

tion to the maximum extent consistent with national security."

In spite of the findings and recommendations of the Hoover Commission, you are going to have an increasing demand for bigger and bigger engineering departments and for the elimination of private engineering services in Government work. The only way to stop this assault on this particular segment of the private enterprise system is to bring about an informed public opinion through an educational process.

This special Highway Investigating Committee, of which I am a minority member, is going to investigate private engineering

costs. I assure you there is a lot of preconceived sentiment for the reduction or elimination of private consultants in highway work. Of course, they will overlook that section of the Highway Act which says:

"It is declared to be in the national interest to encourage and develop the actual and potential capacity of small business and to utilize this important segment of our economy to the fullest practicable extent in construction of the Federal highway systems, including the Interstate System. In order to carry out that intent and encourage full and free competition, the Secretary should assist, insofar as feasible, small business en-

terprises in obtaining contracts in connection with the prosecution of the highway program."

We must insist that before any action is taken, an unbiased study be made of highway construction engineering costs by both Government agencies and by private engineering companies. In other words, the Hoover task force report made in 1955 must be brought up to date. I myself have no doubt as to the outcome of an impartial survey, especially if there is taken into consideration the fact that the private organizations pay taxes back to the Federal Government on whatever profit they make.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 22, 1960

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

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

O Thou who art from everlasting to everlasting: We come conscious of the cloud of witnesses no longer here in the flesh, but who look down upon this Chamber where vital questions challenge the best in mind and heart.

We pray that those who, in this tense day, bear the responsibilities of public office may serve in the spirit of the great legislators and liberators of the past.

May the final enactments which emerge be the true expression of the fairer ideals of brotherhood and freedom which now are seeking their incarnation in a new age.

Grant that the servants of the state may feel ever more deeply that my diversion for private ends of the powers with which the people have entrusted them is a betrayal of the Nation.

In the red glare of the titanic battle now engulfing the earth in a war against Thy supreme sovereignty and against the rights of the individual man, may those who speak or write from any pedestal of influence, scorning party cunning, unite to breathe a new dedication to the things of the spirit which alone have made our America the hope of the world. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, June 21, 1960, was dispensed with.

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 of the Senate, severally with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 2384. An act for the relief of Tommy Tadayoshi Shuto (Tadayoshi Takeda);

S. 2740. An act for the relief of Julia Sukkar; and

S. 2969. An act to authorize the award posthumously of appropriate medals to Chap-

lain George L. Fox, Chaplain Alexander D. Goode, Chaplain Clark V. Poling, and Chaplain John P. Washington.

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

S. 1765. An act to authorize and direct the Treasury to cause the vessel *Edith Q.*, owned by James O. Quinn, of Sunset, Maine, to be documented as a vessel of the United States with full coastwise privileges;

S. 2941. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ming-Chen Hsu (nee Nai-Fu Mo); and

S. 2967. An act for the relief of Huan-pin Tso.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to each of the following bills of the House:

H.R. 6479. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to the village of Highland Falls, N.Y.; and

H.R. 8241. An act to amend certain provisions of the Civil Service Retirement Act relating to the reemployment of former Members of Congress.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 103) favoring the suspension of deportation in the cases of certain aliens, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

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

H.R. 1422. An act for the relief of Alessandro Maraessa;

H.R. 1526. An act for the relief of F. P. Tower, Lillie B. Lewis, the estate of Manuel Branco, John Santos Carinhas, Joaquin Gomez Carinhas, and Manuel Jesus Carinhas;

H.R. 1588. An act for the relief of Julius F. Steinhoff;

H.R. 1643. An act for the relief of Francesco Carozza;

H.R. 1671. An act for the relief of Hans E. T. Hansen;

H.R. 1681. An act for the relief of Maurice Devlin;

H.R. 2117. An act for the relief of Irene D. Brodit and Antonio D. Brodit;

H.R. 2124. An act for the relief of Mrs. Teruko Teri Miyamoto (nee Ikeda);

H.R. 2584. An act for the relief of Gourgen H. Assaturian;

H.R. 2705. An act for the relief of Bernardino Paternostro;

H.R. 2716. An act for the relief of Miss Elisabeth Hollander;

H.R. 2944. An act for the relief of Luciano Di Franco;

H.R. 3534. An act for the relief of Epifanio Trupiano;

H.R. 3536. An act for the relief of Guadalupe Villarreal, Jr.;

H.R. 3800. An act for the relief of Mrs. Maud A. Provost;

H.R. 3804. An act for the relief of Rosolina Cluferr;

H.R. 4236. An act for the relief of Mah Quock;

H.R. 4555. An act for the relief of Anatolijs Janitis;

H.R. 4835. An act for the relief of Milton S. Koblit;

H.R. 4970. An act for the relief of Haralambos Groutas;

H.R. 4981. An act for the relief of Mina and Henek Szneider;

H.R. 5647. An act for the relief of Wong Gee Sing;

H.R. 6338. An act for the relief of Miss Hedwig Dora;

H.R. 6804. An act for the relief of Mary Elizabeth Tighe Crespo;

H.R. 7425. An act for the relief of Mrs. Humko Ross;

H.R. 7551. An act for the relief of Hubert O. Beckles;

H.R. 7854. An act to provide tax relief to the annuity fund of the electrical switchboard and panelboard manufacturing industry of New York City and the contributors thereto;

H.R. 7877. An act for the relief of Vladislav Potich;

H.R. 8054. An act for the relief of William Edgar Weaver;

H.R. 8253. An act for the relief of Pierre R. DeBroux;

H.R. 8384. An act for the relief of Otto Small;

H.R. 8882. An act for the relief of John Calvin Taylor;

H.R. 8989. An act for the relief of Ralph W. Anderson;

H.R. 9042. An act for the relief of Anna Semechole Marcolina;

H.R. 9079. An act for the relief of William Radkovich Co., Inc.;

H.R. 9432. An act for the relief of Maj. Edmund T. Coppinger;

H.R. 9610. An act for the relief of Sister Frances Cabrini (Virginia Bilbao);

H.R. 9648. An act for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth Fowler;

H.R. 9913. An act for the relief of Lt. Matthew A. Wojdak, U.S. Navy (retired);

H.R. 9958. An act for the relief of Brooklyn Steel Warehouse Co.;

H.R. 9960. An act for the relief of Dr. Tze I. Chiang;

H.R. 10002. An act for the relief of Ida Exle (nee Ida Sterio);

H.R. 10376. An act for the relief of Adolf B. Jochnick;

H.R. 10431. An act for the relief of Isami Nozuka (also known as Isami Notsuka);

H.R. 10793. An act for the relief of Ray C. Thompson;

H.R. 10801. An act for the relief of Clark L. Simpson;

H.R. 11165. An act for the relief of Robert J. Reeves;

H.R. 11188. An act for the relief of Edward S. Anderson;
H.R. 11322. An act for the relief of Col. Joseph A. Nichols;
H.R. 11486. An act for the relief of Richard J. Power; and
H.R. 12350. An act for the relief of Marion John Nagurski.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 660) relating to the status of certain aliens, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 762. An act for the relief of Manuel Alves de Carvalho;
S. 2089. An act for the relief of Henry K. Lee (Hyun Kui);
S. 2106. An act for the relief of Emiko Nagamine;
S. 2528. An act for the relief of John Lipset;
S. 2639. An act for the relief of Mo Tong Lui;
S. 2646. An act for the relief of Lloyd C. Kimm;
S. 2681. An act for the relief of Yi Young An;
S. 2768. An act for the relief of Frederick T. C. Yu and his wife, Alice Siao-Fen Chen Yu; and
H.J. Res. 765. Joint resolution making a supplemental appropriation for the Department of Labor for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for other purposes.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

H.R. 1422. An act for the relief of Alessandro Maraessa;
H.R. 1526. An act for the relief of F. P. Tower, Lillie B. Lewis, the estate of Manuel Branco, John Santos Carinhas, Joaquin Gomez Carinhas, and Manuel Jesus Carinhas;
H.R. 1583. An act for the relief of Julius F. Steinhoff;
H.R. 1643. An act for the relief of Francesco Carozza;
H.R. 1671. An act for the relief of Hans E. T. Hansen;
H.R. 1681. An act for the relief of Maurice Devlin;
H.R. 2117. An act for the relief of Irene D. Brodit and Antonio D. Brodit;
H.R. 2124. An act for the relief of Mrs. Teruko Teri Miyamoto (nee Ikeda);
H.R. 2584. An act for the relief of Gourgen H. Assaturian;
H.R. 2705. An act for the relief of Bernardo Paternostro;
H.R. 2716. An act for the relief of Miss Elisabeth Hollander;
H.R. 2944. An act for the relief of Luciano Di Franco;
H.R. 3534. An act for the relief of Epifanio Trupiano;
H.R. 3536. An act for the relief of Guadalupe Villarreal, Jr.;
H.R. 3800. An act for the relief of Mrs. Maud A. Provost;
H.R. 3804. An act for the relief of Rosolina Cluferri;
H.R. 4236. An act for the relief of Mah Quock;
H.R. 4555. An act for the relief of Anatolijs Janitis;

H.R. 4835. An act for the relief of Milton S. Koblitz;
H.R. 4970. An act for the relief of Haralambos Groutas;
H.R. 4981. An act for the relief of Mina and Henek Szalder;
H.R. 5647. An act for the relief of Wong Gee Sing;
H.R. 6338. An act for the relief of Miss Hedwig Dora;
H.R. 6804. An act for the relief of Mary Elizabeth Tighe Crespo;
H.R. 7425. An act for the relief of Mrs. Humiko Ross;
H.R. 7551. An act for the relief of Hubert O. Beckles;
H.R. 7854. An act to provide tax relief to the annuity fund of the electrical switchboard and panelboard manufacturing industry of New York City and the contributors thereto;
H.R. 7877. An act for the relief of Vladislav Fotich;
H.R. 8054. An act for the relief of William Edgar Weaver;
H.R. 8253. An act for the relief of Pierre R. DeBroux;
H.R. 8384. An act for the relief of Otto Small;
H.R. 8882. An act for the relief of John Calvin Taylor;
H.R. 8989. An act for the relief of Ralph W. Anderson;
H.R. 9042. An act for the relief of Anna Semencholo Marcolina;
H.R. 9079. An act for the relief of William Radkovich Co., Inc.;
H.R. 9432. An act for the relief of Maj. Edmund T. Coppinger;
H.R. 9610. An act for the relief of Sister Frances Cabrin (Virginia Bilbao);
H.R. 9648. An act for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth Fowler;
H.R. 9913. An act for the relief of Lt. Matthew A. Wojdak, U.S. Navy (retired);
H.R. 9958. An act for the relief of Brooklyn Steel Warehouse Co.;
H.R. 9960. An act for the relief of Dr. Tze I. Chiang;
H.R. 10002. An act for the relief of Ida Exle (nee Ida Sterio);
H.R. 10376. An act for the relief of Adolf B. Jochnick;
H.R. 10431. An act for the relief of Isami Nozuka (also known as Isami Notsuka);
H.R. 10793. An act for the relief of Ray C. Thompson;
H.R. 10801. An act for the relief of Clark L. Simpson;
H.R. 11165. An act for the relief of Robert J. Reeves;
H.R. 11188. An act for the relief of Edward S. Anderson;
H.R. 11322. An act for the relief of Col. Joseph A. Nichols;
H.R. 11486. An act for the relief of Richard J. Power; and
H.R. 12350. An act for the relief of Marion John Nagurski.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 660) relating to the status of certain aliens, was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress favors the granting of the status of permanent residence in the case of each alien hereinafter named, in which case the Attorney General has determined that such alien is qualified under the provisions of section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended (62 Stat. 101; 64 Stat. 219):
A-6236179 Sciama, Alberto, also known as Alberto Vita Sciama.
A-7210380 Wei, Edith Hou.

A-6355520 Charia, Steven J.
A-6355517 Charia, Nevenka.
A-6348962 Charia, Tania Mira.
A-6384962 Charia, Igor Ivan.
Sec. 2. The Congress approves the granting of the status of permanent residence in the case of each alien hereinafter named, in which case the Attorney General has determined that such alien is qualified under the provisions of section 6 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended (67 Stat. 403; 68 Stat. 1044):
A-8117815 Assing, Carlton also known as Yin Ket Wong.
A-10145339 Chang, Chin also known as Chang, Gene.
A-10491831 Cheng, Chan also known as Quan Hong.
A-8031577 Kuldkepp, Oscar.
A-9547460 Lee, Fou Yueh.
A-7274366 Lee, Irving Tack-Shing or Tack Shing Lee.
A-7274430 Lee, Vivien Wei-Ning or Wei-Ning Lee.
A-10237562 Linker, Jonas Beno.
A-10237561 Linker, Estera Idesa.
A-10136001 Podlaski Jozef.
A-9771465 Wing, Koon.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

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

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

TREATY WITH JAPAN—DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE ELLIOTT, OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at this time the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] and the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] be recognized for 3 minutes each.

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

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, in a few moments it will be my sad duty, as a representative of the Senate, to leave the floor, to attend the funeral of Representative Douglas H. Elliott, of Pennsylvania.

Accordingly, under the unanimous-consent agreement adopted last night, I shall not be able to cast my vote in support of consent to the ratification of the Japanese Treaty.

However, I should like to take just a moment to state for the record my strong support of that treaty, and to have it noted that if I could be on the floor at the time of the taking of the vote, I would vote in favor of consent to the ratification of the treaty.

Anyone who reads the debate which took place yesterday in the Senate must reach the conclusion that this treaty is in the best interest of the United States of America. I harbor some reservations about the treaty; nevertheless, I am convinced that, all things considered, it should be ratified.

We must keep Japan as our friend. She is a staunch ally as well as our second greatest customer. We must have an understanding heart about the problems of Japan. We must not conclude

that only a small handful of Communists is opposed to this treaty. There is a strong neutralist sentiment in Japan, too; and this we must understand, and be sympathetic with, because if we were in the situation of Japan, there would be a large neutralist sentiment in our country, too.

Nevertheless, on the whole, and all things taken into consideration, I am convinced that the treaty should be ratified; and if I were here at the time of the taking of the vote, I would vote for consent to the ratification of the treaty.

I thank the majority leader for his courtesy in making it possible for my colleague, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] and me to make these comments before we must leave the floor.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, as my colleague, the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], has just now stated, the two Senators from Pennsylvania have been appointed by resolution adopted by the Senate, to represent the Senate at the funeral, in the middle of today, of the late Hon. Douglas H. Elliott, a Member of the House of Representatives from the State of Pennsylvania.

I had known Doug Elliott for a great many years. He was a State Senator before he was elected in a special election on April 22 to the present Congress.

He was a man of wonderful, magnetic personality—a tall, handsome, extraverted man, whom all of us admired, respected, and loved.

His death is a great and tragic loss to his family, to all his friends, to all who knew him, and to the Members of Congress. At this very sad time, my colleague and I will attend his funeral.

Mr. President, before leaving the Chamber, my colleague and I have requested this time in order to make these statements.

I wish to say, in addition, that, by the action of the Senate itself, our departure at this time will compel our absence from the Chamber at the time when the vote is taken on the question of consent to the ratification of the security treaty with Japan.

I am very strongly in favor of the treaty. I wish that fact to be recorded at this time, inasmuch as I was unable to gain recognition on the floor on yesterday.

I have visited Japan six times. I was there on the first day of the occupation, as a member of the Third Amphibious Force. I actually drove the first Navy jeep into Tokyo, following the landing of the occupation forces.

I have grown to admire and love the Japanese people and to respect their commitments toward the free world and their definite and strong feelings as a people for freedom, honor, decency, and justice under law.

We need the Japanese people on our side. We need them as much as they need us. The treaty is favorable to Japan, but it is also favorable to the United States.

It is my earnest hope that the ratification of the treaty may, in itself, lead

to a subsidence of the difficulties which presently are occurring in Japan.

Therefore, Mr. President, I gladly and wholeheartedly support the treaty.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

WORKWEEK OF FIRE DEPARTMENT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act of June 19, 1948, relating to the workweek of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

ELIGIBILITY FOR CERTAIN SCHOLARSHIPS UNDER SURPLUS PROPERTY ACT OF 1944

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to make nationals, American and foreign, eligible for certain scholarships under the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AUDIT REPORT ON FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Federal Housing Administration, Housing and Home Finance Agency, fiscal year 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

PETITION

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisors of San Diego County, Calif., favoring the enactment of legislation to repeal the excise tax on transportation, which was ordered to lie on the table.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

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

H.R. 9751. An act for the relief of Mrs. Icie Helen Hinman (Rept. No. 1663).

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, with amendments:

H.R. 7758. An act to improve the administration of overseas activities of the Government of the United States, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1647).

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

S. 3228. A bill to amend the provisions of part II of the Interstate Commerce Act which authorize certain operations within a State as a common carrier by motor vehicle engaged in interstate or foreign commerce if State authorized (Rept. No. 1648).

By Mr. MORSE, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, without amendment:

S. 3416. A bill to provide for the restoration to the United States of amounts expended in the District of Columbia in carrying out the Temporary Unemployment Compensation Act of 1958 (Rept. No. 1649).

By Mr. MORSE, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, with amendments:

S. 2363. A bill to provide for more effective administration of public assistance in the District of Columbia; to make certain relatives responsible for support of needy persons, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1650).

By Mr. HARTKE, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, without amendment:

H.R. 10021. An act providing a uniform law for the transfer of securities to and by fiduciaries in the District of Columbia (Rept. No. 1652).

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

H.J. Res. 397. Joint resolution to enable the United States to participate in the resettlement of certain refugees (Rept. No. 1651).

By Mr. ANDERSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, without amendment:

S. 2806. A bill to revise the boundaries of the Coronado National Memorial and to authorize the repair and maintenance of an access road thereto, in the State of Arizona, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1654); and

S.J. Res. 95. Joint resolution to provide for the acceleration of the various reforestation programs of the Department of Agriculture and the Department of the Interior, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1653).

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

H.R. 6179. An act to grant the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to certain lands to the city of Crawford, Nebr. (Rept. No. 1656).

By Mr. FONG, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, without amendment:

S. 3623. A bill to designate and establish that portion of the Hawaii National Park on the island of Maui, in the State of Hawaii, as the Haleakala National Park, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1655).

By Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, without amendment:

S. Res. 329. Resolution to provide additional funds for the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs;

S. Res. 330. Resolution to study the conditions in American Samoa (Rept. No. 1657);

S. Res. 333. Resolution to print additional copies of the report entitled "Documentation, Indexing, and Retrieval of Scientific Information";

S. Res. 335. Resolution to provide additional funds for the Committee on Appropriations; and

H. Con. Res. 691. Concurrent resolution authorizing the disposal of certain publications now stored in the folding room of the House of Representatives and the warehouse of the Senate (Rept. No. 1661).

By Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with an amendment:

S. Res. 337. Resolution to print a certain number of copies of the prayers of the Chaplain of the Senate for the 85th and 86th Congresses.

By Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with amendments:

S.J. Res. 176. Joint resolution authorizing the preparation and printing of a Supplement to the Constitution of the United States of America, Annotated, as published in 1953 as Senate Document No. 170, 82d Congress (Rept. No. 1659);

S. Con. Res. 107. Concurrent resolution to print for the use of the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee copies of certain publications (Rept. No. 1660); and

S. Res. 328. Resolution amending S. Res. 244 authorizing the Committee on Interstate

and Foreign Commerce to investigate certain matters within its jurisdiction (Rept. No. 1658).

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

H.R. 7965. An act to amend section 612 of title 28, United States Code, to authorize outpatient treatment incident to authorized hospital care for certain veterans (Rept. No. 1662).

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

S. 3274. A bill to permit certain veterans pursuing courses of vocational rehabilitation training to continue in pursuit thereof for such period as may be necessary to complete such courses; (Rept. No. 1644).

EXTENSION OF WORLD WAR II LOAN GUARANTEE PROGRAM—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE—MINORITY VIEWS

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I report favorably, with an amendment, the bill (S. 3275) to extend, with respect to World War II veterans, the guaranteed loan programs under chapter 37 of title 38, United States Code, to February 1, 1965, and I submit a report (No. 1646) thereon. I ask that the report be printed, together with minority views thereon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. 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 Texas.

EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE FOR ORPHANS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE—MINORITY VIEWS

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I report favorably, with amendments, the bill (H.R. 4306) to provide education and training for the children of veterans dying of a service-connected disability incurred after January 31, 1955, and before the end of compulsory military service, and I submit a report (No. 1645) thereon. I ask that the report may be printed, together with minority views thereon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. 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 Texas.

ROSANNE WILLCOX PURVIS

Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 341) to pay a gratuity to Rosanne Willcox Purvis, which was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Rosanne Willcox Purvis, widow of Melvin H. Purvis, an employee of the Senate at the time of his death, a sum equal to 8½ month's compensation at the rate he was receiving at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

LEON R. DEVILLE, JR.

Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 342) to pay a gratuity to Leon R. Deville, Jr., which was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Leon R. Deville, Jr., son of Leon Deville, an employee of the Senate at the time of his death, a sum equal to 1 year's compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

THELMA MARGUARETTE HEDGE

Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 343) to pay a gratuity to Thelma Marguarette Hedge, which was placed on the Calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Thelma Marguarette Hedge, widow of Porter M. Hedge, an employee of the Senate at the time of his death, a sum equal to 10 months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

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

Charles R. Ferguson, of Pennsylvania, to be a member of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review;

Theodore M. Hesburgh, of Indiana, and sundry other persons, to be members of the National Science Board, National Science Foundation; and

James L. Baker, and sundry other candidates, for personnel action in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service.

TIMOTHY J. MURPHY—EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE—MINORITY VIEWS (EX. REPT. NO. 9)

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, as in executive session, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I report favorably the nomination of Timothy J. Murphy of Massachusetts to be an Interstate Commerce Commissioner for the remainder of the term expiring December 31, 1964, vice Anthony F. Arpaia, resigned; and I submit a report thereon.

I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed, together with the minority views of Senators YARBOROUGH, ENGLE, BARTLETT, and MCGEE.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be received and printed, as requested by the Senator from Washington, and the nomination will be placed on the Executive Calendar.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield for a question?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. May I ask the Senator from Washington if this is the gentleman who is being appointed to fill the vacancy created by the failure to reappoint Mr. Connole?

Mr. MAGNUSON. No; this is in the Interstate Commerce Commission, not the Federal Power Commission.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator. The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

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 (for himself, Mr. BIBLE, and Mr. MANSFIELD):

S. 3713. A bill to increase the salaries of officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force, and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, the U.S. Park Police, the White House Police, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ROBERTSON (by request):

S. 3714. A bill to authorize adjustments in accounts of outstanding old series currency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 3715. A bill to improve commerce and industrial development through the establishment of a county industrial agent program; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

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

By Mr. JORDAN:

S. 3716. A bill to delay for 60 days in limited cases the applicability of certain provisions of law relating to humane slaughter of livestock; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. MUSKIE (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. BEALL, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Mr. DODD, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. ERVIN, Mr. FONG, Mr. GREEN, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. KEATING, Mr. LUSK, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. MOSS, Mr. MORSE, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, Mr. MCGEE, and Mr. STENNIS):

S. 3717. A bill to authorize the enlargement of the Arlington National Cemetery and to provide that land therein shall be reserved for the interment of persons who have served with greatest distinction and valor in the Armed Forces of the United States as a memorial to the preservation of our freedoms and the ideals of democracy and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

By Mr. MOSS:

S. 3718. A bill for the relief of Misako Takahashi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 3719. A bill to authorize an additional Assistant Secretary of Commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

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

By Mr. HOLLAND:

S. 3720. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell reserved phosphate interests of the United States in lands

located in the State of Florida to the record owners of the surface thereof; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KEATING (by request):

S. 3721. A bill to amend section 371, title 28, United States Code, to provide an alternative plan for the retirement of justices and judges of the United States having 10 or more years' service, after the attainment of the age of 65 years, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARTKE:

S. 3722. A bill for the relief of Giacomo Ferro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAVITS (for himself and Mr. KEATING):

S.J. Res. 210. Joint resolution to provide for the determination of U.S. participation in the New York World's Fair to be held at New York City in 1964 and 1965; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

RESOLUTIONS

INTERNATIONAL FOOD AND RAW MATERIALS RESERVE

Mr. MURRAY submitted a resolution (S. Res. 340) to provide for the creation of an International Food and Raw Materials Reserve, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

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

ROSANNE WILLCOX PURVIS

Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 341) to pay a gratuity to Rosanne Willcox Purvis, which was placed on the calendar.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. HAYDEN, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

LEON R. DEVILLE, JR.

Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 342) to pay a gratuity to Leon R. Deville, Jr., which was placed on the calendar.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. HAYDEN, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

THELMA MARGARETTE HEDGE

Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 343) to pay a gratuity to Thelma Marguerette Hedge, which was placed on the calendar.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. HAYDEN, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

COUNTY INDUSTRIAL AGENT PROGRAM

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, community cooperation has a very special meaning for Americans. It is a very special part of American life—a hallmark especially of the development of our smaller communities.

We Americans like to get together and talk over a community problem and then set about together to do something

about it. This is the basis for many fine community ventures designed to rehabilitate and revitalize the many declining rural communities and smaller depressed areas in our Nation by attracting new industries, opening new markets, developing new skills among our unemployed men and women and initiating relief measures to ease the terrible personal hardship of economic depression.

Mr. President, since the administration insists on stubbornly ignoring the desperate needs of our people who live in these unfortunately depressed small urban areas or in rural communities losing population to heavily industrialized cities, I propose that the Federal Government take at least one modest step toward creation of new employment opportunities in these areas without reducing employment in other parts of our Nation.

It should be clearly understood that the proposal I am making is not to be viewed as a substitute for so-called depressed areas legislation or area redevelopment legislation. That legislation is still needed. It is regrettable, and unforgivably regrettable, that the administration blocks such legislation at every turn, and that the President has vetoed it.

I believe we can borrow a page from the experience of our agricultural community and establish a county industrial agent program. Like the work of the agricultural extension agent, this program would be supported with equal financial support from county, State, and Federal governments.

It would be the work of this agent to give technical assistance, channeling information on opportunities for diversification of industries, new legislation, new industrial improvements, and new markets to the local community. He would also have the responsibility of reporting on the local situation to the State and Federal authorities so that their policymaking would be based on the hard facts of local conditions and not solely on statistical projections. He would further promote cooperation and coordination of voluntary groups now at work in local communities with public governmental agencies—eliminating costly duplication and false starts. Finally, he would create opportunities for vocational training of the unemployed men and women in each locality.

These responsibilities are stated in terms of the work such an agent might undertake in a depressed area. But, though born of the emergency of the present situation in which some 140 communities bear the label "depressed area," the county industrial agent like his partner, the agricultural agent, would give continuing service to his area.

The vocational training responsibilities he would undertake could easily be adapted to provide for retraining for older workers or those displaced from their farms by automation. The cooperation the agency would promote among private groups—labor and management, a major example—would be of lasting value to the stable growth of the local community.

And finally, a byproduct of efforts to attract new industries would have repercussions for national security, relocating and decentralizing portions of our massive Defense Establishment to reduce its vulnerability to surprise attack.

We must not overlook the fact also that by maintaining smaller communities and rural areas with their own existing educational, health, and other facilities, this program would ease the steadily increasing financial burdens of our large cities faced with sudden influxes of untrained workers.

Thus, Mr. President, for both present and future development of America's industrial and rural communities, I introduce, for appropriate referral, a bill to improve commerce and industrial development through the establishment of a county industrial agent program, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in my remarks.

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

The bill (S. 3715) to improve commerce and industrial development through the establishment of a county industrial agent program, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, 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,

FINDINGS OF THE CONGRESS

SECTION 1. The Congress finds that there exists special circumstances in certain areas of the United States which cause such areas to be at a disadvantage insofar as economic development and social stability is concerned for the following reasons:

- (1) Excessive concentration on one product or one nonbasic industry.
- (2) Changing agricultural technology, which produces a need for fewer and fewer workers, combined with a significant drop in farm income has caused supportive towns and industries to become depressed areas.
- (3) A nonintegrated approach to the problems of economic development in underdeveloped or depressed communities.

PURPOSE OF THE ACT

SEC. 2. The purpose of this Act is to:

- (1) Promote the economic development of certain areas of this country which have been known as one-industry areas.
- (2) Preserve, improve, and protect the sociological advantages of rural communities and family farm living through the creation of new economic opportunities.
- (3) Reestablish as rapidly as possible the industrial and commercial basis of communities outlined in paragraphs (1) and (2) of this section, so that emigration to large urban areas will decrease.
- (4) Establish extension-type education programs to teach alternative jobs and technical skills to residents of areas described in section 1 of this Act.
- (5) Develop well-organized and integrated approach to the problem of area economic development through Federal-State-local cooperation.

COUNTY INDUSTRIAL AGENT PROGRAM

SEC. 3. In order to carry out the purposes of this Act, the Secretary of Commerce is authorized to establish a county industrial agent program as part of the Office of Area Development, and to appoint that number

of industrial agents which he deems appropriate to carry out the purposes of this Act, but no fewer than one-half the number of county agricultural extension agents provided by the Department of Agriculture on the date of enactment of this Act.

COOPERATION WITH CERTAIN AGENCIES AND ORGANIZATIONS

SEC. 4. The Secretary of Commerce and the industrial agents are authorized to cooperate with Government officers and agencies and commercial, agricultural, and labor organizations on a local, State, and National level for the purpose of receiving (1) support and assistance in the establishment of an area development program, and (2) support and assistance in training persons in alternative job skills.

APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED

SEC. 5. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, Father Francis Hayden, rural life director of the diocese of New Ulm, Minn., in a column in the Catholic Bulletin of St. Paul, Minn., on June 3, 1960, analyzed some of the signs of vitality and growth potential in small communities. These signs, development of community facilities, attraction of new industries, vocational training and retraining and, of course, a cooperative spirit of determination and self-help within the community—are all matters which would be the concern of the county industrial agent, who would assist and develop existing community initiatives.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Father Hayden's article, entitled "Improve Your Town; People, Jobs Will Come," be printed at this point in my remarks.

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

IMPROVE YOUR TOWN, PEOPLE, JOBS WILL COME

(By Fr. Francis Hayden)

GAYLORD, MINN.—I am sure it was only a coincidence that placed a report on declining farm population next to the obituary notices in one of our recent Sunday papers.

Unofficial U. S. census figures show, the article said, that 40 of the agricultural counties of Minnesota have suffered a loss in population in the last decade.

Falling farm income and higher city wages are given as part of the reason for the population shift.

Another cause is larger and better machinery which enables a farmer to accomplish much more by himself today than he did 20 years ago with a helper or two. Two decades ago, 23 percent of our population lived on farms. Today, only 11 percent live on the land.

A declining farm population is the result of progress which we have all gladly accepted. No one wants to go back to the horse and buggy or to the sulky plow.

What we do not want to accept, however, is the population loss which we are suffering and which is a problem for the whole rural community. Can we do anything about it?

We can best answer that question by considering the rural counties that reported an increased population and examining the reasons they did.

First of all, there were people who liked their home communities enough to want to stay here.

They hoped that their children too would remain near their homes instead of joining the 70 to 80 percent of the rural youth who

go elsewhere to work and live after they have been raised and educated.

There were also businessmen who, with an eye to the future, sought unselfishly to save their places of business.

Pastors needed their parishioners to share the burden of support of their churches and schools, and they realized that conditions in the rural communities were good for family life.

These people cooperated to build their future.

Secondly, there were others who noted the attractiveness of those towns and moved to live in them. Some were district salesmen who had to make a choice between a dozen or so of the neighboring towns.

Others who made similar decisions were retiring farmers and businessmen. That is about all it takes to make small towns continue to thrive.

Finally, industrialists who were seeking favorable sites for their small factories decided that they could have flourishing establishments in those types of communities. They hired some of the youth who would otherwise have had to move away.

They employed a few of the farmers who were looking for part-time work or, in some cases, gave full-time employment to farmers leaving the land before they were ready to retire.

It usually takes only one such energetic community in a county to enable that county to hold its population. While this happens, it is good for the local governments.

It contributes to the continued success of the businessmen. Churches and schools find it easier to be effective. Many good rural homes are also saved.

That is what happened in the rural counties that showed an increased population. It is really quite simple, beginning with knowing, loving, and serving God through thoughtfulness of our neighbor who bears His image.

How is your town doing?

Maybe you have wanted and have been looking for a factory to coax into your town while you should have been busy making yours the kind of community that factory people would want.

FREEDOM MEMORIAL ACT OF 1960

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and Senators ANDERSON, BARTLETT, BEALL, CAPEHART, CASE of South Dakota, DODD, DOUGLAS, ERVIN, FONG, GREEN, GRUENING, HUMPHREY, JAVITS, KEATING, LUSK, MANSFIELD, McGEE, MOSS, MORSE, RANDOLPH, STENNIS, SYMINGTON, YOUNG of North Dakota, I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the enlargement of Arlington National Cemetery and to provide that land therein shall be reserved for the interment of persons who have served with the greatest distinction and valor in the Armed Forces of the United States.

Mr. President, I was dismayed to learn recently that America's most hallowed ground—Arlington National Cemetery—is filling up so fast that within a very few years all remaining space for the interment of the Nation's honored dead will have been occupied. It has been reliably estimated that the cemetery will be closed to future burials by 1968.

Upon investigation, I found that the area adjoining the north boundary of Arlington National Cemetery, the so-called Nevius tract, consists of approximately 20 acres of unoccupied federally owned land that could well be utilized

in extending the cemetery. It has the same general topography and is contiguous to the present cemetery.

This land is presently under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior. Proposed plans would utilize this high, gently sloping tract of land facing the Potomac River, Washington, and the Mall for a monument to freedom symbolized by the erection of a so-called Freedom Wall 68 feet high, 327½ feet long, and 204½ feet wide.

Mr. President, it would be sheer folly to waste this tract of land, so admirably suited to receive the last remains of those who have borne the Nation's battles, by constructing with Federal funds this gigantic wall and terming it a monument to freedom. I submit that a more appropriate memorial to freedom would be the reservation of this land for the remains of those who have served in the Armed Forces and have been awarded our Nation's highest decorations.

The bill I am introducing would transfer the tract of land in question to the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Army and would reserve it for the interment of persons who have received the Congressional Medal of Honor; the Distinguished Service Cross; the Navy Cross; the Distinguished Flying Cross; the Army and Navy Distinguished Service Medals and such other persons as may be designated by the President of the United States.

This shall then be a fitting memorial to the preservation of our freedoms and the ideals of democracy, and to those persons who by their acts of great valor in time of war exemplified most magnificently the very great contribution made by all members of the armed services of the United States in the defense of this Nation and its ideals and its people.

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

The bill (S. 3717) to authorize the enlargement of the Arlington National Cemetery and to provide that land therein shall be reserved for the interment of persons who have served with greatest distinction and valor in the Armed Forces of the United States as a memorial to the preservation of our freedoms and the ideals of democracy, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MUSKIE (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

ADDITIONAL ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF COMMERCE

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize an additional Assistant Secretary of Commerce. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from the Under Secretary of Commerce, requesting the proposed legislation.

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

The bill (S. 3719) to authorize an additional Assistant Secretary of Commerce, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by

request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The letter presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, D.C., June 15, 1960.

HON. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Transmitted herewith is a draft bill "to authorize an additional Assistant Secretary of Commerce."

Enactment of this legislation is necessary to carry out a major recommendation of the Special Advisory Committee of the National Academy of Sciences and to assure that the important scientific and technical functions and responsibilities of the Department of Commerce are effectively directed by the Secretary assisted by an officer of high rank.

Today, more than ever before in our history, science and technology are playing an ever-increasing role in the industrial and business activities of our Nation. Included within the Department of Commerce, and importantly related to our basic mission of fostering and promoting industry, commerce, and transportation are such outstanding scientific agencies as the National Bureau of Standards, the Weather Bureau, and the Coast and Geodetic Survey. Also contributing to the scientific and technical needs of our expanding economy are such agencies as the Patent Office and the Office of Technical Services. In addition, the fulfillment of the responsibilities of the Bureau of Public Roads and the Maritime Administration require extensive research and development activities in a number of scientific and technical fields. These agencies and the activities they conduct are of immeasurable importance not only to our economy, but to our national defense and the general welfare of our people as well. The scientific and technical functions conducted within the Department of Commerce are important links in the overall scientific efforts being conducted by other agencies of our Government in the areas of national defense, atomic energy, space technology, oceanography, meteorology, and others. The scope and importance of these functions and the part which agencies of the Department of Commerce must assume are constantly increasing.

