the next term, at least—and that is a plenty—to continue my efforts to give us all a better, more efficient and cheaper government, and, I might add, less of it.

Permit me now to state a few facts given to the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee, which closed its hearings on Wednesday, May 18, last, in testimony by Deputy Postmaster General John M. McKibben in opposition to any general pay boost at this time. McKibben said:

Postal jobs are in demand and 238,000 persons applied for them in the first 3

months of this year. The total included 37,000 in New York City, 14,000 in Chicago, and 12,000 in Los Angeles.

Postal salaries have risen 137 percent since 1939 in comparison with a 111.6 percent increase in living costs.

The quit rate is low among postal employees. It was 0.57 per 100 employees a month last year compared with 0.70 for the entire Federal service and 1.25 for private manufacturing concerns.

Average straight time earnings of regular clerks and carriers is $2.31½ cents an hour compared with $2.19 for equivalent jobs in industry and $2.22 for all production workers.

My own personal experience is that, ordinarily, there are several applicants for rural carriers' jobs and, often, clerks desire to be transferred to a rural carrier job because they consider the opportunity to hold such a job superior to a clerk's job or to any job obtainable in that particular locality in private industry.

I will do the very best I can to comply with your requests, but, in considering them, we must—and I will—at all times endeavor to get information on the overall picture and then vote as I sincerely believe I should, having the interest of all in mind.

If the Commission appointed by the President comes up in September, after its long study, with a justifiable recommendation that Federal employees should receive an increase in compensation, either in salaries, wages, or fringe benefits, I certainly will be one of the first to go along.

Let us profit by the experiences of other nations. Let us today go forward. But let us at all times remember that the security of our Nation and the freedom of our people should be ever first in our minds.

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. PATMAN for 15 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa, for 30 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. SCHWENGEL (at the request of Mr. QUIE), for 30 minutes, on May 26.

Mr. MITCHELL (at the request of Mr. RABAUT), for 40 minutes, on Thursday next.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. EVINS and to include a news letter.

Mr. CONTE.

Mr. JENSEN, remarks he made on the bill earlier today, and include the entire committee report, and the names of the members on the Public Works Appropriations Subcommittee.

Mr. BROOMFIELD.

The following Members (at the request of Mr. RABAUT) to extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:

Mr. ANFUSO.

Mr. BARR.

(At the request of Mr. QUIE and to include extraneous matter the following:)

Mr. SAYLOR.

Mr. VAN ZANDT.

Mr. HOSMER.

SENATE BILLS AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

Bills and concurrent resolutions of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 2681. An act for the relief of Yi Young An; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3036. An act to authorize the distribution of copies of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to former Members of Congress requesting such copies; to the Committee on House Administration.

S. Con. Res. 90. Concurrent resolution 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; to the Committee on House Administration.

S. Con. Res. 91. Concurrent resolution 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; to the Committee on House Administration.

S. Con. Res. 94. Concurrent resolution 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 on their water resources and problems; to the Committee on House Administration.

S. Con. Res. 96. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of a revised edition of the Internal Security Manual as a Senate document; and providing for additional copies; to the Committee on House Administration.

S. Con. Res. 97. Concurrent resolution authorizing the reprinting of 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 86th Congress, 1st session; to the Committee on House Administration.

S. Con. Res. 99. Concurrent resolution to print as a Senate document a compilation of studies on United States-Latin American relations; to the Committee on House Administration.

S. Con. Res. 100. Concurrent resolution to print as a Senate document a compilation of studies on U.S. foreign policy; to the Committee on House Administration.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 9465. 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;

H.R. 9818. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to the State of Florida;

H.R. 10809. An act to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for salaries and expenses research and development, construction and equipment, and for other purposes;

H.J. Res. 502. Joint resolution authorizing the erection in the District of Columbia of a memorial to Mary McLeod Bethune; and

H.J. Res. 546. Joint resolution authorizing the Architect of the Capitol to present to the Senators and Representative 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.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 2130. An act to authorize a payment to the Government of Japan.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on May 23, 1960, present to the President, for his approval, bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

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 machine guns 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);

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; and

H.J. Res. 640. Joint resolution to authorize and request the President to issue a proclamation in connection with the centennial of the birth of General of the Armies John J. Pershing.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 41 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 25, 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:

2179. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, relative to reporting that the appro-

priation to the Department of Labor for "Unemployment compensation for Federal employees and ex-servicemen" for the fiscal year 1960, has been apportioned on a basis that indicates the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation, pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended; to the Committee on Appropriations.

2180. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the quarterly report of the Maritime Administration of the Department on the activities and transactions of the Administration under the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946, from January 1, through March 31, 1960, pursuant to section 13 of that act; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

2181. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide for a temporary increase in the amount of obligations, issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, which may be outstanding at any one time"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2182. A letter from the Acting Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, relative to plans for works of improvement relating to the following watersheds: Badger Creek Mill-Picayune Creek, Iowa, Marsh Creek, Ky., and Tenn., Persimmon and Burnt Corn Creek, Miss., Tabo Creek, Mo., Fishing Creek, S.C., and Bad Axe, Wis., pursuant to the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1005), and by Executive Order No. 10654 of January 20, 1956; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2183. A letter from the Acting Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, relative to plans for works of improvement relating to the following watersheds: Upper Black Bear Creek, Okla., Reelfoot-Indian Creek, Tenn. and Ky., and Olmitos and Garcias Creeks, Tex., pursuant to the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1005), and by Executive Order No. 10654 of January 20, 1956; to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC 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. ROGERS of Texas: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. S. 1892. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Norman project, Oklahoma, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1644). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SELDEN: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H.R. 11123. A bill to increase the authorization of appropriations for construction and equipment of facilities for the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory; without amendment (Rept. No. 1645). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 11274. A bill to provide that the unincorporated territories of the Virgin Islands and Guam shall each be represented in Congress by a Territorial Deputy to the House of Representatives; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1646). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HALEY: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. S. 2286. An act to authorize the leasing of certain land in Arizona which comprises a part of the Colorado River Indian Reservation, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1647). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HALEY: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. S. 2456. An act to amend the act of April 19, 1950 (64 Stat. 44; 25 U.S.C. 635), to better promote the rehabilitation of the Navajo and Hopi Tribes of Indians, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1648). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 10310. A bill to amend the Farm Credit Act of 1933 to provide for increased representation by regional banks for cooperatives on the Board of Directors of the Central Bank for Cooperatives; with amendment (Rept. No. 1650). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mrs. PFOST: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 6597. A bill to revise the boundaries of Dinosaur National Monument and provide an entrance road or roads thereto, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1651). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BOYKIN: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. S. 2618. An act to authorize the exchange of certain war-built vessels for more modern and efficient war-built vessels owned by the United States; with amendment (Rept. No. 1652). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

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. HALEY: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 7308. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey land to the Diocese of San Diego Education and Welfare Corp.; with amendment (Rept. No. 1649). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CARNAHAN:

H.R. 12357. A bill to establish a Department of Public Information; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. MERROW:

H.R. 12358. A bill to establish a Department of Public Information; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. COAD:

H.R. 12359. 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. PATMAN:

H.R. 12360. A bill to provide for increases and decreases in income tax if the President determines and proclaims that economic conditions require such increases or decreases; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 12361. A bill to authorize the payment to local governments of sums in lieu of taxes and special assessments with respect to certain Federal real property and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FLYNN:

H.R. 12362. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to the Brighton School District, Kansasville, Wis.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HALEY (by request):

H.R. 12363. A bill to supplement and amend the act of June 30, 1948, relating to the Fort Hall Indian irrigation project, and to approve an order of the Secretary of the Interior issued under the act of June 22, 1936; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KASTENMEIER:

H.R. 12364. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 with respect to the level of price support for milk for manufacturing purposes and for butterfat; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SMITH of Mississippi:

H.R. 12365. A bill to require that all pieces of third-class matter mailed in bulk shall bear the sender's pledge to pay return postage at the current per piece charge; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WALTER:

H.R. 12366. A bill to amend sections 102 and 104 of the Revised Statutes of the United States to provide that misbehavior in the presence of either House of Congress, or any committee thereof, shall constitute a misdemeanor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H.R. 12367. A bill to provide for the admission of certain specified refugees; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 12368. A bill to provide for the crediting of certain past service of secretarial and clerical assistants to U.S. commissioners for purposes of the Civil Service Retirement Act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.R. 12369. A bill to amend section 362 of the Communications Act of 1934 relating to annual inspection of radio equipment on board ships; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KYL:

H.R. 12370. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to raise the amount of outside income recipients of insurance benefits thereunder are permitted to earn, to lower the age after which outside earnings are no longer considered for purposes of deductions from benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H.R. 12371. 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. MILLER of New York:

H.J. Res. 715. Joint resolution to amend the joint resolution of June 16, 1938 creating the Niagara Falls Bridge Commission; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WAINWRIGHT:

H.J. Res. 716. Joint resolution extending an invitation to the Federation Aeronautique Internationale to hold the 1962 world sport parachuting championships at Orange, Mass.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BARR:

H. Res. 539. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Ways and Means to conduct an investigation and study with respect to the desirability and effect of the repeal of certain excise taxes; 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. BROYHILL:

H.R. 12372. A bill for the relief of L. C. Atkins & Son; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12373. A bill for the relief of Quality Seafood, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H.R. 12374. A bill for the relief of William J. Hill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. DWYER:

H.R. 12375. A bill for the relief of Zbigniew Ryba; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FLYNN:

H.R. 12376. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Rose Antressian Sohigian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McSWEEN:

H.R. 12377. A bill for the relief of Concetta Aurora Cordaro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H.R. 12378. A bill for the relief of Fung Kai Wing; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.R. 12379. A bill for the relief of Chin Ziang Yu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WIER:

H.R. 12380. A bill for the relief of Iren Enevold; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H. Res. 540. Resolution providing for sending the bill H.R. 3101 and accompanying papers to the Court of Claims; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

472. By Mr. HARMON: Petition of Rachel Treece as a member of Teamsters Local 298, relative to the denial of the right to elect officers of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

473. Also, petition of Vernon Reffett as a member of Teamsters Local No. 135, relative to the denial of the right to elect officers of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

474. By Mr. WESTLAND: Resolution by members of Haynie Grange No. 169, Ferndale, Wash., recommending the enactment of legislation which would require all imported farm products be plainly labeled to show origin and contents; to the Committee on Agriculture.

475. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Nicolas Nogueras Rivera, president, the Puerto Rico Free Federation of Labor, San Juan, P.R., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to reaffirming their faith in democracy and condemning regional and international communism; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

476. Also, petition of Harold Elsten, New York, N.Y., relative to a redress of grievance relating to a filed petition, pertaining to my submission of allied civil and criminal case to the District Court for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Treatment of Narcotic Addicts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 24, 1960

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the RECORD the text of a statement which I submitted on May 16, 1960, to the President's Interdepartmental Committee on Narcotics at its meeting in New York City that day:

STATEMENT BY CONGRESSMAN VICTOR L. ANFUSO, DEMOCRAT, OF NEW YORK, PRESIDENT'S INTERDEPARTMENTAL COMMITTEE ON NARCOTICS, MAY 16, 1960, IN NEW YORK CITY

I have introduced H.R. 12120, which provides for Federal assistance to the States for the payment of one-half of the cost per bed patient for the treatment of narcotic drug addicts in closed institutions maintained and operated by the States. It is my hope that with financial assistance from the Federal Government the States having a severe narcotic problem will be encouraged to provide for a drug treatment program under which the narcotic drug addict is committed through a State civil action, to remain under treatment until released by competent medical authority as having attained maximum medical benefits.

Statistics recently presented to the Subcommittee on Treasury-Post Office Departments Appropriations of the House Appropriations Committee by Commissioner H. J. Anslinger of the Federal Bureau of Narcotics caused me grave concern. Particularly was I appalled when I learned that of the total number of known drug addicts in the United States 45.7 percent, or 20,732, were recorded as being in my own State of New York. Furthermore, it was enlightening to know that nearly 80 percent of the known drug addicts are recorded as residing in only four States, New York, California, Illinois, and Michigan.

Since I am firmly convinced that drug addicts should be treated and cured of their drug addiction and that this can be successfully accomplished only through their compulsory confinement in a drug-free atmosphere, I endeavored to learn what the States were doing toward accomplishing this purpose. I was shocked to learn how little is being done by the States in this regard. I am convinced that with the proper impetus, which I believe my bill will have, the States will be willing to assume a more active participation in what has so far proved to be their weakest effort at curbing the narcotic drug problem—providing treatment facilities for drug addicts.

I learned that the State of Illinois is preparing to provide a treatment center as quickly as possible to take care of 300 drug addicts at one time. This bill will assist both New York City and Chicago in their efforts to cure the drug addict.

The enforcement of our criminal statutes against the drug peddler cannot alone eliminate drug addiction in this country. We must find a way of providing the much needed facilities for requiring the drug addict to remain under treatment in a hospital institution plus the additional facilities for rehabilitation and reinstatement into a normal life activity after being released from the institution. If we are going to admit that a drug addict is a sick person, we must be willing to spend the money necessary to cure him of his sickness.

The War That Can Be Won

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 24, 1960

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my address entitled "The War That Can Be Won" and describing the massive research effort that can defeat cancer be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I delivered these remarks on May 5 at Wheeling College, Wheeling, W. Va.

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

THE WAR THAT CAN BE WON

(Remarks of Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY at Wheeling College, Wheeling, W. Va., Thursday, May 5, 1960)

I take my theme for today's talk from one of the youngest of living Americans—former President Harry S. Truman.

He said on May 24, 1951: "The only kind of war we seek is the good old fight against man's ancient enemies—poverty, disease, hunger, and illiteracy."

Poverty, disease, hunger, illiteracy.

Each of these ancient enemies could be the topic of many volumes, let alone a single speech.

Today I shall talk mainly about the worldwide fight against one disease—cancer.

And it is appropriate that I should talk about it here in West Virginia.

During three decades, the late Senator Neely led the fight for cancer research on the floor of Congress—led it, with magnificent eloquence and determination, until he himself was cut down by this dread disease.

As long ago as 1928, he proposed an appropriation of $100,000 to the National Academy of Science to make a thorough study of the incidence of cancer in this country. It was slashed to $50,000.

In 1946, while a Member of the House of Representatives, he introduced a bill to appropriate $100 million to be used over whatever period was needed for a large-scale research offensive against cancer.

Matt Neely's words and efforts were not in vain. Last year Congress voted $90 million to the National Cancer Institute for 1 year's research.

When Senator Neely began his fight, 125,000 Americans were dying each year of cancer. Last year it was 260,000.

Because cancer has reached epidemic proportions in this country, we must mobilize every resource to conquer it.

I, therefore, pledge to the American people that, if I am elected President, I will call a

White House conference early in 1961 to bring together the best medical and scientific brains in this country to plan an accelerated attack upon this disease.

I earnestly hope that all other candidates for the Presidency will take the same position.

Cancer strikes without regard to political party. It struck down Senator Taft and Secretary of State John Foster Dulles, just as it did Matt Neely and Senator Brien McMahon.

It pays no heed to the Iron Curtain, either. Almost a year ago a Senate Government Operations Subcommittee, of which I am chairman, issued a report entitled: "Cancer: A Worldwide Menace."

That document pointed out that cancer kills 2 million people a year in all parts of the world, that its incidence is rising in 33 countries, and that it is the second leading cause of death in the Soviet Union, as well as in the United States and most of Europe.

In transmitting this report to the Senate, I pointed out that this disease is one "whose ultimate conquest will undoubtedly involve an unparalleled effort of worldwide biomedical research."

American doctors who have visited the Soviet Union recently report that Russia has embarked upon a massive 15-year plan for medical research on cancer.