It is of vital importance that there be competent direction and administration of our scientific and technical programs and that they be adequately coordinated with other related activities throughout the Government to assure the maximum effectiveness of our national efforts.

It is intended that this additional Assistant Secretary of Commerce will serve as the principal adviser to the Secretary on all scientific and technological matters of concern to the Department.

The incumbent in this new position will provide vital assistance to the Secretary in:

1. The coordination and evaluation of existing programs of the Department in the fields of science and technology;
2. The expansion of such programs where deemed desirable to meet our national needs;
3. The development and implementation of new research and development programs in furtherance of the Department's objectives;
4. Representing the Department on top policy level scientific committees and groups, including the Federal Council for Science and Technology.

Authorization for the appointment of an additional Assistant Secretary of Commerce will make it possible to provide the most effective review of the expanding science activities of the Department of Commerce by

a highly qualified science administrator. The increasing importance of the scientific and technological agencies of the Department of Commerce require an officer with the rank of Assistant Secretary to assure that our responsibilities and programs are adequately carried out in the interests of our economy, national defense, and public welfare.

We strongly urge prompt favorable consideration of this proposed bill by Congress.

It is estimated that enactment of this legislation will involve the expenditure of approximately \$50,000 per year.

We have been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that it would interpose no objection to the submission of this proposed legislation.

Sincerely yours,

PHILIP A. RAY,
Under Secretary of Commerce.

AMENDMENT AND EXTENSION OF SUGAR ACT OF 1948—AMENDMENTS

Mr. CHAVEZ (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. KERR, and Mr. YARBOROUGH) submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (S. 3361) to amend and extend the provisions of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. CHAVEZ (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. KERR, and Mr. YARBOROUGH) submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (S. 3508) to amend and extend the provisions of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed.

AUTHORIZATION FOR HIGHWAY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEARS 1962 AND 1963— AMENDMENT

Mr. JAVITS (for himself and Mr. KEATING) submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (H.R. 10495) to authorize appropriations for the fiscal years 1962 and 1963 for the construction of certain highways in accordance with title 23 of the United States Code, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF MERCHANT MARINE ACT, 1936, TO CHANGE THE LIMITATION OF CONSTRUCTION DIFFERENTIAL SUBSIDY

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. 10644) to amend title V of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, in order to change the limitation of the construction differential subsidy under such title, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. MAGNUSON. 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. PASTORE, Mr. BARTLETT, and Mr. BUTLER conferees on the part of the Senate.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF HAROLD R. TYLER, JR., TO BE AN ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to announce that a public hearing has been scheduled on the nomination of Harold R. Tyler, Jr., of New York, to be Assistant Attorney General, vice W. Wilson White, resigned, for 10:30 a.m., Wednesday, June 29, 1960, in room 2228, New Senate Office Building.

At the indicated time and place all persons interested in this nomination may make such representations as are pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], and myself, as chairman.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF JACOB MISHLER TO BE U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE, EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to announce that a public hearing has been scheduled on the nomination of Jacob Mishler, of New York, to be U.S. district judge, for the eastern district of New York, vice Mortimer Byers, retired, for 2:30 p.m., Wednesday, June 29, 1960, in room 2228, New Senate Office Building.

At the indicated time and place all persons interested in this nomination may make such representations as are pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], and myself, as chairman.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF ROBERT S. RANKIN TO BE A MEMBER OF COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to announce that a public hearing has been scheduled on the nomination of Robert S. Rankin, of North Carolina, to be member of the Commission on Civil Rights, vice John S. Battle, resigned, for 2:30 p.m., Wednesday, June 29, 1960, in room 2228, New Senate Office Building.

At the indicated time and place all persons interested in this nomination may make such representations as are pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], and myself, as chairman.

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. BYRD of Virginia:

Address delivered by him at Peaks of Otter, Va., in connection with the ceremonies opening the James River Bridge on the Blue Ridge Parkway.

THE TREATY WITH JAPAN

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, we are soon to take one of the most important actions of this session—ratification of the Japanese security treaty.

I think it is a good example for the world that the Senate has debated this treaty objectively, coolly, and with dignity. We have neither stampeded into hasty action nor slowed down to no action at all.

I do not intend to go into a lengthy discussion of the treaty itself. I am convinced it is one of mutual advantage to both the United States and Japan; and the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee [Mr. FULBRIGHT], for whom I have great respect, and the other members of that committee have assured me that, after many tedious hours and much diligent study, they too, have reached that conclusion. That is good enough for me; and I am convinced, as I have said, that the treaty is of mutual advantage to both the United States and Japan, and is in the best interest of our country and in the best interest of the free world.

It is crucial in these days that we look to shoring up the defenses of the free world. We must erect a shield around the boundaries of freedom, if the institutions that we cherish are to survive.

The unfortunate events which took place in Japan itself are evidence of the threat against freedom. There can be no question but that Communists played upon the understandable fears of the Japanese people—the only people who have felt the fury of atomic war—to humiliate and to embarrass our country.

But I think we can be certain that the Communists in Japan are a very small minority, and that the great majority of the Japanese still prefer freedom as a way of life.

The massive Communist attack against our way of life is being felt on many fronts—Japan; Quemoy and Matsu; West Berlin; the Middle East; here in our own hemisphere, our own front door, Cuba; and many other areas. Without strength we cannot survive, because the Communists will always resort to brute force if they think it will achieve their ends.

I think it should be said, however, that we also realize that strength alone will not bring us peace. The best we can hope from weapons and armed might is a shield to frustrate a physical attack upon the free world.

We will not be worthy of our heritage or equal to our responsibilities if we do not make moves behind that shield which will truly bring us peace.

For the past 2 days, I have been conducting hearings upon the State Department appropriation bill for the coming fiscal year. I have heard the dedicated officials of our State Department outline their activities throughout the world.

It seems to me that there is a depressing lack of vital, new ideas in our foreign policy. What we are doing is commendable. The people who are carrying out our programs are patriotic, dedicated, and devoted. But I cannot find the bold steps that would reach to the hearts and souls of men throughout the world and convince them that their future lies with freedom;

I believe we will have to launch somewhere along the line, sometime soon, a really massive offensive for peace.

I think it is incumbent upon us, as the leader of the free world, and one of the stronger nations, to propose great programs, through the United Nations, that would stamp out killing and crippling disease.

I think we will have to propose great programs of international cooperation in moving the world's food surplus to areas of deficit.

I should think we will have to propose great programs of international cooperation to break down the barriers that prevent communications between people.

I think we will have to propose great programs of international cooperation to harness the water resources in arid regions of the world.

Some of these things we are doing already. But they are being done on far too modest a scale and without the dramatic drive that would symbolize the heart and soul of America.

I vote for this treaty today because I believe it is a wise and prudent move; because it has been recommended by the outstanding scholars and the ablest foreign relations experts in this body.

But I hope that in the days which lie ahead we shall really realize that this treaty is basically a defensive measure, and that we in America must do much more—yes, much more—if we are to find true peace in this world.

THE LAUNCHING TODAY OF TRANSIT-II-A

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, the United States has achieved outstanding success in the science of space exploration in the short span of just 2 years.

Since our first successful launching of a space vehicle in 1958, we have put 24 scientific devices in orbit, compared with 6 by the Soviet Union—our only rival in this field.

Our latest achievement, the perfect launching early today of the Transit-II-A, should silence any regular critics who apparently seek to make a career of disparaging their own country.

The Transit-II-A success serves to reassure all Americans, as well as the rest of the world, that the United States intends to stay in the foreground of the space race.

Our scientists, engineers, and skilled technicians—not to mention the American taxpayers who foot the bills for all

this—deserve the hearty congratulations and thanks of the entire world, for Transit-II-A was designed to benefit the whole world.

The scientific objectives of this two-package satellite attest to the moral fiber of the people of the United States, who unselfishly seek information to be shared with all peoples everywhere.

First. We intend to give all nations a pinpoint accurate navigation system for ships and planes. The prospect of a time when a ship never will be lost at sea, when rescuers will go directly and promptly to a downed aircraft, when food can be shipped to any point on the globe directly and in record time, staggers the imagination.

Second. The significance of a completely accurate time system—when all the clocks of the world will strike at the same time—is a monumental contribution to civilization.

Third. Further and accurate measurement of the sun's radiation will contribute immensely to scientific achievement in many areas.

Those who were so willing to relegate the United States to a "has-been" status in science and technology should take heart from the notable achievement represented by the launching of Transit-II-A.

I congratulate the Navy and Air Force in their successful joint endeavor, and I also congratulate the administration for its continued success in space achievements.

"THE SACCO-VANZETTI STORY"—TELEVISION PLAY

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, in these days when the fundamental institutions of this country are constantly open to question and attack, in many instances, I believe, by Communist propagandists who are trying to undermine us, it seems hardly necessary to further that effort, even unwittingly, in the field of entertainment.

Mr. President, I refer specifically to the play, "The Sacco-Vanzetti Story," by Reginald Rose, which was recently adapted for television and appeared in two parts of 1 hour each on June 3 and June 10. I do not for a moment feel that our institutions are so untouchably sacrosanct that they should be immune to growth and helpful change. It is essential to the proper working of our republican form of government that failures and shortcomings in our institutions should be openly and objectively discussed. What I do object to is taking historical incidents, distorting them apparently for dramatic effect, and yet presenting them as though a strictly documentary presentation was being made. That is actually what was done in the case of the NBC television show to which I referred and in which the American judicial system, as administered by the courts of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, was presented in a most unobjective and slanted fashion.

The tragedy of this sort of presentation of a course of events starting 40 years ago is that many people are too

young to have a firsthand knowledge of the historical facts, and the tendency will be for them to give full faith and credit to this distorted dramatic presentation, rather than to take the time in this fast-paced life to do their own historical research.

It is for this reason, Mr. President, that I felt that the television reviews pointing out the historical distortion should have as wide distribution as possible. To that end, Mr. President, I request that at this point in the body of the RECORD the following articles be included: the column of Arthur E. Fetrige entitled "On Television," with particular reference to the section entitled "Lovely People," from the Boston Herald of June 3, 1960; the article by Arthur E. Fetrige entitled "Famed Trial 'Distorted' as TV Play," from the June 4, 1960, issue of the Boston Herald; the article by Peter Barnicle entitled "TV Play Excoriates Courts, Governor Fuller," from the June 11, 1960, issue of the Boston Herald; the column by Percy Shain entitled "Night Watch," with subtitle "Governor Fuller Vilified as S-V Drama Ends," appearing in the June 11, 1960, issue of the Boston Globe; the editorial entitled "Bias and Distortion," from the Boston Traveler of June 14, 1960; and the article by Paul Jones entitled "Television's Slanted Sacco-Vanzetti Drama," appearing in the June 23, 1960, issue of Human Events.

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

[From the Boston Herald, June 3, 1960]

ON TELEVISION—"THE MILLIONAIRE" DEPARTS IN FALL

(By Arthur E. Fetrige)

"The Millionaire," one of the longest run television series, will join "Father Knows Best," "The Steve Allen Show," and "George Gobel Show" in departing from the evening scene next fall. "The Millionaire," which has "given away" a million dollars each Wednesday night on the CBS network during the regular season, has been on the air for the past 5 years.

It will be replaced in the Wednesday night 9 to 9:30 time period by "My Sister Eileen." Elaine Stritch will portray Ruth Sherwood. The role of Eileen is yet to be filled.

The sponsors made their decision on "My Sister Eileen" only after a research bureau was hired to help it choose between this series, which will be based on the Ruth McKinley stories in the New Yorker, and a drama anthology series.

A hot tip for those who care to stay up tonight: Don't under any circumstances miss the premiere play of the week, "Medea," on channel 4 at 11:15. Judith Anderson's performance is one of the best we've ever seen on television.

Channel 2's popular summer feature, "Pianoforte," opens the series tonight at 9 with the noted concert pianist and Boston University professor, Alexander Borovsky, who will play Bach, Beethoven, and Prokofiev.

LOVELY PEOPLE

The more interviews we read in other newspapers with Robert Aurthur, executive producer, and Reginald Rose, who did the television script, the more convinced we are that "The Sacco-Vanzetti Story," to be seen on channel 4 in two parts—the first tonight at 8:30—will follow the "they weren't guilty theory" straight down the line.

Rose is quoted by a nationally syndicated columnist as saying of Sacco and Vanzetti: "They were intelligent, lovely, gentle people." What utter rot. They were admitted draft dodgers, they admitted they carried loaded guns and there is little doubt they were anarchists. Vanzetti had been convicted only a short time before he was arrested in this controversial case of another armed robbery.

Of course they were intelligent, lovely, gentle people.

Producer Aurthur is so certain these two men, who were convicted of murder by a jury, were innocent that he would like to have them tried again and then have Governor Furcolo issue posthumous pardons.

I shall watch this great exposé of a miscarriage of justice in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts as done by that unbiased pair with great interest tonight at 8:30.

[From the Boston Herald, June 4, 1960]

FAMED TRIAL "DISTORTED" AS TV PLAY

(By Arthur E. Fetrige)

To those who knew little or nothing about the famous Sacco-Vanzetti case the Commonwealth of Massachusetts stood convicted of a grave miscarriage of justice in hanging them on the basis of the first part of the "Sacco-Vanzetti Story," as presented last night on channel 4.

The author, Reginald Rose, made out a very plausible case for the innocence of these two men. People who never had read unbiased newspaper accounts of the trial and the jury's decision that they were guilty in the first degree of the murder of two paymasters in Bridgewater on April 15, 1920, would have little choice but to agree with Rose that they were not guilty.

VIEW OF JUDGE

Judge Webster Thayer, who presided over the trial, was made to look like a doddering old man. If it was the intent of the producer to make him a knave, as well, he succeeded beautifully.

Prior to the trial Rose let us in on a bit of conversation between two of the prospective jurors. One was overheard saying that if he had his way all "Dagoes" would be banned from this country and he'd be glad to help convict this pair. He became the jury foreman.

The author played the "Italian angle" heavily. He also built up the anarchist angle, evidently in an effort to show that it was because these men were anarchists and draftdodgers that they were convicted for that reason alone and that they never should have been found guilty of the murders.

District Attorney Frederick Katzmann was seen practically ordering Capt. William H. Proctor of the State police to change his testimony as to whether the bullet found in the body of one of the victims came from Sacco's pistol.

SCENES INJECTED

Scenes like that and many others that did not take place in the courtroom were injected into the drama, all of which gave the definite impression that Sacco and Vanzetti were victims of a horrible frameup.

Credibility of several witnesses for the prosecution was impugned, but never actually in the courtroom in this presentation. We constantly wondered why the defense lawyer failed to bring out the points that Rose emphasized so strongly in his play.

From an entertainment point of view, the play was dull. However, the acting of Martin Balsam as Sacco and Steven Hill as Vanzetti was excellent. Carroll O'Connor made a fine district attorney and the narration by Ben Grauer couldn't have been bettered.

Part II to be seen next Friday will cover the fight to free the men through numerous appeals and mass meetings throughout the world.

[From the Boston Herald, June 10, 1960]

MORE SACCO, VANZETTI—TV PLAY EXCORIATES COURTS, GOVERNOR FULLER

(By Peter Barnicle)

The courts of Massachusetts, Gov. Alvan T. Fuller and the Lowell Commission, named to review testimony, were excoriated last night in the second part of NBC's television version of the famed Sacco-Vanzetti case (WBZ-TV, Ch. 4).

What viewers in other sections of the country thought we do not know. But we are sure that Massachusetts viewers were shocked to see TV author Reginald Rose imply that the Governor of the Commonwealth visited the state prison at Charlestown and offered condemned murderer Celestino Maderios a chance for commutation if he would retract his alleged confession of the crime for which Nicola Sacco and Bartolomeo Vanzetti were convicted.

Granted, the narrator did say that the scene was based on a conversation which Maderios reported to defense attorneys.

The play also implied that Governor Fuller had his eye on the White House in holding firm against commuting the sentences of the two men who were convicted of the murder of a South Braintree paymaster and his guard on April 15, 1920.

The Lowell Commission made up of A. Lawrence Lowell, president of Harvard, Julius A. Stratton, president of M.I.T., and Judge Robert Grant, were depicted as three men who had made up their minds before they sat down to discuss the case.

The worst indictment was read against Judge Webster Thayer who presided at the trial. He was portrayed as a doddering old man who looked to be about 85 or 90. At the time of the trial Judge Thayer was in his mid-sixties—hardly the age of senility.

It is difficult to understand why after more than 30 years the case should be presented again in such a biased and prejudiced manner and why the courts of Massachusetts should be held up to ridicule.

Although the action was slow, comprising a series of scenes in which each defeat for the condemned men was highlighted with hope and then despair, the acting was excellent.

[From the Boston Globe, June 11, 1960]

NIGHT WATCH—GOVERNOR FULLER VILIFIED AS S-V DRAMA ENDS—SACCO-VANZETTI STORY, CHANNEL 4

(By Percy Shain)

Massachusetts officialdom in an hysterical frenzy; killing Sacco and Vanzetti because it didn't dare not; even hoping to profit personally by their executions.

That was the frankly nauseating picture left behind in the concluding chapter of this searing, tearing, Robert Alan Arthur production on the NBC network last night.

Gov. Alvan T. Fuller, a public benefactor of long standing and considered one of Massachusetts' abler Governors, was the latest to be vilified by the train of events as built up by writer Reginald Rose in sketching the losing fight to save these two men from the shadow of the electric chair.

This is what Rose said about Fuller (by putting the words into the mouth of a defense committee leader):

"He's trying to become President of the United States over their dead bodies, as Calvin Coolidge did before him on the issue of law and order."

And this is what Rose said Fuller did (on the word of a convicted killer):

He offered Celestino Maderios, the killer, a "deal" for his life. He would commute the pending execution if Maderios would take back his statement that he was in on the Braintree murder-robbery and that Sacco and Vanzetti were not there.

Those weren't the exact words he was quoted as using in their prison cell talk, but the meaning was plain.

And when Madeiros refused, the Governor, according to the TV version, called him a "double murderer," which to Madeiros meant that Fuller didn't think the famed pair were guilty.

Fuller was depicted as being frankly contemptuous of the poor—as calling them the rabble, the great unwashed. He was shown as more horrified by the property damage done in demonstrations than by the possibility that he might be putting two innocent men to death.

But that's not all.

"Gentlemen, there's such a thing as overselling your case," he told committee counsel (as if he were talking about a product instead of human lives, Rose points out).

And he couldn't understand why William Thompson was fighting for them.

"You're not Italian, are you?" he asked the noted lawyer.

"They are anarchists. I believe they should be crucified," he said at another point.

To him, the issue was strictly class and race, according to the script. The merits of the case were secondary. And all he did about the facts were to try to twist them to justify his actions, such as believing one man who said Sacco and Vanzetti were at the crime scene and ignoring the testimony of 40 others who said they weren't. That's the way Rose plainly viewed it.

But what about the commission he appointed to study the case, headed by A. Lawrence Lowell, president of Harvard?

Rose dismisses them casually.

They listened to an eccentric, taking her words seriously even though she spoke vaguely of "music running through my head."

And one of the three members of the board was biased anyway. He believed the two were guilty even before they started the probe, according to Rose.

And of course there was more about old Judge Webster Thayer, who was the prime villain in last week's chapter.

TO SUPREME COURT

"Did you see what I did to those anarchists . . . the other day?" he asks a friend at a Dartmouth homecoming football game. "Now let them go to the Supreme Court."

(The Supreme Court was powerless to act on the evidence; only on the conduct of the trial. It did not find the trial was conducted unfairly.)

Later, as execution day nears, he is shown sipping up to some newsmen.

"I treated you pretty good. See what you can do for me," he pleads plaintively.

There was much of this emotional type of drama—the blacks very black, the whites very white, in the manner of the most elemental crime yarns.

But there was also a solid array of facts on the crime itself which attests to the thorough research done by Arthur and his cohorts in advance of filming.

They not only set out to prove Sacco and Vanzetti didn't do it; they told who did, almost down to the last detail.

It was the Morelli gang from Providence, professional killers out on bail from another job, according to writer Rose. And the motive? They needed the money to finance their coming trial.

The guns checked, the number of bullets checked, the facts checked, the story was complete, in this version.

Who fired the bullets? Joe Morelli and Tony Mancini, two members of the mob. Also the defense dug up a Maine man, Roy E. Gould, who was within 5 feet of the bandits and swore Sacco and Vanzetti weren't among them.

But all this made no difference to Judge Thayer. He kept turning down appeals for a new trial.

HEARTRENDING

And if much of this material was most moving to those who hate injustice, the last words of the defendants just before they went to the chair were even more heartrending.

Sacco is seen writing to his son, urging him to "live for father's plea: Love me a little."

Vanzetti's final words: "This last moment belongs to us. This agony is our triumph."

Once again, the acting was on a high level.

Martin Balsam and Steven Hill showed the torture and agony of 7 long years of waiting in most convincing terms. Robert Emhardt made a brusque, heartless Governor Fuller. Stuart Germain completed the task of making Judge Thayer an object of contempt. E. G. Marshall was excellent as shocked lawyer Thompson who could not believe what was going on around him.

Summing up: This was as stirring a drama as has been seen on the networks this season. But in sharpening the conflict, pointing up the story values, the script was guilty of shameless distortions and omissions that make it highly suspect as a documentary.

It was an absorbing story. How true it was nobody will ever know. It's a shame Massachusetts had to be the scapegoat in the 1960 televised play that will be remembered longest.

[From the Boston Traveler, June 14, 1960]

BIAS AND DISTORTION

The television version of the Sacco-Vanzetti case was a dangerous disservice to the American public.

It was dangerous in the sense that it set a precedent for feeding the TV fans a concoction of distortions and half-truths that perverted the documented facts of the case. This may have opened the way for other outpourings of bias through the TV pipeline.

It was a disservice in the sense that it misled the public, it ridiculed a respected judicial system, and it deliberately misrepresented honorable men like Judge Thayer and Gov. Alvan T. Fuller.

All this—for the sake of arousing old bitterness, deriding American justice and whipping up sympathy for two convicted murderers.

Scores of TV editors already have blasted author Rose for his misshapen story and his spurning of the truth. There's no sense in beating a dead horse by citing more of the same here.

The TV industry needs a sharp warning, though. It has lost face in allowing itself to be the stooge for the false rantings of author Rose. His is the sort of hokum that turns an audience away in disgust.

[From Human Events, June 23, 1960]

TELEVISION'S SLANTED SACCO-VANZETTI DRAMA (By Paul Jones)

What is adult television?

TV is not precisely our field, but the question we have just posed has been nagging us ever since we sat through two programs concerned with the Sacco-Vanzetti case. Critics in general found the direction routine, the presentation partial, and the characters oversimplified. Yet, said many, this was adult television, and we should have more of the same.

Presumably it was adult because it dealt with a controversial subject which agitated many people 25 years ago. On the other hand, it is scarcely adult to present a complicated issue in the crude colors of a children's primer.

The "goodies" and the "baddies" in the melodrama we saw were neatly divided. The prisoners at the bar, their defense counsel, their friends and families, everybody who was on their side glowed with the inner light

of perfect innocence and unselfish devotion. Their adversaries, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, its Governor, the prosecutor, and the judge, not to mention the police, came off very badly.

The judge was represented as doddering and senile, with a persecution mania; in point of fact, he was 63 at the time of the first trial, and sat on the bench for 13 years thereafter, retiring only after his house was blown up by a bomb.

The Governor was shown as a monstrous combination of political ambition and dishonest doubledealing. The prosecutor was ready at all times to falsify evidence, with the ready cooperation of an unprincipled police force.

These, of course, are routine characterizations in the sort of fictional courtroom drama that TV writers love. But the Sacco-Vanzetti case was supposed to be a documentary, with some of the accuracy of history and some of the responsibility that reporters have.

One difficulty that must have confronted the playwrights was the fact that Governor Fuller, 7 years after the first trial, named a public commission to look into the case and offer impartial advice on whether justice had or had not been done. The members of this tribunal were A. Lawrence Lowell, president of Harvard, Samuel Stratton, president of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and Robert Grant, a former probate court judge.

On August 6, 1927, they rendered a report on their findings.

They said: "The inquiry that you have asked the committee to undertake seems to consist of the three following questions:"

1. "In their opinion, was the trial fairly conducted?" To this, their answer was "Yes."

2. "Was the subsequently discovered evidence such that in their opinion a new trial ought to have been granted?" To this they answered "No."

3. "Are they, or are they not, convinced beyond reasonable doubt that Sacco and Vanzetti were guilty of the murder?" On this their verdict was guilty, after an exhaustive examination of the record, and long questioning of 10 jurors (1 had died, another was in Florida) and available witnesses.

A key paragraph read: "To the committee the jury seemed an unusually intelligent and independent body of men, and withal representative, 7 of the 12 appearing to be wage earners, 1 a farmer, 2 engaged in dealing in real estate, a grocer. Each of them felt sure that the fact that the accused were foreigners and radicals had no effect upon his opinion, and that native Americans would have been equally certain to be convicted upon the same evidence."

They examined the evidence for and against in the greatest detail, weighing the credibility of witnesses and the statements of the accused, as well as the evidence of the ballistic experts. "The fact," they said, "that persons accused are or are not Socialists or radicals of any type neither increases nor lessens the probability of their having committed the crime, and should be left wholly out of account."

The basic question, of course, is: Did the prisoners get a fair shake? And on the record, but not on TV, the answer had to be yes, unless you assume an enormous conspiracy to defeat justice.

TWELVE-NATION TREATY ON THE ANTARCTIC

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, today I addressed a letter to the Honorable Thomas S. Gates, Jr., Secretary of Defense, relating to the treaty on the Antarctic, this week approved by the

Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. I addressed the Secretary as follows:

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: As you perhaps know, the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations met this week and voted out with approval the 12-nation treaty on the Antarctic. On June 14, I appeared before the committee and opposed the ratification of the treaty. At that time I expressed considerable interest, among other things, in the military aspects of the treaty and raised some serious questions regarding the effect the treaty may have on the military posture of this country.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my statement before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations be made a part of my remarks at the conclusion hereof.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, I continue to read the letter to the Secretary of Defense, Mr. Gates:

I have noted that within recent months we have substantially increased the range of our Atlas missile. Present reports indicate also that the Navy plans on perhaps doubling the range of the Polaris. Our information is that the Russians have a greater capability in the field of thrust than we have. Under these circumstances

Mr. President, this is a key question:

I would like to raise the question as to whether or not it would be possible in the foreseeable future for the Soviets to increase the range of their intercontinental ballistic missiles sufficiently to enable them to launch missiles around the underside of the globe at targets in the United States.

In asking this question I have in mind that we have built and are building our detection system on the assumption of an attack over the arctic regions. This detection system will be built at great expense. It seems to me that we may be guarding the front door and leaving the rear of our house wide open to attack. My reading of the Antarctic Treaty indicates that it would preclude the installation of even passive defensive systems, that is, detection systems of any type.

This is the key to the matter. The treaty precludes the installation of any defensive system, including a passive defensive system for detection purposes. It is my belief the Soviets can increase the range of their missiles, fire them around the underside of the world, and hit targets in the United States of America; and in approving the treaty we are, while guarding our front door in the Arctic region, leaving the rear door open to attack.

Mr. President, I continue to read the letter:

If it is technically possible for the Soviets to increase the range of their missiles and come around the underside of the globe, passive defensive systems for detecting purposes would be of immense importance to our Government, and the time might come when the installation of active defensive systems in the Antarctic area would be the logical location for such systems.

I mean that when we perfect the Nike-Zeus and other active defensive systems it may be logical to put them in the Antarctic, rather than somewhere else, and the treaty would preclude it from happening.

Mr. President, I continue to read the letter:

In addition to the answer to this specific question, it would be appreciated if you would give me your observations on what you think is the general effect of demilitarizing the Antarctic area on the present and future military posture of this country.

I have in mind that the Navy testified in this matter for the Department of Defense. I read the testimony. It boils down to what we could call, out West, "a bucket of smoke." It does not amount to anything. I should like to have the Secretary of Defense give us the kind of answers we ought to have with respect to this vital question.

I continue to read the letter:

Inasmuch as there are only several days left in this session and since it is anticipated that the treaty will be called up in the Senate in the next few days, I would like your answer at the earliest possible time for my guidance in discussing the treaty when it comes up on the Senate floor.

Mr. President, because I have read the letter in excerpts and because I have commented upon the letter in reading it, I ask unanimous consent that the letter in toto be made a part of the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 2.)

EXHIBIT 1

THE SENATE SHOULD REJECT THE ANTARCTIC TREATY

(Testimony of Senator CLAIR ENGLE, before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, June 14, 1960)

Mr. Chairman, I am sure that my colleagues are all aware that the Antarctic Treaty, which was signed by the 12 participating countries last December 1, is pending before the Senate for ratification. They may not be equally aware of the fact that the United States took the lead in initiating the conference in 1958 which led to the creation and signature of the treaty. They may not be aware that the U.S.S.R., as 1 of the 12 countries participating in the International Geophysical Year program in Antarctica, received a gratuitous invitation to enter into the treaty and lost no time in doing so. They may well consider these matters and ask "why?"

Indeed, I ask that primary question and a good many others besides. And I am still looking for adequate answers. It is difficult for me to escape the conclusion that there are none, and that the Antarctic Treaty perforce is a setback for U.S. interests.

Frankly, I cannot but believe that signature of the treaty by this country violates at least two sound maxims: One historically prevalent in legal and diplomatic circles, and the other of a proverbial nature. On the one hand, we are giving something for nothing; or, if we insist on the value of small promises, we are giving a very large quid for an insignificant quo. In essence, we are settling the seal of free world recognition on the Soviet presence in Antarctica in return for whatever assurance the treaty offers that the Soviets will not be troublemakers. On the other hand, we are indeed "putting the cart before the horse." For the treaty demilitarizes the continent and prohibits nuclear explosions and disposal of waste just as if we had already concluded disarmament and nuclear test ban agreements with the U.S.S.R. The truth seems to be that prospects for such agreements have been made dimmer by the current Soviet tantrums of bellicosity and bad manners than they have been for quite some time.

But before I pursue these lines of inquiry in greater depth, let us first look at the historical setting in order to ascertain the comparative relevance of Soviet, American, and other interests in the subcontinent.

Between 1819 and 1821, the Russian explorer Von Bellingshausen, duplicated the feat of Capt. James Cook nearly 50 years earlier by crossing the Antarctic Circle; the Russian also sighted two islands off the coast of the continent, but apparently did not sight the mainland. During the century and a quarter between that time and the period after the end of World War II, the Russians displayed no further interest in Antarctic exploration. In fact, the Soviet bases established through participation in the IGY are all located in territory claimed by Australia.

The United States, on the other hand, has had perhaps the longest and clearest record of continuing interest in the Antarctic Continent. There is little doubt that it has the legal right to territorial sovereignty over a large portion of Antarctica. It could base its claim on discoveries, explorations, occupations, or performance of administrative acts, the main basis for the claims which have been filed to date.

On any basis that sovereignty over new territory is determined, the United States has a sound position. An example is discovery. American investigators believe that the continent of Antarctica was first sighted by Nathaniel Brown Palmer, an American sealing captain, on November 17, 1820. Nineteen years later the American naval officer, Charles Wilkes, made a voyage more than halfway around Antarctica and demonstrated the existence of a continental landmass.

Rights based upon early discoveries are strengthened by an outstanding American role in exploring the continent. Americans all take pride in such activities as the establishment of Little America by Rear Adm. Richard E. Byrd—Byrd's flight over the South Pole on November 29, 1929—and Lincoln Ellsworth's later flight across the entire continent.

Many of the American citizens who took part in these historic explorations have made claims on behalf of their country. For example, Marie Byrd land was claimed for the United States by the first Byrd expedition. James W. Ellsworth land was claimed in 1936 by Lincoln Ellsworth, who also claimed another portion for the United States in 1939. Additional markers laying the basis for U.S. claims were planted during the postwar Antarctic expeditions undertaken prior to the International Geophysical Year. Instructions for these expeditions called for the extension and consolidation of U.S. sovereignty over "the largest practicable area of the Antarctic Continent." By these activities the groundwork has been laid for the United States to assert its sovereignty. All that has been lacking is the official action on the part of the Government which would solidify the claims.

Unfortunately, while the State Department through the years adopted a narrowly legalistic interpretation of the basis for a claim, other countries were not encumbered by the fiction that a requirement of permanent settlement had much relevance to Antarctica. Seven nations have made formal claims to portions of the continent. Of these, Britain and Norway, through years of exploration, have rights most nearly comparable in weight to those of the United States. Whatever the status of these disputed claims, none of which is recognized by this country, the fact remains that only the unfavorably situated territory between 90° and 150° west longitude is as yet unclaimed. At a minimum then, it would seem that the United States should be concerned with establishing its rights in this one uncontested area.

On the contrary, however, the U.S. Government has signed a treaty which in effect

denies this country the opportunity to take such a step. For the treaty explicitly provides that no new claims may be asserted as long as it is in effect.

Now proponents of the treaty argue that no nation will be giving up anything, since the treaty also provides that claims, rights to claims, and recognition of claims are frozen as they currently exist for the duration of the treaty. This is true in theory because the treaty states that nothing in it shall be interpreted as a renunciation of previously asserted claims to territorial sovereignty, or as a renunciation or diminution of any basis of claim. In spite of these provisions, however, it is only realistic to recognize that once the treaty comes into force it is very unlikely the United States will ever gain any benefit from its preeminent role in the opening up of Antarctica.

In the first place, the whole purpose of the treaty is to extinguish national claims once and for all. It seems apparent that the clause freezing the status of claims was adopted primarily for the purpose of making the treaty palatable to states which have already made claims. The treaty has no termination date and seems designed to stay in effect indefinitely. As long as it remains in force, the entire continent would be under international control. But while the treaty is supposedly permanent in nature, the provisions freezing sovereign rights give the impression that at some future date the treaty will expire and the status of claims will fall back into the same pattern which exists today.

Second, even if the treaty were unsuccessful in its objective of bringing about permanent internationalization, it is extremely unlikely that U.S. rights in the unclaimed area would ever again be as predominant and undisputed as they are now. Countries such as the Soviet Union, which have been given a voice in the control of Antarctica by this treaty, will not readily pack up and go home if the treaty comes to an end. Meanwhile, the claims problem will have become more difficult as more and more countries undertake activities.

Again, the treaty has a provision to mask this danger. It states that no activities taking place during the treaty period shall constitute a basis for asserting, supporting, or denying a claim. In practice, however, we can be fairly sure that if the treaty arrangement eventually were to dissolve, new claims not now justified would be made. It is difficult to believe that the Soviet Union would be backward in this respect.

Well, some may ask, why all the fuss about an almost inaccessible chunk of ice at the bottom of the world? Perhaps they should also ask the skipper of the *Nautilus* why he believed there was any significance in his trip under the ice across the roof of the world. Yet we need not be quite so contemporary in our thinking about the shrunken nature of our globe and its lines of communications.

Even in World War II Antarctica proved of military advantage to an enemy. German raiders operated very successfully from antarctic waters against allied shipping, sinking or capturing several hundred thousands tons; a substantial part of the Norwegian whaling fleet was captured in the area. So important were the shipping routes near the Antarctic that three major fleet actions were fought by the British squadron based in the Falkland Islands. If the Panama or the Suez Canals were closed in a future war, Western shipping would be detoured into the southern oceans around Cape Horn, the Cape of Good Hope, and Australia. Whoever controlled Antarctica would have a great asset in the control of these vital southern routes.

With current advances in military technology, the strategic importance of Antarctica for the defense of the free world has

manifestly increased. Not only is the continent advantageously situated for the observation and conduct of space activities, it could also be made into a long-range missile base of signal importance.

It is true that the treaty makes sweeping provisions for demilitarization of Antarctica, and for complete freedom of inspection from land, sea, and air. Yet the use of military personnel and equipment for scientific and other peaceful purposes would be permitted. This in itself could provide an avenue for evasion of the much-heralded full inspection to be permitted each country. Far more significant, however, is the fact that the vast inaccessible Antarctic Continent is over 5 million square miles in extent, more than six times the size of Greenland and not very much smaller than all of South America. The policing of this isolated region could prove a monumental undertaking.

Other applauded features of the treaty which could have quite reverse effects from those intended relate to the prohibitions against nuclear explosions and disposal of radioactive waste material. It is also stated that in the event of an international agreement on these issues, the rules of the agreement would be applied to Antarctica—provided all the Antarctic Treaty countries adhere to the nuclear treaty. Despite the breakdown at the summit, it is still within the realm of possibility that a global test ban, including Antarctica, may yet be concluded. Until that time, however, it seems unwise to prohibit all nuclear explosions in the Antarctic Continent.

In the first place, if tests are going to continue, Antarctica would be a better region in which to explode nuclear weapons than previous and existing possible sites. It is isolated from any centers of population, and residual radioactivity would not be as great a problem as in populated areas. In the second place, nuclear explosions for peaceful uses could have greater possibilities in Antarctica than anywhere else in the world. They might be used to open up harbors or melt the icecap. The Soviet Union has agreed, in principle, that nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes should be permitted under a worldwide test ban. If such a treaty were not concluded, however, Antarctica would be denied the use of nuclear explosions, no matter how necessary they might be.

Similarly, the prohibition of the disposal of radioactive waste material in Antarctica could be very disadvantageous. Nuclear power may be the key to opening up Antarctica and developing its potentialities. Even for the scientific projects of the near future, nuclear power could save the transportation of huge quantities of fuel. The flat prohibition of all disposal of radioactive waste material, a prohibition which does not exist in this country, should be carefully studied by those engaged in nuclear power projects to make sure that radioactive waste would not be diverted to locations more dangerous to mankind.

Alongside these political and strategic considerations, it would be shortsighted not to think of Antarctica in terms of economic importance. Antarctica is a land of the future. Its potentialities are hidden by ice and snow. Nevertheless, we can be virtually certain that modern science and technology in time will open up the continent to beneficial uses. For the United States to give up the sovereign rights it has earned in Antarctica would be as great a folly as it would have been many years ago to forego the purchase of Alaska.

The amount of natural resources in Antarctica is still a subject of study. Already, however, traces of some 175 minerals have been found, including manganese, copper, lead, nickel, and uranium. It is believed Antarctica may contain one of the most extensive coal fields in the world. Certainly

there are many problems to be solved before these resources can be extracted, but in an atomic age there is every reason to believe it can be done. As the resources in the rest of the world are depleted, the resources of Antarctica will increase in value.

Looking further into the future, Antarctica may hold even greater benefits in store. For example, it is not inconceivable that Antarctica might help provide food for the world's rapidly growing population. The Antarctic seas abound in certain types of plant and animal life which scientists believe might be harvested someday.

Although the Antarctic Treaty provides for freedom of scientific investigation, it makes no mention of the logical aftermath of the scientific research—namely, economic development. This is a subject which is entirely omitted. Moreover, because the development of the Antarctic resources will require large amounts of funds, it is highly questionable whether development will be undertaken as long as the continent is under international control. A nation such as the United States could afford to make the necessary investments if it knew that the American taxpayers who paid the bill were also to reap the benefits. However, it would be reluctant to invest for the benefit of the Soviet Government. The experience of the United Nations has shown that it is very difficult to obtain large amounts of funds for international projects; it is thus no idle fear that the economic development of Antarctica will be impeded by this treaty.

Mr. Chairman, I think I have said enough to permit a summing up of one American's reaction to the Antarctic Treaty. In practice, if not in theory, it will reduce the preeminent rights which the United States has in a large part of Antarctica. It will give the Soviet Union a position of equality which it does not deserve, and which poses a danger to the security of the United States and its allies in the Southern Hemisphere.

One alleged return for these sacrifices is freedom of scientific investigation. This has always existed in Antarctica anyway for the nations willing to undertake the effort involved.

Another alleged gain is the settlement of a political problem by the freezing of national claims in favor of international control. It seems likely that if international control ever ends, and the claims thaw, they will be more complicated than ever before. They certainly will not be restricted to free world nations as they have been in the past.

Proponents of the treaty point to the demilitarization of Antarctica as a step forward. In reality, it appears to take what could have been an asset to the defense of the free world and, at best, neutralizes it. At worst, the treaty does not fully insure against the possibility of clandestine military operations by the Soviet Union.

Frankly, Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that the Soviet record with respect to the maintenance of treaties is one which could inspire confidence in anyone but a congenial optimist. I do believe that the Senate should reject this treaty as being contrary to the best interests of the United States.

EXHIBIT 2

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, D.C., June 22, 1960.

HON. THOMAS S. GATES, JR.,
The Secretary of Defense,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: As you perhaps know, the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations met this week and voted out with approval the 12-nation treaty on the Antarctic. On June 14, I appeared before the committee and opposed the ratification of the treaty. At that time I expressed considerable interest, among other things, in the military aspects

of the treaty and raised some serious questions regarding the effect the treaty may have on the military posture of this country.

I have noted that within recent months we have substantially increased the range of our Atlas missile. Present reports indicate also that the Navy plans on perhaps doubling the range of the Polaris. Our information is that the Russians have a greater capability in the field of thrust than we have. Under these circumstances, I would like to raise the question as to whether or not it would be possible in the foreseeable future for the Soviets to increase the range of their intercontinental ballistic missiles sufficiently to enable them to launch missiles around the underside of the globe at targets in the United States.

In asking this question I have in mind that we have built and are building our detection systems on the assumption of an attack over the Arctic regions. This detection system will be built at great expense. It seems to me that we may be guarding the front door and leaving the rear of our house wide open to attack. My reading of the Antarctic Treaty indicates that it would preclude the installation of even passive defensive systems, that is, detection systems of any type.

If it is technically possible for the Soviets to increase the range of their missiles and come around the underside of the globe, passive defensive systems for detecting purposes would be of immense importance to our Government, and the time might come when the installation of active defensive systems in the Antarctic area would be the logical location of such system.

In addition to the answer to this specific question, it would be appreciated if you would give me your observations on what you think is the general effect of demilitarizing the Antarctic area on the present and future military posture of this country.

Inasmuch as there are only several days left in this session and since it is anticipated that the treaty will be called up in the Senate in the next few days, I would like your answer at the earliest possible time for my guidance in discussing the treaty when it comes up on the Senate floor.

Sincerely yours,

CLAIR ENGLE,
U.S. Senator.

PRESIDENT EISENHOWER'S TRAVELS ABROAD

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, there has been some criticism recently of President Eisenhower's travels abroad. I believe that this primarily stems, simply enough, from the fact that all has not gone exactly as well as it might have in our relationship with friends abroad and our efforts to seek peace. But the reasoning offered is that the administration is substituting so-called "personal diplomacy" for normal and traditional diplomatic procedures.

Yesterday I listened to Secretary of State Herter testify on the State Department appropriations bill, and he touched upon the President's trip to the Far East. Mr. Herter emphasized the importance of regular channels for international contact. But he stressed that the purpose of President Eisenhower's travels were to increase friendliness and understanding across the world, and not to negotiate with foreign chiefs of state. The one exception, of course—and the point has been clearly made—was the trip to Paris for the summit meeting.

It seems to me that the criticism I have mentioned is founded on a misunderstanding, either accidental or con-

trived, of the true purpose of the President's trips. There is need, therefore, for a clear distinction to be made between international contact among Government officials for actual negotiation and, on the other hand, for the generation of good will.

Perhaps the catchy term "personal diplomacy" has been used too often to describe the President's intent. It has certainly been used imprecisely and even inaccurately. Diplomacy relates directly to conducting negotiations; to arranging treaties, for instance. The President's travels did not have negotiation as their purpose, and therefore could not supplant the normal diplomatic processes, which have continued unabated. Perhaps we should carefully make the distinction between "social" and "business" purposes when we characterize the Eisenhower trips. When the term "personal Presidential diplomacy" is used it must be applied specifically to a situation like the Paris summit meeting, rather than tossed around casually as a description of everything the President does outside the borders of the United States. Good will missions, efforts to convince farflung peoples of the basic unity of free men everywhere, travels to demonstrate the dynamic belief of the United States in world peace—these must be separately identified and given full credit for what they are.

I believe these purposes are not only valuable, but necessary, considering the nature of the world today and the character of the Soviet challenge.

It is actually standard practice for chiefs of state and heads of government to advance their national interests by good will trips, and with good reason. We all know of Chairman Khrushchev's efforts in this regard, continuing, in one way or another, since the highly publicized Bulganin-Khrushchev "team visit" to India in 1955. There is no doubt that this is a crucial weapon in the battle for men's minds, and it would be preposterous for anyone to suggest we should leave it for the Russians alone.

The need for goodwill tours for the President of the leader of free world nations has been advanced by the revolution in transportation and communications technology. If a head of state can easily and practically visit those he claims to be his foreign friends, it becomes increasingly difficult for him not to do so.

There is another revolution, so-called, which affects the matter also, and more basically. The new, yearning, emerging nations of the less developed areas have high aspirations for success and prestige in a world previously closed to them. This is the revolution of rising expectations. In order to encourage these peoples to sustain self-determination, independence and progress in a free democratic context, we must prove our affection and regard for them. We must seek to build their self-confidence and self-respect. We go to their homelands to do this, demonstrating directly and personally our recognition of and regard for them. This the President has sought to accomplish in his immensely successful visits to the Near East in 1959, and

Latin America and the Far East in 1960. His European trip in 1959 was directed toward vigorously cementing the ties of unity and friendship between ourselves and our Western allies.

Indeed, a prime reason for Chairman Khrushchev's cancellation of President Eisenhower's visit to the Soviet Union was the fear that such a trip might be too successful from the free world's point of view. The same apprehension undoubtedly directed the organized Communist efforts to block the President's visit to Japan more recently. President Eisenhower's tremendous reputation as a man of peace has had a profound effect on the tactics of international communism.

The dissatisfaction of the Tokyo agitators must be measured against the overwhelming outpourings of affection, admiration, and support from millions of people who have greeted President Eisenhower across the world. We must not overdraw this recent and temporary damage to our prestige. In many visits—for the first time—of the American head of government to overlooked nations and peoples, President Eisenhower has demonstrated his willingness to go many thousands of extra miles to improve the chances for peace. Foreign leaders have assured us of the great value to the cause of peace of these journeys, and they have received universal support from within the United States.

USELESS AGENCY—CIVIL DEFENSE

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, later today the Senate will consider the independent offices appropriation bill, which includes the appropriation for the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization.

Civil defense, Mr. President, might have been of some value during World War II and for a few years thereafter. However, we are now in an age of intercontinental ballistic missiles, nuclear bombs and space satellites.

Civil defense as it is now operated is about as useful as flintlock muskets, tallow dips, mustache cups, or Civil War cannonballs. This boondoggling bureaucracy has spent over \$1 billion of taxpayers' money during the past 9 years. I challenge anyone to prove that the American people are in reality any more secure than when this wasteful program began.

Yet, with this fact staring us in the face, we continue to fool ourselves and to take money from taxpayers with a civil defense program which is not only false in concept of defense in this nuclear age, but wasteful and extravagant in its implementation.

The goals of our civil defense planners are hidden by confusion. On the one hand they tell us to build shelters in our basements and back yards. On the other hand they map out elaborate evacuation schemes and tell us to run in event of attack.

As I have pointed out many times before, neither of these plans is feasible. Together they are ludicrous.

The futility, the waste, and the bungling of this outmoded agency are almost beyond belief.

In the bill which will be before the Senate shortly this agency is requesting \$12 million in matching funds for personnel. In reality, we are being asked to provide this money to create more than 4,000 paid positions in city halls and county courthouses. Not only is this a waste of Federal funds, it is also an encouragement to State and local governments to waste money.

In Ohio there are some 90 employees in the State organization costing the State \$554,000. Under the proposed matching program, Ohio would have 200 salaried civil defense workers and would spend almost \$1½ million, of which the Federal Government would contribute \$570,000. I wonder whether the people of Ohio will be any more secure with these added paid employees. To judge by the past, there will be no more safety but a lot more confusion.

We are told that these new employees will be chosen under State civil service merit systems. If these are the same merit systems that have given us the paid civil defense employees we have today, I shudder to think of the consequences.

At the same time I cannot say enough on behalf of the fine volunteer workers who have made sacrifices and rendered great services in time of floods and fires and other disasters without thought of compensation. They will do so again as they have always done without paid civil defense officials directing them from behind desks.

This bill also contains an appropriation of \$6½ million for the General Services Administration for fallout shelters in proposed Government buildings throughout the country. The only people this will help are contractors.

Of what earthly use will shallow shelters be in Federal buildings, most of which are located in metropolitan areas where shelters will be of little or no protection?

At a time when the Nation faces serious housing problems which administration leaders refuse to face for fear of unbalancing the Federal budget, this same administration proposes \$6 million worth of useless shelters in Government buildings.

It is interesting to note that, of the \$76 million requested for this agency, \$47 million, or 62 percent of the total appropriation request, is designated for salaries and expenses.

Mr. President, the House of Representatives denied the \$12 million request for salaries and the \$6½ million for fallout shelters. I intend to vote against this bill if these requests are included in its final version. It is my fervent hope that the House of Representatives will stand firm, as it did last year, in refusing to grant these sums.

If we allow this bureaucratic monstrosity to expand this year, who knows to what extent it will grow and spend; grow and waste—always a refuge for ex-governors, defeated politicians, and political hangers-on of the party in power.

Mr. President, rather than pouring additional millions of taxpayers' dollars into a worthless plan for passive resistance, let us scrap civil defense as

now conducted. Boot out the politicians from the Federal Administrator of the Office of Civilian Defense and Mobilization right down the line. Remove these paid officials and employees from the public payroll. Place the defense of citizens of our country in the hands of those trained to defend and maintain our freedom—the Armed Forces of our country. Surely, the defense of civilians is too important to be entrusted to civilians in armbands.

Shelter programs for basements and backyards required in the construction of buildings connote a waste of money. In reality, in event of a nuclear attack and conflagrations that would follow, such so-called shelters would not be shelters but would prove deadly firetraps. We should depend upon our Armed Forces and their power for instant retaliation and defending this nation and its citizens instead of adding appropriations for this worse than useless Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization.

PLAIN TALK ON CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the July edition of Reader's Digest magazine contains an informative and interesting article that is in the nature of a debate between two of our distinguished colleagues, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS]. The subject matter of their debate deals with the so-called civil rights question.

As every Member of the Senate is well aware, both of these Senators are well informed on this subject. Both are able and articulate spokesmen for the point of view they hold on this issue. Because of the general interest in the so-called civil rights question, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

PLAIN TALK ON CIVIL RIGHTS

(Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS versus Senator HERMAN E. TALMADGE)

(The explosive civil rights issue will undoubtedly shake the platforms of both the Democratic and Republican national conventions during the coming month. It is an issue on which it is impossible for an informed U.S. citizen not to have an opinion. With this in mind, shortly after passage of the controversial Civil Rights Act of 1960, the Reader's Digest asked Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois, leading advocate of civil rights legislation, to participate in a candid, face-to-face discussion of the subject with Senator HERMAN E. TALMADGE, Democrat, of Georgia, a most articulate spokesman for the southern viewpoint. A recording of their forthright talk follows:)

Senator DOUGLAS. Senator TALMADGE, the current conflict over civil rights, to my mind, is the most tragic thing that has occurred to divide our Nation in this century. If we are going to discuss our views—and we know we differ—I think we must do so calmly but frankly, and with the hope that we can make some contribution toward solving the problem.

Senator TALMADGE. I certainly want to enter the discussion in that spirit, Senator DOUGLAS. I agree that this tragic issue is dividing our country, setting section against

section and race against race, at a time when we should be strong and united in a troubled world.

Senator DOUGLAS. Let us begin with fundamentals. I think our attitude toward the Negro depends largely upon our view of the nature of man. If we believe, as I think most Americans do, that all men, regardless of race or color, are created equal by Almighty God, that they all have within them the divine spark, and that they all have the right and, indeed, the obligation to develop their moral character as God would have it, then we must reexamine our attitude toward the Negro in the light of that belief.

Senator TALMADGE. I agree that all men of all races are equal in the sight of God and that all American citizens have equal rights under the Constitution of the United States and the laws of the individual States.

Senator DOUGLAS. Then we cannot set the Negroes apart as social or intellectual inferiors. We cannot hamper them in getting an education. We cannot deprive them of the right to vote. On the contrary, we have an almost sacred duty to enhance the Negroes' social, economic, and political development. That is what we are trying to do in our efforts to safeguard the Negroes' rights as American citizens. I believe that is the basic issue in the present civil rights controversy.

Senator TALMADGE. I cannot agree that that is the basic issue. The people of the South do not want to deny the Negro his right to vote, or to deprive his children of an equal education. Neither do they want to hamper his development as an individual or as a good citizen.

Senator DOUGLAS. Those are brave and heartening words, Senator. But, unhappily, they are not supported by the facts in the Southern States. May I ask what you consider the basic issue?

Senator TALMADGE. What the people in the South resent is the attempt of powerful forces within this country to elevate a minority, in this case, the Negroes, to a special and favored status by means of Federal laws. They resent Federal compulsion to make fundamental changes in the social traditions of the majority merely as a special political favor to the minority.

Senator DOUGLAS. That is not the case, Senator. We seek only to obtain and guarantee equal rights for the Negro under the law.

Senator TALMADGE. But when we speak of equal rights, Senator, we must remember that under our republican form of government the individual has other rights. Among them are the rights of privacy, of protecting one's family, of educating one's children according to one's own choosing. These are rights that are cherished not only by southerners but by free men everywhere. Yet the social reformers and agitators would sacrifice these rights of the majority in order to bestow special rights on a minority. That is the issue that is now dividing our country. And it is working to the detriment of our Negro citizens instead of advancing their interests.

Senator DOUGLAS. I am afraid you are confusing the issue, Senator. No one is proposing that white people must invite Negro citizens into their homes. No one is saying that white girls should marry Negro boys. No one is saying that Negroes must be admitted to white private clubs. What we are discussing is the attitude of the Southern States toward the law of the land. Will the Southern States, in defiance of the Constitution, hamper the Negro in obtaining an adequate education. Will the Southern States continue to set the Negroes apart as inferiors? Will the Southern States continue to deprive the Negro citizen, because of his race, of his right to vote?

Senator TALMADGE. Senator, those rights were established in 1868-70 by the 14th and

15th amendments to the Constitution. When those amendments were adopted, most States already had separate school systems for whites and for Negroes. And up until 1954 the courts held in a long series of decisions that the provisions of the 14th amendment were being complied with when the States provided separate but equal facilities for both races. Then, in 1954, without any amendment to the Constitution or any act of Congress, without any basis except sociological and psychological theories, the Supreme Court reversed all these precedents and ruled that separate but equal schools were no longer constitutional.

Senator DOUGLAS. But you and I know Senator, that these separate schools for Negroes were seldom equal. I think it is undeniable that schools for Negroes in the South, indeed in some sections of the North, were grossly inferior. But then, a few years ago, came the case of Topeka, Kans., where the separate high schools for Negroes were approximately equal to the white schools. The Supreme Court then had to decide whether segregation in itself was not a denial of the equal protection of the laws guaranteed by the 14th amendment. The Court ruled unanimously that the segregation of children because of race and during their formative years actually retarded their education and implanted an inferiority complex in the children which becomes a handicap in later life. That decision was reaffirmed later by the Supreme Court, and again unanimously, with three new justices sitting.

Senator TALMADGE. But public education is the right and responsibility of the States, Senator. The acts of Congress admitting the last 14 States to the Union makes that perfectly clear. Yet the Supreme Court decision of 1954 sought to deny the Southern States that right.

Senator DOUGLAS. The court decision dealt with but one thing, segregation—which it declared unconstitutional. It didn't tell you how to desegregate or when to desegregate, and I don't think it interfered with your States rights. I know that you have called the decision "sociological and psychological jurisprudence." But I believe that the decision clearly reflects the awakening of America's moral consciousness to what is involved in the separation of American citizens along racial lines.

Senator TALMADGE. During recent years the people of the South, whites and Negroes, have made real progress in promoting racial harmony and good will. The court decision of 1954, contrary to its own declaration, really turned back the clock. Why? The answer can be found in the Supreme Court decision of 1896 which declared: "If the races are to meet upon terms of social equality, it must be the result of natural affinities, a mutual appreciation of each other's merits, and a voluntary consent of the individuals." We cannot solve by Federal laws or court decisions social problems as old and complex as those involved here. If the 18th amendment taught us anything, it is that Federal laws cannot be effective or enforced when they lack the support of the majority of the people—or what the Declaration of Independence calls the "consent of the governed."

Senator DOUGLAS. But that refers to the consent of the majority in the Nation as a whole. What you are saying, as I understand it, Senator, is, "These are local problems, and we must deal with them locally in the South." The sad fact is that the white South has not dealt with the problems either fairly or realistically. Even today, 6 years after the Supreme Court decision, every State in the South appropriates less money for Negro schools than for white schools.

Senator TALMADGE. I do not say that our schools for white or colored children are what we want them to be. But I must remind you that until very recent years the

South has been struggling to overcome the legacy of destruction and poverty which it inherited after the War Between the States. Only after World War II were the Southern States able to provide for the educational needs of their children, both white, and colored. During my administration as Governor of Georgia from 1947 to 1955, we spent about 53 cents of every tax dollar for education, and launched a \$200 million building program which has since been accelerated. The people of Georgia do not have to apologize to anyone for their schools for whites or Negroes, and those schools are open to the inspection of anyone.

Senator DOUGLAS. Well, Senator, perhaps we should take another look. For the record shows plainly that in Georgia as well as in other Southern States there is a great disparity between public school facilities for Negroes and those for white children. But let us talk about voting, which is another critical problem. There are 16 counties in the South where, even though Negroes constitute the majority, there is not a single registered Negro voter. There are 49 counties where Negroes are the majority, but where less than 5 percent of the Negroes of voting age are registered. There are about 5 million Negroes of voting age in the South, but only about 1,200,000 were registered in 1956. Is this the best that the white South, left to its own devices, can do to solve that problem?

Senator TALMADGE. You must be aware, Senator DOUGLAS, that a time factor is involved here. Until 1946 we had white Democratic primaries in the South in which Negroes did not vote. Since the Supreme Court held the white primaries unconstitutional in 1946 we have come a long way. While I do not consider the report of the Civil Rights Commission authoritative, let us look at those figures. They show that Negro registration in the Southern States climbed from 595,000 in 1947 to about 1,200,000 in 1956. In Georgia, where we have some 600,000 Negroes of voting age, more than 180,000 are registered and voting, and the number is increasing every year.

Senator DOUGLAS. But aren't these Negro voters nearly all in the cities? How many are voting in the rural areas?

Senator TALMADGE. These voters are scattered all over the State. True, there is a large concentration—about 33,000—in Fulton County where Atlanta is located. But in Liberty County, which is rural, there are more Negroes than whites voting. The Negro vote is equal to the white vote in Long, McIntosh, and Taliaferro Counties, all of which are rural. Colored voters in Georgia have elected public officials. They frequently hold the balance of power in local elections. My point is that we have accomplished this in less than 15 years. We have done it under State law and without Federal compulsion. We cannot help it if all the Negroes who are qualified to vote do not choose to exercise that right. The National Association for the Advancement of Colored People has reported that only 25 percent of the Negroes in Cleveland, Ohio, register and vote. We do better than that in Georgia.

Senator DOUGLAS. Well, it is good to know that Negroes in Georgia are voting in such numbers. But let us not blink the fact, Senator, that in many parts of the South, Negroes are being denied their right to vote in an outrageous manner. Read the facts in the report of the President's Civil Rights Commission—a six-member body that included three southerners, incidentally.

Senator TALMADGE. In my opinion that report is a prejudiced and unreliable document, and I call your attention to the dissent of Commissioner Battle, who states: "I concur in the proposition that all properly qualified American citizens should have the right to vote, but I believe that the present laws are sufficient to protect that right."

Senator DOUGLAS. But, Senator, the evidence shows that present laws are far from sufficient. Consider what happened in Tuskegee, Ala., the site of the renowned Tuskegee Institute. Negro Ph. D.'s were denied the right to register on the ground that they were not qualified. Then the State of Alabama gerrymandered the town boundaries in such a way as to disenfranchise Tuskegee Negroes in the local elections.

Senator TALMADGE. Let me say that if any citizen in the Tuskegee area feels he has been denied his right to vote, he has four recourses under Federal law, including the Civil Rights Acts of 1957 and 1960. I have yet to hear of any citizen, of whatever race, who sought protection of his voting rights who did not receive redress in the courts.

Senator DOUGLAS. Well, thus far, Senator, you have asserted that the white people in the South do not wish to deprive the Negro of his right to vote, and you have pointed with pride to the increasing number of Negroes in Georgia who are voting. Why, then, do you oppose the recommendation of fair-minded people who are only trying to enable the Negro to exercise his constitutional rights?

Senator TALMADGE. We oppose such recommendations because they tend to violate our States rights, because they usually emanate from agitators and social theorists, and because they result in dangerous and unworkable laws which do more harm than good. So far as voting is concerned, further laws are unnecessary. But the Supreme Court decision affecting the schools of the South is particularly repugnant to the majority of southerners because it would force the intermingling of white and colored children at their most impressionable ages. I think it is fundamental that people prefer to associate with their own kind—whites with whites, Negroes with Negroes: you may call this discrimination. But people of all races discriminate all through their lives and even among themselves. We whites discriminate when we select our churches, schools, and clubs. We discriminate when we choose our friends and our children's playmates. We discriminate when we decide which boys may escort our daughters to a dance.

Senator DOUGLAS. Now, Senator, I think you are getting to the crux of the matter. But you are only hinting at it. I believe that the southern attitude is based upon fears or prejudices which are unjustified.

Senator TALMADGE. We are reluctant to discuss this aspect of the problem. Whenever we do, we are called racist or worse. But I cannot agree that the fears of southern people are as unfounded as you say. Let me put it this way: history shows that wherever people of different races have been forced to mingle intimately, as would be the case in our public schools, the result has been a biological mixing of the races, whether legally or otherwise. This has been true in Cuba, Egypt, Brazil, and elsewhere. People in some of these countries are proud of their racial assimilation. We do not want it to happen in the South. Indeed, I think it is repugnant to Americans of all regions, whether they are white or colored. You will find a number of Negro sociologists who have written that assimilation will be the inevitable result of integration. Only a few years ago, to cite a specific example, a Negro lawyer in South Carolina, a local counsel of the NAACP, told a reporter that while intermarriage was not discussed at NAACP meetings, "I am sure the NAACP knows that once you integrate it is the natural consequence." You cannot expect us to derive any reassurance from that sort of talk.

Senator DOUGLAS. That does not follow at all. There is no more intermarriage in the North than in the South, and, I might add, there is far less interbreeding.

Senator TALMADGE. Nor are we reassured, Senator, when we read about what happens

in the North as a result of efforts to mix Negroes and whites in schools and housing developments. There has been plenty of violence in your own State of Illinois, and only recently there was rioting and at least one fatal stabbing in a newly integrated school in Philadelphia. We have been able to avoid that sort of thing in the South, and we want to continue doing so.

Senator DOUGLAS. We are not entirely blameless in the North, and we, too, have our problems to solve. Nevertheless, there have been racial clashes in the South recently, and the whites have been the aggressors. The peace which previously existed in southern communities was due primarily to the Negroes' fear of white violence if they stood up for their rights. A graveyard is a rather peaceful place, too, Senator; but who wants to live there?

Senator TALMADGE. Most southerners, Senator, are born and bred in the traditions of the Old and New Testaments. They know and acknowledge the true brotherhood of man. We are also traditionally a conservative and law abiding people. But Thomas Jefferson once said that while strict observance of the law is one of the highest duties of a good citizen, it is not the highest. "To lose our country by scrupulous adherence to written law," he said, "would be to lose the law itself, with life, liberty, property and all those who are enjoying them with us—thus absurdly sacrificing the end to the means."

Senator DOUGLAS. Yes, Senator, but it was Thomas Jefferson who fought to have slavery outlawed by the Constitution, and he was defeated by his colleagues from the South. I believe Thomas Jefferson would be on our side today. And, despite what you say, I am convinced that there is a large and growing body of white citizens in the South who are eager to have this problem settled once and for all within the framework of the Constitution.

Senator TALMADGE. These people would like to see the school issue settled, Senator, by a constitutional amendment, and not by the whims of the Court. It has not been easy for us to get the southern viewpoint before the rest of the Nation. But I think that is changing. Last April a survey of public opinion in 39 States outside the South disclosed genuine sympathy for the southern viewpoint.

"From California to Maine," the survey reported, "men recognize that decades of strict social custom in the South cannot be overturned quickly." Those are heartwarming words to all thinking southerners.

JANE ADDAMS AND THE ARTS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, it was my privilege this morning to hear a wonderful talk by the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] when he addressed the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom. As usual, he did a grand job. The occasion, of course, was a part of the Jane Addams Centennial.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, it might seem a contradiction to some that Jane Addams, raised in an almost Puritanical background and early in life deeply concerned with righting the social injustices that she saw, should have begun her efforts to help the poor by providing an opportunity for them to participate in and appreciate the arts.

Hull House was begun as a kindergarten where mothers could leave their children with Jane Addams and Ellen

Gates Starr, while they worked long hours over a machine, knowing that the children would be fed and well cared for. More than that, as Jane Addams observed the children playing, in the particularly creative way that children play, the idea of this creative life for all people, for the continuing use of the imagination that adults often forget, began to take hold. She wrote: "We realize afresh that it is the business of youth to reaffirm the beauty and joy in the world that such spontaneity may become a source of new vitality, a wellspring of refreshment to a jaded city. It is easy to fail to utilize it; the artists are preoccupied trying to recapture it after the first bloom has escaped them and only occasionally do the educators demonstrate that each child lives not only in an actual environment visible to all, but in enchanted surroundings which may be reproduced by the child himself."

She saw the value of each national and racial culture as a very real contribution to American society into which each was assimilating, and she saw this growing American culture as the product of all of them.

But more than that she recognized the value to each individual and family of preserving and taking pride in the music and art of the old country. She watched older immigrants gain new self-respect when given the opportunity to pursue crafts they had learned as young people and which had since been shunted aside in the growing industrialism of the New World. It was to foster the art instinct of these immigrants that the Hull House Labor Museum was started; and it was a delight to Miss Addams. Here one found a Russian woman spinning, an Irish woman carding, Syrians making rugs, a German potter's wheel, a bindery, a basketry, and the din of cabinetmaking or metalwork.

And she watched the young people, children and grandchildren of the immigrants, take a fresh look at the old folks. "It has made Americanized children look upon the Old World accomplishments of their parents with something better than eyes of scorn," she writes.

The very first large gift of funds to Hull House was used for the erection and maintenance of an art gallery, and it was a matter of great pride to Jane Addams that "the first brick-and-mortar expansion of Hull House should be in the field of pure esthetics." She saw the awakening of pride in the young people, and the surge to go forward, beginning where their parents had left off. There immediately began clubs and classes for children in the studio. Adults, too, soon entered the fold, and Hull House later developed a close alliance with the Chicago Art Institute.

A key, then, of Jane Addams' receptivity to art was its use toward that goal that half a century later, we are faced with the problem of achieving through the educational and recreation programs that began in her days: the fullest development of the child and adult potential.

I ask unanimous consent that an article entitled "Jane Addams and the Arts" be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

JANE ADDAMS AND THE ARTS

CHILD-NATURE AND ART

Nurtured as Jane Addams was in an almost Puritanical background, her warm response to the creative arts may seem a strange anomaly, but as we follow her development of social consciousness, the key quite easily reveals itself. Take Jane, the eight-year-old little girl playing with her stepbrother: "When we said that the purple windflowers—the anemone patterns—'looked as if the winds had made them,' we thought much more of the fact that they were wind-born than that they were beautiful; we clapped our hands in sudden joy over the soft radiance of the rainbow, but its enchantment lay in our half belief that a pot of gold was to be found at its farther end." In the chapter on "The Play Instinct and The Arts" of her book, "The Second Twenty Years At Hull House," her words carry us along in the development of this early theme: "We realize afresh that it is the business of youth to reaffirm the beauty and joy in the world that such spontaneity may become a source of new vitality, a wellspring of refreshment to a jaded city. It is easy to fail to utilize it, the artists are preoccupied trying to recapture it after the first bloom has escaped them and only occasionally do the educators demonstrate that each child lives not only in an actual environment visible to all, but in enchanted surroundings which may be reproduced by the child himself."

CITY DWELLER AND ART

But Jane Addams had equal concern for the old ones: "What is the function of art but to preserve in permanent and lovely form those emotions and solaces which cheer life and make it kindlier, more heroic and easier to comprehend; which lift the mind of the worker from the harshness and loneliness of his task, and by connecting him with what has gone before, free him from a besetting sense of isolation and hardship?" She sees the release function of art, the offering of an escape from the monotony of daily living. Nor did she omit to stress the American's need to appreciate the rich heritage of the foreign-born; has he been properly taught if he never learns to recognize that the Greek peddling bananas at the corner once awakened every morning in sight of the Acropolis, and what that sight has meant to him? It was to foster the art instinct of these immigrants that the Hull House Labor Museum was started; and it became a delight to Miss Addams. Here one found a Russian woman spinning, an Irish woman carding, Syrians making rugs, a German potter's wheel, a bindery, basketry, and the din of cabinet-making or metal work. This inspired Julius Rosenwald to found the Industrial Museum in the Fine Arts Building at Jackson Park, Chicago. Of even more importance to Jane Addams: "It has made Americanized children look upon the old-world accomplishments of their parents with something better than eyes of scorn."

MORAL RESPONSIBILITIES OF ART

Art for art's sake was never enough for Jane Addams, even as a very young woman traveling abroad: "The wonder and beauty of Italy later brought healing and some relief to the paralyzing sense of the futility of all artistic and intellectual effort when disconnected from the ultimate test of the conduct it inspired." She reiterated: "We were spending 2 months in Dresden that winter, given over to much reading of the 'History of Art' and to much visiting of its art gallery and opera house, and after such an experience I would invariably suffer a moral revulsion against this feverish search after culture."

Now she began to demand a certain artistic integrity. "It was doubtless in such moods that I founded my admiration for Albrecht Dürer, taking his wonderful pictures, however, in the most unorthodox manner, merely as human documents. I was chiefly appealed to by his unwillingness to lend himself to a smooth and cultivated view of life, by his determination to record its frustrations and even the hideous forms which darken the day for our imagination and to ignore no human complications. . . . I believed that his canvases intimated the coming religious and social changes of the Reformation and the peasants' wars, that they were surcharged with pity for the downtrodden, that his sad knights, gravely standing guard, were longing to avert that shedding of blood which is sure to occur when men forget how complicated life is and insist upon reducing it to logical dogmas." A unique approach, indeed.

ART AT HULL HOUSE

With art so closely interwoven by Jane Addams' consciousness into the very art of living, it is more easily understood how art became such an important cornerstone at the founding of Hull House. So it happened that the very first large gift of funds was used for the erection and maintenance of an art gallery, and it was a matter of great pride to her that "the first brick-and-mortar expansion of Hull House should be in the field of pure esthetics." There immediately began clubs and classes for children in the studio. Miss Addams "was not in the least afraid of what much later came to be called fads and frill in the schools—she would have liked to see everybody 'privileged' in the same fashion." Adults soon entered the fold, and Hull House then developed a close alliance with the Chicago Art Institute.

"Her quest for beauty, her dream of bringing beauty into even the most miserable of the lives about her did not cease." And there began at Hull House "that scheme for giving the public school children of Chicago a chance to see good pictures every day, which has since developed so splendidly into the Public School Art Society." The Hull House Dramatic Association was founded—to become "the oldest continuously performing 'Little Theater' group in America." At the same time the Music School began to flourish: "In addition to sharing with our neighborhood the best music we could procure, we have conscientiously provided careful musical instruction that at least a few young people might understand those old usages of art." . . . "From the first lessons they are taught to compose and to reduce to order the musical suggestions which may come to them, and in this wise the school has sometimes been able to recover the songs of immigrants through their children." Again that concern for sharing at all ages.

From the music school young professionals began to emerge and take their place in the musical world, and from the Hull House Theatre talented young actors entered the legitimate stage. The art studio, presided over by the genius of Enella Benedict, who had been there from the very first, mothered impoverished artists—even to allowing an occasional student to sleep upon the studio couch when all resources had failed, one among: "that gallant company of men and women—who are fairly indifferent to starvation itself because of their preoccupation with higher ends." Added to the young unknowns (many of whom have since become famous), a nucleus of established artists came from far and wide as residents. Under the leadership of some of these "the work of the studio merged into the crafts—a shop was opened at Hull House under the direction of residents who were also members of the Chicago Arts & Crafts Society" and "buildings on the Hull House quadrangle furnish studios for artists who find some-

thing of the same spirit in the contiguous Italian colony—they find their classes filled not only by young people but also by the older people to whom the studio affords the one opportunity of escape from dreariness."