We keep secret—and the Soviet Union keeps secret—the research that goes into the development of ever more devastating weapons.

But we have no reason to keep secret—and every reason to share—the research aimed at this deadly enemy, which spares neither American Senators nor Communist commissars.

That is why, when I had my 8-hour talk with Mr. Khrushchev a year ago, I spent much of it urging upon him a worldwide attack upon the killers and cripplers of mankind—cancer, heart disease, tuberculosis, malaria, and many others.

It made sense to him—even to this hard, cunning, and dedicated Communist. He liked the idea of what I call "Health for Peace."

Indeed, I have long advocated a "Works of Peace" program aimed at poverty, hunger, and illiteracy as well as disease.

I have voted again and again for programs of oversea technical and economic aid. And I have always maintained that the Americans of Cabin Creek are as fully entitled to help—the kind that helps people to help themselves—as the people of Afghanistan or Africa.

I have talked, too, about "Food for Peace"—putting our God-given abundance of food to work providing balanced diets in West Virginia and wherever in the world people are hungry.

I have talked, too, of "Education for Peace"—a coordinated, worldwide attack upon illiteracy which would make use of the soft currencies we receive in repayment for development loans and for sales of surplus food.

These ideas—these "Works of Peace"—are not original with me. They draw upon a rich American tradition—and, may I say, a Jesuit tradition as well.

The great Jesuit missionaries preached the word of God—but they also healed the sick, fed the hungry, and taught the illiterate.

Indeed, in many places they gave the people among whom they worked the very gift of literacy—putting into writing languages that hitherto had been only spoken.

There are some people who say that wars among men will only end when we face the attack of a common enemy. Half cynically, half humorously, they have suggested that the world will unite only to repel invaders from Mars.

We don't need to wait for the little green men to launch their science fiction attack. Our common enemies—poverty, disease, hunger, and illiteracy—have always been with us.

Until day before yesterday, we lacked the knowledge and the resources to attack them effectively.

Now what we principally lack is the intelligence and the will.

I pray that, within my lifetime and certainly within yours, this will be the only war that anyone in this world will seek.

Jobs After 40

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 24, 1960

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, Senators JACOB K. JAVITS and HUBERT HUMPHREY have both been active in dispelling discrimination against older workers. The following are extracts from what each has said or written on the subject:

JOBS FOR OLDER WORKERS

(By Senator JACOB K. JAVITS)

One of the most critical issues in the American economic structure is our inability to deal with the unjust and unreasonable discrimination against workers over 45—indeed, in some instances over 40—in their opportunities for employment.

Such discrimination deprives the Nation of a most important resource of experience, highly skilled employees and it adds materially to the number of persons requiring public assistance. It deprives mature citizens of the dignity and status of self-support and continued participation in constructive economic activity.

You shouldn't take my word for the fact that this is a problem. Here are a few simple figures:

Statistics show men over 45 collecting unemployment compensation take substantially longer to find new jobs.

Opportunities for getting a job, once in the unemployed category, are about 50 percent less for the man who is over 45.

More than half of openings listed with employment offices in cities surveyed contained maximum hiring ages.

Yet the fact is that the older worker has greater skill, greater dependability in many cases and a lower accident rate.

Things that you can do to aid include:

1. Urge the Government Contracts Committee to end age discrimination in defense industries.

2. Back the pending bill, S. 1073, the National Act Against Age Discrimination in Employment.

3. Make an effort to get your State to pass a law against age discrimination in industry.

JOBS FOR OLDER WORKERS

(By HUBERT H. HUMPHREY)

Despite the fact that wisdom comes with experience, and experience comes only with time, our most precious human resource—wisdom—is nevertheless being wasted by the present social attitude toward our aging population.

Productivity: One of the arguments against employing workers over 40 has been the belief in management circles that low-cost mass production conflicts with the hiring of older jobseekers. Yet, Department of Labor studies indicate that older workers produce just as much and sometimes more than younger workers.

Proneness to accident: Other assumptions against hiring older workers also have been refuted, such as the argument that they are injured more frequently than younger workers. A study of 17,800 workers in a variety of manufacturing industries, published in 1948 by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, shows that the opposite is true.

Absenteeism: The same is true of attendance records which, according to a study conducted by the Bureau of Labor Statistics of 15,500 men in 109 manufacturing plants, showed that older workers had a 20 percent better attendance record than the younger workers.

Pending before the present Congress is legislation, supported by the Fraternal Order of Eagles, which would make unlawful discrimination against an individual with respect to employment because of age. Also pending is a House joint resolution which would create a Commission of Manpower Utilization to conduct an investigation of all phases of employment of older workers in the United States, including the extent of bias against hiring older workers.

The Eagles "Jobs After 40" campaign is a most commendable and worthy project, and one which deserves wholehearted support. You certainly can count on mine.

Role of the U–2 and Past Efforts of President Eisenhower To Win Approval of His "Open Skies" Inspection Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 24, 1960

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, a few years ago, a handful of men here in the House of Representatives made a fateful decision. The decision was to approve funds for the design and construction of the U–2 reconnaissance plane, the aircraft which has been receiving so much publicity in every corner of the world recently.

Besides Chairman CLARENCE CANNON of the House Appropriations Committee, one of the gentlemen "in the know" about the flights of our observation planes over the Soviet Union was my good friend and colleague, the Honorable JERRY FORD, of Michigan.

Recently Congressman FORD explained the role of the U–2 and the past efforts by President Eisenhower to win approval for his "open skies" inspection plan as a safeguard to world peace in a newsletter to his constituents.

Because of the excellence of his presentation and the good sense of Congressman FORD's remarks, I am placing them in the RECORD for the perusal of my colleagues:

The mission of Francis Powers may well be one of the most significant events in 1960. Reams of copy have been written on this event and its implications, and millions of

words have been spoken about it. In all of this, certain basic considerations must be established and emphasized:

1. It is the highest and most serious responsibility of the U.S. Government (the President, Congress, and judiciary) to protect the lives and property of all its people. In the year 1960 this means protection from any surprise attack by missiles or manned aircraft of the Soviet Union.

2. To carry out successfully this responsibility, certain agencies of the Federal Government must obtain sufficient essential information about the intentions and capabilities of the Soviet Union in order that our Government can provide an adequate defense program. To do less would amount to criminal negligence and could border on treason.

3. International spying as a diplomatic or military operation is as old as recorded history. The fact that the spies bring back excellent photographs of military installations rather than a "branch with one cluster of grapes" (Numbers 13: 23) does not change the nature of the business.

4. Because this business inevitably involves deceit, misrepresentation, falsehood, intrigue, and every devious avenue of approach, public officials may not jeopardize the national security by publicizing the true facts about the business. This in no way reflects upon their personal integrity nor upon the broader aspects of public morality. But when a given situation (no matter how embarrassing) becomes public knowledge, we commend a frank and honest disclosure.

5. As long as the cold war continues it is absolutely imperative that our Government continue to obtain essential information about the Soviet military potential. Aerial photography from high-altitude planes is a practical and effective method of getting this information. There is no good reason to eliminate this practice as long as there exists the possibility of a surprise attack upon the United States.

6. This event can help to assure the American people of our advancements in aeronautics and aerial photography, and in our ability to penetrate the Iron Curtain with manned and armed aircraft if that becomes necessary.

7. The overall direction and control of our intelligence program is in the hands of competent men, highly responsible, knowledgeable, and experienced. While the President approved the program, it is not expected that he must have personal knowledge of any given operation or of each specific plane flight.

8. The House of Representatives, through a special subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, has not only authorized the espionage program but has specifically supplied the funds necessary to carry it out. According to Representative CANNON, Democrat, of Missouri, chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations, the Central Intelligance Agency was under specific instructions from the elected representatives of the people to make sure that we have no more Pearl Harbors nor any recurrence of the sudden Chinese Communist attack experienced in Korea in 1950.

9. The establishment and use of over 250 oversea military bases is an integral part of our national defense effort. We expect to keep these bases and to protect the sovereignty of all free nations, including their right to participate in a mutual security program.