In the last months of her life Jane Addams proudly noted: "A thousand children a week find room there (at Hull House) to sing, to dance, to act, to draw, to read poetry—and to play games." The key, then, of Jane Addams' receptivity to art was its use toward that goal she consistently cherished—the fullest development of the child, or adult, potential. We hope her words may be especially prophetic at this late hour: "Doubtless our scientific advance depends more upon disinterested intellectual curiosity than upon any other human trait, but we may be faced at this moment with an opportunity to so revitalize our own experiences that we may score as never before in the very art of living itself. We may drink from a fountain into which are flowing fresh waters from remote mountain ranges which only the artists could have discovered and made part of our familiar world."

(ACKNOWLEDGMENT.—All quotations are from: "First 20 Years at Hull House"; "Second 20 Years at Hull House"; "Jane Addams," by James Weber Linn.)

FOUR HUNDRED THOUSAND DOLLARS FOR ARMS CONTROL STUDIES SHOULD BE RESTORED IN STATE DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION

Mr. PROXMIER. Mr. President, in our discussions and evaluations of recent events in Japan and the Far East, let us not lose sight of a relatively small but crucially important appropriation in the State Department budget for 1961. I refer to the appropriation of \$400,000 requested for arms control studies and preparation for disarmament.

In his prepared statement before the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the State Department, Secretary of State Christian Herter yesterday gave top priority to the restoration of this sum, which has been deleted in the House. Here is what Secretary Herter said:

First there are items which bear directly upon the future of East-West relations. The most important of these is the request for disarmament studies and staff.

Disarmament negotiations are continuing at Geneva, as you are aware, both those dealing with a possible nuclear test ban, and those looking toward broader arms reductions. The prospects for early progress are, frankly, a bit uncertain at present. Nevertheless, discussions continue. The problems of disarmament are so important that we must exhaust all avenues in seeking meaningful, enforceable agreements. We must by every action demonstrate the continuing good faith of our side. We must by our preparations be ready to deal promptly and realistically both with technological change and with any eventual progress in negotiation.

In the past 10 days we here in the Senate have appropriated over \$41 billion to maintain and strengthen our Military Establishment. All of us supported this enormous expenditure on final passage, because we believe it is essential for our country to stay strong, at a peak of military ability, to deter attack from any potential enemy.

It was timely that a few minutes ago the majority leader, the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], called for a mas-

sive program for peace. I could not agree more with the majority leader, but what a travesty it will be if the Senate fails to match its words with deeds when we have this opportunity to do so.

The \$400,000 request for disarmament and arms control studies in the State Department represents a fantastically tiny fraction of our total arms budget, less than one-thousandth of 1 percent. Small as it is in the total arms picture, this sum would make possible a far more effective and coordinated program of research and development concerned with an enforceable nuclear test ban, effective arms control, and eventual controlled worldwide disarmament. It would permit the State Department to devote the full time and skills of some of its personnel to preparations in this area, providing badly needed background support for our negotiators in Geneva. We are currently engaged in two sets of negotiations in that city, one concerned with the achievement of a ban on nuclear testing, the other with the more general question of disarmament. Setting aside a specific sum for preparations in this area seems to me the very least we can do at this time to demonstrate our good faith, and our continuing belief in the possibility of a successful conclusion to these negotiations.

I have written to the Appropriations Subcommittee in support of this appropriation, and I ask consent that a copy of my letter be printed at this point in my remarks.

Mr. President, I should also like to have printed at the conclusion of these remarks two articles which demonstrate the need for thorough preparations prior to disarmament, arms control, and test ban negotiations. One is by columnist Marquis Childs, and is entitled "Lack of Support Perils Arms Talk." It appeared in the Washington Post and other papers on May 13, 1960. The events of the 5 weeks since Mr. Childs' comments appeared have served to underline the urgency of his concern.

The United Nations correspondent of the Christian Science Monitor, Mr. William R. Frye, has written a thoughtful account of the present state of disarmament research in this country, which points again to the need for a greater expenditure in this area.

I ask unanimous consent that both these articles be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

JUNE 21, 1960.

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Departments of State, Justice, Judiciary, and Related Agencies Appropriations, Senate Committee on Appropriations, Washington, D.C.

DEAR LYNDON: I am writing to urge that the appropriation of \$400,000 for arms control studies and preparation for disarmament be included in the Department of State appropriation for 1961.

As you know, the disarmament and nuclear test ban talks are continuing in Geneva. In the New York Times today, Mr. Dana Adams Schmidt reports that the chief U.S. delegate to the 10-nation disarmament

conference, Mr. Frederick M. Eaton, on June 20 advised the State Department and Department of Defense that "the West needed a fresh approach to disarmament." The article goes on to state that it is Mr. Eaton's belief "that the West's March 15 (disarmament) proposals could be modified and made more effective for purposes of propaganda and negotiation."

In a companion article, New York Times correspondent A. M. Rosenthal reports: "Geneva's two East-West conferences were in political suspension today while their futures were being decided in Washington and Moscow. . . . Under the urging of its allies, Washington is considering whether to present any new disarmament proposals to the Geneva conference. Some Western diplomats feel that, having praised the Soviet Union, perhaps too fully, for having made 'concessions' the West should now make a move of its own."

In my view, it is of the greatest importance that the United States once again clearly demonstrate its readiness to explore every avenue which may lead to a solution of the very difficult questions being discussed in Geneva. We have ample evidence that technological changes are continually reshaping the problems connected with arms control. New detection systems are devised, and more advanced military weapons are invented. Research in this field is badly needed. Expenditure of a relatively modest sum would enable the State Department to coordinate a program of research and preparation looking toward effective arms control, an enforceable nuclear test ban, and eventual worldwide, controlled disarmament. This is the least we can do at this time to demonstrate our good faith, and our continuing belief in the possibility of a successful conclusion to the negotiations in Geneva.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM PROXMIER.

[From the Washington Post, May 13, 1960]

LACK OF SUPPORT PERILS ARMS TALK

(By Marquis Childs)

GENEVA.—It is not alone the pilots of espionage airplanes who brave great dangers in the service of their country on overseas missions. Diplomats and negotiators confronting the Russians across the conference table all too often find themselves perched precariously at the end of a forgotten limb.

A case in point is Ambassador James J. Wadsworth, who was sent here 18 months ago by Washington to negotiate a nuclear test agreement treaty with the British and the Russians. Close to success after long and painstaking effort, he finds that a massive propaganda attack is being launched against the treaty and, incidentally, against him. From the principal figures in the administration, who are supposedly behind his efforts, there comes scarcely a peep of support, not to mention encouragement.

The propaganda concentrates on the technical difficulties of perfecting a system of inspection that will be cheatproof, and these difficulties are considerable. But this stress entirely ignores the political advantages of a test treaty and by implication it greatly exaggerates the gains that might come from further testing.

A familiar experience of the American negotiator is to have an American Senator or Congressman pop in and out for a few days and then to presume on the basis of this brief experience of an enormously complicated subject that he knows more than the men around the conference table. Wadsworth has experienced this kind of harassment which has included inspired attacks on him in the familiar clichés of "soft" and "appeaser."

He comes of a family distinguished for public service in a tradition more familiar in Britain than in America. His father, the late James W. Wadsworth, served first in the

Senate from his native New York and then in the House. Ambassador Wadsworth's grandfather was John Hay, who started his public career as secretary to Lincoln and then, as the climax to a series of diplomatic posts, became Secretary of State.

A big, shambling man with an easy, friendly manner, he has shown a monumental patience and persistence in bringing the Soviets around to the Western view on the major issues of control, inspection and joint research. If he—and far more important his work—are to be shot down in flames, the disastrous effect on America's standing in the world can hardly be exaggerated.

America's position is rapidly deteriorating because the visible signs of leadership, the friendly grin to one side, are fewer and fewer. The tragedy of the U-2 illuminated this as with a lightning flash. The universal regret and sorrow in the European press, even in West Germany where there is a confused desire to cling to the concept of American infallibility, are expressed in terms of restraint that cloak dismay and indignation.

At the 10-nation disarmament conference, which met here for 7 weeks of polite futility, the chief of the American delegation was Frederick M. Eaton. A New York lawyer of standing and integrity, Eaton started from scratch with no knowledge of disarmament, of the Russians, or of negotiation. He proved himself a quick and resourceful learner who often puzzled the Soviets by the novel frankness of his approach.

But he was thrown in against a tough, hardened, experienced, professional Valerian Zorin, a deputy foreign minister and head of the Soviet delegation. Zorin held repeated press conferences at which the world press represented in Geneva was free to ask any and all questions. After repeated prodding, Eaton announced a press conference. He appeared with a written statement which he said he would read but no questions would be permitted. That was the last as well as the first Eaton press conference.

What is most damaging to America's prestige and standing is the wobble and wobble of American policy from one side of the road to the other. Nothing could illustrate this more forcefully than the backing and filling over the proposed nuclear test treaty; the impression so strongly reinforced in the U-2 case that the left hand and the right hand are operated by quite different sets of intellectual and emotional controls. The record on nuclear testing can be set straight only by strong affirmative words from the President and his Secretary of State.

[From the Christian Science Monitor]

UNITED STATES RESTUDIES ARMS CONTROL

(By William R. Frye)

UNITED NATIONS, N.Y.—As East and West sit down anew at Geneva to explore disarmament with the propaganda initiative apparently in Soviet hands, a group of leading American educators, natural scientists, businessmen, and others have posed this question:

Why should the United States spend hundreds of millions—indeed, billions—of dollars each year developing new weapons systems and at the same time refuse to spend more than a few thousand dollars exploring such other paths to national security as arms control?

A mere handful—not even a dozen—full-time experts are assigned to this subject in the U.S. Government, it is pointed out; and although a number of private study groups have been established to consider it, their work is ill coordinated and rarely has direct impact on governmental policy planning.

IMPROVISATION CHARGED

At least two proposals have gone through the machinery of the Eisenhower administra-

tion for a special department or section devoted to peace planning. For a time, special Presidential Assistant Harold E. Stassen headed the nucleus of such a group. But the Stassen operation broke down, and efforts to replace it have been wrecked by inter-departmental rivalries.

Thus at a time such as this, with a new or ostensibly new Soviet proposal on the table in Geneva, the United States must improvise its response as best it can and hope that the technique of asking questions and making skeptical speeches—that is, of "barking and nipping at the heels," as it sometimes is called—will prove adequate in the worldwide market place of ideas.

Continuous, long-range contingency planning would do much to help regain the initiative in such instances, and to avoid losing it in the first place, it is pointed out.

QUESTIONS FIRED

Had the Western powers been on record with a more imaginative plan of their own, many feel, the Soviet Union could not have outbid them with anything of such limited novelty and value as the latest Moscow plan for general and complete disarmament.

The group of educators, natural scientists, and business and professional men was brought together at Arden House, Harriman, N.Y., by Tom Slick, multimillionaire Texas oilman, with Mrs. Mary Lasker, New York philanthropist, also a sponsor. There were approximately 110 in the group.

Their "strategy for peace conference" lasted 3 days, June 3 to 5. In that time, they could not do much more than attempt to ask the right questions, it was agreed. Some of the questions posed during the discussion were these:

Are there any circumstances under which the United States could go down to "zero force level," that is, complete disarmament, accepting the risk that, despite all legal inspection and illegal espionage, between 50 and 500 nuclear weapons might still be secreted away in the Soviet Union?

NEW STRATEGY NEEDED?

Would surreptitious delivery mechanisms—mobile intercontinental ballistic missiles, for example—be of much value in a surprise attack after they had been left unused for, say, 3 or 4 years? Would an international police force be able to deal with whatever security threat there was?

On the other hand, would general and complete disarmament simply be followed by some political crisis—for example, over Berlin or Formosa—which would touch off a new arms race in which the Soviet Union, because of its ability to concentrate formidable efforts in a single field, would have an advantage?

In a completely disarmed world, policed by an international force, which rival in the political, economic, and psychological cold war would have an advantage? Would a disarmed world be more or less likely to become gradually communized than an armed world?

If total disarmament is not desired or feasible, should the West frankly say so at Geneva? Or should it continue to accept battle on the terms Soviet Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev has laid down, professing to seek total disarmament and attempting to demonstrate Soviet insecurity?

If a minimum nuclear deterrent should be kept by both sides to protect against secret evasions, how large should it be? Large enough to knock out the enemy's forces in a first-strike blow? Or just large enough to retaliate in a second strike?

PRIORITIES PROBED

The latter, it is estimated, probably would require no more than 500 to 1,000 bombs, plus hard (relatively invulnerable) delivery mechanisms which an enemy could not knock out without vast superiority in num-

bers. Efforts to build such a superiority could be detected by any reasonably adequate inspection system, it was argued, once both sides had reduced down to the agreed minimum.

Those who preferred the latter plan to general and complete disarmament expressed dissatisfaction that higher priority had not been given inside the Government to the task of hardening the United States present nuclear deterrent.

Few agreed conclusions were reached on matters of this kind, since the group was chosen from a broad spectrum of opinion. But virtually no one disagreed that intensive, full-time study of the problem was needed both inside the Government and outside, and, indeed, within the United Nations Secretariat as well. The need was called tremendous.

The group also called for "more active steps to develop and implement a working system of international law," beginning with repeal by the U.S. Congress of the Connally amendment, which restricts World Court jurisdiction over disputes involving the United States.

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

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota, without losing my right to the floor.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to thank the Senator from Wisconsin for his timely remarks. It is wonderful to have assistance in the cause of disarmament, and the brilliant mind and effective words of the Senator from Wisconsin will be the power of a legion. I am deeply grateful to him for his words this morning relating to this appropriation. His words relating to the appropriation are surely very helpful. As the Senator knows, it is my privilege to work with him in this effort to see if we cannot at least make some beginning toward the kinds of studies and inquiries that are necessitated by the disarmament problem.

Mr. PROXMIRE. What I am doing, of course, is following the leadership of the Senator from Minnesota. There is no leadership I would rather follow. There is no question that he has led a fight which sometimes must have seemed to him to be a lonely contest. The fight for a thoughtful and effective arms control program is the most important fight in America today.

ELDERLY MAN FACES BLINDNESS BECAUSE OF HIGH MEDICAL COSTS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, picture the plight of senior citizens who desperately need operations—perhaps to block or arrest serious disease or to save their eyesight—and who put off such operations simply because they have no way to pay for them.

Major surgery plus extended hospital care costs anywhere from several hundreds to several thousands of dollars. Compare that with the facts cited by Secretary Arthur S. Flemming of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in testimony before the Subcommittee on Problems of the Aged of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee:

Fifty percent of the aged have less than \$1,000 a year in income; 23 percent have between \$1,000 and \$2,000; 8 percent have

between \$2,000 and \$3,000; 12 percent have \$3,000 or more.

The cost of medical care to the aged is more than double the cost to the average citizen because of the high incidence of illness among older people, and those costs are rising rapidly.

Every day we delay action, we are prolonging a great and growing American tragedy that cries out for a solution only we can provide. Here is a letter from a senior citizen of Wisconsin that illustrates this tragedy. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that this letter be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

DEAR SENATOR: I am writing about the medical and hospital benefits you are trying to get for old people. They do need it so badly; I know as I am one of them.

I have cataracts on my eyes and don't see how I can afford an operation, which costs about \$1,000 for one eye and \$2,000 for both eyes in two separate operations. I am 70 years old and my husband is 76 and it's impossible to get work.

I do hope this bill will be passed before I have to have my eyes operated on which may be in another year. We had to drop our hospital and medical insurance as we can't afford to pay on it each month, and I know at least a dozen of my friends who are in the same fix. What can we do?

So please push hard for this bill. I pray that you will be able to get them to see how we older ones need this.

Sincerely,

DOCUMENTATION OF THE VESSEL "EDITH Q"

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask the Presiding Officer to lay before the Senate a message from the House on the bill, S. 1765, to authorize and direct the Treasury to cause the vessel, *Edith Q.*, owned by James O. Quinn, of Sunset, Maine, to be documented as a vessel of the United States with full coastwise privileges.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1765) to authorize and direct the Treasury to cause the vessel *Edith Q.*, owned by James O. Quinn, of Sunset, Maine, to be documented as a vessel of the United States with full coastwise privileges, which were, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 4132 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended (46 U.S.C. 11), the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to cause that certain vessel now known as the *Edith Q.* (formerly the *Miss Paul*), built in 1950 in Nova Scotia, and now owned by James O. Quinn, of Sunset, Maine, to be documented as a vessel of the United States, upon compliance with the usual requirements, with the privilege of engaging in the coastwise trade to the extent necessary to permit the carriage of passengers and merchandise, whether for hire or otherwise, between Camden, Great Spruce Head Island, and other points in Maine, located on the Penobscot River and Penobscot Bay, and the tributaries and approaches thereto, during the period from May 15 through September 15 annually, so long as the vessel shall continue to be owned by a citizen of the United States.

And to amend the title so as to read:

An act to authorize and direct the Treasury to cause the vessel *Edith Q.*, owned by James O. Quinn, of Sunset, Maine, to be documented as a vessel of the United States with limited coastwise privileges.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The House added a very minor technical amendment to the bill. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Washington.

The motion was agreed to.

PILOTAGE REQUIREMENTS IN NAVIGATION OF WATERS OF GREAT LAKES

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate a message from the House on the bill, S. 3019, to provide for certain pilotage requirements in the navigation of U.S. waters of the Great Lakes, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 3019) to provide for certain pilotage requirements in the navigation of U.S. waters of the Great Lakes, and for other purposes, which were on page 11, line 4, strike out "(a)", and on page 11, strike out lines 8 through 15 inclusive.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The only difference between the House and the Senate bills is that the Senate bill provided for the creation of some supergrades in the civil service to handle the pilot problem. The House bill did not do so. In view of the time element involved, and the necessity of having pilotage in our growing commerce on the Great Lakes and St. Lawrence Seaway, I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Washington.

The motion was agreed to.

THE JAPANESE-UNITED STATES TREATY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, yesterday I addressed myself to the subject which is on our executive calendar, namely, the treaty between Japan and the United States. I wish to supplement those remarks during the morning hour with some insertions in the RECORD.

When the summit conference collapsed, I predicted that there would be a significant step-up of both propaganda and military attack by the Chinese Communists.

It seemed to me that the Communists would feel that the failure of the summit conference would catch the United States off balance and cast our leadership into a sea of doubt.

We have already been given proof of a step-up of Chinese Communist military efforts. While the President was in Formosa, Red Chinese guns fired across the Formosa Strait to blast Quemoy.

This might be just a beginning. I think we can expect further aggressive

military tactics by the Chinese Communists, including additional infiltrations on the Chinese-Indian border and on every other front.

The Peiping regime was also quick to intensify a propaganda campaign of hate directed toward the United States. An Associated Press story in this morning's Washington Post reports:

Newspapers, radio stations, posters on sidewalk bulletin boards and public address systems piped into every town and village square blared their message of hate against the United States in general and Mr. Eisenhower in particular.

These stories need to be read and understood by every American.

It indicates what confronts us in the Far East and, therefore, the caution with which we must proceed.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Associated Press article entitled "Red Chinese Drive Against the United States Rises in Fury," published in the Washington Post and Times Herald of June 22, 1960, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

RED CHINESE DRIVE AGAINST THE UNITED STATES RISES IN FURY

TOKYO, June 21.—Red China today launched an anti-United States imperialist propaganda week keyed to its furious campaign of vituperation against President Eisenhower.

Drumming out its main theme that Mr. Eisenhower's Asian good will tour was a flop—the campaign went into high gear at mass rallies across China. The Peiping radio said millions of Chinese from subtropical Kwangtung Province to northernmost Heilungkiang were screaming denunciations of the American President.

Mr. Eisenhower was described as the "chieftain of U.S. imperialism," the "god of plague," and the "viscous wolf of Western imperialism."

Newspapers, radio stations, posters on sidewalk bulletin boards, and public address systems piped into every town and village square blared their message of hate against the United States in general and Mr. Eisenhower in particular.

The official Peiping People's Daily said the President's tour ended in "ignominious failure."

The Communist New China News Agency said that "everywhere he went he was like a rat scurrying down the street with the people shouting, 'Kill it!'"

"Mr. Eisenhower," it said, "made a laughing stock of himself and was condemned everywhere."

According to the Peiping radio, the million or more Filipinos who turned out to welcome Mr. Eisenhower in Manila were shouting curses and not friendly greetings.

The Chinese on Formosa who gave Mr. Eisenhower one of his most colorful welcomes had, according to the broadcast, nothing but scorn for the President.

One hundred thousand Okinawans "put Eisenhower to such fright 'that he left earlier than scheduled,'" the radio said. Actually the overwhelming majority of the Okinawan crowds welcomed Mr. Eisenhower, and only a small Communist-led minority staged a noisy anti-American demonstration.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, it is also vital for us to realize the delicate situation in the Far East today. The focus of the Communist attacks there is Japan, which is a center of free world power in Asia. An article written by

Wilbur Elston, and published in the Minneapolis, Minn., Tribune, reads, in part:

Japan, of course, is an especially inviting target for both Communist China and the Soviet Union. . . .

Japan has become an important factor on the anti-Communist side in the struggle in Asia between the free world and the Communist world.

Mr. President, I commend to all Senators the reading of the article because it contains a very thoughtful discussion of the complex political situation which exists in Japan and the relationship of the United States-Japanese treaty to that political situation. The article is particularly pertinent at this time in the Senate's deliberations because of the action to be taken by the Senate relating to the ratification of the treaty. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Elston's article entitled "Why Japan Is Choice Communist Target," be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

WHY JAPAN IS CHOICE COMMUNIST TARGET (By Wilbur Elston)

It is too early to say whether the Japanese-United States security treaty will be a casualty of the rioting in Japan, but it is obvious that American-Japanese relations already have been severely damaged.

Such a result must be extremely satisfying to Premier Chou En-lai in Peiping and Premier Khrushchev in Moscow. Both no doubt will view it as one of the major dividends of Mr. K's new tough line toward the West.

After the breakdown of the Paris summit talks, Khrushchev renewed his campaign to destroy America's system of defensive alliances that encircle the globe. Now Khrushchev and Chou, who had been attacking U.S. bases in the Far East even during Khrushchev's advocacy of peaceful coexistence with the West, will take credit for what happened in Japan, although many other factors also were responsible.

Japan, of course, is an especially inviting target for both Communist China and the Soviet Union.

In just the 15 years since the end of World War II, Japan has rebuilt its economy and now is one of the most productive industrial nations in the world. Japan also has allied itself with the free world. It has provided bases for American forces. And it has even begun to give economic help to the other free nations of Asia.

In other words, Japan has become an important factor on the anti-Communist side in the struggle in Asia between the free world and the Communist world. In that part of the world, the territories and independence of more than 300 million people are at stake in this contest.

Supporting the Communists in that area are bases in the eastern part of the Soviet Union, in North Korea, in North Vietnam and in Communist China. Adm. Harry D. Felt, Navy commander in chief in the Pacific, recently told the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

America's contributions to the defense of the free nations in the Far East include 243,000 sailors, marines and naval aviators manning two fleets, one in the eastern Pacific and the Seventh Fleet in the western Pacific, Felt told the committee. In addition, 67,000 American soldiers are stationed in Korea and in reserve in Hawaii. Another 70,000 air force officers and men fly from bases in Korea, Okinawa, the Philippines, Taiwan and Japan.

The United States also backs up its allies in the Far East with military and economic aid programs. In the last 10 years, for example, the United States has provided \$711,557,000 in military aid and \$16,253,000 in economic aid to Japan as part of more than \$9,500 million allocated to the Far Eastern area in the 1950-59 decade.

Those expenditures in Japan do not include the cost of procurement for and maintenance of American military forces in Japan. Back in 1955, the cost amounted to more than half a billion dollars a year, but it has been cut in recent years because of Japan's economic recovery and the rebuilding of Japan's own military forces.

Starting in 1950, the Japanese, with American help, now have developed a military force of more than 210,000 men. In addition, the Japanese recently decided to build the F-104 all-weather jet fighter. This is the third postwar aircraft production program started in Japan.

The new democracy of Japan has increased in economic growth in the past decade at a rate almost twice as high as that in the United States and in Western Europe. As a consequence, the living standard has risen rapidly and national income per capita now surpasses the prewar level by more than 30 percent.

Japan also has become the second largest market for American goods and the United States is Japan's largest single market with almost one-third of Japan's exports coming to this country. Japan expects to become the world's third largest steel producer, after the United States and the Soviet Union.

In part because of Japan's resurgence, American administrators of the mutual security program were optimistic about the Far East when they went before congressional committees early this spring. One said "stabilization has been substantially achieved," although he acknowledged that the activities of Communist China in its border disputes indicated that stabilization is inimical to its objectives.

MSA witnesses also did note that "repeatedly the Chinese Communists revert to tactics of bluster and threat as they did in January when the Japanese signed the new treaty of mutual cooperation and security." This is the same treaty that now is up for ratification in Japan.

But the MSA administrators, while asking for \$1,231,000,000 in aid for the Far East during the 1961 fiscal year, also seemed optimistic about Japan's future. They pointed out the United States technical assistance is being phased out in Japan and U.S. military aid there is becoming "more selective and limited."

In addition, they pointed with pride to the "important Japanese assistance" being extended to other countries of southwest Asia in the form of reparations and special assistance.

Such factors help explain why Japan now is an inviting target for the Communists. They also help explain why the United States is anxious to keep Japan in the non-Communist camp and to help preserve its freedom.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the situation in Japan right now is extremely complex and delicate. Our relations with that country hang in the balance. Any misstep on our part could fan new violence and opposition and could result in a government unfriendly to the United States.

The issue of the Japanese-American security treaty has stirred strong pacifist feelings on the part of the Japanese people, particularly among the students and the young, whose views were formed during a period when pacifism was en-

couraged by the occupation by the United States.

This suggests the need for America to expand not only its military programs in Japan, but its political, technical, and cultural efforts, as well. We must show the Japanese people that the United States will back up its talk about peace with solid works for peace.

I was very much pleased to hear the remarks of the majority leader this morning, when he said to the Senate, in support of the Japanese-American security treaty:

I believe we will have to launch somewhere along the line a really massive offensive for peace.

I think it is incumbent upon us, as the leader of the free world, and one of the stronger nations, to propose great programs, through the United Nations, that would stamp out killing and crippling disease.

I think we will have to propose great programs of international cooperation in moving the world's food surplus to areas of deficit.

I should think we will have to propose great programs of international cooperation to break down the barriers that prevent communications between people.

I think we will have to propose great programs of international cooperation to harness the water resources in arid regions of the world.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have 3 more minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the words of the majority leader I have read must be taken seriously. It is important that they have been said by the leader of the majority of the Senate, because his word means, at least, a statement of policy by the majority. I commend the majority leader.

Mr. President, an editorial entitled, "Japanese Dilemma," published in the Minneapolis Tribune of June 19, 1960, points up the dilemma of the Japanese in the matter of conflicting pacifist-militarist viewpoints. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

JAPANESE DILEMMA

Japan's seven major newspapers have issued a joint statement saying, "Never have we been so concerned over the future of Japan." They might well be worried—not because there is a difference of opinion about the security treaty with the United States but because Communist elements have been able to use widespread pacifist feeling to generate demonstrations which threaten growing chaos.

Americans would be deceiving themselves if they placed all antitreaty sentiment with the Communists. A recent editorial in the Asahi Evening News of Tokyo said: "The Japanese people are firmly determined to uphold the spirit of article 9 of the Constitution which renounces war and bans the possession of war material. The Japanese will endure any hardship to live up to the spirit of the article."

"While we fully recognize the improvements that have been made in the revised

security treaty, we have opposed the inclusion of the purport of the Vandenberg resolution and article 5 which gives the pact the character of a joint defense pact. It is our belief that United States-Japan cooperation must gradually switch from military cooperation to political and economic cooperation."

The Japan Times, however, defends the new treaty as rectifying the arrangements of the old security treaty (signed at San Francisco in 1951) to which many Japanese objected—permitting the United States to use bases and deploy forces elsewhere in the Far East in such a manner as might involve Japan; allowing the use of nuclear arms without consultation with the Japanese Government; permitting American forces to intervene in large-scale domestic disturbances.

Says the Times: "We have to look further afield for the real reasons for the noisy opposition to ratification of the new treaty. We see first of all the Socialist Party, repeatedly defeated at the polls and recently torn asunder by internal faction, seeking under new leadership for an opportunity to ride to power on a wave of popular emotion, however unfairly engendered, and secondly a combined effort on the part of the various leftist elements whose political and economic ideas are borrowed from the Communist regimes in Soviet Russia and Red China to break off Japan's friendship with the United States."

The situation calls for careful handling by those in authority in both Japan and the United States so that the leftists are not able to capitalize enough on Japanese antiwar feeling to put themselves into power in Tokyo.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, an article entitled "Contradictions Blur Picture of Japanese Crisis," written by Bill Hosokawa, of the Denver Post, relates, in concise, succinct terms, some of the issues which are at stake in the present political situation in Japan. I commend the article to the careful reading of Senators as a part of the general discussion relating to the Japanese-United States treaty. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

CONTRADICTIONS BLUR PICTURE OF JAPANESE CRISIS

(By Bill Hosokawa)

TOKYO, June 21.—On the same night last week that a quarter million Japanese demonstrated against the Kishi government—and incidentally the United States, thousands jammed a Tokyo stadium to see a baseball game. Both events were televised and some viewers switched from one to the other as excitement rose or waned.

Nor did the Japanese think it unusual when a group of students, who had been up most of the night in a snake-dancing protest to Mr. Eisenhower's impending visit voiced concern when their American teacher failed to appear for a class.

This is the confused atmosphere in which Japan's American-imposed democracy is getting its severest test. Some Japanese see that current series of demonstrations as a battle to the death between constitutional democracy and anarchy.

Other sophisticates, carousing in Tokyo's countless tiny bars, kid the girls and chant lewd parodies of the rallying cries used by leftist student demonstrators.

This much is certain:

The demonstrations, with a broad range of targets, have stirred the public imagination as nothing else since war's end.

The demonstrations are well organized and bear the unmistakable earmarks of professional Communist leadership and financing.

Demonstration masterminds are capitalizing on the public's genuine and widespread fear of war and intense pacifism. However, most of the demonstrators and their sympathizers have only vague understanding of real issues.

The Kishi government has been inept but by no means is it a bad, repressive or corrupt government.

The American people still enjoy a good deal of respect, if not affection, among the Japanese masses.

The Japanese people are a long way from political maturity, and the nation will suffer many crises before it reaches maturity.

DISCONTENT MOUNTS

The magnitude and rapid spread of Japan's protest demonstrations bespeak discontent that was building up for a long time. However, the event that touched off the demonstrations took place the night of May 19.

On that night Japan's Parliament was studying extension of the session another 50 days. For months, Parliament had been locked in debate on the United States-Japan security pact. The majority party, Kishi's Liberal-Democrats, had sought to ratify it. The opposition Socialists opposed it bitterly.

A joint committee had met 39 times and debated the treaty inconclusively for a total of 140 hours.

Now, as the Parliament session neared its constitutional end, it appeared the Socialists' delaying tactics would force postponement of a ratification vote. So the Liberal-Democrats proposed to extend the session, the strategy being to let the Socialists talk themselves out and bring the matter to a vote. Since Kishi commanded an absolute majority, there could be no question of the outcome.

When the Speaker of the House announced his intention to call for a vote on extending the session, the Socialists imprisoned him in his office so he could not reach the chamber. Six hours later the Speaker summoned police, who carried out a number of Socialists bodily to clear a path for the Speaker.

Once the Speaker reached the floor the police left and the Socialists were free to enter the chamber for the vote. They chose instead to boycott the session.

TREATY APPROVED

Since a quorum was present Parliament quickly voted to extend the session as proposed. Then someone—he was never identified—suggested that the treaty be approved while the Socialists were absent, and this was quickly done.

The Socialists reacted explosively. They accused Kishi of high-handed tactics and demanded his resignation. By a curious logic, the Socialists portrayed themselves as defenders of parliamentary government and Kishi as its foe. The Socialists came up with the concept "tasu boryoku," which can be translated as "dictatorship by the majority." In other words, they were arguing Kishi was wrong to utilize his majority power.

The militant far-left Zengakuren student federation needed no encouragement to jump into the hassle. Soon, chanting, marching students were demonstrating almost nightly against the security pact and Kishi.

The demonstrations were not born of mass indignation. Many students admit they showed up because their friends did, and their friends were demonstrating because somebody told them to.

The demonstrators I talked to could answer glibly that they were opposed to the security pact, that Kishi must resign, but they were far less articulate when asked precisely why the treaty was bad for Japan, or where Kishi had failed.

Nor are their elders often better informed, most having never studied the treaty.

Obviously, when a people as highly literate as the Japanese are willing to follow the crowd unquestioningly, there's something wrong.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, it is widely and erroneously believed that the demonstrations in Tokyo were caused by a small minority, dominated by the Communists. Although there is no question that the Communists played a leading role in organizing these demonstrations, there is also every evidence that they reflected widespread public sentiment. No definitive study has been made of neutralist sentiment in Japan, but responsible estimates range from 35 to 50 percent of the Japanese public opposed to the security pact. If the prevalence of neutralist thinking in Japan is ignored, the nature of recent events cannot be properly understood and future policies cannot be intelligently appraised. Clear evidence of public sentiment is that the Kishi government was unwilling to quell the riots by the use of traditional anti-riot police work. This inability is widely interpreted in Japan as a recognition that forcible suppression of the riots would not have been tolerated by the public.

Much of the public reaction in Japan to the current situation can be explained as anti-Kishi rather than anti-American or even anti-pact.

Kishi's unpopularity in Japan stems from the following factors: First, he is identified with the prewar and wartime governments of Japan and although he espouses democracy publicly, it is feared by some that his real sentiments are of another era; second, he has declared himself in favor of amending the "no-war" provision of the constitution; third, in the fall of 1958, he proposed an amendment to the police laws which would have strengthened the powers of the police to arrest. This, it was feared, was the first step in a return to prewar police power; fourth, his espousal of the security pact was looked upon as an integral part of a program which included revision of the constitution and amendment of the police laws; and fifth, Kishi's parliamentary tactics, although perhaps defensible in our view of the role of majorities, were in Japan widely interpreted as anti-democratic.

Kishi is and has for some time been generally unpopular in Japan. A poll conducted on June 2 by the Asahi, Japan's leading newspaper, showed the following: Do you approve of Kishi pushing the security pact through the Diet? Fifty percent were against; 6 percent were for; 18 percent were undecided; 25 percent, no answer; other opinions, 1 percent. Do you approve of the Socialists' sitdown and blockade tactics in the Diet? Eleven percent were for; 32 percent were against; 31 percent were undecided; 25 percent had no answer; 1 percent had other answers. Do you think the Diet really represents the opinions of the people? Yes, 17 percent; no, 56 percent; other, 5 percent; no answer, 22 percent.

I remind the Senate that this information came from the largest and supposedly most responsible press in Japan.

A poll taken about a month ago showed that only 20 percent supported the Kishi cabinet. In the face of this widespread unpopularity, our policies, nevertheless, were apparently directed to the support of Kishi. The facts here are elusive, but the statement of the Secretary of State before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on this pact left little doubt that in fact our policies were directed toward the support of Kishi. It is widely believed in Japan that our Ambassador played Japanese politics in support of Kishi. It is widely alleged that our Embassy had limited contacts with other factions of the Liberal Democratic Party and for all intents and purposes completely ignored the opposition party. The facts here are difficult to ascertain, but these widespread beliefs cannot be ignored. Whether true or not, these rumors and comments are repeated again and again. I, personally, doubt their validity; but I am concerned.

Our State Department has apparently not been well informed of Japanese thinking. This may be attributed to the lack of contact with other factions of the Liberal Democratic Party and with the Socialist Party.

In view of the foregoing, it seems to have been a mistake to have interjected a Presidential visit to Japan in the midst of great internal disruption. It calls into question the judgment of those who felt it desirable that the pact be rushed through the Diet so as to complete action before the President's visit. There have been stories in the Japanese press to the effect that the initiative came from our Ambassador. I do not know if this is true and perhaps the facts will never come to light, but it should have been clear to those in positions of responsibility that a visit by the President on June 19, the same day on which ratification was completed, would be inopportune. At best, it would have given a flavor to the visit—which was planned to commemorate the centennial of United States-Japan relations—which was inappropriate. At worst, the riots, which in fact resulted, and which caused the President to cancel his trip could have been foreseen.

In conclusion, we have rather clumsily interjected ourselves or have been drawn into Japanese politics and greatly damaged what have been the most cordial and friendly relations with Japan.

Therefore, I urge that in our action on the treaty we emphasize the economic, political, and social aspects, and that we seek to improve the relations between our two countries in the most careful and prudent manner.

CENTENARY OF BIRTH OF JANE ADDAMS

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, Miss Jane Addams was born 100 years ago, and the Nation is properly celebrating the centenary of her birth.

Miss Addams died a quarter of a century ago. A great deal of recognition of her true worth and nobility has dawned upon the American public.

It was my personal privilege to know Miss Addams fairly intimately for the last 15 years of her life, and of course, for many years previous to that I had known about her work and her character.

I can say with due restraint that Miss Addams is the only person of my knowledge who could properly be called a saint. To me, she was the finest character I have ever known or known about in my generation. She was the living embodiment of intelligent good will translated into action. She was a woman of great courage, who was willing to take unpopular positions; and although she suffered from attack and contumely which she felt keenly, that never damaged her spirit, which always was loving and kind to all those who attacked her.

Some weeks ago, I had the privilege of speaking at greater length about Miss Addams at a service at Rockford College, from which she graduated in the early 1880's; and on a previous occasion I had that address printed in the RECORD, together with an address by another noted person, Dr. Frank Graham. So, at this time I shall not make lengthy comments about Miss Addams.

We in Illinois have sometimes been criticized for abuses which have occurred in our State. But we take pride in the fact that not only Abraham Lincoln came from Illinois, but also Jane Addams came from Illinois.

She lived for almost 50 years in what was known as the Bloody 20th Ward; and her influence was always for good. She had culture, as well as character. She had intelligence, as well as compassion. She had kindness, as well as acuteness of mind. She supported every good movement for the benefit of mankind. Since her name began with "Add," it was always at the head of every list of supporters of good causes. Hence like Arnold von Winkelried, she drew upon herself the arrows and slings of those who were opposed to those measures.

I did not always agree with Miss Addams in every position she took, but I knew that everything she did was swayed by her sensitive conscience and her brave soul.

I have often thought of the similarity between Miss Addams and the last scene in Bernard Shaw's "St. Joan," where St. Joan is about to return to the earth, and where those who praised her suddenly take alarm at the thought that she might come back, and that they would be exposed to great dangers if she once again started to crusade for the things in which she believed.

It is very easy to praise Miss Addams, now that she has been dead for 25 years. I could not agree with her on every position she took, particularly on the question of nonresistance; but I certainly loved and admired her; and the concluding words of Shaw's play are, I think, appropriate in the case of Miss Addams:

O God, who made this beautiful earth, when will it be ready to receive Thy sons? How long, O Lord, how long?

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from Illinois in regard to this great and wonderful woman, Miss Jane Addams. It is always a joy to hear the Senator from Illinois give testimony in praise of our great Americans, or, indeed, to hear him speak on any subject.

But I believe his remarks today were especially moving, because he was speaking of a person whom he has known, and one for whom he has great respect and admiration.

Such testimony to a crusader and reformer is much needed at this time in American life. In our America of 1960 there is a great lack of Jane Addamses; and if ever there were a time when we needed this same spirit, it is now, when we see such monstrous evil throughout the world, so many challenges which need to be met, and so many problems which need to be faced.

Mr. President, it is a particular honor to pay tribute to Jane Addams, an extraordinary American woman, who with vision and determination brought our Nation to realize and accept its responsibilities to our neighbors who were poor, weak, exploited, or otherwise unfortunate.

Jane Addams had great courage. She had tremendous respect for the dignity of every individual. For a woman of her times, she had an unusual grasp of the "solidarity of the human race."

Her understanding of the worth of every man, woman, and child, and of the impact of every individual's life on that of every other individual, not only in his neighborhood, but in the entire world, was at the root of her concern for peace.

Jane Addams devoted her life to the cause of peace—within the family, in her city, and, finally, on the international scene, through her founding and leadership of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom.

Nineteen hundred and sixty is the 100th anniversary of the birth of Jane Addams, Mr. President. Because of Jane Addams' leadership and inspiration, we are closer to attaining some of the goals of social peace in our Nation which she set. Our educational system, our social welfare programs, our standard of living, and our great labor movement are ample testimony to this. But the goal of world peace seems at times to recede, especially as the threat of a nuclear holocaust appears on the horizon and grows.

In honoring Jane Addams, I know that we could do nothing better than rededicate ourselves, whatever the sacrifices required, to a great offensive in the cause of world peace with justice and with freedom.

I always believe that when one talks of peace and dedicates himself to it, he must never forget that peace is meaningless without justice and without freedom. It is the peace of justice and freedom that is worthy of people of democratic persuasion.

I thank the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, this year marks the 100th anniversary of the birth of Jane Addams, famed social worker and founder of one of our most notable institutions of social welfare—Hull

House in Chicago. I think it appropriate that we pause to remember her today and to note the latest of many tributes to her. Two days ago, the Committee of Twenty-one of the Hall of Fame for Great Americans announced that Miss Addams was one of three people deemed worthy of special consideration for election to the Hall of Fame at New York University. That election will be held on November 1.

Jane Addams' accomplishments served both America and the world. At home, she made Hull House a lively community of those whose interest was reform and whose end was justice. She led the effort to obtain passage of juvenile court laws, mothers' pensions, tenement house regulations, workmen's compensation laws, and woman suffrage. Internationally, Miss Addams worked consistently for world peace through the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, of which she was president. The work of the International Congress of Women at The Hague in 1915, over which she presided, became important to President Woodrow Wilson when he composed his program for world peace. And Miss Addams worked after the war as well to see that Europe's food needs were satisfied.

Jane Addams' teachings can guide us today. Her articulate concern for civil rights—as well as her awareness of the difficulty of their vindication—is clear in these words from her book, "Democracy and Social Ethics":

We believe that man's moral idealism is the constructive force of progress—but we are skeptical of the moral idealism of the few and demand the education of the many. * * * We are not content to include all men in our hopes but have become conscious that all men are hoping and are part of the same movement.

SENATOR CHURCH, OF IDAHO, TO DELIVER KEYNOTE ADDRESS AT DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL CONVENTION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the youngest Member of the Senate of the United States, the junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] is, in many respects, one of the most mature Members of this body. He has been selected to be the keynote at the Democratic Convention in Los Angeles on July 11. We are honored indeed that this outstanding member of our party has been selected.

I ask unanimous consent that a series of editorials, articles, and stories relative to this honor may be inserted at this point in the RECORD with my remarks.

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

[From the New York Post, May 29, 1960]

VERY JUNIOR SENATOR FROM THE GOLDEN WEST

(By Robert G. Spivack)

When his colleagues speak of Senator FRANK F. CHURCH, JR., the 35-year-old, modern-day "silver-tongued orator of the Golden West" who has been chosen to keynote the Democratic National Convention, they call him a "nice young fellow" who is "well-mannered and pleasant"—the "kind of kid who doesn't try to throw his weight around."

They will also tell you that the junior Senator from Idaho is not the most exciting young man to hit this hard-boiled town. Certainly he lacks the dash and daring of, for example, his Democratic confrere from Ohio, STEPHEN M. YOUNG, twice CHURCH's age but a rebel whose tart, well-phrased barbs have made him the delight of the press corps.

Nor is CHURCH a brash young Bobby Kennedy, or a Roy Cohn, or a Rush Holt, the former West Virginia Senator who started out in the Senate, also in his early thirties, as ultraradical and finished up at the other side of the political spectrum.

In short, FRANK CHURCH is not an angry young man. To put it more specifically, he is a happy young man—but in a hurry.

When the word reached him that he had been chosen as convention keynoter, he was motoring between Leadore and Mountain Home, two tiny towns in his home State, to which he returns at this time of the year to deliver commencement addresses.

"I am deeply moved by this news," said CHURCH in a statement issued by his office. "The keynoter must state the case for the Democratic Party at a convention which will be watched by an attentive nation and an anxious world."

"This is a grave responsibility," he somberly continued.

Then he injected the proper note of boldness and caution: "I intend to pull no punches, but there will be no hitting below the belt."

These were the public utterances.

But his first words, according to his attractive young wife, Bethine, were, "Well, we made it, didn't we?"

She added earnestly that "it was nice of him to include me in it." However, her own reaction on hearing the good news was more succinct. "Yippee."

Actually, she explained, the young Senator has been thinking all year about the possibility that he might be named keynoter and has given much thought to the "posture of the Democratic Party."

Obviously, the bigger things are not all that CHURCH gives thought to. Although from Los Angeles he will be addressing a nationwide television audience of possibly 100 million, there were only 7 students in the high school graduating class at Leadore, Idaho. He is not one to overlook the smaller things that affect people in their daily lives, and therein lies a clue to his success as a politician at such an early age.

While he has not set the Capital on fire, CHURCH's popularity stems, in part, from the contrast people inevitably make between him and some of the bright, young men who started to come here in the early days of the New Deal.

Most of the others have worn too well. They tended to become too opinionated, or too self-centered, or too eager to rebuild Rome in a day.

MOTIVE

Politics being politics and politicians being a naturally suspicious breed, there has been the usual search for motives behind Democratic National Chairman Paul Butler's choice of CHURCH as the Los Angeles keynoter.

As far as the presidential hopefuls are concerned, CHURCH is a self-proclaimed neutral (although as a Member of the Senate he has been a faithful follower of Majority Leader LYNDON JOHNSON). He has a rich, sonorous voice, is mildly liberal, won an American Legion oratory award and used the \$4,000 prize to help pay his way through Stanford University. But if there is anything otherwise significant about the selection of CHURCH it has yet to be discovered.

Some wits have suggested that CHURCH was really chosen because he is so young in appearance that the delegates may come to think of the current frontrunner, Senator JOHN KENNEDY, as elderly by comparison.

When CHURCH first came to Washington his biggest problem, once the thrill of being a Senator subsided, was that he was constantly being mistaken for a Senate page boy. So often was he asked to run errands and carry messages that he gave up blue suits in favor of brown. By Senate custom, page boys always wear blue.

Aside from such minor annoyances, CHURCH's first term has been relatively tranquil. His voting record on liberal questions, as rated by Americans for Democratic Action, has varied between 77 and 83 percent. The only time he ran into real trouble was in trying to help out JOHNSON and some of the majority leader's western allies in the Senate.

This was during the civil rights debate of 1957. CHURCH and 10 others went along with the southerners in insisting on the so-called jury trial amendment, which meant the Justice Department could not get injunctions where civil rights violations were charged. CHURCH tried to remove some of the onus of being allied with the Dixie Democrats by introducing an amendment which provided that Negroes be given the right to serve on Federal juries.

TEMPEST

Critics felt that this was a meaningless gesture, although it was dressed up as a new civil right for Negroes. CHURCH's move so angered Negro leaders that an invitation to address a Minnesota Young Democratic-Farmer-Labor dinner in September, 1957, was withdrawn. CHURCH defended himself and insisted he was dedicated to the cause of civil rights.

In time, he predicted, the jury trial amendment will come to be regarded as having served the best interests of civil rights for all the people, colored and white alike.

CHURCH's other views have stirred less controversy. He has criticized the Eisenhower policy of peace by pilgrimage and he has spoken of a stopgap agreement with Russia to halt nuclear tests.

One of his major activities has been to fight for construction of the Hell's Canyon power project, a matter of intense interest in his State and throughout the Northwest. He helped pilot a Hell's Canyon bill through the Senate, but the administration and private utilities killed it eventually.

Although it is his reputation as a boy orator that first won him national attention, CHURCH practiced law in Boise, Idaho, served two terms as departmental judge advocate for the American Legion in his State, and in 1950-51 was legal counsel for the Idaho Office of Price Stabilization.

He was born on July 25, 1924, at Boise. His father operated a sporting goods store. In 1942, at the age of 18, he enlisted as a private in the Army and 2 years later was commissioned a second lieutenant in the infantry. He transferred to military intelligence and served overseas in the China-Burma-India theater.

CHURCH received the Bronze Star and was commended for his work with the Chinese Combat Command. He was discharged on June 22, 1946, as a first lieutenant.

VICTORY

Although brought up in a Republican family, he married Democratic. His wife is the daughter of a former Federal judge. The Churches have two sons, Forrester, 11, and Clark, 2.

After he returned to his studies at Stanford, he earned a Phi Beta Kappa key, studied briefly at Harvard and then returned to Stanford, winning a law degree in 1950. In the next 2 years he became active in the Young Democratic Clubs of Idaho and served as their State president in 1952-54. In 1956 he entered the Democratic senatorial primary and defeated, by 170 votes, former Senator Glen Taylor, the banjo-strumming 1948 Progressive Party candidate for Vice President.

CHURCH went on to wallop Herman Welker, a Joe McCarthy Republican, by some 50,000 votes out of 250,000 cast. That made him the youngest Senator and he was on his way.

Despite his reputation as a talker, he has generally abided by the rule that first-term Senators are seen and not heard.

Once he turned to poetry during the debate over the missile gap and said this is how the President might have expressed the state of the Union:

"Now we lay us down to sleep
With Ike's smug team the watch to keep;
If we die before we wake,
Well, the bed was soft and we slept too late."

He may have to work up a little more oratorical lather to make the rafters ring at Los Angeles, but these days the administration seems to be providing him with enough material to make his assignment comparatively easy.

His big problem will be to overcome the tradition that the words of convention keynoters are not long remembered. But considering some of his predecessors in recent years, that may be just as well.

[From the Montgomery County (Md.) Record, June 2, 1960]

DEDICATION TO YOUTH

It was 1896 at the Democratic National Convention at Chicago. William Jennings Bryan, a 36-year-old silver-tongued orator from Nebraska, delivered his "Cross of Gold" speech. He swayed the delegates into nominating him for President despite his years. It was the first of three times that his party was to make the Commoner its standard bearer.

July 16 at Los Angeles, another silver-tongued orator will be 9 days short of his 36th birthday. Senator FRANK CHURCH of Idaho has the gift to sway the convention and he will be the keynote speaker. But while no one expects him to sweep the delegates to give him the presidential nomination, the second place on the ticket could come his way.

CHURCH has been an orator 20 of his 36 years. At 16, he won a nationwide American Legion oratory contest on "Our Way of Life" that brought him a \$4,000 scholarship. At 20, he was commissioned a second lieutenant and saw service in the China-Burma-India theater. At 28, he was the keynote speaker at the Idaho State Democratic Convention. At 32, he was elected U.S. Senator.

He is sure to get the Democratic Convention off to a rousing start, and especially to emphasize its dedication to youth.

[From the Payette (Idaho) Independent-Enterprise, June 2, 1960]

THE NAMING OF SENATOR CHURCH AS DEMOCRATIC KEYNOTER WAS A COMPLIMENT TO THE STATE OF IDAHO

We believe that the naming of Senator FRANK CHURCH to be the keynoter speaker at the Democratic National Convention at Los Angeles next month was a compliment to both the young Senator himself and to the State of Idaho as well.

Moreover we believe that the appointment to the coveted post should be considered complimentary both by Idaho Republicans and Democrats.

We should remember, that while government and politics are important, and necessarily bring differences of opinion among us, we can and should be on common grounds when it comes to the matter of loyalty to our great State.

Idaho as everyone knows, because of its size is pretty "small potatoes" when it comes to the tremendous big game of national politics. For a man from Idaho and particularly one as young as Senator CHURCH, to receive such a prize plum, is something to be elated over and cherished.

In fact it will be the first time in history that Idaho has received such an honor.

All Idahoans should therefore be pleased, because it will bring much needed good publicity to the State.

People across the Nation will learn that here in Idaho we produce outstanding young men as well as big potatoes.

[From the Idaho County Free Press, June 2, 1960]

THE KEYNOTER

Idaho Democrats are quite proud of the selection of Senator CHURCH to be keynoter for the Democratic Convention in Los Angeles beginning July 11. This genius at oratory will undoubtedly spark the convention from the outset and set the pace for an unending attack on Republicans everywhere.

This does not mean the Grand Old Party must run for shelter, for its chance comes in Chicago at another date.

It is timely, however, to congratulate Idaho's youthful Senator on his assignment. Idaho elected him in 1956. During his service in Congress his speechmaking ability won acclaim in a rip-roaring about Hells Canyon. President Eisenhower appointed him to serve the United States in a delegation to South America and he also was enrolled in an international conference in Poland. The Senator also has met Premier Khrushchev, if that means anything now.

The Senator has won respect from leaders of both political parties for his proposals regarding the Geneva conference on curtailing worldwide atomic tests of lethal weapons.

So the Democratic keynoter in a brief time has established himself as a coming statesman.

[From the Kimberly Advertiser, June 2, 1960]

IDAHO'S SENATOR CHURCH TO KEYNOTE AT DEMOCRATIC CONVENTION IN LOS ANGELES

Senator FRANK CHURCH will be the first Idahoan in history to play a major role at a National Democratic Convention when he keynotes the 1960 session at Los Angeles.

Selection of CHURCH as keynoter was announced last week by the convention arrangements committee meeting in New York.

In recent years, the keynote address has been delivered by a Democratic Governor, and CHURCH will be the first United States Senator to deliver the address since the late Alben W. Barkley in 1948. Barkley was elected Vice President the same year.

The convention has been keynoted by a Senator only 4 times since 1920, with Barkley doing the honors in 1932, 1936 and 1948. Senator Pat Harrison, of Mississippi, was keynoter of the 1924 convention in New York.

CHURCH has earned a reputation as one of the outstanding speakers of the Senate, which has a tradition of oratory, and only recently was named to the Senate Democratic campaign committee.

The Idaho Senator was keynoter for the Young Democratic Clubs of America at the annual convention in Reno, Nev., in 1957. In 1958, in recognition of his work for Alaskan statehood, he was invited to keynote the new State's Democratic convention.

[From the Louisville Courier-Journal, May 26, 1960]

TWO FAIR OMENS FOR THE SUMMER

Of the two national political conventions this summer, the Democratic gathering promises at the moment to be far the more interesting and thus to attract the larger television audience. Vice President Nixon seems likely to be in unchallenged, cut-and-dried control of the Republican machinery, able to dictate not only his own nomination but also that of his running mate. Not many people think that Governor Rockefeller, who among all the leading Republican figures excites the most popular curiosity, expects to be in the picture, even though available.

So the Democrats have an unusual opportunity, and the early signs are that they propose to take advantage of it. Gov. LeRoy Collins, of Florida, has been chosen to be their chairman and Senator FRANK CHURCH, of Idaho, their keynoter. Neither of them is a mere windbag. Each has impressively substantial qualities. Governor Collins has displayed both outstanding ability as an administrator and the courage to be a moderate on the race question in a region whose more violent inhabitants regard moderation as a kind of treason.

Senator CHURCH, youngest Member of the upper House has, without being brash, won more attention than a newcomer generally does in that august assembly. He is 36 years old, and Governor Collins, at 51, can hardly be classed as an ancient. Both men have engaging personalities and appealing speaking styles. The impression they make upon the televisioners should be favorable.

Of course, the Democrats, as history proves, are always capable of making a shambles out of a national convention. If they do that this time, it will be in spite of the good omen suggested by the choice of Messrs. Collins and CHURCH.

[From the Miami News, June 1, 1960]

CHURCH: "DEMO" KEYNOTER

Senator FRANK FORRESTER CHURCH, Democrat of Idaho, will make the keynote speech at the Democratic National Convention at Los Angeles in July. This address, to be heard throughout the Nation, will keynote the program presided over by permanent chairman, Gov. LeRoy Collins (Governor Collins also will address the gathering).

The 35-year-old Senator doubtless will be ready with a thundering speech—one which both points with pride and views with alarm. This is in the time-tested tradition of all good keynoters.

Public speaking is nothing new to the Idaho Democrat. As a boy of 16 he won a nationwide public speaking contest sponsored by the American Legion.

As a young man of 28 he keynoted the Idaho State Democratic convention.

Senator CHURCH has made rapid progress in politics since his election to the Senate in 1956. Prior to that, he was virtually unknown outside of Boise, where he was born July 25, 1924.

When he first came to the Senate, he was so youthful in appearance that he found it necessary to wear brown suits so (he) wouldn't be mistaken for one of the page boys, who have to wear blue.

The Senator's interest in politics began during his high school days when, he says, he became a converted and confirmed Democrat despite a Republican family, and was determined to become a U.S. Senator.

Son of a sporting goods dealer, the young CHURCH married Bethine Clark whose father, Chase A. Clark, was a former Idaho Governor. (The latter is now a Federal judge.)

Senator CHURCH has a personal feeling for history.

Affixed to his Senate office door is a simple, handwrought brass plate bearing the name "F. F. CHURCH." The marker originally belonged to his grandfather who had nailed it to his own office door when appointed a U.S. assayer in Boise during the gold rush of the 1890's.

Someday the nameplate will be passed on to the Senator's oldest son, 11-year-old Frank Forrester Church IV.

[From the Blackfoot (Idaho) News, May 26, 1960]

SENATOR CHURCH SPEAKS TO GRADUATES

"Schooling is the means provided to help you achieve a good life as a free citizen," Senator FRANK CHURCH told members of the Snake River High School graduating class last night at commencement exercises.

"Only by earning your own way can you achieve the independence that will permit you to be free.

"But don't spend the rest of your life working just to make money. You can make life as flat and dull as this gymnasium floor, or you can make of it a beautiful tapestry.

"Acquire good reading habits. Learn to read a good book a week. Set aside time to appreciate the beautiful, both man-made and God-made."

He told members of the graduating class they have inherited a bundle of rights in a free land. Those rights came to them unearned. They can earn them only by using them and passing them on, Senator CHURCH said.

Those unearned rights include the right to choose the place in which they shall live—the right of free movement. Included are the right to choose work and the right to change that work—the right to own property which is protected against the trespass of others. They have the right to worship in the church of their choice.

Other inherited rights that Senator CHURCH reminded them of are the rights to a fair trial if accused of a wrong; the right to learn; the right to differ; the right of self-government; the right to engage in politics which is the art of self-government by majority vote.

Senator CHURCH told of the college student who told him he couldn't see the difference between the United States and Russia. Russians are acquiring housing and automobiles, he said: they own television sets and refrigerators.

In a world half slave and half free, Senator CHURCH said, that student had not learned to measure the value of his country. He did not understand that the United States is great not because it is rich, but because it is free.

As an example of wrong emphasis he cited an evening of TV commercials. "You owe it to yourself to be beautiful—to be comfortable—"

"It takes character and intelligence to remain free. In a world filled with people who would like to do your thinking for you, you must look within. With the training that you have received if you look within you, you will find the means to help keep your country strong and free."

So spoke the junior Senator from Idaho, a man who in the coming months will be in the national spotlight as he delivers the keynote address of a national political convention.

There was not a reference to politics or to national affairs.

It is hard to reproduce words and make them meaningful out of context of manner and delivery.

Those hearing him last night, regardless of political affiliation, must have experienced a sense of pride that in 4 years of service in the U.S. Senate he has demonstrated a high order of statesmanship.

When the Senator from Idaho speaks to the Nation he will carry conviction to his listeners.

[From the New York Times, May 26, 1960]

LOS ANGELES APPROACHING

The quickening tempo of this campaign year is signaled by the Democrats' announcement that they have chosen the permanent chairman and the keynote speaker for their Los Angeles convention. Now all they have to do is agree on a presidential nominee.

The man selected for the chairmanship, Governor LeRoy Collins, of Florida, is universally liked and respected, even though he did receive a rude political defeat in his home State on the very day he was picked to run the convention. In a hot gubernatorial primary which was the equivalent of election,

the candidate Mr. Collins had endorsed was, unfortunately, beaten by an opponent who had taken a much stronger pro-segregation line.

Mr. Collins himself, now nearing the end of his 6 years' service as chief executive, is nationally known as one of the leading Southern "moderationists" as well as an exceptionally able and successful Governor. His selection as permanent chairman of the Democratic convention would be a good choice on any grounds, but it is of particular interest because it clearly reflects the tragic dichotomy on integration that exists within the party. Though a southerner, Governor Collins is acceptable to the northern liberals, or at least he is not mortally offensive to them, because he is a moderate on the race question; though a moderate on the race question, he is still a southerner and thus anathema only to the radical extremists of the South. As the convention's permanent chairman he is a symbol of the Democratic hope that on this most important domestic issue the South can be restrained from walking out while the North remains satisfied with the party's platform position.

Senator FRANK CHURCH, this generation's boy orator from well beyond the Platte, is a natural for keynoter. He is young, handsome, articulate, uninhibited, with a western enthusiasm that is sure to blow in upon the steaming delegates like a refreshing Idaho mountain breeze. It may be irrelevant in a keynote speaker, but Senator CHURCH is also capable of thought; and it would be a delightful innovation if he should decide to exercise his very considerable talents to give this keynote speech some real content appropriate to the grave issues that are facing the voter and the country.

[From the New York Daily News, May 28, 1960]

D.C. WASH

(By Gwen Gibson)

WASHINGTON, May 27.—It's debatable at best whether young Senator FRANK CHURCH, the golden-voiced orator from the west, won a political plum or a hot potato when he was named keynote speaker for the 1960 Democratic National Convention. Since the advent of nationwide TV, the job has spelled nothing but trouble.

Two of CHURCH's promising predecessors, the late Paul A. Dever and Frank G. Clement, keynoters respectively of the 1952 and 1956 conventions, went on to political obscurity.

And don't forget Arthur B. Langlie, who keynoted the 1956 Republican convention. Langlie lost his bid for reelection as Governor of Washington the next fall.

CHURCH steps into the make-or-break hot spot with one ironic strike against him—his youthful good looks. He's 35 and looks younger. He also is a serious-minded, able lawmaker with courtly manners, all of which once caused a colleague to joke that "sometimes he seems like a cross between a Boy Scout and an old maid."

HE'S PLAGUED BY "PAGE BOY" JOKES

Jokes about how often he is mistaken for a Senate page boy have been the bane of CHURCH's existence since the voters of Idaho sent him to the Senate in 1956 as the youngest Member of that body.

The classic involves the day the tall, dark, and boyishly slim Senator was standing near a page boy waiting for an elevator. A kindly little old lady walked up and said, "I understand you boys are often mistaken for Senator CHURCH."

On the plus side, CHURCH is a champion speaker. He has been winning oratorical prizes since he was 16, when the American Legion awarded him \$4,000 as the top high school speaker in a nationwide contest.

CHURCH still makes springtime tours of Idaho, delivering high school commencement

addresses. He was talking to a graduating class of seven at Leadore, Idaho, a remote sheep and cattle-raising village, when the official announcement came that he was to make the keynote address at Los Angeles for an audience of some 70 million.

HE'LL PULL NO PUNCHES AND HIT HIGH, HE SAYS

"I intend to pull no punches," CHURCH proclaimed. "But there will be no hitting below the belt."

The chubby Dever, then Governor of Massachusetts, appalled many TV viewers and party faithfuls with a diatribe, delivered in a hoarse and gravelly voice as beads of sweat poured into his collar. So raucous was the speech that Republicans used recordings of it when Dever sought reelection the next fall. He was defeated by Christian Herter, now Secretary of State.

Clement, whose appearance had been widely heralded, came to the 1956 Democratic Convention at Chicago with one asset—his beautiful, blonde wife. The arm-waving, hackneyed speech he gave was pure backwoods demagoguery, and even some Democrats cringed at his vitriolic attacks on Vice President Nixon.

Clement was then serving his second term as Governor of Tennessee. He apparently felt his popularity had plummeted, because he failed to run against ESTES KEFAUVER for U.S. Senator as expected. He has retired from bigtime politics.

CAN BE BLISTERING WITH HONEYED TONES

If CHURCH delivers ringing denunciations of the GOP, they will be in honeyed tones.

He has provided the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with some of its most eloquent language. For example, his opening speech on the Alaskan statehood bill began: "Mr. President, many years ago a poet stood on America's last frontier. With wonderment he watched the Arctic lights turn the sky to fire. He listened to the crack of the glacier as it yielded to the sea. He heard the sounding water of mighty rivers and he felt the loneliness of this virgin land."

CHURCH proceeded to quote to his elders verses which he said "give voice to the need of Alaska."

Assistant Senate Majority Leader MIKE MANSFIELD, Democrat, of Montana, gives CHURCH as much credit as anyone for getting the Alaskan statehood bill through the last Congress.

Church has moved ahead exceptionally fast in the Senate, copying assignments on such committees as the labor rackets investigating group (now dissolved) and the Foreign Relations Committee.

GAVE JIMMY HOFFA HIS COMEUPPANCE

During a labor rackets hearing, he once shut up Teamster czar Jimmy Hoffa—no easy job—with a fatherly scolding that started, "We don't need you, Mr. Hoffa, to come up here and moralize on what's right and wrong."

It was a long time before CHURCH, the low-ranking member in terms of seniority, got a chance to preside over a session of the Foreign Relations Committee. When the chance finally came, CHURCH walked to the chairman's high-backed swivel chair trying to look as old and dignified as possible. With confidence he leaned back—and toppled right over on his head.

Unruffled, he righted himself and the chair and calmly observed: "The junior Senator from Idaho is not accustomed to presiding over this lofty committee."

WIFE REMINDS YOU OF GIRL NEXT DOOR

CHURCH is married and the father of two boys, 2 and 11. His wife, Bethline—an attractive brunette who reminds you of the girl next door—is from an Idaho family long prominent in Democratic politics.

Asked to size up CHURCH as a keynoter, she diplomatically predicted that he will be "different . . . straightforward."

"He looks older on TV," Mrs. Church said. CHURCH and other Democratic officials will be welcomed to Los Angeles for the July convention by Mayor Norris Poulson, a staunch Republican who made national news last September by dressing down Communist boss Khrushchev.

RELIEF FOR LAMB AND WOOL GROWERS—TRIBUTE TO SENATORS FROM WYOMING

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] has long been known as "Mr. Wool" because of the interest he has displayed in the sheep industry, which is one of the most important economic segments of the State of Wyoming. To our sorrow, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] is to leave us shortly; but those of us who come from the West and who have a deep interest in the wool and sheep industry in our part of the country, are glad to know that the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE] is not only a worthy associate of JOE O'MAHONEY, but is also an extremely capable successor.

I ask unanimous consent that an editorial which appeared in the Wyoming Eagle, of Cheyenne, Wyo., on June 16, 1960, entitled "Relief for Sheepmen," be included in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

RELIEF FOR SHEEPMEN

Wyoming's Senator McGEE has taken the lead in Congress in attempting to get relief for one of the vital economic interests in the West—the business of lamb and wool growing.

In a speech on the floor of the Senate last week, the Wyoming Senator urged careful study by his colleagues of a report by two members of the U.S. Tariff Commission in which they advocate fixed quotas on imports of live sheep and lambs, lamb and mutton.

Relief for the industry is long overdue, for it has been in serious economic straits for some time. The seriousness of its economic condition has been aggravated by the imports of lamb from the Pacific side of the continent, primarily Australia and New Zealand.

Various appeals have been presented to the Tariff Commission in recent years, but the Commission has not seen fit to take action to sustain the interests of the lamb and wool industry of this country.

"I hasten to point out to my colleagues that in the event of national emergency, such as in time of war, both lamb and wool are regarded as indispensable parts of our national economic effort; it is agreed by all that the industry should be sustained.

"Yet in recent years, the industry has been losing ground; now it is threatened with going out of existence entirely," McGEE declared.

While recognizing the necessity for the international exchange of goods, McGEE added, "It is necessary to help sustain essential industries which must operate in the American economy if the Nation is to continue its economic growth and also is to have sufficient economic capacity in the event of emergency."

It is to be hoped McGEE's petition that the lamb and wool industry be shown more consideration than the Tariff Commission has given to date will be given favorable attention. Some relief is essential if one of the West's great industries is to survive and provide a modest measure of profit.

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR FOR THE HONORABLE PEDRO BELTRAN, PRIME MINISTER OF PERU

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the Senate is honored today to have as its guest the distinguished Prime Minister of Peru, the Honorable Pedro Beltran.

I ask unanimous consent that Prime Minister Beltran may be accorded the privilege of the floor so that he may be introduced to the Senate by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT].

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am making this request ahead of time, because the Prime Minister of Peru is not on the floor at this time, but will be, I believe, within the hour.

AMERICAN NURSES' FOUNDATION DRIVE

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the American Nurses' Foundation has made and continues to make tremendous strides forward in its program for research in nursing. The foundation is undertaking, at this time, to further expand this important nursing research program. As funds become available, the foundation will make grants to research teams, to colleges and universities, to hospitals, special study groups, and to selected individuals in the promotion of an expanded nursing research program. Research fellowships, research consultant services, and research information services will be initiated to carry the program forward.

Mr. President, many of us today remember when nursing consisted of little more than an elaborate system of domestic service. It was just before the turn of the century that schools were founded offering regular courses of instruction for American nurses. It was not until after 1900 that standards for licensing nurses were first established.

In the years following these early beginnings, the nurse's responsibilities grew rapidly both in variety and complexity. Her quick hand, versatility, and courage in the face of emergency gained for her a ready acceptance among men of medicine. Patients, too, were quick to appreciate the essential care that the nurses alone could render.

Her special skills soon were in great demand in areas outside the general hospital; in chronic disease hospitals, in public health, in industry, in institutions for the mentally ill, in the convalescent home, in private homes, in the doctor's office.

Keeping pace with the mounting need for well-trained nurses, the number of schools dedicated to nursing education has risen from 35 before 1900 to over a thousand institutions today located throughout the United States and its territories. Our nursing population has grown to nearly a half million licensed professional nurses actively engaged in providing expert nursing care for the American public.

Probably no other profession has attained greater maturity in so short a

time. In 1950, nursing authorities recognized that if sound progress were to continue, a way had to be found whereby the rapid advances already made in nursing practice could be more efficiently assimilated, and new areas and methods could be explored to provide the knowledge and direction needed to maintain continued improvements in patient care.

To determine how this might best be done, the American Nurses' Association initiated an intensive 5-year program of studies of nursing functions. This program was financed entirely by the nurses themselves.

Approximately 30 separate investigations into nursing practice brought to light much information of immense value to the profession. It was discovered, for example, existing research activity in the field was the work of a comparatively few nurses, and their efforts represented an attempt to determine the forces which prevent or enhance the effective performance of nursing personnel.

Great credit is due these sturdy pioneers, because they had voluntarily undertaken these tasks while carrying heavy responsibilities in full-time positions. Most of their research work had been done in comparative isolation, and only occasionally did the results of their studies reach a wider public through Government reports or publications in the health field.

The evidence gathered during the 5-year program pointed to an overwhelming need for an effective national organization to conduct and sponsor research and for a center where nursing research information could be made available, quickly sifted, evaluated and disseminated to all members of the profession and to other interested groups.

To meet the need for such a research center, the American Nurses Association, in 1955, brought into being the American Nurses Foundation, located at 10 Columbus Circle in New York City. The foundation was created as a nonprofit organization to identify nursing needs and to enrich nursing knowledge urgently required for the proper health care of America's fast growing population.

In its first year of service, the foundation administered the final phases of ANA's original 5-year program. Since then, it has struck out in many directions to uncover new knowledge and to record and to correlate a wealth of facts about existing procedures in nursing.

With funds made available to ANF from private sources, foundations, the Government, and from the American Nurses Association, the foundation has sponsored, guided, and conducted research studies on: Private duty nursing in a metropolitan hospital environment, and its relation to other areas of nursing practice; patterns of career mobility in professional nursing; practical nursing in nonmetropolitan hospitals; patterns of psychiatric nursing; current nursing practice in relation to care of the chronically ill; social and psychological factors involved in nursing practice in hospital outpatient departments; nursing practice in industrial plants; and public health nursing practice.

On an international level, the foundation has undertaken a program to implement the exchange of information with nurses from other countries studying in the United States. As a result of a special grant from the Rockefeller Foundation, the nurses foundation has been able to locate Hungarian refugee nurses and advise them on requirements for reestablishing their careers in this country.

A grant of \$11,831 from the National Institutes of Health of the U.S. Public Health Service enabled the foundation to conduct a major workshop session on the progress and future of research in nursing. This conference and workshop, held at Cleveland's Western Reserve University in September of 1958, was attended by 87 outstanding leaders in the fields of social science, health, and patient care.