All of this is not to say that we have no regrets concerning the incident. The downing of one of our U-2 planes 1,300 miles inside the boundaries of Russia while on an espionage mission and the apparent capture of its American pilot is indeed regrettable.

1. We regret the existence of a cold war which makes this sort of business necessary.

2. We regret that the event occurred so close to the date of a summit meeting.

3. We regret the temporary propaganda advantage presented to Mr. Khrushchev.

4. We regret that the incident may result in cancellation of the visit to the Soviet Union of President Eisenhower, America's greatest ambassador of good will whose person-to-person appeal to the Russian people would be a mollifying influence in the cold war.

5. Most assuredly, we regret what appears to be the capture of Francis Powers, the pilot of the plane, on this vital national defense mission.

However, we must point out that there are workable alternatives to cold war and espionage, and that out of this incident overall benefits may be derived.

1. At Geneva in 1955 President Eisenhower proposed that the major powers give to each other a complete blueprint of our military establishments. He suggested that each nation provide within our countries facilities for aerial photography to the other country. Regrettably this open skies plan was rejected by the Soviets. The United States is prepared to offer this plan at the summit meeting this month. Its acceptance by Russia will eliminate further need of U-2 flights.

2. President Eisenhower also said in 1955 that we were ready to consider a reliable system of inspections and reporting in an effort to reduce all armaments. Good faith on the part of the Communists at the disarmament conference at Geneva would help to ease world tensions. A safe disarmament program must be our ultimate goal.

3. We trust that the demonstrated success of our aircraft flights over Russia during the past 4 years will have a salutary effect on the Kremlin. The masters there must know that we are as sincere and effective in playing according to their rules as we are urging a change in the rules for the benefit of all mankind.

In closing, your Congressman highly compliments the Democratic chairman of my committee, Representative CANNON, who in a dramatic speech on the floor of the House of Representatives, fully endorsed U.S. policy in protecting our citizens and our cherished land. Mr. CANNON, a 38-year veteran in the House reemphasized there must be no more Pearl Harbors or Koreas. I concur without qualification or hesitation.

Afterthoughts on the Summit Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 24, 1960

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, we all agree with Stephen Decatur, the American patriot, who said:

> Our country! In her intercourse with foreign nations may she always be in the right; but our country, right or wrong.

However, we would be derelict in our responsibility if we did not take precautions to see that errors are not repeated in the future. In this connection, in my newsletter this week I reported some afterthoughts on the summit conference, and, under unanimous consent, I include this newsletter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The newsletter follows:

AFTERTHOUGHTS ON THE SUMMIT CONFERENCE

The tragic failure and collapse of the Paris summit conference this week has shocked the world. All Americans, and indeed the free world, had hopes that this conference might open the way to lessening the cold war and lead to a permanent and more lasting peace. Now the pathway toward peace is less clear. The cold war continues and the ways to solve it more difficult to determine.

In the midst of the blowup of the summit conference, our Nation and our President have been humiliated as never before in our history. Our friends and our allies have been given great cause to doubt America's competence, our judgment and effectiveness as a leader in foreign affairs.

Despite these results and the blasting of our hopes and plans for some progress toward peace, we must, as a nation, remain united. It was Stephen Decatur, American patriot, who said: "Our country. In her intercourse with foreign nations may she always be in the right; but our country, right or wrong."

Democratic leaders have joined with others in sending a telegram to the President to acquaint the people of the world with the fact that we in this country stand united in matters of international affairs. Our leaders cabled the President:

"We feel that total failure of the summit conference and increasing mistrust on both sides will be serious and deeply disturbing to the world. All of the American people earnestly desire peace, an end to the arms race and ever better relations between our countries."

Others have publicly said that we should not try to brush under the rug our mistakes, failings and shortcomings. It is known that Premier Khrushchev of the Soviet Union is difficult to deal with and having this knowledge our Nation should have fully and properly prepared for the summit conference. On the eve of a conference as important as this one—which carried with it the hopes of peace—the President should have required that all flights over the Soviet Union at this time be cleared with the White House. This was not done. It seems that one agency of the Government does not know what another agency is doing. Their work was not coordinated and most of all the President seemed not fully informed about the situation.

At first there was a denial that the plane had been ordered flown over Soviet Russia. Another report merely stated that the plane was on a weather observation mission. An additional report admitted that the plane was on a spying mission, and even at this point our leaders should have stated that the situation was being investigated and thus provide a cooling-off period. However, the President implied that reconnaissance flights or spy missions over Soviet territory would be continued. Later, at the opening of the Paris summit conference, he announced that such flights had been ordered discontinued.

In the face of these conflicting reports, the Soviet leader was given a wedge and an opportunity to sabotage and torpedo the conference, a device for which he was obviously looking.

While we must stand behind our country and behind our Nation's President, it seems only honest to admit that in our bureaucratic workings we are not infallible, and that administrative mistakes and mistakes in timing have been made; there has also been a lack of coordination in planning.

The miscalculations and unpreparedness which our country's leaders have displayed

in its presummit and summit activities are regrettable. The collapse of our plans at this crucial time has vividly pointed out the need for a reexamination and a reappraisal of our Nation's handling of foreign affairs.

The failure of the summit conference has thus demonstrated the failure of the President to come to grips with the vital details which are so very important in all matters and doubly important to this Nation and to the peace of the world.

Someone has said that there is no substitute for doing our homework and that there are some matters that cannot be delegated.

America will recover our position and its prestige, which has been shattered, but we must learn from the lessons of our bungling and failures. We must profit by our mistakes and, above all, we need to be ourselves, Americans at our best, and not flinch from facts, truth, and realities. In this hour we need to be fed not just good and pleasant words, but truth, however distasteful; then we can march forward together with new ideas and well-thought-out plans and policies in the field of foreign affairs and patiently continue to work for the promotion of peace.

Mr. Frank Austin Bond

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 24, 1960

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, the recent passing of Mr. Frank Austin Bond, native of North Adams, Mass., ended a career of distinguished service and unselfish dedication to civic activity which spanned more than 40 years. With the exception of his student days at Cornell University and honorable military service in World War I, Mr. Bond spent his entire life in the town of his birth which he so dearly loved.

In the years of his career the posts he held were many and varied. He first undertook civic responsibilities as a member of the school committee in 1916 and later as city councilman, both elected positions. But far and above official positions, he gave his time and energy to those voluntary tasks of incalculable community benefit. He was president of the YMCA, chamber of commerce, and Community Chest. During World War II and after, he served as a member of the North Adams Draft Board. In 1943 he was chairman of the war fund drive and in 1944 a director of the State war fund council of the National War Fund. The Governor appointed him a trustee of the soldiers' home in Chelsea.

In the wider field of politics, Mr. Bond was a member of the Republican State Committee and in 1944 attended the GOP national convention as a delegate.

His many offices of public service included membership in 1934 on the NRA committee for savings banks and advisory committee on civil defense for the State, in 1954.

His career as a businessman was varied and successful. He headed the North Adams Industrial Co.; president of the Richmond-Wellington Hotel Corp.; director of the former Blackinton Mills Corp.; and president of the Hoosac Savings Bank.

To all of these multiple activities, whether civic, public service, or business, he contributed his ability and energy, integrity of character, and humane dedication. His unselfish devotion merited the friendship and respect of the entire community which owes him so much.

I know that this distinguished body joins me in expressing my profound sympathy and deep condolences to his family. The city of North Adams remains as his monument, the only one I am sure, he would have liked best. We join this community in paying reverent respect to the memory of this great American citizen.

Disarmament and the Summit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 24, 1960

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on May 5, I was privileged to address faculty and students of Bethany College, Bethany, W. Va., on the subject of disarmament. I ask unanimous consent that my address be printed in the RECORD.

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

DISARMAMENT AND THE SUMMIT—BETHANY COLLEGE, WEST VIRGINIA, MAY 5

Only 11 days from now President Eisenhower, Chairman Khrushchev, Prime Minister Macmillan, and President de Gaulle will begin the summit meeting at Geneva.