Mr. President, in its brief 5-year history, the achievements of the American Nurses Foundation have been significant. Since its founding in 1955, almost \$300,000 has been expended in research projects. Approximately \$100,000 of this sum was dispersed in the form of grants to nine institutions consisting mainly of universities to conduct research in nursing studies. Most of the studies supported by the foundation were conducted by staffs on which nurses participated with social scientists, clinical psychologists, and psychiatrists.

In those instances where projects have now been completed, research reports have been prepared and widely distributed. Interim reports have been issued on projects which are still going forward.

In addition a nucleus of books, papers, and pamphlets has been assembled by the foundation to form the beginnings of a comprehensive research library.

In a recent address, a leading sociologist said:

We must recognize that a profession is committed to the task of enlarging the body of knowledge that applies to the problems and troubles with which it deals. The provision of research personnel and resources is one of the greatest requirements of a profession.

While great satisfaction can be taken in the progress that has been made, the work accomplished to date has also provided ample evidence that we need to continue the present programs and to move out into new areas of research now more than ever before.

Today, research in nursing faces a prime responsibility for finding—in a variety of nursing situations—new and better methods of patient care to help ease both immediate and future shortages of well-trained nurses to meet the needs of our increasing population. The foundation is emphasizing four areas of study:

First. Nursing procedures: Continue activities in promoting or conducting studies, surveys, and demonstrations in patient care and nursing practices. A part of this program will include experiments on new and more effective ways of providing comfort and safety to patients, ways of improving human relations with patients and families, and methods for

health teaching and the rehabilitation of patients.

Second. Effects on nursing due to changing patterns of patient care: Study the impact of changes taking place outside the nursing profession, such as: the development of new drugs and equipment, new techniques, and new philosophies of health care, which automatically necessitate new approaches to patient care.

Third. Effects of administrative organization on patient care: Study nursing care in a variety of administrative units including hospitals, clinics, public health agencies, industries, nursing and convalescent homes and the physician's office.

Fourth. Nursing needs of patients and nursing in different categories of illness: Seek a deeper understanding of the many types of patients and their particular nursing problems since the values, attitudes, and cultural background of the patients and their families affect what medicine and nursing care can accomplish. Special emphasis will be directed toward studying chronically ill and long-term patients in their own homes as well as in hospitals.

To strengthen research in nursing, the foundation is concentrating its efforts through five principal approaches:

First. Sponsor research projects: The foundation will identify and sponsor financially the most urgent projects that can be carried out with qualified personnel within the four general research areas described above. Such projects will be performed by colleges, universities, hospitals, special study groups, and selected individuals.

Second. Conduct research projects: Although the ANF is primarily committed to sponsoring—rather than doing—research, there are instances wherein unique circumstances would indicate a limited number of projects which should be undertaken by the organization itself because of its position in the field of nursing research. In such instances, the foundation staff will conduct research projects.

Third. Stimulate research progress: Through a program of fellowships, the foundation will provide financial aid to nurse researchers and encourage other nurses with research talents to take part in projects.

Matching funds will be made available for joint research projects undertaken in cooperation with other organizations.

Fourth. Provide research consultant services: A staff of skilled and experienced personnel will be maintained to provide counsel, both in the headquarters office and in the field, in planning and developing research projects. Research consultants will be available to advise organizations and groups on particular problems.

Fifth. Disseminate research information: Research findings and other pertinent information will be distributed in the United States and abroad. Monographs and a journal of applied research will be published and a research library will be maintained to stimulate interest in and give information on research

findings. Mailings, field demonstrations, lectures, seminars, annual workshop conferences, and other activities will be included in this program.

Mr. President, the nursing profession of our Nation is closely associated with and directly influences the degree of success with which our medical profession is able to protect and improve the health and happiness of our people.

The American Nurses' Foundation is doing a splendid and challenging job of helping the nursing profession to better meet its vast responsibilities by providing immediate and developing programs for better nursing and health care for our people.

The foundation's efforts in this regard directly affect the care of more than 25 million Americans each year, or one out of every seven persons throughout our Nation.

I believe, therefore, that the program of the American Nurses' Foundation is of urgent interest and common concern to all of us, Mr. President, and it is for this reason that I bring the matter to the attention of my colleagues at this time.

COLD WAR GI BILL SHOULD PASS NOW

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, within a few days the Senate again will be called upon to consider and pass the cold war veterans readjustment bill, this time as an amendment to H.R. 10596.

Additional Senate action on the cold war veterans bill was made necessary by the fact that, although the original proposal, S. 1138, was approved by the Senate last July 21 by a vote of 57 to 31, the full House membership has not yet been given the opportunity to vote on it.

Since this matter is of vital importance to more than a million veterans and their families, as well as a significant step in our national effort to develop the abilities and talents of more of our young people, I believe all Members of the Congress will be particularly interested in seeing estimates on how many veterans from their States can be expected to train under this program.

As I have said, S. 1138 passed the Senate last year by a vote of 57 to 31. It is in the House Veterans Affairs Committee, and the House as a whole has had no opportunity to pass on it, though many informal polls show that Members of the House favor the bill by a margin of over 2 to 1.

With respect to H.R. 10596, which is pending on the Senate Calendar, the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare amended the bill by placing the full text of S. 1138 in the bill, which was passed by the Senate last year, in order to give this body an opportunity to pass it and to give an opportunity to the entire House to vote on the bill.

It is one of the most critically needed programs in our country today. For example, based on experience with the Korean GI educational program, the Veterans' Administration estimates that 72,000 young Texans would participate in this

cold war veterans training program and would have allowances totaling \$106.5 million.

In California, which would have the largest number of participants, 121,000 young veterans would probably take the training and receive allowances of \$131.5 million over the 5-year life of the program. A total of 1,237,000 veterans could be expected to take part in the program.

From the State of Ohio, for example, 50,000 are expected to take the training, representing a total outlay of more than \$53 million.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a table of probable participation and total amounts of educational allowances by State for the first 5 years under the readjustment training program proposed by amendments to H.R. 10596.

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

Probable participation and total amounts of educational allowances by State for the 1st 5 years under the readjustment training program proposed by amendments to H.R. 10596

State	1st 5 years only ¹	
	Veterans expected to train	Amounts of educational allowances
Total	1,237,000	\$1,654,000,000
Alabama	32,000	53,900,000
Alaska	1,000	500,000
Arizona	8,000	10,100,000
Arkansas	12,000	19,000,000
California	121,000	151,500,000
Colorado	14,000	19,000,000
Connecticut	15,000	17,000,000
Delaware	2,000	2,000,000
District of Columbia	16,000	24,600,000
Florida	34,000	43,800,000
Georgia	34,000	50,000,000
Hawaii	4,000	10,400,000
Idaho	4,000	6,500,000
Illinois	64,000	76,300,000
Indiana	26,000	33,200,000
Iowa	18,000	29,400,000
Kansas	13,000	15,600,000
Kentucky	18,000	24,800,000
Louisiana	24,000	40,500,000
Maine	4,000	5,800,000
Maryland	15,000	11,600,000
Massachusetts	40,000	44,700,000
Michigan	42,000	50,800,000
Minnesota	27,000	35,900,000
Mississippi	15,000	26,800,000
Missouri	32,000	45,800,000
Montana	4,000	6,100,000
Nebraska	12,000	19,800,000
Nevada	1,000	1,200,000
New Hampshire	3,000	4,300,000
New Jersey	28,000	26,500,000
New Mexico	7,000	9,600,000
New York	107,000	109,700,000
North Carolina	33,000	47,100,000
North Dakota	6,000	10,800,000
Ohio	50,000	53,300,000
Oklahoma	22,000	33,200,000
Oregon	11,000	14,400,000
Pennsylvania	75,000	90,300,000
Rhode Island	6,000	8,900,000
South Carolina	17,000	27,100,000
South Dakota	7,000	11,600,000
Tennessee	27,000	39,000,000
Texas	72,000	106,500,000
Utah	11,000	16,900,000
Vermont	2,000	2,600,000
Virginia	18,000	22,500,000
Washington	20,000	24,000,000
West Virginia	12,000	14,700,000
Wisconsin	22,000	31,600,000
Wyoming	2,000	2,800,000
Territories and possessions (total)	23,000	60,400,000
Foreign (total)	4,000	4,300,000

¹ State distributions are based on cumulative experience with Korean veterans.

PADRE ISLAND

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, for more than a quarter of a century efforts have been made periodically to have a national park area established on Padre Island. Establishing such a national park is mandatory if this last long stretch of America's natural shoreline is to be kept open for the inspiration and enjoyment of all Americans.

Today the fight to preserve Padre Island has moved into an emergency status. Some landowners and cattle owners have taken railroad ties and driven them into the beach as barricades to prevent free access to the beach and passage up and down the beach.

From the earliest days of the settlement of the area, the people have had full and free passage to the beach, first under Spanish rule, then under Mexican rule, then under the Republic of Texas, and then under the flag of the United States.

Mr. President, after more than 200 years of settlement by people of European descent in that area, for the first time in more than two centuries under the four different governments and the six flags which have waved over Texas, this effort is made to disturb the free passage over those beaches. After two centuries of free passage, within the past 3 weeks the land and cattle companies are driving in the railroad ties. Unfortunately, we cannot have photographs printed in the RECORD. I should like to have some photographs of cross-tie barriers shown. One would think these men were putting up barricades to keep tanks from going up and down the beach.

This fight has been a critical one, from the standpoint of time. Some property owners already have built fences and are attempting to regulate access to the beaches of Padre Island. Therefore, I believe pending legislation to establish a national seashore recreation area has taken on new significance and immediacy.

Nothing is to be gained and a great deal may be lost by further delay on this already too long delayed project. I strongly urge the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee to approve S. 4, as amended, without loss of time so that we may have congressional action on the bill this year.

Mr. President, I should like to explain my proposal. As I introduced the bill S. 4 early last year, to create the Padre Island National Seashore Recreation Area, we had hoped to have a recreation area on that beach for 100 miles of the island. The island is 117 miles long, and about 5 miles on each end is developed, either under private ownership or in county parks. There is Cameron County on the south end and Nueces County on the north end.

The bill would have provided a 100-mile national recreation area, would have excluded all the developed areas at each end, and would have excluded some other lands, so that they might be developed also. That left a 100-mile beach on the island, without a single building.

This is a barrier reef island from a half mile to 3 miles wide, which is off the mainland and the shore. It is separated from the mainland by a body of water known as Laguna Madre, a shallow body of water.

The area has been found by the National Parks Advisory Board as an ideal site for a seashore recreation area. It is the longest stretch of undeveloped beach in America.

Mr. President, it is 3,700 miles along the Gulf of Mexico and the Atlantic Ocean, from Brownsville, Tex., at the mouth of the Rio Grande, the southernmost point in Texas, to the easternmost point on the shore of Maine. In those 3,700 miles we have only 265 miles of public parks, beaches and recreation areas. Of the 265 miles of such areas, over half are federally owned. Over half of the limited area of 265 miles of public beaches, from a total along the vast Atlantic Ocean and Gulf of Mexico coast shoreline of 3,700 miles, is in Federal ownership. The Acadia National Park in Maine, with its great rockbound coast, has little beach. The great swamp areas of the Everglades of Florida, on the southwestern shores of Florida, have few beaches. The marshes gradually merge into the sea. We have the one good beach at Cape Hatteras recreation area in North Carolina, which is about 50 miles long.

If we establish the proposed 100-mile park we shall have the greatest beach area in America, the only place which is still available which might be made into a recreation area for all Americans.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Texas has expired.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may speak for an additional 3 minutes.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, this beach needs to be preserved for all Americans.

One item which held up the establishment of this park was an objection to the full 100-mile area which I advocated. However, the Secretary of the Interior has endorsed an 88-mile park. I agree with him in that matter. The majority leader has issued a public statement approving the 88-mile park. There is a composite administration bill to create the Padre Island Park, the Oregon Dunes Park, and the Cape Cod Park in Massachusetts, all of which are covered in one bill.

On the 23d of May, 1960, Secretary of the Interior Seaton wrote a letter to the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] approving S. 4 as a separate bill, and placed the support of the administration behind it.

Mr. President, S. 4 as a separate bill would establish the Padre Island recreation area alone.

We have the statement of the Secretary of the Interior that the administra-

tion is willing to spend \$8 million in a 5-year period to preserve the beach for the American people.

These are the reasons why the need is immediate and is urgent, Mr. President. The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs should report the bill to the Senate immediately, because of the fact that railroad ties have been driven into the beaches to block access by Americans. The Secretary of the Interior recognizes the urgency of the problem, and says that he is willing to spend this money in a period of 5 years, \$4 million to buy the land and the other money for facilities.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD two timely editorials on this subject; one from the Corpus Christi Caller of June 10, 1960 entitled "Act Now To Make Padre National Seashore Area," and the other from the Houston Press of June 16, 1960 entitled "What's Holding Up Action on Padre?"

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

[From the Corpus Christi Caller-Times, June 10, 1960]

ACT NOW TO MAKE PADRE NATIONAL SEASHORE AREA

Padre Island ought to be made a national seashore area.

The designation, which requires an act of Congress, should be made without further delay.

Developments in the last few days should make it clear to all that the best way to preserve the primitive beauty of the long, wind-swept, sandy island and guarantee its accessibility to this and future generations is to bring it under the protection of the Federal Government's National Park Service.

Visitors to national parks all over the Nation are generally in agreement that the Park Service has done an outstanding job of safeguarding natural wonders and taking care of the millions of citizens who want to enjoy them. National Park Service experts have testified that Padre Island would make an excellent shoreline park. They have stated that it would be desirable to have 88 miles of the island included within the park. This would leave a few miles at each end for private development.

Some of the politicians who have publicly committed themselves to a national seashore on Padre have remained vague on the area to be involved. It appears they are willing for the Federal Government to control a portion of the island, provided, of course, that it builds highways the full length to provide access to all types of private development. If this attitude prevails it will kill the whole project. Federal officials here for the Senate hearing last fall made it clear that they were not interested in any such plan; they want to preserve the whole primitive seashore area. If Texans don't want a national seashore, the Government money can be spent in Massachusetts, Oregon, or some of the other States which are clamoring for the establishment of such a park.

We believe that Texans do want the national seashore, however. Those who have taken for granted their right of access to the beaches of the gulf don't want that right denied to their children and grandchildren.

Congress probably will adjourn within the next few weeks. There is still time, however, to enact a national seashore measure. If you want this done, act today. If you live in the 14th (Corpus Christi) Congressional

District, your Congressman is Representative JOHN YOUNG, House Office Building, Washington, D.C. If you live in the 15th (Valley) Congressional District, your Congressman is Representative JOE KILGORE, House Office Building, Washington, D.C. Your Senators are Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON and Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH, both of whom can be addressed at Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Write or wire them right now.

[From the Houston Press, June 16, 1960]

WHAT'S HOLDING UP ACTION ON PADRE?

Now that our State conventions are over and our Congressmen are back on the job in Washington, we'd like to remind them of one serious piece of unfinished business.

That's congressional action approving and providing funds for the establishment on Padre Island of a national seashore park.

Nearly everybody's for this project to some degree. There are those, however, who would try to use this development for private gain by having an inadequate part of Padre preserved as a park. Most of us agree with the National Parks Board that a national park covering 88 miles of Padre's 110-mile length would retain the island's magnificent isolation and untouched grandeur while leaving ample space at each end for private, commercial development.

President Eisenhower weeks ago put in a request to Congress for the necessary funds and action. Senators JOHNSON and YARBOROUGH have given their unqualified support. Most of Texas' 25 Congressmen are on record for the project.

Everything's set for Congress to act.

What are we waiting on?

The national conventions begin shortly. This Congress is due to adjourn before they begin.

No good purpose can be served by losing any more time.

From Corpus Christi, we've recently had news that private owners are trying to fence off sections of Padre Beach and require the public to register at their "gates" to improve their land titles.

Fortunately, Texas Attorney General Will Wilson hopped on this hard and fast. He has secured temporary injunctions. He has stopped the fence builders. But the warning is clear:

Act now on Padre or trouble as well as fences will build up—and build up fast.

That's something we mustn't let happen, on a project that means as much to America as the preservation of Padre.

THE REPUBLICAN RECORD OF ACCOMPLISHMENTS IN REGARD TO THE PEACEFUL UTILIZATION OF ATOMIC ENERGY

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, since its innovation, all mankind has been interested in opportunities for peaceful utilization of atomic energy. The senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] has compiled and presented an important report on the Republican record of accomplishments in this field.

President Eisenhower expressed his view in 1953 that this new source of energy should be dedicated to man's betterment rather than his annihilation. Since that time the administration has made great progress along this road. The construction of nuclear powerplants and the flow of knowledge from research have materially contributed to the success of this program.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this excellent report by the Senator from Iowa be printed in the body of the RECORD following these remarks.

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

THE REPUBLICAN RECORD OF ACCOMPLISHMENTS IN ATOMIC ENERGY, 1953-60

(By U.S. Senator BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER, of Iowa, senior Republican member, Joint Committee on Atomic Energy)

The Atomic Energy Commission programs for developing the uses of atomic energy have been reshaped and organized in the past 7 years to place full emphasis upon the President's fundamental policy, announced in 1953, that this great new source of energy should be dedicated to man's betterment—not to his annihilation.

Under this policy, the Republican administration has taken the first steps toward economic benefits, both in this country and among our friends in other nations, has accomplished sound progress in the search for new knowledge, and has promoted the peace of the world through scientific and economic cooperation, and through providing the free world with a defensive shield of atomic weapons.

BACKGROUND

When the Republican Party took office, the Nation was rich in opportunities for peaceful utilization of atomic energy, and the full weapons potential also remained to be developed. An international deadlock—unbroken since 1946—prevented all constructive international cooperation in the field of atomic energy. The Federal Government held a monopoly of ownership of atomic energy facilities and of atomic knowledge. Late in 1952, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy had reported that "Since spring 1950 there has been no major project whose purpose is to achieve a reactor directly advancing industrial power." The United States had a strong stockpile of atomic weapons, but thermonuclear bombs had only recently been tested. The first nuclear-powered submarine was still on the way. Major production plants were under construction in the years after the outbreak of the Korean conflict. The United States was still largely dependent on imports for the raw materials of nuclear power and nuclear weapons.

All of these situations were left to the Republicans when Mr. Eisenhower took office in January 1953.

INTERNATIONAL

The international deadlock was broken when, on December 8, 1953, President Eisenhower made a world-applauded address before the United Nations General Assembly, and brought forth the first fresh approach to this problem since 1946: That peaceful boons from atomic science could be achieved by united effort, and need not wait until the intricate problem of weapons control was solved.

Since that time, 42 nations, and the city of West Berlin, have joined with the United States in bilateral agreements to develop and apply this new source of energy to economic betterment and human welfare throughout the free world.

The nations of Western Europe formed the Euratom Community to develop and build nuclear power stations in cooperation with the United States.

The International Atomic Energy Agency, which President Eisenhower proposed in his historic address, has become an actuality with 70 nations cooperating for peaceful uses of the atom. The Organization of American States is moving forward with atomic sciences and applications.

In recent months there have been conferences between the Western Allies and the

Soviet Union on means of ending the menace of nuclear warfare, and weapons tests have been suspended.

The United States has given comprehensive libraries of atomic energy information to 58 countries, and five international organizations. It has made or authorized grants to 19 nations to assist in research reactor projects, and is making grants of research equipment.

Our Nation has allocated more than three-quarter billion dollars' worth of uranium 235 for sale or lease to friendly nations, and has provided deferred payment for the fuel for power reactors overseas. An equal amount has been made available for similar purposes in the United States.

The United States initiated the First International Conference on Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy in 1955 in which 72 nations participated. In this and in the Second United Nations Conference on Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy held in 1958, this country presented for unlimited use a great volume of data to assist further progress in beneficial uses. Cooperation in the application of atomic energy to the welfare of man has become a living fact throughout the free world.

THE NEW ATOMIC CHARTER

The President's pledge before the world in 1953 was swiftly supported in 1954 by a new charter for the peaceful development of atomic energy in the United States, and for cooperative work with other nations. This notable legislation of the Republican administration—the Atomic Energy Act of 1954—opened the door for private ownership and development of atomic power. It ended the Federal monopoly on atomic science and technology. It authorized and energized international cooperation for all peaceful purposes. It made possible the rapid advances of the last 6 years in applying atomic energy to mankind's betterment.

ATOMIC POWER

The United States leads the world in atomic power today, a leadership measured not in the production of high-cost kilowatts, but in the basic technology and variety of approaches to the problem of competitive costs for power. Industry is cooperating fully in the attack on this problem.

Eight nuclear powerplants that were not even on the designing boards when this administration took office are now operable, and 21 additional plants have been authorized for construction, either by government or by industry.

Most of the plants are relatively small, but we can expect—on the basis of plants already authorized—a total of some 1,400,000 kilowatts of electricity on the line by the end of 1964. Most of this capacity will come into operation during 1960, 1961, and 1962.

A survey of expenditures and commitments for nuclear reactors, as of the end of 1959, showed that about \$1.7 billion was being invested in civilian and military reactors under construction or active development by the Government and industry. About \$1 billion of the total was for civilian projects and the remainder for military projects, including more than \$650 million for naval powerplants.

This administration has formulated and adopted as guidelines for the Nation's development of civilian nuclear power these five broad objectives:

1. To reduce the cost of nuclear power to competitive levels in high-cost energy areas of this country by 1968.
2. To assist friendly nations now having high energy cost to achieve competitive levels in a shorter period.
3. To support a continuing long-range program to further reduce the cost of nuclear power.
4. To maintain the U.S. position of leadership in the technology of nuclear power for civilian use.

5. To develop breeder type reactors to make full use of nuclear energy latent in both uranium and thorium.

The Republican administration has laid plans for an aggressive 10-year effort to accomplish these objectives. We are laying down detailed programs for efficient development. With expanded industrial cooperation, we believe this effort will make it possible to achieve economic nuclear power in high-cost areas of the United States by 1968 with two types of reactors—those cooled with water, and those cooled with organic materials such as benzene derivatives. We believe that, later on, it will be possible to attain economic costs in wider areas of the country.

The Republican administration is continuing its pattern of cooperative development under Federal leadership with the vigorous support of publicly and privately owned utilities.

The leadership of this administration has produced and will continue to produce technology, and to promote development so that before this country must have nuclear energy to supplement conventional fuels in meeting the ever-growing energy needs of this expanding economy nuclear power will be available at competitive costs.

NUCLEAR MERCHANT SHIPS

Late this year, the world's first nuclear-powered merchant ship, the *NS Savannah*, will begin initial test operations in domestic waters. When initial operations are successfully completed, the *Savannah* will visit various ports on both coasts of North America, after which a cruise in foreign waters will be scheduled.

Operation of this vessel will carry over into ships of peace the success of the Navy's developing fleet of nuclear craft. Plans for other merchant ships, and for increasingly efficient nuclear plants, are under development.

The United States is extending into this promising field the technological leadership it already has demonstrated in design, construction, and operation of power reactors.

THE PROMISE OF RESEARCH

The flow of knowledge and ideas from research in the atomic energy sciences which has contributed to this Nation's advances has been broadened and expanded.

The Atomic Energy Commission's major laboratories have been strengthened and provided with new facilities for research in physical, medical and biological sciences. Research in colleges and research institutions has been largely increased. For the current year, there were 1,083 contracts for research of this kind that in total amounted to \$52 million—an increase of 75 percent in numbers and more than 185 percent in dollar amounts over 1953.

A portion of this research is directed toward producing useful power from heavy hydrogen in the fusion reaction—the field of controlled thermonuclear research. Encouraging first results have been won, and each year sees further gains.

This program is for the future, but to make sure that this Nation and the world gain every possible advantage from this field, our research in controlled thermonuclear power has been expanded several hundred-fold, and the results made available to the public, to science, and to industry.

Every practical use for nuclear energy that our scientists and technologists can extract is being fully exploited.

The United States is investigating the possible peaceful uses of nuclear explosives (the Plowshare program).

Many peaceful applications such as scientific measurements, excavation, exploitation of natural resources, production of power and isotopes and the development of new industrial chemicals appear to be feasible. Initial experiments are being considered in

excavation, power and isotope production, and in oil recovery. No detonation of nuclear devices has been authorized.

Initial tests have been successfully completed in a series of experiments leading toward the use of nuclear energy to propel space vehicles.

Lightweight, compact nuclear batteries—actually miniature electric plants—are being developed for a wide range of applications, including power for space vehicle instruments. They give promise of having other practical uses—to power remote weather stations and navigation aids, and as power sources for isolated stations.

RADIOISOTOPES

Since 1953 the use of radioisotopes in research and in practical applications has increased threefold. As tools of research, as diagnostic and therapeutic devices in medicine, and as adjuncts of industrial operations, these radioactive varieties of chemical elements have already yielded the equivalent of large dividends on the tax investment in atomic energy.

The ills of a million medical patients are being diagnosed or treated with the aid of radioisotopes each year—a rapidly developing program urged by the Republican Administration.

In agriculture, radioisotopes have opened the way to new and more accurate knowledge of the action of fertilizers on crops, of weed killers and other chemical aids to agriculture. Radiation applied to plant genetics has assisted in developing rust-resistant strains of oats and wheat, and stronger, higher yielding strains of peanuts. The screwworm fly—that costly pest of the cattle industry—has been practically eradicated from the southeastern States, and the campaign of eradication is being extended.

In industry, savings through the use of isotopes have been increasing rapidly since 1953 and further savings lie ahead. Radioisotopes are being used to preserve food and avert food contamination, to improve sewage disposal, to combat sewage and stream pollution, and to increase industrial safety.

Many isotope applications have become standard practice for an entire segment of industry.

Over 90 percent of the tire fabric and 80 percent of the tin cans made in the United States now are controlled in production by radioisotope thickness gages. Similar devices are contributing to the efficiency of steel rolling mills.

To hasten realization of these, and of other benefits from the use of radioisotopes, the Atomic Energy Commission has undertaken, with the encouragement of the Republican administration, a development program to discover new uses of public benefit, to increase training and understanding in industrial uses, and to make larger quantities of radioisotopes available at lower cost.

Over 1 million curies of radioisotopes valued at \$20 million have been shipped to doctors, researchers, industries, and private processors.

INDUSTRIAL PARTICIPATION

The great increase of industrial participation in the atomic energy program, and the growth of international cooperation, were made possible by the grants of authority under the new charter, the Atomic Energy Act of 1954. Under the previous law, a vast body of scientific and technical knowledge necessarily was held secret.

Since passage of the act, the United States has established a privately owned atomic energy industry, licensed, regulated, and inspected to assure the public health and safety.

This progress would not have been possible without the success of vigorous efforts to place in the public domain, accessible to all, most of the nonweapons technological data previously held secret by the Govern-

ment. This enormous, but careful, release of information has been accomplished without compromising the essential defense and security of this country.

Indicative of this progress is the rate of declassification of technical reports during the last 6 years. In 1954 fewer than 9,000 reports had been declassified; by 1960 the total had grown to more than 30,000.

In addition, the United States has made strong efforts to see that the technical information produced in the atomic energy program has been assembled into reports and distributed. In 1954 some 300,000 individual copies of reports had been placed on deposit at libraries through the country for open use by scientists and engineers; by 1960 this number of documents had grown to over 2,400,000. The reports also have been made available through public sale.

HEALTH AND SAFETY

The Republican administration has actively enforced safeguards for the public health in every phase of atomic energy activity.

It laid down the licensing and regulation procedures for U.S. industry, based on years of experience and research in Government operation.

It established a Federal Radiation Council to advise on safety standards, and a Reactor Safeguard Committee to review licensed reactor installations from the standpoint of safety—both bodies afterward being given a statutory charter by the Congress.

This country has readily made available to the use of all nations its knowledge and techniques in the fields of radiation safety—the basis for an unprecedented record of safety in the Federal atomic energy program which has received numerous safety awards—so that this vast new source of energy may be put to work for mankind with a minimum of hazard.

PRODUCTION

During this administration, a complex of production plants was completed which pours out a steady flow of uranium 235 and plutonium for production of the nuclear weapons that guard the free world, and for the production of power in nuclear reactors.

The United States has become the world's leading producer of uranium ore. In fact, the rate of discovery and the flow of raw materials in this country became so large that, since 1957 and 1958, it was necessary for the Government to announce a limitation on development and purchase to bring the domestic supply, plus its commitment for imports, more nearly in line with requirements. This contrasts with the inadequate supplies of uranium up to the mid-1950's—under another administration.

ATOMIC DEFENSE

The United States has, of course, continued to produce and improve powerful weapons for the defense of the free world.

The noblest product of this Nation's atomic energy program is the shield for the peace of the free world. The number of weapons has increased manifold in total numbers as well as in the variety and military usefulness of fissionable material. New designs have been introduced, and others are under development, which greatly simplify the logistic problems of nuclear weapons use, and which meet specific military requirements. As a result of these gains, increased emphasis became possible on defensive weapons to protect the people of the free world from airborne or missileborne attack.

The contribution of atomic energy to free-world defense goes far beyond the design and production of weapons and new methods for their delivery. It has made possible a fleet of nuclear-powered warships without equal in the world.

The first nuclear-powered submarine was launched in January 1954. Since that time, the *Nautilus* and other nuclear submarines—the *Skate*, the *Seawolf*, the *Triton*—have cruised thousands of miles beneath the surface, have crossed and recrossed the North Pole beneath the ice, have circled the globe while submerged. They are the first true submarines in the world, as contrasted with the earlier submarines which were actually surface craft capable of submerging.

This achievement, unique in the world, has added greatly to the international stature of the United States as a pioneer in technology, and as a leader in atomic energy development.

This administration has been prompt to seize upon and exploit our lead in this important aspect of defense.

We are building a nuclear Navy, presently including 37 atomic submarines, constructed or authorized—10 already are operating—3 surface vessels, a missile-armed cruiser and destroyed, and an aircraft carrier.

We are developing small portable nuclear power stations for use in remote regions such as on the DEW line radar warning system.

SUMMARY

The progress of this Nation in all aspects of atomic energy during the Republican administration has been sound and rapid—in peaceful uses of this new source of energy and its products, in developing power, and in promoting human welfare in this and other countries.

Equally, this awful power has been harnessed for the defense and protection of the free world.

The promise for mankind's betterment, and for peace, is strong and encouraging. The progress is steadily forward.

THE REPUBLICAN RECORD ON BEHALF OF SMALL BUSINESS—1953-60

MR. COTTON. Mr President, the status of the American small businessman has long been of concern to Congress. My colleague, the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], has prepared a heartening report reviewing the record of the Republican administration on behalf of small business, to which I commend the attention of this body.

The birth of the Small Business Administration in 1953 has proven a tremendous impetus to the character of our economy over the past 7 years. Today there are nearly 5 million businesses in the United States, and 95 percent of these are small enterprises.

We hear much these days about the growth and influence of big business. It is gratifying indeed to know that the backbone of our national economy is still the small businessman; as he prospers so does our country prosper.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the excellent report of the Senator from New Hampshire be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point.

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

THE REPUBLICAN RECORD ON BEHALF OF SMALL BUSINESS—1953-60

(By U.S. Senator STYLES BRIDGES, of New Hampshire, chairman, Senate Republican policy committee)

American small business has grown and prospered more in the 7½ years of the Republican administration than at any time during the previous 20 years.

Today, there are 4,666,000 businesses in the United States, an alltime high, and 95 percent of them are small enterprises.

The Small Business Administration, created in 1953 by the Republican 83d Congress upon recommendation of the Republican administration, now is a permanent agency, by act of Congress in 1958—upon the recommendation of President Eisenhower.

Twenty thousand business loans have been made by the Small Business Administration for an aggregate of about \$930 million, of which about \$787 million have been furnished by SBA, the remainder coming from local banks and lending institutions which participated.

SBA loans of all types—though running high into the thousands—have been good loans in more than 98 cases out of 100. Fewer than 2 percent of all SBA loans have been written off as losses. This record attests to the character of those who are the backbone of our economy—the small businessman.

Enterprises in all States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands have been aided.

The Small Business Administration's activities extend far beyond the lending program.

More than 9,000 disaster loans have been made—at 3-percent interest—to owners of homes, businesses, and charitable institutions damaged or destroyed by floods, storms, droughts, or other natural disasters. These loans have amounted to some \$96 million, with local banks furnishing about \$3½ million and the SBA furnishing the remainder.

The Congress declared, in creating the agency, that particular efforts should be directed toward helping small businesses to participate in Government contracts and services.

Under what is called the joint set-aside program, SBA has worked closely with other Government agencies to get proposed Federal purchases, sales, and services specifically earmarked for competitive bidding by qualified small enterprises. The results in this case have been great. More than 79,700 contracts, valued at nearly \$5 billion, have been channeled into small businesses by this program.

Similar services by SBA include certificates of competency which go to concerns showing their capacity to perform specific Government contracts. About 700 of these certificates have been issued, resulting in contracts amounting to \$105 million.

Another program is called registration of facilities. Under it, small concerns are placed on appropriate bidders' lists. There are approximately 46,600 firms registered with SBA under this program.

A popular SBA program is that of research and development which is carried on at Government expense and the findings or benefits passed on to small concerns not individually able to do it themselves.

Other SBA projects provide small plant production surveys and regular listings of new products and processes which small firms might want to take up.

The Small Business Administration's management assistance program has been of widespread value. The agency publishes a variety of technical aids for small manufacturers, wholesalers, and retailers, which are distributed free upon request. Nearly 8 million of these have been distributed.

This program includes special management courses offered by public and private schools and other institutions. Instituted 6 years ago, this project has been offered in 275 institutions for a total of 800 courses. More than 24,000 small business owners and managers have attended. The cost is borne by tuition.

Financial grants have been made to schools and colleges across the country for specific small business management research studies.

These findings are later released, in published form, to small businesses.

The Small Business Investment Division, created by Congress in 1958, helps finance small firms at the local level.

This program has generated (mid-June) over \$80 million in funds, mostly private, which are available for long-term loans and equity financing of small businesses through privately owned and operated small business investment companies (SBIC's), licensed by the Small Business Administration.

Already, more than 100 SBIC's have been formed. They are located in all parts of the country. Hundreds of small firms have been financed by these SBIC's in a wide variety of industries.

SBA helps small businesses through loans to State and local development companies. This is to help establish diversified industries in local communities through Government cooperation with local citizens. In this way, SBA has helped to finance some 50 projects in 19 States totaling some \$10 million.

The small business record of the Republican administration is one of outstanding assistance in helping to keep the national economy healthy and prosperous and to provide jobs.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR GREEN BEFORE INTER-AMERICAN DEFENSE BOARD

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks an address which I delivered on June 22, 1960, before representatives of the Inter-American Defense Board.

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

REMARKS OF U.S. SENATOR THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN OF RHODE ISLAND, CHAIRMAN EMERITUS OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS, ADDRESSING REPRESENTATIVES OF THE INTER-AMERICAN DEFENSE BOARD, WEDNESDAY, JUNE 22, 1960

General Mathewson and representatives of the Inter-American Defense Board, it is a pleasure and an honor for me on behalf of the Congress of the United States to welcome you to our Capitol. In these troubled times it is of increasing importance that we Americans stand shoulder to shoulder and present a united front to the rest of the world. There probably is no single group which contributes more in the way of practical achievements toward this solidarity than you gentlemen here. I wish personally, and also in behalf of my colleagues in the Congress, to congratulate you upon this extremely important work which you are accomplishing.

We members of the American Congress are happy that you have taken the time from your busy schedules to come to the Capitol and observe the workings of our Congress. We believe that it presents an excellent example of how peoples with varied and sometimes conflicting interests can solve their problems to their mutual advantage. Perhaps this Congress will serve as a useful example of how the American States working together may contribute to the common good.

Many times, as a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee I have visited your various Embassies and in several instances your respective countries. On all of these occasions I have been greeted with a warm handshake of friendliness. I have many cherished friendships among your countrymen. It is this type of warm friendship that all of us seek on a worldwide

basis. I am sure that each of you as a representative of your individual country shares in this desire. Individually and as a body you are probably the greatest influence toward peace and friendship throughout the Americas. It is the firm belief of my colleagues and myself that only through the ceaseless, tireless, work accomplished by organizations like yours, can we ever arrive at a lasting peace based on friendship, mutual understanding and above all else, respect. Gentlemen, I salute you and again on behalf of all Members of the U.S. Congress I bid you welcome to our Capitol and may your stay among us be happy, fruitful, and an experience you will cherish forever.

AMENDMENT OF THE NORRIS-LAGUARDIA ACT, THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT, AND THE RAILWAY LABOR ACT

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be inserted in the RECORD three statements that have been made before the subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee on Senate bill 3548, on which hearings are in progress at the present time.