I have no crystal ball, and I will not attempt to prophesy what the outcome will be. I do know what I hope President Eisenhower will work for, with all the influence and persuasive power he—and I mean he, and not any stand-in—can bring to bear.

I hope that he will propose that disarmament and arms control will be put at the very top of the agenda, and that the other three leaders will agree.

I know that armaments and political tensions among nations feed upon one another. I know that many students of international affairs maintain that you cannot make any progress on one without the other.

I cannot agree to that. It reminds me of the law that some town passed about the crossing of two railroad lines: "When two trains meet at the crossing, neither shall proceed before the other."

I think that, for the time being, we and the Soviet Union shall have to agree to disagree about Berlin—and, indeed, about the two Germanys, and all the other political problems that clutter the international agenda.

The Russians have given no indication that they are, in the field of political problems, ready to stop propagandizing and begin serious negotiation. That does not mean that we should forget these problems, or condone them.

It does mean, however, that our immediate major effort should be in disarmament, where the Russians seem in a mood to "talk turkey." There are obvious reasons for this. The Russians have come to recognize that the armaments race threatens both sides of the Iron Curtain with mutual annihilation. Moreover—as the recent news of strikes and riots among Soviet workers emphasizes—the men in the Kremlin have compelling domestic reasons for wanting to beat some of their swords into ploughshares.

Indeed, I noted over a year ago—on my return from my visit to the Soviet Union—that Chairman Khrushchev needed peace. I predicted even then that he would launch a big push for disarmament. We should have been ready, but we weren't.

There are two major steps toward disarmament that can and should be taken at the summit meeting. One of these is to resolve the major obstacle standing in the way of a nuclear test ban agreement. The second is to lay down general directives for the future course of the current 10-nation disarmament talks.

Because time does not permit, I shall not describe the test ban treaty in detail. Agreement on some important points has been reached; on others it has not.

I believe, however, that it is fair to say that the major obstacle to agreement is the dispute over the number of veto-free, on-site inspections that shall be permitted in the Soviet Union each year.

Like so much in this complex question of disarmament, this is a highly technical question. I shall explain it as best I can.

If the treaty is agreed upon, control posts would be set up within the Soviet Union—as elsewhere in the world—to monitor shocks to the earth's surface.

Up to a certain number of times each year, an international inspection team should have the right, free of veto, to make onsite investigations on an event registered at the control posts which could not be identified as an earthquake.

The U.S. position is that at least 20 inspections a year would be needed in the Soviet Union to check for possible prohibited explosions. I fully support that position. Indeed, I have publicly warned the Soviet leaders that no treaty which provides for less than 20 would command the two-thirds majority in the Senate needed for its ratification.

I know the traditional Russian bent for secrecy—a bent long preceding Soviet assession to power. But I hope they will recognize that this is a modest and reasonable adjustment to make.

The achievement of a test-ban agreement at the summit—or, to be more realistic, the removal of this major obstacle—would sound a trumpet of hope for troubled and fearful mankind.

Such hopes, however, would be cruelly disappointed if the summit conference stopped there—and did not make a real effort to get the 10-nation disarmament talks off the dead center where they are currently stranded.

The problem is that the great powers each want to ride off in a difference direction—and therefore are getting nowhere. If the summit conference can decide on the direction of the next steps in these negotiations, even in very general terms, it would be most helpful.

Meanwhile, there is a lot of urgent homework that we need to do. We need to know much more about controls before we can seriously negotiate them. We cannot expect the Soviets to do this work for us. They are allergic to controls, and will accept as little as they can. Asking them to develop controls is like expecting a man condemned to be hanged to make his own rope.

I have been warning for many months that we are not prepared for serious negotiation on controls. At long last, the Department of State itself has acknowledged this fact.

Here is a quotation from the testimony of Mr. Raymond Hare, the Deputy Under Secretary of State, before the House Appropriations Committee:

"In reviewing our approach to disarmament, it was further found that the most serious deficiency in the U.S. approach has been the lack of adequate planning and studies in the field of disarmament."

At long last, too, there are reports of a possible upgrading of the Office of Disarmament within the Department of State. That is good as far as it goes—but it doesn't go nearly far enough. It comes late—I don't say "too late"—and it is certainly too little.

What we really need—as the Senate Disarmament Committee proposed as long ago as September 1957—is a special agency devoted to the single and comprehensive problem of disarmament—a sort of "Manhattan Project for Peace."

Early in February I introduced legislation to establish a National Peace Agency. It should have the services of some of the ablest and most dedicated people in the country. It should have authority to coordinate the many different projects in the general disarmament field which are presently splintered among the Department of Defense, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Central Intelligence Agency, and the Department of State.

Its single, overriding assignment should be to find a way to end the arms race. In the existing agencies, this is at best a part-time or occasional assignment. Then, too, there is a built-in contradiction in expecting any Department of Defense to give wholehearted enthusiasm to limiting armaments—or any Atomic Energy Commission to show as much zeal for curtailing atom bombs as for developing more effective and varied ones.

The Department of State would continue, of course, to carry on disarmament negotiations—and I have introduced legislation to upgrade this function by establishing an Assistant Secretary of State for Disarmament and Atomic Energy Affairs.

The quest for safeguarded disarmament must be at the heart and center of American foreign policy. It must be placed as far as possible within the framework of the United Nations because disarmament is a concern of all countries, and not only of the great powers. By making our statements on disarmament in the forum of the United Nations we can—if our case is sound—rally behind it the moral force and the conscience of mankind.

We have a better than even chance of making the last four decades of the 20th century decades of peace. And if we can keep peace for the next 40 years, there is real hope that the habit may take hold for good.

The 1960 National Convention of Mothers of Men in Service (MOMS of America), Altoona, Pa., May 18–22

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 24, 1960

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, my hometown of Altoona, Pa., was the scene of the 1960 National Convention of the MOMS of America, an organization composed of mothers of men in service.

The host for the convention was the Hollidaysburg, Pa., unit of the MOMS of America under the leadership of Mrs. Mary Ratchford, president. The convention was well attended by delegates from many States. It was my privilege to deliver the principal address at the annual banquet, which follows:

SPEECH BY JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, 20TH DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA, AT THE 1960 NATIONAL CONVENTION OF MOMS OF AMERICA, PENN-ALTO HOTEL, ALTOONA, PA., MAY 19, 1960

It is a distinct privilege to address you on the occasion of your 1960 national convention and to join in welcoming you to my hometown of Altoona, Pa.

The Hollidaysburg, Pa., unit of the MOMS of America under the able guidance of its president has developed into an organization in which we of Blair County are pardonably proud for the part it plays in community life.

Not only has the Hollidaysburg MOMS of America maintained a lively interest in servicemen but it has also been very active in caring for the comfort and needs of veterans in the Altoona Veterans' Administration hospital.

In this connection the Hollidaysburg MOMS donated a tape recorder to the Altoona Veterans' Administration hospital and supplies the tape each year.

In addition patients are the recipients of gifts from the MOMS while an annual bingo party is one of the highlights of the MOMS hospital program.

At the community level the Hollidaysburg MOMS have an enviable record in support of local projects such as the public library, YMCA, Christmas baskets for the needy and other praiseworthy programs.

Therefore, on this occasion it is a pleasure to pay tribute to Mrs. Mary Ratchford, president, and the members of the Hollidaysburg MOMS of America as they play host to the 1960 national convention and welcome their national president, Mrs. Marjorie Estes.

I join my fellow citizens of Blair County in wishing the MOMS of America a highly successful and truly enjoyable 1960 national convention.

I need not tell you of my deep personal interest in the servicemen and the veterans of America.

This interest likewise encompasses your organization which came into being in 1941.

Each war crisis our Nation has faced has brought American women further and further to the fore.

Words of tribute are inadequate, indeed, to express to the mothers of servicemen and veterans, the love and devotion and respect America holds for you.

Since the days of the first settlers the women of America have stood side by side with the men in the making of our Nation.

The pioneer women who ventured forth with their men in conquest of the American Continent shouldered hardships, endured the perils, and won the victories of the frontier.

Throughout the years of our development, the hands that rocked the cradle have been instrumental in laying the foundations upon which our Republic has been built.

Home and family are by no means the least of these foundations.

The family in this atomic age faces the same drastic changes that confront other American institutions, our industries, our governmental agencies, our Congress, our schools, and our churches.

Actually the changes that have occurred since World War II have brought as much complexity to the problems of home and family as to business and government.

For many this theory may be difficult to accept.

The home and the family are basic institutions that are expected to "be there" in spite of any existing tension or emergency.

These facts place a tremendous burden on the mothers of our Nation.

It is not my intent to offer sympathy to the MOMS of America because of the sacrifice you have already made or because of the difficulties and uncertainties you face in the future.

I do not offer you sympathy.

Your actions indicate you accept our age as a challenger.

Your sacrifices have become elements of consecration rather than elements of surrender.

You utilize uncertainty as a tonic and existing difficulty becomes a rededication.

All of America could profitably follow this pattern and, as all mothers throughout the ages have done, set its face toward the future with confidence.

In the hurricane of our times, in this world of sudden revolutions, the family must remain a haven of sweet comfort and security.

The beauty of this fact is that whether among Samoans in Polynesia, Pennsylvanians in America, or Londoners in England the family is the center of human affections.

Beyond this, what the family teaches makes our world.

Through the ages the foundations of the family have been moral, from the long preaching in a Navajo hut to a New England mother's reading of the Bible to her children.

Right and wrong have come to sharp focus in the family through the years.

And at the core of the family is the joy and innocence of the child, the protective love for him as he learns to trust, the understanding love as he learns to be independent, to adjust to the world, and to imagine and develop ideas.

Where the family goes, the world follows.

So we can learn from the family something of mankind's direction.

Onrushing technology is reshaping the life pattern of millions.

But we cannot neglect to emphasize that onrushing technology is the direct result of individual thought.

And it is largely in the family—whether in the flamboyant green of a jungle or the vast impersonality of a city—that the identity of the individual takes form.

Robert R. Brunn, American news editor of the Christian Science Monitor, has reminded us that "Globally the trend is toward the Western family, now in the minority."

In centuries to come this could well be the universal pattern.

In Islam's sweeping crescent from North Africa through the Middle East to Pakistan and Indonesia ancient family modes are fading before 20th century enlightenment.

Slavery, the despotic father, the bargaining away of brides, and the wearing of the veil are still present—but all are faltering.

Young people demand change—and so do the women.

Turkey is a striking example.

There the veil and exclusion of women were outlawed years ago.

It is fortunate that in European countries the marriage of convenience is fading.

Father domination holds on in many sections, however.

It does appear though that a pattern of free individual choice and independence is forcing its way in to unlock social shackles in many areas of old Europe.

In Germany after the Nazi thrust for power which involved war occupation and the holding of tens of thousands of husbands and fathers in Soviet camps for years, the family has emerged triumphant.

Twenty long years of trials have strengthened the average German's devotion to family values.

Latin America's family patterns are in many ways closer to those of Europe and Asia than those of the United States and Canada.

But the pressure to change in South America comes from the north and in the Latin-American cities the American-type family is becoming plainly visible.

In all of the instances I have cited more education and more understanding is bringing more individual freedom, and in turn, an elevation of the influence of the family.

It is a gripping thought that dictatorship cannot accept loyalty to the family—loyalty to the mother or the father.

In the eyes of the dictator, loyalty to the family weakens the grip of the state on the individual.

Following the Red Revolution, Communist doctrine preached that the family was an outmoded and useless device, as outworn as private property.

In this belief the Soviets have gone against human nature, not to mention morality, taste, history, sociology, politics, and expediency.

Currently we see evidence that the Soviet Union is trying desperately to convince the eyes of the world that family is important.

But thus far their love of family has by no means become an example for the rest of the world.

There is not displayed in Russia a high regard for the individual.

The Soviet Union first and then the individual, that remains an integral part of their political philosophy.

In any national crisis our mothers—our homemakers—must first and foremost defend the homes of America.

For those who leave their homes for military service to defend the cause of freedom, the mothers of America have kept the home intact as a bright and shining institution.

Defense of the homefront should not be dropped from the docket, however, in times of peace.

There are certain hallmarks of American homelife that further the learning of the ways of our Republic.

These I would like to mention.

(a) The home has as its primary object and central purpose the welfare of all in the household.

(b) There is equal opportunity for all regardless of sex or age in a true American home.

(c) Our basic American liberties and the practices of these liberties are first started in the home.

(d) The economic, social, and political conditions of the home are maintained in order that all in the household may have enjoyment that is realized from these three factors.

(e) All in the home have the right to share and help determine the program and policies to be pursued.

(f) The homes of America teach that every privilege entails a corresponding duty and responsibility to that particular individual who in turn is held responsible to the family as a whole.

(g) The home trains the individual to be efficient in citizenship.

(h) The home promotes loyalty and understanding.

(i) The home develops in each individual of that home the ability to solve problems.

The MOMS of America and every American mother know better than I that the fine art of living together in peace must be established in our homes.

The past few decades have not been without change in the American family.

The American family no longer tends to determine careers, marriages, prestige, or a person's political position.

The American family has been freed to concentrate on personal relationships and moral evaluation to create an atmosphere of love and order devoted to the perfection of the family as individuals.

At a time when the freedoms of men and women are being efficiently and ruthlessly destroyed overnight the home in America stands as the fact and the symbol of individual freedom.

Not even our own Government can enter it without legal consent.

In how many places in the world is the home still inviolate?

This security of man in his own home, with his family, is one of the world's wonders, yet we Americans too frequently take it as a simple thing, natural to us.

You, as representative American mothers, preside over American homes which are equipped with the facilities for teaching our children during the precarious stages of growth.

Today we are deluged with gadgets, equipment, and devices for making homelife more efficient.

This is as it should be.

Modern technology has lessened the drudgery for our homemakers.

But the underwriter of the home continues to be the entirely reliable institution of motherhood.

The qualifications are those which call for the highest attributes of mind, personality, and executive ability.

The American home will continue on its way to build for a better world so long as mothers say to their sons and daughters, "I promise to match your honesty with my honesty, your loyalty with my loyalty, and your fairness with my fairness."

But most of all I am firmly convinced that the mothers of our Nation must create within our homes a fuller understanding of our world.

I do not wish to leave with you pure sentiment and mere platitudes concerning home, family and mother.

But I wish to emphasize your job as a living, practical symbol in a world of uncertainty.

It is your job to make home a place where we learn how to be free.

In the perfect home we stretch out on the floor, or cook hideous dishes in the kitchen at midnight, or bellow our favorite tunes in the shower.

But it is not enough to enjoy our freedom. We have duties.

The snow must be shoveled.

The dog must be trained not to dig up the flowers.

The leaky roof must be patched.

The floor scratched by the party must be waxed.

The hedge must be trimmed.

This is the unyielding routine.

This is the slow forming of a character geared to the real world.

The homemaker who complains of drudgery can, if she will, beat her shackles into bracelets and turn toil into play.

In making her home beautiful, and her family happy, she too makes herself beautiful.

Finally, it is my belief that the mothers of our generation, and especially you who are dedicated to the high principles of the MOMS of America, wish for your children a future which will bring to the world a combination of peace and tolerance, a future where homes will turn self-interest and mechanics into a human civilization.

And now in conclusion let me summarize my remarks by simply saying that here in America our homes are the citadels of American freedom.

Area Development Legislation Is Still Possible

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 24, 1960

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, in the President's veto message on the area redevelopment bill, he stated:

I return herewith, without my approval, S. 722, the area redevelopment bill.

For 5 consecutive years I have urged the Congress to enact sound area assistance legislation. On repeated occasions I have clearly outlined standards for the kind of program that is needed and that I would gladly approve.