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

STATEMENT OF THEODORE R. ISERMAN ON BEHALF OF NATIONAL SMALL BUSINESS MEN'S ASSOCIATION, BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY, U.S. SENATE, SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE HOLDING HEARINGS ON S. 3548, JUNE 16, 1960

My name is Theodore R. Iserman. I am a member of the law firm of Kelley, Drye, Newhall & Maginnes, 70 Broadway, New York, N.Y. I appear here today on behalf of the National Small Business Men's Association. This association represents some 35,000 small business concerns, a great many of which have a vital interest in S. 3548.

Featherbedding is one of the most malignant evils in our economic system. It is one with which Congress long has battled, but too often when Congress thought it had gained a victory in its war on this particular form of social and economic waste, the courts have managed to turn the victory into defeat or to deprive the country of the fruits of the victory.

Featherbedding is, perhaps, most notorious on the railroads. The facts in the Chicago & North Western case, in which the Supreme Court, contrary to what seems to be the clear congressional intent, opened wide the doors to more and more featherbedding, typify the tremendous waste that featherbedding involves in that industry. But featherbedding takes many other forms and prevails in many other industries.

Labor, whether organized, or unorganized, generally tends to resist labor-saving changes. But, as the late Professor Slichter pointed out,¹ organized resistance always is much more effective than unorganized resistance. Employees fear that more output will mean fewer jobs. This has not been the general experience of American industry. With higher output, costs and prices go down. So many people buy the cheaper goods or services that, notwithstanding the greater output per man-hour, we use more people to make the goods or to render the services.

The practice of unions, either through formal agreements or through pressure on their members, to limit the output resulting from improved methods and techniques has two evil effects on the public. First, it makes

¹ "Union Policies and Industrial Management," Brookings Institution, 1941, p. 172.

the cost of goods needlessly high, thereby pricing some consumers out of the market and holding down their standard of living. When unions limit output, they increase not only the cost of direct labor in the product, but also the cost of indirect labor, burden and overhead that goes into each unit. Thus, in the North Western case, the railroad must not only pay the wages of scores of employees it does not need, but it must pay, also, the cost of maintaining the surplus stations in which those employees idle away their time.

The second adverse effect of featherbedding is to discourage progress. Employers are less inclined to invest ingenuity and capital in new methods and machines that raise output and lower costs if unions are unwilling to permit the new methods and machines to operate efficiently.

Congress repeatedly has shown its concern over various forms of featherbedding. An early instance was in 1934, when it passed the Anti-Racketeering Act (48 Stat. 979 U.S.C., T. 18, 420(a)). That act undertook to put a stop to a form of racketeering that was common in the trucking industry, especially around New York, where officials of Teamsters Local 807 coerced drivers of trucks entering New York City, including members of other Teamster locals, farmers and other self-employed persons, to pay the equivalent of a day's wages to the officials or to hire members of local 807 to ride the trucks into the city. The Supreme Court in effect eviscerated the Anti-Racketeering Act, holding local 807's extortion to be permissible if it offered to provide drivers, even if it persisted in its demands after the truck-owner declined those services.²

In the Case bill (H.R. 4908) in 1946, Congress sought to correct that decision, but the President vetoed that bill. Congress later incorporated the Case bill's antiracketeering provisions in the Hobbs bill, which it passed (60 Stat. 420; U.S.C., T. 18, 1951, 62 Stat. 793). This third effort to discourage one form of extortion in trucking has been relatively effective.

In 1946, Congress passed also the Lea Act (60 Stat. 89). That purported to forbid the American Federation of Musicians to coerce radio stations to employ or agree to employ "any person or persons in excess of the number of employees needed . . . to perform actual services," or to pay more than once for services rendered. In *United States v. Petrillo*, Judge La Buy, in the District Court for the Eastern District of Illinois, held the Lea Act to be unconstitutional under the 5th (due process and equal protection of the laws), 1st (free speech), and 13th (involuntary servitude) amendments (68 F. Supp. 845 (N.D. Ill., 1946)). On appeal, the Supreme Court sustained the constitutionality of the Lea Act (332 U.S. 1 (1947)). On a retrial before Judge La Buy, notwithstanding that Mr. Petrillo had publicly proclaimed that he was deliberately violating the act in order to test its constitutionality, the judge held that Mr. Petrillo was innocent because the prosecution did not show that Mr. Petrillo knew that the radio station involved in the case did not need the extra employees that Mr. Petrillo, by picketing, had forced it to hire. The judge again dismissed the indictment (75 F. Supp. 176 (N.D. Ill., 1948)). Since then, there has been no effective enforcement of the Lea Act.

In 1947, in enacting the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, over the President's veto, Congress made it an unfair labor practice for a labor union "to cause or attempt to cause an employer to pay or deliver or agree to pay or deliver any money or other

thing of value, in the nature of an exaction, for services which are not performed or not to be performed."³

The U.S. Supreme Court made a dead letter of this provision in two decisions. In the first, it held that the International Typographers Union's enforcing its "bogus work" rule did not violate the clause. Under this rule, the union requires newspapers and other employers in the printing business to set up duplicate forms for mats from which they print advertisements, which forms ordinarily serve no useful purpose and are destroyed as soon as the printers finish setting them up (*American Newspaper Publishers' Ass'n v. N.L.R.B.*, 345 U.S. 100 (1953)). In the second case, the Court held that the American Federation of Musicians did not violate the act by requiring a theater to employ a local orchestra to render services that the theater did not want or need (*N.L.R.B. v. Gamble Enterprises*, 345 U.S. 117 (1953)). Since then, the National Labor Relations Board has deemed it futile to try to enforce the clause.

Turning now to S. 3548, it does not go nearly as far as the Hobbs Act went in dealing with abuses in the trucking industry, as the Lea Act purported to go in dealing with abuses in the broadcasting industry, or as Congress obviously intended to go in enacting section 8(b) (6) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended. Indeed, if there is any fair criticism of the bill, it is that the bill does not go far enough.

The truth is that a statute ought not to be necessary to exclude the creation or discontinuance of positions from the area of collective bargaining. Very respectable authority holds that a union, when it strikes to prevent an employer from discontinuing an operation, illegally interferes with the employer's business. New York has a "Little Norris-LaGuardia Act" (Civil Practice Act, sec. 876a). Yet the courts of that State have held repeatedly that striking and picketing to force an employer to continue an operation does not constitute a "labor dispute" within the meaning of the State's Anti-Injunction Act, and that such strikes and picketing may be enjoined notwithstanding such act.

The leading New York case is *Paul v. Mencher* (169 Misc. 657 (1937), aff'd in 254 App. Div. 851 (1938), leave to appeal denied in 279 N.Y. 813 (1939)). At special term, the Court said:

"There is no labor dispute as defined by statute between the parties hereto. It is the prerogative of any businessman, with or without reason, to continue or discontinue in business as he sees fit without necessity of explanation or excuse to anyone. When the plaintiff elected to discontinue his factory no one was privileged to complain even though it was done deliberately to avoid a labor dispute. Since there is no labor dispute there is no need to consider whether compliance with 876-a, Civil Practice Act, has been had, as that is not an issue."

The same reasoning applies to strikes and picketing to prevent employers from discontinuing either all or part of their operations. See, for example, *Huron Stevedoring Corp. v. Grogan* (127 N.Y.S. 2d 99 (1953)), involving maintenance work that the employer discontinued and contracted out to another company; *Anheuser-Busch, Inc. v. Brewery Workers Local 1059, et al.* (N.Y.L.J. Apr. 6, 1955, leave to appeal denied in 285 App. Div. 1134 (1955)), involving the discontinuance of certain branch distribution centers. In *American Type Founders, Inc. v. Webendorff-Wills Employees' Ass'n, Inc.* (N.Y.L.J., Jan. 13, 1955, p. 3) the employer announced its intention to close a branch operation at Mount Vernon, N.Y., and move it to the main

plant in New Jersey. The employees picketed the New York plant, preventing the employer from moving its operations. In granting an injunction, the Supreme Court of New York, per Bailey, J., said:

"It is the prerogative of any man in business to terminate such business or a branch thereof. The decision to do so constitutes the exercise of a fundamental right and is binding upon the employees. The cessation of business terminates the employer-employee relationship and precludes the existence of a labor controversy. Any picketing thereafter is without a lawful labor objective and may be restrained (*Paul v. Mencher* (169 Misc. 657, aff'd 254 App. Div. 851, leave to appeal denied, 279 N.Y. 813); *Huron Stevedoring Corp'n et al. v. Grogan* (127 N.Y. Supp. 2d 99), and *M. Mittman & Co. v. Sirota* (111 N.Y. Supp. 2d, 100, not otherwise reported)).

"Picketing conducted without a lawful labor objective may be enjoined without compliance with section 876a, Civil Practice Act (*Goodwins, Inc. v. Hagedorn* (303 N.Y. 300)).

"The absence of a labor controversy and a lawful labor objective reduces the picketing to tortious conduct which does not fall within the preempted field of Federal jurisdiction but may be enjoined by State courts (*S-M News Co., Inc. v. Simons* (279 App. Div. 364); *Willoughby Camera Stores v. District No. 15, etc.* (205 Misc. 455); *G. H. & E. Freyberg, Inc. v. Internat. Ladies' Garment Workers Union et al.* (128 N.Y. Supp. 2d 470, not otherwise reported))."

The effect of S. 3548 would be to provide, as the New York courts now hold, that striking and picketing to compel an employer to create jobs or to continue existing jobs does not constitute a labor dispute within the meaning of the Norris-LaGuardia Act. This would not in any way interfere with the right of labor unions to negotiate concerning the terms and conditions of employment in jobs that the employer establishes or concerning benefits, in the way of severance pay or new jobs, for employees who lose work by reason of the discontinuance of their positions, nor would the new statute limit the right of labor unions to strike and picket in order to enforce their demands in these areas.

In concluding, I wish to commend to the attention of the committee language that appeared in H.R. 3020, which the House adopted by an overwhelming majority in 1947. That bill made "featherbedding practices" unlawful concerted activities, and defined "featherbedding practice" in section 2(17) as follows:

"(17) The term 'featherbedding practice' means a practice which has as its purpose or effect requiring an employer—

"(A) to employ or agree to employ any person or persons in excess of the number of employees reasonably required by such employer to perform actual services; or

"(B) to pay or give or agree to pay or give any money or other thing of value in lieu of employing, or on account of failure to employ, any person or persons, in connection with the conduct of the business of an employer, in excess of the number of employees reasonably required by such employer to perform actual services; or

"(C) to pay or agree to pay more than once for services performed; or

"(D) to pay or give or agree to pay or give any money or other thing of value for services, in connection with the conduct of a business, which are not to be performed; or

"(E) to pay or agree to pay any tax or exaction for the privilege of, or on account of, producing, preparing, manufacturing, selling, buying, renting, operating, using, or maintaining any article, machine, equipment, or materials; or to accede to or impose any restriction upon the production, preparation, manufacture, sale, purchase, rental, operation, use, or maintenance of the

² *United States v. Local 807* (315 U.S. 521 (1942)).

³ 49 Stat. 452, 61 Stat. 140; U.S.C., T. 29, 158(b) (6).

same, if such restriction is for the purpose of preventing or limiting the use of such article, machine, equipment or materials."

S. 3548 is a step in the right direction, but it is only a step. Complete and effective relief against such practices can result only from exempting them, as the Hartley bill defined them, from the immunities of the Norris-LaGuardia Act or by making such practices unlawful under the antitrust laws or other statutes.

STATEMENT OF HARRY O. MATHEWS ON BEHALF OF THE NATIONAL INDUSTRIAL TRAFFIC LEAGUE BEFORE A SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY IN SUPPORT OF S. 3548

My name is Harry O. Mathews and I am manager of transportation for Armour & Co.; my office is in Chicago, Ill. I appear today in my capacity as chairman of the legislative committee of the National Industrial Traffic League, of which my company is a member and in which I have been active for many years. The league strongly supports the principle of the bill, S. 3548, insofar as it relates to transportation, either private or for hire.

The league is a nationwide organization of shippers. Its membership numbers over 1,700 and includes those directly and individually engaged in the shipment and receipt of commodities, as well as numerous chambers of commerce and traffic associations which in turn represent many members of their own. Many league members conduct extensive transportation operations as private carriers. League members generally are the ones who pay the freight.

The league has a primary concern for sound economic conditions in transportation and the encouragement of fair wages and equitable working conditions in accordance with the National Transportation Policy. Accordingly, it is a policy of the league that work rules which are inconsistent with modern operating practices and sound economic conditions in transportation should be eliminated. The league favors fair and flexible working rules in harmony with modern economic transportation methods. This policy was considered by the entire membership and adopted at the last annual meeting of the league in November 1959.

The league policy is opposed to unwarranted requirements or payments for work that is not needed or not performed. So far as such requirements or payments are proposed in connection with existing jobs as to which there is no question of the creation or discontinuation of positions, they raise questions which may be recognized as labor disputes and which are customarily handled by labor negotiation between the carriers and their employees. The proposed bill would not affect that process. However, a very different situation exists in respect of attempts to require a carrier to continue to provide jobs even though the jobs relate to a service or facility that has been abandoned or merged by authority of regulatory agencies. Where such jobs are proven to be unnecessary or to involve no performance of work their continuance runs counter to the sound principle of economic conditions in transportation. Moreover, until recently such matters have not been the subject of labor dispute or negotiation between the carriers and their employees. Instead, they have been treated in the regulatory proceedings in which the carriers obtained authority for the service abandonment or unification which resulted in the discontinuance of jobs.

For example, when a railroad desires to abandon a branch line it is required as a requisite therefor to obtain a certificate from the Interstate Commerce Commission under section 1(18) of the Interstate Commerce Act. In exercising its authority to grant such certificate the Commission is authorized to impose conditions for the protection

of employees who are eliminated by the abandonment. This is customarily done as in the case of *Chicago, B. & Q.R. Co. Abandonment* ((1944) 257 I.C.C. 700). Further, consolidations of railroads are permitted only with approval of the Interstate Commerce Commission under section 5(2)(f) of the Interstate Commerce Act, which provides that the Commission "shall require a fair and equitable arrangement to protect the interests of the railroad employees affected." Similar treatment of other types of carriers is provided.

I am not familiar with all the State laws on the subject but I do know that the general custom and practice in the railroad industry in connection with discontinuance of service has been for the unions to appear in the formal regulatory proceedings, where they urge and obtain protection of the employees. State and Federal regulatory authorities have generally granted such protection according to their fair and impartial view of the merits. In any event it has not been the practice of labor and management to negotiate the discontinuance of service or jobs or the terms and conditions for the protection of employees affected thereby.

As far as I know the first important example of a labor union attempting to negotiate a contract providing that its consent must be obtained for the discontinuance of any jobs is the recent case of the railroad telegraphers demands upon the Chicago & North Western Railway, which was decided by the Supreme Court of the United States last April. Although the Court was divided on the questions of law presented, we think there can be no question but what the inclusion of such dispute in the broad range of subjects for labor negotiation will be a revolutionary and wholly injurious change.

Labor unions understandably desire to have the right to veto any discontinuance of jobs. They attempted to get that right through the Harrington amendment to section 5(2)(f) of the Interstate Commerce Act as presented in the 84th Congress. That amendment would have forbidden the approval of any merger or consolidation if such transaction would result in unemployment or displacement of employees. Congress wisely rejected the Harrington proviso because the very object of unification is to save expense, usually by the saving of labor. The matter is fully discussed in the dissenting opinion of four Justices in the recent *North Western* case.

Since the *North Western* case, it is clear that amendment of labor laws along the lines proposed in S. 3548 is absolutely necessary. Otherwise, labor unions will have the power to veto any unification or abandonment of service even though it has been authorized or is required by order of the Interstate Commerce Commission or a State regulatory body. Under the present workable scheme of regulation of transportation, the subject of job discontinuance is simply not an appropriate subject for negotiation. It always has been and should remain a subject for managerial discretion subject only to such appropriate terms and conditions as may be within the power of Government agencies to impose in the regulatory certificates.

The league urgently petitions the Congress to act before adjournment in this important matter by adopting the principles of S. 3548 to exclude from the broad coverage of the phrase "terms or conditions of employment" the creation or discontinuation of positions.

TESTIMONY OF STUART G. TIPTON, PRESIDENT, AIR TRANSPORT ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA, BEFORE A SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE, ON S. 3548, JUNE 22, 1960

My name is Stuart G. Tipton. I am president of the Air Transport Association of

America, which is the association of the certificated, regularly scheduled airlines of the United States. The airline industry is grateful to the committee for this opportunity to state its views in support of S. 3548.

As the committee studies the legislation before it, occasioned by the Supreme Court decision in the *Telegraphers v. North Western Railroad* case, it is necessary, we believe, that the committee understand the probable effect of this case on the airline industry.

Specifically, the Supreme Court case treated the question of whether the Norris-LaGuardia Act, prohibiting Federal court injunctions in cases involving labor disputes, would bar an injunction in the circumstances there presented.

Briefly stated, the underlying facts were as follows:

In the latter part of 1957 the North Western Railroad filed petitions with various State utility commissions to institute a "central agency plan" which would consolidate and abolish many small, unproductive, outdated freight stations. A few weeks later the union presented the company with a contract demand to the effect that:

"No position in existence on December 3, 1957, will be abolished or discontinued except by agreement between the carrier and the organization."

When the railroad refused to consider this demand and suggested instead that they discuss severance pay, relocation allowances, etc., the union threatened to strike. The railroad sought an injunction from the Federal district court, challenging the legality of the demand in that the State regulatory commissions had given, or were considering, approval to abolish these stations, which included the jobs in issue at those stations.

The Supreme Court, in a 5 to 4 decision, upheld the legality of a strike over this demand and denied the Federal court's jurisdiction to grant an injunction.

It is significant to note that in denying *North Western's* claim for an injunction, the Supreme Court was not altogether unsympathetic with the situation of the railroad. Justice Black stated:

"In concluding that the injunction ordered by the court of appeals is forbidden . . . we have taken due account of the railroad's argument that the operation of unnecessary stations, services, and lines is wasteful and thus runs counter to the congressional policy . . . these arguments, however, are addressed to the wrong forum. If the scope of the Norris-LaGuardia Act is to be cut down in order to prevent waste . . . Congress should be the body to do so."

The bill before the committee responds to these latter remarks.

S. 3548, in our opinion, will prevent waste. It will relieve unions of the temptation to make demands for veto power over job discontinuances or abolishments. It will allow the company, presented with such a demand, to seek a Federal court injunction against a strike to enforce such a demand. This is as it should be. Such a demand should not be decided upon the basis of relative economic strength.

We, therefore, support S. 3548.

In essence, the result of this legislation would be to preserve the recognized methods of protecting employee rights. The right to be represented by a union would not be affected. The right to bargain over seniority rights, severance pay, unemployment compensation, retirement benefits, relocation expenses, etc., would not be reduced.

In terms of the airline industry and airline employees, the general application of the Railway Labor Act would not be changed; existing union representation certifications would continue; existing conflicts would not be eradicated, the National Mediation Board would continue to mediate airline labor disputes in an attempt to bring about peaceful

settlements; the Federal Aviation Agency would continue to exercise its best judgment for promoting safety in the public interest, as it has done in the past; and the Civil Aeronautics Board would continue to exercise its best economic judgment for promoting and safeguarding the public interest, as it has done in the past.

What is sought is "the ounce of prevention" more than "the pound of cure."

Just as the North Western case involved abandonments and abolishments which required Commission approval, so too, the airline abandonments and abolishments require Civil Aeronautics Board approval.

Once an air carrier has received a certificate of public convenience and necessity from the CAB, prescribing the points it may serve and the service to be rendered, it may not give up, transfer or otherwise abandon that service without approval from the CAB in the public interest. Likewise, the CAB, upon its own initiative, may alter, amend, modify or suspend any such certificate, if the public convenience and necessity so require (sec. 401 of the Federal Aviation Act).

Just as the railroad was considering a "Central Agency Plan" to eliminate inefficient operations and to prevent waste, so too, are the airlines operating under an avowed policy, supported by the Civil Aeronautics Board, to eliminate inefficient operations and to prevent waste.

As you know, the trunk air carriers have been reequipping with long range jets at a very rapid rate. This equipment, because of its size and operation, requires a realignment of route patterns. As a result, there are some instances where short distance service between intermediate points is being transferred from the larger trunk carriers to the smaller, local service carriers. The local service carriers, at the same time, have stepped up from the old DC-3 equipment to faster more modern aircraft which allow them to adequately serve these intermediate points. In addition, the local service carriers are instituting new air service at some communities on a use it or lose it basis, which means that if the locality will support air service by enplaning an average of five daily passengers during a specified period, the service will remain; if not, it will be abandoned.

In terms of specifics, the most significant recent case is one involving an area of seven States (Illinois, Iowa, Minnesota, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Wisconsin). The CAB here, approved requests for suspension of service at 3 points and deletion of service at some 22 points by Braniff Airways, United Air Lines, and Western Air Lines. These points and others were to be served by local service carriers in accordance with the use it or lose it policy.

In the past year and a half, since the Seven States Area case, the CAB has heard the Pacific Northwest and the Montana-Local cases involving suspensions and deletions for Northwest and United; the North East Area case involving suspensions and deletions for American, Capital, Northeast, and United; and the South East Area case involving suspensions and deletions for Delta and National.

Based on these mentioned cases, the CAB has approved trunkline "abandonments" of service in 48 instances. More will follow. The Wall Street Journal recently predicted that the CAB is planning to "overhaul its policies to better fit the jet age," which will mean "abandonment of money-losing airline service to perhaps 100 smaller cities and towns."

These forward steps, involving the discontinuance of service by trunk carriers in favor of the local service carriers and the possible future abandonment of service by local service carriers where the "use it or lose it" test is not satisfied, could be seriously hampered if the air carriers are forced to negotiate the type of union demand held to be legal in the

North Western case. It would be senseless for a carrier to discontinue service at an intermediate point and at the same time perpetuate the employment of personnel at such point. A union rule which would freeze jobs on the airlines could also freeze progress.

Another area of potential injury to airline progress is in terms of restriction on mergers and consolidations. It is well known that TWA and Northeast Airlines are considering a merger and that various other airlines have stated their willingness to consider mergers which will strengthen their position and allow them to give better service in this highly expensive jet age. Some writers have even predicted that the only salvation for the airlines' poor earning future lies in reduction of almost violent competition through mergers and consolidations.

In order to perfect a consolidation, merger, purchase, operational lease, contract or other arrangement, air carriers must obtain the approval of the CAB. To be approved the action must be in the public interest (sec. 408 of the act). Since 1943 there have been approximately 20 proposals for mergers, half of which were consummated.

In 1952 the CAB approved the merger of Braniff Airways with Mid-Continent Airlines, and Delta Air Lines with Chicago and Southern Air Lines. In 1954 the CAB approved the merger of Flying Tiger Line with Slick Airways, and of Continental Air Lines with Pioneer Air Lines. In 1956 the CAB approved the merger of Eastern Air Lines with Colonial Airlines.

Each of these mergers was subject to certain economic conditions which included employee protective provisions so that no one would be placed in a worse position without appropriate compensation. The compensation referred to included CAB-determined monthly displacement allowances, dismissal allowances, and separation allowances, as well as moving allowances and relocation expenses and losses.

Future mergers, like these, will invariably result in duplicated job positions, and a union rule that jobs may not be discontinued without union approval could seriously affect a proposed merger. The price a union may demand for job discontinuance could more than offset the advantages sought and thus deny the practicality of the merger.

Thus you have the picture of the airline industry in terms of the discontinuance of service and jobs occasioned by abandonments or mergers and consolidations. An airline may not discontinue service unless the CAB finds such action to be in the public interest. And the CAB's guardianship of the public interest includes the imposition of conditions to protect employees who may be separated from service entirely, temporarily laid off, relocated, or otherwise put in a worse position financially.

As stated by Second Circuit Judge Chase in a 1953 test case of this interpretation of the public interest, *Kent v. CAB* (204 F. 2d 263 at p. 265):

"Statutory authority is broad enough to enable the Board to approve a merger and transfer of a certificate upon 'such terms and conditions as it shall find to be just and reasonable' in the public interest. This public interest, though not broadly one of general employee welfare, is to obtain the degree of stability in air transportation that freedom from industrial strife will provide."

If the recent Supreme Court decision in the North Western case is to stand, however, what was determined by an arm of the Federal Government in the public interest, may hereafter be determined by a strong union bargaining committee in the private interests of a minority of its union members. There will not be "freedom from industrial strife."

Let us assume for the purposes of this discussion that trunk airlines, which may be

contemplating a deletion or suspension of service at intermediate points which are better served by local service carriers, or a merger or consolidation, are faced with the same type of contract demand that the North Western Railroad received. That is, that no position in existence on a given date will be abolished or discontinued without union approval. To give in to such a demand would totally divest management of its inherent right to control the size of its work force; it would be granting the union the power of veto. To refuse to give in to such a demand could mean a long and costly strike.

The air transport industry requires the protection that S. 3548 offers. Without it, continued progress may be seriously curtailed.

THE EXISTENCE OF GOD

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a lecture on the existence of God, delivered at Gonzaga University in Spokane, Wash., by the Reverend Francis J. Conklin, S.J.

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

We have outlined the fundamental materialistic interpretation which Karl Marx gave to this universe. In this lecture we will endeavor to understand his analysis and conclusions regarding the existence of God. Before proceeding we must emphasize a very important distinction. A considerable gulf often separates the rational proofs for the existence of God and the personal relationship which each individual human being has with God.

Marx rejects some of the rational proofs for the existence of God and his interpretation is perfectly correct because the rejected proofs were invalid. With some reservations, the God whom Marx denied did not exist anyway.

On the other side of the slate, the question of Marx's personal contact with God remains a mystery. We do not know and cannot discover what graces Marx may have received; we do not know what special lights he received, nor what formal sin he may or may not have committed. The judgment of any individual person remains in the hands of God alone, and no idle speculation can anticipate nor supplant the judgment of God in so profound and intimate a matter.

In one sense we must sympathize with Marx, because you will remember that St. Augustine spent years before he realized that something can exist which is not matter. Marx selected matter as the absolute; as the eternal and self-explanatory. Once this commitment crystallizes, as a philosopher (perhaps logician is a better word) Marx no longer need look beyond external matter for an explanation and ultimate principle of being. Marx sincerely believed—and we must give him credit for that—that the material evolution explained everything requiring explanation in the philosophic world. We can call his viewpoint shortsighted and we can disagree—but we must acknowledge his sincerity—and the climate in which he lived.

Without too much playing at the psychologist, we can examine in some detail certain motives which bolstered Marx's conviction that God does not exist. To begin with, the political attitude of the clergy was, to Marx, appalling. The prominent representatives of God in Europe in the early part of the 19th century were allied with the forces of political reaction. Make no mistake about that.

Catholic Austria was easily identified with the ultraconservatism of Metternich. On the throne of Peter, prior to Pius IX, sat some

of the most conservative and reactionary Popes that ever walked the earth. And the incipient liberalism (too little, too late) of Pius IX was summarily stifled by the exigencies of the times. In Protestant Prussia, Lutheranism was the state religion. And Marx quickly pointed to the anomaly of an official state religion: the Jew could not be a citizen in Prussia because the public question of religious affiliation cut off from the body of the state a natural member.

In Russia the Orthodox Church was tied in so completely with the reigning Czar that the situation simply eludes comprehension, due to our American prejudices. We cannot form a simple apprehension of Russian Caesaro-papism.

The phrase "Caesaro-papism" dates back to the Council of Nicea. Shortly after Christianity became the official religion of the Roman State, the very bishops who had been so bitterly persecuted just a short time before marched to the sessions of the Council between honor guards of servient soldiers. Most were frightened by the presence of the soldiers. The sudden transformation from fugitives to powerfully protected administrators ultimately pleased the hierarchy. Gradually, the idea developed that the head of the church and the head of the state should reside in the same place. In later years Constantinople became the center of the Eastern Roman Empire and the focal point around which the orthodox bishops sate. After Kiev, Moscow became the center of Russia's political world and Russian orthodox bishops transferred their allegiance from the patriarchs of Constantinople to the patriarch of the third Rome.

Without doubt the union of church and state solves a host of financial and administrative problems for the church. But the judgment of history must be that politico-religious union creates more problems than it solves. Despite the advantages gained by individual ambitious churchmen through concordats and other concessions, the sword of the spirit always seems to end up in the service of the great sword of state.

Continuing our view of religion in Europe in Marx's time: In England the established church was the church of the respectable or propertied class. Such new religions as Methodism were disreputable. We can draw a parallel in the United States today. Middle class, comfortable Catholicism, to a certain extent, although not exclusively; certain branches of Lutheranism and Episcopalianism have arrived. They have established and proved themselves as respectable religions. This seems to mean that the majority of their members belong to the classes which are financially secure, or at least, financially independent. For the poor classes—Negroes; poor whites; many Mexicans—religious desires are increasingly filled in those forms of religion which are less reputable: evangelical and pentecostal sects, revivalism, etc.

In Catholic France the passionate agitation for the restoration of L'ancienne regime served to identify many members of the laity and hierarchy with the cause of ultra conservatism. This political partisanship alienated many of the French social thinkers of that era. Moreover, the Catholics in France developed a ghetto attitude, which may be defined as a defensive outlook, whereby all must be defended and justified. In any organization as large as the Catholic Church, the human element plays a vital part. Human mistakes are inevitable. A ghetto attitude refuses to concede the error in human frailty and defends mistakes after they are made. This refusal to face very evident shortcomings and defects in individual clergymen, joined with the longing for the restoration of the good old days of political

absolutism, was enough to permanently turn away many who had more progressive and liberal ideas.

Permit me to digress for a moment. Without any doubt any alert Catholic may be tempted to sin because he sees unconscious injustice or even deliberate wrong committed by those who hold high places in the visible hierarchy of the church's administration. When we are victims of this supposed or real injustice the human element of the church stands out in all its naked reality. Even a sincere and mutual desire for the good, even for the same good, does not prevent tragic clashes. It can even provoke them. In such a situation patience and loving silence will be of more value than anything else to the true Catholic. There is, of course, nothing to fear in the judgments of those who do not see the heart and we can comfort ourselves with the thought that the church never gives Christ to us better than when she offers us a chance of sharing in the likeness of his passion. But while they may be profoundly true for an "insider"—even the "insider" occasionally rebels. The "outsider"—and Marx was an outsider, by instinct, a natural instinct of justice—turns away from the institution which occasioned his misfortune.

Returning to our central theme; another point bears emphasis: When an individual clergyman speaks in behalf of religion—whether he be Catholic, Protestant, or Jew—and his teaching or writing reaches an atheist, the reader does not make the distinctions which a person more familiar with religion would make. For example, the fact that a single priest or an individual minister makes an intemperate statement will be interpreted as the common teaching of all religions by a person who is not disposed to make careful distinctions.

Without doubt, during the 19th century, certain religious leaders taught that the existence of the poor was a plan of divine providence. We mentioned some of them in our first lecture. In other words, God was held up as a justification of existing social inequalities. To classify morality as an exclusively individual problem appealed to the self-directed men in Victorian Europe. In this view the only consequential moral considerations relate to personal holiness and sanctification. Anything dealing with a broader application of the moral code; anything relating to the social consequences of the gospel message, is passed over in silence.

We might add—and must add—that today one of the frequent charges pressed against Western European religions by the various Communist parties, is that the churches lack a social conscience. One proof advanced for this assertion—and not without foundation—in questions of personal morality, especially anything pertaining to chastity, the thinking of divines and moral theologians has been very specific and detailed. For example, ask any Catholic girl who has had the benefit of a Catholic education what is the most serious sin she can commit. Her instinctive defense of purity will scarcely coincide with the emphasis Christ placed upon charity as the characteristic of the new life of grace. When more complex questions are proposed: problems of legal justice, e.g., the moral effect of a statute of limitations, etc.; or distributive justice; or social justice; the chorus of unanimity is replaced by an apprehensive silence—broken by a few isolated thinkers.

At this point we must clarify the phrase "promethean atheism." In the myth Prometheus, a Titan out of power, and Zeus or Jupiter or Jove, the supreme god, clashed. Prometheus tricked Zeus by placing sacrificial bones covered with a thin layer of fat alongside entrails stuffed with

fat. Zeus loved fat meat, greedily chose the bones—discovered the fraud, and angrily took fire from Prometheus so that no more such fraudulent sacrifices could be offered.

Prometheus stole fire from heaven, i.e., he showed men how to rub sticks together in order to make fire. This infuriated Zeus. To punish Prometheus, Zeus tied him to a rock over in the Caucasus and all day long an eagle picked out Prometheus' liver. Since Prometheus was an immortal the liver grew back again at night, and Prometheus was thus condemned to eternal torment. To punish mankind for having received the gift of fire Zeus created woman.

The idea behind the myth is that Zeus—i.e., the supreme god—is a tyrant, a despot and an enemy of man. In other words, men suffer because of God's tyranny. God is unjust and enjoys torturing men. Prometheus symbolizes man's defiant will. Even though God is all-powerful, man will resist to the last. It is better to reign in hell than to serve in heaven. Man's immortal spirit cannot be killed and those who benefit mankind, although they must suffer to wrest secrets from nature and from nature's god, will nevertheless triumph by defying the all-powerful but merciless God.

What we are saying is simply this: the central problem in the philosophy of Marx is the problem of evil. This gives rise to the whole of this system. The entire superstructure of dialectical materialism constitutes a solution to the problem of evil. Of course, we have memorized somewhere, that God wills physical evil only indirectly; moral evil He does not will at all but only permits. So that takes care of Karl Marx. Would to God it were that simple.

One rational proof for the existence of God which Marx attacks was an argument which is often confused with the fifth way of St. Thomas: If we contemplate the order and harmony within the universe, we find the balance so delicate that one cannot move a flower without moving a star. Such a disposition and ordering could not have come into existence by chance. It could only be the result of a supreme intelligence which exists and guides all beings to their proper destiny. The intricate mechanism of an ordinary watch could not have come about by chance, so the universe itself could never be the result of blind forces in nature. Consequently, there must be a God.

This argument does not prove the existence of God. The supreme architect could have passed out of existence many years ago, and the universe itself would continue to exist just like the watch—a mute memorial to the skill of its fabricator. The frequently misunderstood five proofs of St. Thomas are not five distinct proofs but one proof which St. Thomas expressed in five different ways. In this same connection, St. Thomas pointed out that any attempt to prove the existence of God by what he calls *causae per accidens subordinatae* is predestined to failure. Among other reasons there is the fact that you cannot prove by reason alone whether or not the world, that is, the material world, is eternal. Another difficulty: Suppose we say that A was made by B, which was made by C, etc. Finally we may arrive at a concept of a being which is necessary—and then we fall into the trap of the Anselmian argument. In other words, we argue from the nature of the concept to the existence of a supreme being.

These arguments, especially the argument from order in the universe, were used by the Deists at the time of Marx. Deism was a respectable type of religion for the statesman and businessman, because Deism demanded very little and provided a convenient method to dispose of God during the important hours of the business week. By allowing God a certain amount of time on

the Sabbath the Deist could keep pace with respectable neighbors, and return to the jungle of the Monday morning business world without the impediments which arise from conscience.

Marx and Engels launched out against Deism. The charges of hypocrisy which they leveled against many of their English acquaintances were certainly well founded. Their classic attack on Deism is contained in Engels' "Dialectics of Nature":

"God is nowhere treated worse than by natural scientists who believe in Him. * * * But what God has had to suffer at the hands of His defenders. In the history of modern natural science, God is treated by His defenders as Frederick William III was treated by his generals and officials in the campaign of Jena. One division of the army after another lowers its weapons, one fortress after another capitulates before the march of science, until at last there is no place left in it for the Creator. Newton still allowed Him the 'first impulse' but forbade Him any further interference in His solar system. Father Secchi bows Him out of the solar system altogether, with all canonical honors it is true, but nonetheless categorically for all that, and he only allows Him a creative act as regards the primordial nebula. And so in all spheres. In biology, his last great Don Quixote, Agassiz, even ascribes positive nonsense to Him; He is supposed to have created not only the actual animals, but also abstract animals, the fish as such. And finally Tyndall totally forbids Him any entry into nature and relegates Him to the world of emotional processes, only admitting Him, because, after all, there must be somebody who knows more about all these things (nature) than J. Tyndall. What a distance from the old God—the Creator of Heaven and Earth, the maintainer of all things—without whom not a hair can fall from the head."