In 1958 I vetoed a bill because it departed greatly from those standards. In 1959, despite my renewed urging, no area assistance bill was passed by the Congress.

Now in 1960, another election year, a new bill is before me that contains certain features which I find even more objectionable than those I found unacceptable in the 1958 bill.

The people of the relatively few communities of chronic unemployment—who want to share in the general prosperity—are, after 5 years, properly becoming increasingly impatient and are rightfully desirous of constructive action. The need is for truly sound and helpful legislation on which the Congress and the Executive can agree. There is still time and I willingly pledge once again my wholehearted cooperation in obtaining such a law.

After listing his objections to this bill, he again called upon the Congress to present legislation that would meet the approval of both the Congress and the Executive, as follows:

Again, I strongly urge the Congress to enact new legislation at this session—but without those features of S. 722 that I find objectionable. I would, however, accept the eligibility criteria set forth in the bill that first passed the Senate even though these criteria are broader than those contained in the administration bill.

Moreover, during the process of developing a new bill, I would hope that in other areas of past differences solutions could be found satisfactory to both the Congress and the Executive.

My profound hope is that sound, new legislation will be promptly enacted. If it is, our communities of chronic unemployment will be only the immediate beneficiaries. A tone will have been set that would hold forth, for the remainder of the session, the hope of sound and rewarding legislation in other vital areas—mutual security, wheat, sugar, minimum wage, interest rates, revenue measures, medical care for the aged and aid to education to mention but a few.

Only this result can truly serve the finest and best interests of all our people.

It is time for the Congress and Executive to give serious attention to the enactment of an area redevelopment bill. I call upon the leadership of the House to bring forth a measure that can be enactment of an area redevelopment bill. I done now. The President has asked for a moderate bill—let us, therefore, give

him one that will meet with the administration's approval and get this program going at once.

I, along with my colleagues Mr. VAN ZANDT and Mr. FENTON, have introduced measures in the House which represent a good compromise, and one that can become law during this session of Congress.

As part of my remarks, I include an editorial from the Johnstown Tribune-Democrat of May 14, 1960:

AREA DEVELOPMENT BILL STILL POSSIBLE

President Eisenhower's veto of the area development bill can hardly be called unexpected. It had been forecast in debate on the bill in both House and Senate. The bill was much the same as the one the President vetoed in 1958, though somewhat lower in amount, and no effort had been made by the bill's sponsors to meet the President's objections in other respects or to seek a compromise.

There is, however, one major difference between the veto this year, and the veto in 1958. That was a pocket-veto after Congress had adjourned, since the measure had been passed in the closing days of the session. This time the veto message was sent to Congress in sufficient time to permit passage of a more moderate measure such as Mr. Eisenhower has asked for years—if the Democratic Congress really wants area development legislation.

The veto, on the basis of the narrow margin by which the bill was approved in the House and Senate, cannot be overridden. But a compromise bill could be whipped through Congress on quick order; and if it is not, the political purpose of the original bill will become apparent. There is good evidence that its principal sponsors wanted an issue for the coming campaign, instead of a law.

If Congress does not pass a bill which would set this activity in motion promptly, the evidence will be conclusive that the original measure was simply designed to play politics with human hopes and human distress.

Like the President, this newspaper believes and has said that the vetoed bill was far too broad for an experimental effort of this kind, for which there had been no experiences on a national scale. A series of articles on this page has pointed out the sharp disagreements in Congress itself on several phases of the bill that Congress passed. It had to be altered on the floor of the House, for that matter, up to the last minute, though the subject has been under active consideration in Congress for more than 5 years.

We do not know how effectively a Federal area development program would work—nor does anyone else. There is one basic conflict within the plan itself. It seeks to help depressed areas attract new industry, but it also professes to avoid drawing such industry from other more prosperous areas. State and local activities for depressed areas do not contain such internal contradictions, since they are frankly competitive.

Certainly there is reason to approach such a Federal program cautiously, and this is what the administration wants to do. The amount of money is a far less serious matter; and, if the plan works, additional money would be forthcoming swiftly. Meanwhile, if those who have made such an outcry for this legisation are sincere, they will try now for a moderate start.

This newspaper is as anxious as anyone could be for a program which will help the area it serves, and the State of Pennsylvania. We do not, however, want legislation which would raise hopes, only to dash them later. We believe that the administration plan offers a sound approach to the problem of depressed areas. And we trust that those who have been calling upon Mr. Eisenhower to sign a bill he does not believe sound, will now be equally vociferous in calling upon Congress to pass a bill which can become law within a few weeks.

Our Federal Excise Tax Structure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH W. BARR

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 24, 1960

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced a resolution into the House of Representatives authorizing and directing the Ways and Means Committee to begin a study of our Federal excise tax structure. The purpose of this study is to determine which taxes the United States can give up and return to the States for educational and other purposes. We are estimating budget receipts of $9,100 million from excise taxes in fiscal 1960, and from a preliminary check it would seem to me that about 5 percent of this total, or about $500 million comes from taxes that could be collected efficiently by the States. All the taxes under the budget heading "Retailers Excise Taxes" and including the taxes on jewelry, furs, and so forth, could probably be efficiently collected by the States. The total under this budget heading comes to an estimated $377 mil-
inary check it would seem to me that about $150 million from the budget heading "Miscellaneous Excise Taxes" and including taxes on admissions, club dues, billiard tables, and bowling alleys could be turned back to the States.

Because of the fact that our business is conducted more and more on a national level, it becomes increasingly difficult for the States to collect certain taxes. They simply cannot get the money stopped as it flows across the country. This is the reason I have asked for a study by Ways and Means to determine what excise taxes now collected by the Federal Government could be efficiently collected by the States. As I mentioned above, a preliminary check seems to indicate that taxes totaling about $500 million would fit this test.

Since the collapse of the summit conference, the Congress has been besieged by new spending requests. The very next day the Department of Defense came to us and asked that we put back in the appropriation bill about $300 million for an atomic aircraft carrier and about the same amount for Bomarc missiles. In my opinion this is foolish. I for one had no hopes of any results from the summit and voted for the defense budget assuming that the cold war would be around for quite a while. Khrushchev's belligerence came as no particular surprise to me, so I am not going to be stampeded into an enormous increase in military spending.

History has been telling us for several thousand years that nations are not murdered by an aggressor; they usually commit suicide by neglecting their internal problems. This is a good time to remember the lesson. If we are stampeded into diverting more and more of our national resources into military funds rather than facing the purely local problems of schools, teachers' salaries, sanitation, hospitals, libraries, police protection, and transportation, we can kill this Nation as effectively as the Communists could by aggression.

The solution of these local problems by local and State governments has become increasingly difficult because the United States has literally crowded them out of many fields of taxation. If local governments are going to solve local problems, they must get their hands on some money. The old standby of local government, the property tax, is just about "on the ropes." There is not much room for additional revenue from this source. So the alternatives are simple. The Federal Government can try to solve local problems, or it can vacate certain fields of taxation and let the States go after this money. I would favor trying the last alternative first for the simple reason that it is so difficult to devise a national program to fit the diverse problems of all the States in this country.

The proposal that I am bringing forward could provide an initial $500 million for local problems. This should mean about $12½ million a year for our State of Indiana and about $2½ million a year for my congressional district. It would at least be a start in facing up to our local problems of education, urban development, sanitation, and police and fire protection.

Address Delivered by Senator Smathers Before the Atlanta Bar Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD B. RUSSELL

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 24, 1960

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, last Friday the Bar Association of the City of Atlanta had the good fortune to hear a timely address by our distinguished and able colleague, the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS].

The Senator's remarks dealt with the crisis that is confronting our Nation as a result of the U–2 plane incident and the subsequent breakup of the summit conference in Paris.

Mr. President, I believe all of us can profit from the calm and reasoned analysis that the Senator from Florida has made of these momentous events. Certainly all of us wholeheartedly support his conclusion, namely that this Nation must make it unmistakably clear to

Khrushchev that we intend to stand firm in the face of his blusters and threats. As he has so well stated it:

We must show that we do mean business—that we will not abandon our rights nor shirk our duties. * * * This is the surest road to peace.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the remarks of the Senator from Florida printed in the RECORD.

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

Let me turn now to a subject which has been dominating the world's front pages during all of the past fortnight.

I refer, of course, to the U-2 "spy-in-the-sky" incident and the consequent breakdown in the summit meetings at Paris.

First of all, let me say this about the crisis atmosphere in which we now find ourselves: Basically, all that has happened is a dashing of expectations; nothing fundamental has changed at all.

Regardless of what might have happened at Paris in the way of relaxing world tensions, the Soviet Union would not have given up its intention of converting the world, by hook or crook, to communism. The tactics may change, but never the final strategy.

Accordingly, just as there was never any ground for wild anticipation, neither is there, in the current situation, any reason for panic.

No doubt we will see, in the months ahead, a lowering of temperatures in the cold war. We must be prepared, again, for a series of challenges to Western solidarity and, again, we must meet them coolly—as we have met previous challenges.

Certainly, the danger of thermonuclear war has not been diminished by the developments of May 1960—but, neither, it seems to me, has this danger been much increased. Unless the Russians achieve military preponderance, they have nothing to gain from war.

No one wins a war of mutual annihilation. The Russians are realists, and they know this as well as we do.

One of our most important tasks is to see to it that the Soviet Union never obtains the military preponderance which will make the risk of war seem attractive.

If the "spy-in-the-sky" incident has not in fact materially altered the reality of the world situation—as opposed to its appearance—what then has occurred? What is all the fuss about?

Personally, I think there is a certain amount of real comfort to be derived from the U-2 flight. It demonstrates, to our citizens and to the world at large, that the myth of Soviet impregnability is exactly that—a myth. If a single, unarmed, slow-moving spy plane can penetrate Soviet airspace to a distance of 1,300 miles, then obviously a mass flight of Strategic Air Command bombers can also penetrate to perform SAC's assigned task of retaliation in event of surprise attack.

Nonetheless, while I take this consolation from the U-2 affair, I must say that the timing of the flight and our handling of its exposure were major blunders.

I say this for these reasons:

I have always believed in the positive value of conversation between East and West even though they cannot, in the nature of things, lead to a total resolution of differences. I think they could, in favorable circumstances, affect the nature of the competition between East and West, changing it from cold war competition to peaceful economic, political, and social competition.

Such a change would materially reduce the possibility of accidental war and the danger of limited but still quite deadly warfare such as we have experienced in Korea and Indochina.

Accordingly, I regret the timing of the U-2 flight insofar as that flight has become a factor in the interruption of conversations between Mr. Khrushchev and the Big Three.

Nonetheless, it must be clear from his performance in Paris that Mr. Khrushchev wanted the summit meeting to disintegrate, that the U-2 incident was the vehicle of the breakup but not its cause.

Had Mr. Khrushchev been disposed to continue the dialog between East and West he could have accepted, without damaging the world position of the Soviet Union, President Eisenhower's statement that U-2 flights had been canceled and would not be resumed.

Indeed he would have seemed magnanimous, and he would no doubt have won a considerable propaganda victory.

Instead, Khrushchev made a series of demands the United States could not meet under any considerable circumstances.

Why?

The answer, I think, crept out in Mr. Khrushchev's tirade Monday. The U-2 incident, he said, had become a factor in the internal politics of the Soviet Union.

We in the West have known for a long time of the behind-the-scenes jockeying in the Kremlin over the policy of peaceful coexistence. Arrayed against Mr. Khrushchev and his supporters have stood the Stalinist clique with its nostalgia for the old days of the mailed fist, and, in tandem, the generals of the Red army and air force. Over Khrushchev's shoulder at all stages has loomed the menace of Red China and its Stalin-type leadership.

These groups have never had any confidence in the policy of peaceful coexistence. They have, according to our certain knowledge, sabotaged it every inch of the way and now, with a boost from the U-2 incident, they have stolen the initiative.

Mr. Khrushchev, in other words, is playing the simple cat-and-mouse game of political survival in the toughest league there is—the Kremlin hierarchy.

Where does all of this leave the West?

Fortunately, I think, Mr. Khrushchev has overreached himself with world opinion.

His phony innocence deceives no one. "As God is my witness," he said on Monday, "I come here with clean hands and a pure soul."

The only way I know to describe this statement is with the Yiddish word "Hutspeh" ("u" like the "oo" in "foot") which may be defined as the quality shown by the man who murdered his mother and father and then demanded mercy because he was an orphan.

The world surely recognizes Nikita Khrushchev for the sanctimonious hypocrite he is.

And so I would judge that we have not lost much, if any, ground in our propaganda battle with the Soviet Union.

We will have to play our hand carefully with respect to the U-2 incident, but, for the moment at least, we do not seem to be at any great disadvantage. Happily, the Russians have done a very clumsy piece of work and have muffed their opportunity.

More serious, I think, are the pressures the Soviet Union is certain to exert on the circle of countries which serve as U.S. airbases. Norway, Turkey, Pakistan, Japan, and others have already felt the hot breath of Kremlin displeasure and they are squirming under it.

Given the delicate state of the political situation in many of these countries as it affects relations with the United States, we will have to exert the utmost dexterity to avoid the loss of our forward bases and at the same time prevent the raising of political issues which could do enormous damage to friendly governments with their own electorates.

This task will require cool and careful diplomacy on the part of the administration and great restraint on the part of all U.S. political leaders. We can afford no further blunders. Neither should criticism of the administration's handling of this episode be permitted to degenerate into a backbiting exchange of charge and countercharge. The country's interests are above personal or party interests. At all times we should strive to maintain bipartisan unity at the water's edge. It is the key to survival.

Now, let me add this further thought. We need as a people, in developing this bipartisan unity at the water's edge, to recognize that we are in for a long, hard pull.

The U-2 incident is merely an episode.

Those who were pinning all their hopes on a miracle at the summit were bound to be disappointed sooner or later. They have merely been disappointed sooner.

Let's remember that the springlike atmosphere of the 1955 summit meeting was subsequently dispelled by Hungary and by Suez—and yet the Big Four managed once again to find its way to the summit.

Regardless of which phase we are in—summit or contrasummit—we need to keep our vision as firmly fixed on our goal as the Soviet Union's vision is fixed on its goal.

Their cause is world revolution by whatever route; our cause is the spread of democratic methods and institutions as a means of checking communism and contributing to the economic progress of the free nations of the earth.

We dare not allow our glance to be diverted from our objective by scare tactics nor even by overt actions short of war.

If there is a nuclear stalemate in the world, if there is a balance of terror, then this stalemate and this balance affect the Russians as well as they affect us.

Cowardice in the face of danger will only cause us to give away what cannot be taken from us.

Regardless of what cards he draws, the man who does not know the value of his own hand will walk away from the poker table without his shirt. He will be bluffed into throwing away his winning hands and suckered into entering pots he cannot claim.

This metaphor, I think, holds except in three respects: The stakes are higher. The play of the hands is infinitely more complex. And this is no game.

We are in the deadly serious business of seeing to our survival as a nation, as a civilization, as a species.

The greatest danger, as I see it, to survival in all three of these categories is that our antagonist will miscalculate.

We must not in a moment of vacillation allow him to misjudge the point at which we will yield no further, as Hitler misread the intentions of the British in the aftermath of Munich.

We must show that we do mean business—that we will not abandon our rights nor shirk our duties. We must demonstrate that we shall stand firm in the face of threats—and, if we do this, then we shall make the men in the Kremlin realize that the line has been drawn and they cannot cross it without unleashing the fury of a war which no one can win.

This is the surest road to peace. It will not be an easy road—the Communists will put roadblocks every mile along the way and try to tempt us and our allies, with detours which they can make attractive looking indeed at the entrance, carefully camouflaging the beartraps to which they lead. But it is the road we must follow, whatever sacrifices it may require, if we as a nation are to survive—if Western civilization is to be preserved.