We come now to a more profound consideration of the influence of Ludwig Feuerbach. In the "Essence of Christianity," Feuerbach writes:

"Religion has its basis in the essential difference between man and the brute—the brutes have no religion. What is the essential difference between man and the brute? The most simple, general, and also the most popular answer to this question is consciousness; but consciousness in the strict sense, for the consciousness implied in the feeling of self as an individual, in discrimination by the senses, in the perception and even judgment of outward things according to definite sensible signs, cannot be denied to the brutes. Consciousness in the strictest sense is present only in a being to whom his species, his essential nature, is an object of thought. Religion being identical with the distinctive characteristic of man is then identical with self-consciousness—with the consciousness which man has of his nature. But religion, expressed generally, is consciousness of the infinite; thus it is and can be nothing else than the consciousness which man has of his own not finite but infinite nature."

Expressed in terms of the Hegelian dialectic, the same concept may be more easily comprehended. We begin with the thesis: The existing self with the attributes, i.e., the potentialities for reason and love which are infinite; i.e. unlimited. This self projects a god: i.e. man creates his own God. Then comes the synthesis wherein man realizes that he is divine and that God is a denial of self.

Marx is not content to merely accept Feuerbach at face value. Marx says that Feuerbach has done a good job, but has not gone far enough. "Feuerbach starts out from the fact of religious self-alienation, the duplication of this world into a religious

imaginary world and a real one. But he overlooks the fact that after completing this analysis the chief thing remains to be done." ("Thesis on Feuerbach.")

Feuerbach does not explain why man creates God. The man who creates God is no abstraction like humanity; he is a real concrete human being, a social being, an individual immersed in society. Consequently, it is society which creates religion and society creates religion or creates God because society is alienated, unreal, frustrated—or, if you prefer, contains a contradiction at the heart.

Marx goes further. Men are distinguished from animals by consciousness or anything else that you want. But the real thing that distinguishes man from animal is the fact that men produce the means of their existence: in a word men produce their own material life. Marx employs a phrase which has to be pondered: "It is not the consciousness of men which determines their existence, but their existence determines their consciousness."

Marx has completely broken with subjective idealism, so it is not the makeup of the human mind that determines the real world—the world of existence—but this world in which economics is of such vital importance is what determines the thinking of men. Thus, it is the production of life's necessities and after their production, their exchange, which forms the basis of all history.

Engels wrote: "Then came Feuerbach's 'Essence of Christianity.' With one blow it pulverized the contradiction, in that without circumlocutions it placed materialism on the throne again. * * * Nothing exists outside nature and man, and the higher beings our religious fantasies have created are only the fantastic reflection of our own essence."

In the process of creating God man is no abstract being squatting outside the world; man is the world, of men, the state and society. The essence of man is no abstraction inherent in each individual; it is the reality of the ensemble or group of social relations. Men distinguish themselves from animals, as soon as they begin to produce their means of subsistence. By producing these means of subsistence, men are indirectly producing their actual material life—their own existence, as such. For this reason the production of life's necessities, and after production their distribution and exchange constitutes the driving force of all history.

The consequence of this is that the contradiction which creates religions must be sought for in the world of political economy. In political economy, the true contradiction must be found, understood and revolutionized in practice. In the 19th century society in which Marx lived, production was a social phenomena; in other words, all men worked, but the enjoyment of the fruits of work was granted only to the few. Consequently, social production was contrasted starkly with individual enjoyment. This contradiction lay like a cancer at the very core of 19th century economic life. To eradicate this cancer Marx would reconstruct society through revolution. A new society must be created which is humane; which is constituted by a socialized humanity in which all will enjoy the fruits of production.

"This is the process of development of practical humanism. Atheism is humanism brought about by abolishing religion; communism is humanism brought about by abolishing private property. Only by first removing this interceding element, which, however, is a necessary prerequisite, does positive, self-created humanism come into being. Atheism and communism are not escapes; they are not abstractions, they are not a loss of the real world produced by man or of his powers which have matured into

objectivity. They are not a poverty returning to unnatural, undeveloped simplicity. They are the first real development, the first materialization for man of his being." ("Literature and Art," p. 62.)

"When this act has been accomplished, when society by taking possession of all means of production and using them on a planned basis has freed itself and all its members from the bondage in which they are now held by these means of production which they themselves have produced but which now confront them as an irresistible extraneous force; when therefore, 'man no longer merely proposes, but also disposes—only then will the last extraneous force which is still reflected in religion vanish, and with it will also vanish the religious reflection itself, for the simple reason that there will be nothing left to reflect.'" ("Anti Duhring," p. 355.)

"Thus the criticism of heaven transforms itself into a criticism of earth, the criticism of religion into the criticism of legal rights and the criticism of theology into the criticism of politics." (Marx penned this prophecy in an early newspaper article.)

Marx has surpassed Feuerbach. Feuerbach has correctly analyzed the nature of religion. Marx has explained why man creates religion. Religion arises from the contradictions, strain, alienation and frustration in the real day-to-day economic order.

The problem with all previous philosophers—Feuerbach included—is that they have only interpreted the world. The point is to change it.

Therefore, "The criticism of religion ends with the doctrine that man is the supreme being for mankind, and with the categorical imperative to overthrow all conditions in which man is a degraded, servile, neglected contemptible being."

"The religion of the worker has no god since it seeks to restore the divinity of man."

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief 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.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, is morning business concluded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

TREATY OF MUTUAL COOPERATION AND SECURITY BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND JAPAN

The Senate resumed the consideration of Executive E (86th Cong., 2d sess.), the Treaty of Mutual Cooperation and Security between the United States of America and Japan, signed at Washington on January 19, 1960.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the order of the Senate, the resolution of ratification of the Japanese-United States treaty is before the Senate under a 30-minute limitation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask that 15 minutes be allotted to the distinguished and beloved Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long].

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

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, as one member of the Foreign Relations Committee, I purposely absented myself from the session of the committee when it was considering the Japanese Treaty, in deference to the desire of many members that the treaty might be favorably reported by unanimous vote. Had I voted, I would have voted against it.

Since the day the treaty was reported, I have had occasion to consider what advantages, if any, this Nation would achieve from a unanimous showing of advice and consent. It is my conclusion that, in this case, unanimity gains us nothing. In fact, it will even be costly to us. The Communists around the world will seize upon the ratification of this treaty to claim that we have imposed upon a vanquished nation terms and conditions to which the people of that nation were unwilling to agree. A unanimous vote will be construed by many to indicate that the treaty was extremely favorable to the United States and contrary to the interests of Japan.

Actually, the facts are the other way around.

This treaty is entirely a one-way street. We give much and gain practically nothing that we do not already have.

In the first place, this treaty gives away the right of the United States to use bases on Japanese soil for the defense of the free world unless the Japanese Government agrees to such use. In view of the imminent fall of the Kishi government and the indications that this government is likely to be succeeded by a Socialist or neutralist government, with the clear possibility that the nation will be taken over by a Communist coup at any time, the rights which we give here can very well mean that the Japanese bases upon which we have spent more than a billion dollars could not be used to defend the position of the free world.

Second. In contrast to our existing treaty, it will be possible that troops of a foreign nation can be stationed on Japanese soil without our consent. While this is not an immediate possibility, it could lead to the eventual situation wherein Communist forces could be stationed on Japanese soil, and perhaps enjoy the use of some of the same facilities constructed there with our money.

Third, and most important of all, we undertake to commit ourselves to defend the nation of Japan if that country is attacked, without any reciprocal commitment that the Japanese nation will take similar action to assist the United States if we are the victim of aggression. Under the terms and conditions to which we agree here, it could very well happen that the United States will be attacked

suddenly by intercontinental missiles and nuclear explosives. We might find within a few hours that over 40 million of our people had been killed and 80 percent of our fighting capacity destroyed by surprise.

If this Nation had been so devastated that it had little left with which to retaliate, it is entirely likely that any nation which was privileged to remain neutral would not dare subject itself to the same devastation. Under those conditions, we could predict that the Japanese Government would not permit our planes to take off from the bases in Japan. Under this treaty, the government which succeeds the Kishi regime will have the right and power to insist upon precautions to assure the compliance with article 5 of this treaty with the result that American forces in Japan will not be used to engage in hostilities outside of that nation without the agreement of the Japanese Government.

Our experience in Korea should have demonstrated how little assistance we can expect from other nations under the general terms of the United Nations Charter. It will be recalled in that instance that the Soviet Union had boycotted the Security Council and was not present to exercise its veto. This is not likely to happen in the future.

Even after the Security Council had called upon all United Nations members to resist aggression in Korea, it was only the United States that sent more than token forces. The help that we received varied from one division to an ambulance.

A nation which made one of the greatest contributions was Turkey—a nation which lies in a very exposed position to the Soviet Union. At that time, Turkey had no treaty with the United States and she was seeking to obtain a commitment that we would assist Turkey in the event of Soviet aggression. Turkey was perfectly willing and expected to make a similar commitment to respond in the event that the United States was attacked.

One of the reasons why Turkey responded so admirably compared to other members of the United Nations was the hope of Turkey that she could obtain an alliance with the United States.

This Nation is, in my judgment, foolhardy to agree to defend nations who are not willing to make a firm agreement that they will join in the common defense. Those who are unwilling to assist in the common defense have no right to request or demand that others should fight for them.

The United States has far more to offer than any other nation to the resistance of Communist aggression and Communist subversion. We have, by far, the strongest Air Force, Army, and Navy, as well as the most advanced missiles and weapons in the free world. Based on the relation of military expenditures to gross national product, the United States is making almost twice the effort being made by any of our allies, with the possible exception of those nations whose governments are being supported by the American Treasury.

How can we expect other nations to provide adequately for their own defense

when they can expect Uncle Sam to do it for them and Uncle Sam has a good reputation for keeping his word?

How can we expect them to provide anything like adequate defenses for themselves when that which they can provide is only a fraction of that which Uncle Sam will provide otherwise?

How can we expect them to fight at all when they are faced with the imminent threat of nuclear destruction on the one hand while their contribution may very well be small and undecisive on the other?

The smaller and weaker nations have every incentive and every advantage in standing aside while the great powers fight it out. A power which is privileged to remain neutral can be spared the horrors of nuclear warfare by staying out of the conflict and by bending to the will of the victor, whoever he may be, if demands should be made by that power.

A neutral government in Japan would not permit the use of American forces from Japanese bases knowing that the granting of such permission would immediately subject that nation to a charge of belligerency by the Soviet Union or by Communist China.

It would be my suggestion that this Nation should seek firm commitments from all nations of the free world that each member would join in the common defense and that each member would make an adequate contribution to that common defense. Failure of any nation to make its adequate contribution should cause it to be in default on its obligations and hence not entitled to the protection which would otherwise have been accorded.

As the Nation with the most to give, this Nation should withhold commitments to those who would not join in the common effort.

Instead of working consistently toward such a policy, our State Department has undertaken to commit us first by one treaty and next by another to defend almost every nation on earth which borders upon the Soviet Union or Communist China and almost every nation that is located anywhere in the vicinity of those great powers. Practically all of these undertakings are sufficiently vague to permit other powers to stop short of actual hostilities in the event the United States is attacked. There is no doubt of the intentions of this country that we expect to fight if those nations are attacked. The worst part of these piecemeal pacts and treaties is that, in many instances, we are committed to fight under circumstances where very few, if any, of our allies are committed to do likewise.

The Japanese Treaty is, in this respect, the worst of them all.

We undertake to defend Japan against aggression if an attack is made upon territory under the administration of Japan. Japan does not agree to fight if an attack is made upon the United States or any of its possessions, or upon any of our military units located in the Far East and outside Japanese territory.

These one-way, unilateral, lopsided agreements, always tilted against the United States, seem to be a part of a

State Department pattern to firmly pledge the United States to go to war no matter where the Communist powers may move without any serious effort to assure us that we will have strong and dependable allies at our side. The developments of postwar diplomacy—viewed in totality—amount to a tremendous diplomatic victory for many free nations over the United States of America.

At the close of World War II, nations which bordered the Soviet Union were in a very exposed position. They were in danger of being overrun by Communist armies and in need of a strong defense which an alliance with the United States could provide them. Those nations have now succeeded in working out arrangements whereby Communist movements must, in all events, be engaged by U.S. arms. There is no ironclad agreement that any of these nations will go to war under all conditions. In fact, it can hardly be said that there is a firm agreement anywhere that any of these nations will go to war under any conditions.

The United States is expected to fight under all conditions.

It would be foolish indeed for the Soviet Union to start a war by military aggression upon those nations which lie along its borders. To do so would offer the United States complete justification for striking the first blow with all of the enormous military advantages which that decision entails. If the Soviet Union has decided to embark upon a pattern of military aggression, the kind of pacts, treaties, and agreements to which this Nation has become committed since World War II gives us assurance that the entire weight of her military potential will be thrown against the United States as the first victim. The type treaty to which we here agree is conferring to another nation the protection of our arms and a free ringside seat as an observer at the fight if it should occur.

Stress has been laid upon the provision of the Japanese Constitution in which that nation renounces the right to wage war. This condition was imposed upon the Japanese by General MacArthur in pursuance of American policy at that time. Viewed from hindsight, it has been regarded as a major mistake. The Japanese as well as the Germans, notwithstanding past differences with other nations of the free world, are potentially two of the strongest forces to maintain freedom and resist Communist aggression. They should bear their fair share of the cost and burdens of freedom.

Unless and until Japan is willing to modify its Constitution to join in a common defense with other free nations, it is, in my opinion, an unwise commitment for the strongest military power in the free world to agree unilaterally to defend that nation or any other which will not make a reasonable effort to assist in a joint undertaking.

One further point should not be overlooked.

The Communist and otherwise politically inspired rioting going on in Japan

today precedes the fall of the Kishi regime. I know little of Premier Kishi but everything I know about him is good. If ratification of this treaty would save his government, I might be inclined to reconsider my position. Unfortunately, Premier Kishi is a man of peace who is on his way out of power. From all appearances, he is a marked man for assassination or other brutality at the hands of Communists and Communist sympathizers. It will not be Kishi who will administer the powers of the Japanese Government under this treaty. In all probability, the successor to the Kishi government will immediately demand renegotiation of this treaty, ratified by a lame-duck government of Japan against the stormy protests of mobs in the street.

Sooner or later—and probably sooner—our Nation will be compelled to renegotiate and make further concessions. When the renegotiations begin we will already have given away everything we could afford to give and much that we could not afford to give. We will have nothing left with which to bargain and yet we shall be compelled to make further concessions to pacify the same type mob violence of which we are being daily informed.

Accordingly, Mr. President, I see much to be lost and little to be gained by ratification of the treaty before us, and I shall cast my vote against consenting to it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the treaty which we are considering has caused me grave concern, as I am sure it has the other Members of the Senate. I have certain reservations about some of its provisions, but I feel that the serious world conditions we face today make it imperative that the Senate consent to the ratification of the treaty and do so by an overwhelming vote.

Communists in Japan have been leading riots against the ratification of this treaty, evidently because they feel that ratification would not be in the best interest of their goal of communization of the world. If we were to refuse to consent to the ratification at this time, we would be playing directly into the hands of the Communists by insuring without question not only the downfall of Mr. Kishi but of the entire Japanese Government. This would result in increased strength and prestige for the radical and rioting elements in Japan.

In addition, this treaty serves notice on Mr. Khrushchev and his Communist cohorts that the armed might of the United States stands behind the security of the Japanese people against Communist attack. If we refuse to approve the treaty, we will present the Soviets an open invitation to gobble up Japan, which, in the view of experts on world affairs, is the key to the entire Far East. Should Japan fall to communism, then all of Korea, Formosa, and other vital areas of the Far East, extending on into southeast Asia, with its huge populations and great wealth of mineral and other resources, will be endangered.

As I stated at the beginning of these remarks, I realize full well that this is by no means a perfect treaty. However, under the circumstances I have mentioned, I feel that there is no alternative to the Senate voting to consent to the ratification of the treaty, despite the very serious reservations which I have as to some provisions of it.

Mr. President, at this critical time we cannot fail to affirm our unswerving purpose to stand steadfastly by our friends throughout the free world.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, we shall soon make one of the most important decisions we shall be called upon to make at this session. The distinguished members of the Committee on Foreign Relations, on both sides of the aisle, have given the treaty their most thorough consideration. They have reported the treaty to the Senate with the recommendation that it is in the national interest to ratify it.

I am hopeful that the Senate will carefully reflect upon those recommendations, will consider them studiously, and will confirm the action of the committee.

I believe the approval of the treaty by the Senate is in the best interest of the Nation and in the best interest of the free world. In these crucial days, it is incumbent upon us, as responsible leaders, to do all we can to shore up the defenses of the free world. I think the treaty is a step in the right direction.

The distinguished Secretary of State has written to the leadership, has testified before the Committee on Foreign Relations, and as late as yesterday afternoon felt that the course of wisdom dictated that the Senate should act expeditiously and favorably upon the treaty. I trust that the Senate will support the recommendations of the Secretary of State, the President of the United States, and the Committee on Foreign Relations. I have confidence that we shall do so overwhelmingly.

I yield to the distinguished Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I join with the distinguished majority leader in urging the Senate to consent to the ratification of the treaty which is now before the Senate. I hope the treaty will not be involved in personalities, either in this country or in Japan, and that it will not be involved in any issue either in this country or in Japan.

We are, as a matter of record, faced with an accomplished fact. The treaty has passed through the Japanese Diet and has been ratified and signed by the Emperor of Japan. It is now in its final stage here.

In the best interests of both Japan and the United States, I believe the best thing we can do is to bring the matter to a speedy and successful conclusion.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thank the Senator from Montana. I believe the Senate has set a very good example for the world, because we have debated the treaty in an atmosphere of calmness and judiciousness. We have been thorough. Now we are about to resolve the matter.

I yield to the distinguished Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, when the consultations begin on a matter as solemn as a treaty, I think the experts who sit around the table are conscious of their responsibilities and who they represent. In this connection, obviously the representatives of the Japanese Government were considering some 90 million people who had their peculiar problems. The representatives of the United States, on the other hand, were thinking of a country of 180 million people who had their problems, also. To put everything together in a solemn document, ultimately to be ratified and to be placed into effect for a long period of time, is indeed a solemn responsibility. I believe all the experts have measured up to it, and have brought to us a most acceptable treaty.

As the majority whip, the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], has pointed out, the treaty was ratified in Japan. As a matter of fact, it was ratified in the Japanese Diet on the 20th day of May.

All the stormy action which took place followed a very carefully calculated pattern. It was Red inspired, even as the Japanese Prime Minister said. It followed two lines: First, an effort to stop the ratification of the treaty; second, if that could not be done, then either dissolve or prorogue or adjourn or put an end to the sessions of the Japanese Diet, because then the treaty would automatically fail.

The Japanese opposition failed on the first count. The treaty was ratified on May 20. They failed on the second count because the Diet remained in session until Saturday noon, our time, Sunday noon, Japanese time, and automatically the treaty became effective.

Under the treaty, we retain our bases; we retain our facilities. It is an 11-year treaty, meaning 10 years plus the year which is involved when notice might be given by either side. If ever there was a defeat for the Red-inspired crowd, that was it.

I add one thought. There have been many speculations as to whether the United States has lost prestige in this matter. When one wins, he does not lose prestige. When we win by having the treaty ratified, we do not lose prestige. When we win by keeping the Diet in session, we do not lose prestige. When we retain our bases, contrary to every Communist hope that the U.S. troops might ultimately be expelled from Japan, we do not lose prestige.

As we prepare for the final approval of the treaty, I concur fully in what the distinguished majority leader said. I hope there will be an overwhelming vote in favor of the ratification of the treaty.

If I might utter a fervent hope, it would be that there will be no vote against the treaty, so that when the word goes out across the Pacific, the Japanese people will know how this body acted as representative of the American people.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thank the distinguished minority leader for his very fine comment.

I conclude on this note: The alternative to this treaty is the existing treaty. I do not believe there is any question that all of us admit that what we are seeking is a better treaty than the one which exists. I am confident that the great majority of the Japanese people still prefer freedom as the way of life. I think that in the interest of freedom in Japan and the United States, and all the other countries who look to us for leadership, the treaty should be ratified.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield back the remainder of my time.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has been yielded back.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

If there be no objection, the treaty will be considered as having passed through its several parliamentary stages, up to the point of consideration of the resolution of ratification, which the clerk will read.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution of ratification, as follows:

Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of Executive E, 86th Congress, 2d session, the Treaty of Mutual Cooperation and Security between the United States of America and Japan, signed at Washington on January 19, 1960.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the resolution of ratification of the treaty?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on this question, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the resolution of ratification of the treaty?

On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina (when his name was called). On this vote, I have a pair with the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] and the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT]. If the two Senators from Pennsylvania were present and voting, they would each 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 New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNING] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] is necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNING], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPP] is absent because of death in his family. If present and voting, the Senator from Kansas would vote "yea."

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] is absent on official business, as a Member of the Senate attending the funeral of Representative Douglas H. Elliott.

The pair of the Senator from Pennsylvania has previously been announced.

The yeas and nays resulted, yeas 90, nays 2, as follows:

YEAS—90

Aiken	Ervin	Magnuson
Allott	Fong	Mansfield
Anderson	Frear	Martin
Bartlett	Fulbright	Monroney
Beall	Goldwater	Morse
Bennett	Green	Morton
Bible	Gruening	Moss
Bridges	Hart	Mundt
Brunsdale	Hartke	Murray
Bush	Hayden	Muskie
Butler	Hickenlooper	O'Mahoney
Byrd, Va.	Hill	Pastore
Byrd, W. Va.	Holland	Prouty
Cannon	Hruska	Proxmire
Capehart	Humphrey	Randolph
Carlson	Jackson	Robertson
Carroll	Javits	Saltonstall
Case, N.J.	Johnson, Tex.	Smathers
Case, S. Dak.	Jordan	Smith
Church	Keating	Sparkman
Cooper	Kennedy	Stennis
Cotton	Kerr	Symington
Curtis	Kuchel	Talmadge
Dirksen	Lausche	Thurmond
Dodd	Long, Hawaii	Wiley
Douglas	Lusk	Williams, Del.
Dworshak	McCarthy	Williams, N.J.
Eastland	McClellan	Yarborough
Ellender	McGee	Young, N. Dak.
Engle	McNamara	Young, Ohio

NAYS—2

Long, La.

Russell

NOT VOTING—8

Chavez	Hennings	Schoeppel
Clark	Johnston, S.C.	Scott
Gore	Kefauver	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 90; the nays are 2. Two-thirds of the Senators present having voted in the affirmative, the resolution of ratification is agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask that the President be notified immediately that the Senate has advised and consented to the ratification.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The President will be so notified.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS, 1961

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1674, H.R. 11776, the independent offices appropriation bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H.R. 11776) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to inform the Senate that we are going to ask the Senate to take a 5-minute recess in order that Members of the Senate, at the suggestion of the very able and distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, may have an opportunity to visit with the distinguished Prime Minister of Peru.

I should like all Members of the Senate to know we anticipate debating, and voting if possible, on the independent offices appropriation bill and the general government matters appropriations bill. These appropriation bills need to go to conference. We hope we may act on them first, and that Senators will make their speeches on extraneous matters later; but we agreed last night to consent to a 30-minute speech. Perhaps it will be necessary to give consent for an equal amount of time to the other side.

I plead with Senators to give me their cooperation, so that we may act on the bills and so they may go to conference first. Then we shall be glad to keep the Senate in session as long as necessary for Senators to make speeches on other matters.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to the minority leader.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I am sure Senators would like to be advised, if the majority leader knows at this time, what will follow the two appropriation bills, which will probably take the remainder of the day, and whether the calendar of business for tomorrow has been determined at this time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I would anticipate the order of business would be the independent offices appropriation bill first. How long it will take, I do not know. It depends largely on the desire of Members of the Senate to get the bill to conference.

Second, I would think the general government appropriations bill.

Appropriation bills have the highest priority.

Third, I would think the amendment to the Mineral Leasing Act.

Fourth, I would think Calendar No. 1553, H.R. 2565, relating to wildlife conservation on military reservations.

Fifth, Calendar No. 1588, S. 2692, relating to marine sciences, and so forth.

In addition, there are some other measures that I do not have before me at the moment, but that have been cleared by both sides and are on the calendar.

It could very well be we shall be in here late tonight and not complete action on the appropriation bill. If I could get a unanimous-consent agreement to limit debate, I would request one, but I am informed I could not. We will have to play it by ear. I do not know how many Senators will want to talk. It is important that we get these two appropriation bills to conference.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY PEDRO BELTRAN, PRIME MINISTER AND MINISTER OF FINANCE OF PERU

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the Senate is honored today by the presence of one of the most distinguished leaders of the Latin American world. I take great pleasure in introducing the Prime Minister of Peru, Senor Pedro Beltran.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate take a recess for 10 minutes in order to give Senators an opportunity to meet the Prime Minister.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arkansas? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

[Applause, Senators rising.]

Thereupon (at 2 o'clock and 20 minutes p.m.) the Senate took a recess until 2:30 p.m.

During the recess, the Prime Minister of Peru was greeted by Members of the Senate, who were presented by Mr. AIKEN.

On the expiration of the recess, the Senate reassembled, and was called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. CANNON in the chair).

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a biographic sketch of Pedro Beltran, Prime Minister and Minister of Finance of Peru.

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

BIOGRAPHIC SKETCH OF PEDRO BELTRAN, PRIME MINISTER AND MINISTER OF FINANCE OF PERU

Born in Lima on February 17, 1897, Pedro Beltran comes from the old aristocracy of Peru, with considerable land holdings and investments in mining and other enterprises. His secondary education was at the Colegio de la Recoleta in Lima, and he is a graduate of the School of Economics of the University of London. He is married to the former Miriam Kropp, of San Francisco.

Beltran's career has been devoted largely to finance, journalism, diplomacy and government. In the field of diplomacy and international financial and economic affairs, he served as Commercial Delegate of Peru to Great Britain, France, and the United

States (1940-43); member of the Inter-American Financial and Economic Advisory Committee, Washington (1940-43); delegate to the Third Meeting of Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the American Republics, Rio de Janeiro (1942); Ambassador to the United States (May 1944-November 1945); the U.N. Monetary Conference, Bretton Woods (1944); the Chapultepec Conference, Mexico City (1945); the U.N. Conference on International Organization, San Francisco (1945); and President Prado's representative on the Committee of Presidential Representatives formed to improve operations of the OAS (1957). At home Beltran has served as president of the Central Reserve Bank (1948-50); and more recently as chairman of President Prado's Committee for Agrarian Reform and Housing. In addition to managing his land holdings (including ranching) and business investments, Beltran is the owner and was long the editor of the Lima daily La Prensa, a moderate conservative paper.

By mid-1959, Peru's economic and financial situation had reached the point of serious crisis, with an increasingly unfavorable balance of trade resulting largely from a drop in the prices of Peru's major export commodities, with the near exhaustion of Peru's dollar reserves, with continued deficit spending, with an increasing spiral of inflation and with the expatriation of capital. Beltran, while serving President Prado on the aforementioned committees, was one of the Government's strongest critics as far as its financial policies were concerned, and his criticism was voiced both directly and through La Prensa. In July 1959, however, President Prado asked his critic to head a new Cabinet to face up to the crisis.

Under Beltran's firm and able leadership great strides have been made to reverse the deteriorating economic and financial situation and to restore confidence. As a result of a series of measures undertaken by the Government (as well as an improvement in the prices of Peru's export commodities), Peru's unfavorable trade balance has been converted to a favorable one, deficit spending has been largely halted, dollar reserves have grown notably, the inflationary spiral has been checked and flight capital has been returning. With the restoration of a sound, stable economy, Beltran is now in a position to undertake his longer range economic and social program, encompassing the fields of economic development, housing, agrarian reform, colonization, etc.

As far as the United States is concerned, Prime Minister Beltran is one of our staunchest friends both in the political and economic spheres of international relations. A firm believer in the free enterprise system, he is in full sympathy with Peru's policy of encouraging American capital investment. His friendship is frank, however, and he has not hesitated to criticize certain U.S. policies with which he disagrees.

WORLD FOOD BANK

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, the headlines of yesterday's morning paper from Minot, N. Dak., report that Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON has made the distribution of food surpluses to needy people around the world through the United Nations a major plank in his farm program.

The Vice President revealed that President Eisenhower had intended to make the proposal at the summit conference in Paris last month.

The proposal is extremely familiar to me. As a matter of fact, I was the author, together with a number of other Senators, of resolutions in both the 83d

and 84th Congresses to initiate a World Food Bank.

On March 30, 1955, in the 84th Congress, I introduced Senate Resolution 86, for myself, Mr. Case of South Dakota, Mr. Chavez, Mr. Douglas, Mr. Hennings, Mr. Hill, Mr. Humphrey, Mr. Jackson, Mr. Kefauver, Mr. Kerr, Mr. Kilgore, Mr. Lehman, Mr. Long of Louisiana, Mr. Magnuson, Mr. Mansfield, Mr. Morse, Mr. Mundt, Mr. Neely, Mr. Neuberger, Mr. Scott, Mr. Sparkman, Mr. Stennis, and Mr. Young. The resolution declared it the policy of the Congress that the United States participate with other nations under the auspices of the United Nations, the Food and Agriculture Organization, and other specialized international agencies in sponsoring an international food and raw materials reserve.

The resolution authorized and requested the President to enter into international negotiations on a specific international agreement or agreements along the lines proposed.

Hearings were held on Senate Resolution 86 on May 28 and 29, 1956. Assistant Secretary of Agriculture Earl L. Butz advised the subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Committee that—

We see no need for the proposed World Food Bank or the proposed food and raw materials reserve.

Thorston B. Kalijarvi, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, advised the committee that the proposed World Food Bank would be unmanageable. He was concerned by interference with free market forces. He advised the committee:

The inherent difficulties in managing such programs would surely be increased by the multiplicity and conflict of interests represented through a large number of participating governments.

In view of the existing programs, and in view of the prospective heavy cost, negotiating and administering difficulty and threat of displacement of normal trade and interference with private enterprise connected with the proposed food bank or materials reserve, the Department is unable to support Resolution 85 or 86.

It is heartening to know, despite the wasted years, that the Vice President and the President of the United States now regard an international food agency as a workable, promising, and enlightened proposal.

In view of the new situation, I resubmit in my own behalf, and in behalf of any others who may wish to join me, a copy of Senate Resolution 86 of the 84th Congress, edited slightly to bring up to date section 1, which is in the nature of a preamble. I request that the resolution lie on the desk until Friday, June 24, so any other Members who care to do so may join in its authorship.

Now that the Vice President is for it and the President was prepared to propose a world food agency at the summit conference, perhaps we can get some action on this proposal before the Congress adjourns rather than wait another year while it is used as a political vehicle.

I do not desire to discourage the Vice President in any way in taking the position on this matter which he took in North Dakota yesterday. I ran for re-

election to the Senate on it in 1954 and won. I might add that I won in spite of an effort to smear me which is today being repeated against the Democratic candidate for the Senate in North Dakota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the resolution will lie on the desk until June 24, as requested.

The resolution (S. Res. 340) was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate of the United States hereby finds that—

(a) the prices and incomes received by American farmers have been declining and threaten to decline still further in the future;

(b) there is need to increase the export of American farm products;

(c) shrinkage in foreign markets for American farm products might bring about a decline in farm and national income which could not be offset, even with a more adequate system of farm credit, price supports, and stockpiling programs;

(d) the world market for farm commodities and raw materials has historically been characterized by fluctuations which adversely affect prices, undermine the security of producers, and impede steady expansion consistent with the need for larger supplies of food, clothing, and other commodities as basic elements in expanding economies and improved living standards;

(e) fluctuations in the level of the prices of primary materials have had disruptive effects on world production and trade, and declines in the general level of these prices have historically been important factors in world economic depressions;

(f) food, clothing, and other essential supplies per person in many areas of the world are far below the minimum required for healthful and productive living;

(g) the people in some countries live under the ever-present threat of famine and starvation;

(h) the development of more adequate reserves of farm products and other raw materials would provide essential safeguards against shortages resulting from natural causes such as drought, flood, and pestilence; from breakdowns in distribution; from inflation, insurrection, and war;

(i) the ever-present threat of a major decline in the level of raw-material prices makes it impossible for underdeveloped countries to proceed with the confidence that is needed for their orderly development; and

(j) the existence of a reserve from which could be drawn, in time of need, some of the basic materials from which food, clothing, and other essentials are produced, would be an important step toward strengthening democracy throughout the world and creating the economic foundations and the atmosphere of hope and confidence necessary for world peace.

SEC. 2. It is the policy of the Congress that the United States participate with other nations, under the auspices of the United Nations, the Food and Agriculture Organization, and other specialized international agencies, in establishing an International Food and Raw Materials Reserve which would—

(a) provide for the acquisition and appropriate storage, in the United States and in other countries, of raw or processed farm products and other raw materials, such acquisition to take place at times when overall surpluses of such materials would otherwise cause undesirable price movements;

(b) be developed in a manner that will help to prevent extreme price fluctuations

in the international market for farm products and other raw materials and keep production expanding to meet the world's pressing need for more food, clothing, and other essential supplies;

(c) be used to prevent famine and starvation;

(d) help absorb temporary market surpluses of farm products and other raw materials;

(e) provide for the use of currencies paid to the International Food and Raw Materials Reserve by purchasers of materials, or for the use of instruments of credit issued in connection with the operations of the Reserve, to finance purchases of raw or processed products or to assist in the financing of approved economic and social development programs, formulated in cooperation with the appropriate international lending, economic development, and technical assistance agencies, such programs to include (without being limited to) those which further universal public general and vocational education, literacy, public health and medical care.

SEC. 3. The President and his representatives before the United Nations and the Food and Agriculture Organization and other appropriate international bodies are hereby authorized and requested to enter into international negotiations for the purpose of preparing a specific plan and a proposed international agreement or agreements on the creation of an International Food and Raw Materials Reserve along the general lines set forth in section 2 hereof.

SEC. 4. The plan and agreement or agreements developed in accordance with section 3 hereof, together with full supporting material and information on operating methods, shall be presented to the Senate of the United States for approval.

NATIONAL CLEARINGHOUSE OF INFORMATION ON CROOKED BUSINESS SCHEMES

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, on May 10, I introduced, on behalf of the senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and myself, a bill (S. 3530) to authorize the Attorney General to maintain records of fraudulent and other unethical business practices. The purpose of the bill is to make it easier for State and local authorities to keep tabs on business racketeers, and to make it as difficult as possible for unscrupulous promoters to set up fly-by-night operations in locality after locality throughout the country.

The bill was an outgrowth of recommendations made by the attorney general of New York, the Honorable Louis J. Lefkowitz, who has done outstanding work in the field. Attorney General Lefkowitz recently wrote a letter to each member of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, explaining the importance of the establishment of the clearinghouse proposed in the bill, and urging its support. I know that many Members of the Senate will be interested in Attorney General Lefkowitz' comments on this important subject, and I therefore ask unanimous consent that the text of his letter be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

NEW YORK, N.Y., June 15, 1960.

DEAR SENATOR: I am writing to urge your support of S. 3530 (cosponsored by Sena-

tors KEATING and JAVITS) and now before the Committee on the Judiciary.

This bill authorizes the Attorney General of the United States to maintain, and make available to other governmental and private agencies, records of injunctions, dissolutions and other civil and administrative actions involving unethical or fraudulent business practices.

There is a shocking scope to the frauds, deceptions and illegal practices which enable a relatively small segment of business and security racketeers to drain millions of dollars from the consumer and investor each year.

Shady operators and their slick schemes not only rob the consumer but do incalculable harm to the legitimate businessman. Through monopolistic practices which destroy free competition and impose arbitrary price premiums, they squeeze a bit more out of the consumer's pocketbook. Silently and unseen, they drive upward the cost of living and add to inflationary pressures.

Unscrupulous securities promoters not alone defraud the investor but undermine public confidence in the integrity of capital markets, and deprive industry of the mechanism by which is raised the capital required to serve the economic needs of our people.

In New York State, and in other States I am sure, law enforcement agencies are carrying on a vigorous fight to drive these business charlatans out of business. But these unprincipled operators do not give up easily. The individual or firm driven out of business in one State moves to another location and continues fraudulent activities there. Without a central agency which can catalog and make the pertinent information available to all States and local agencies we find ourselves in a merry-go-round situation.

The central clearing medium established by S. 3530 would be the center for an exchange of information. Here would be gathered and cross indexed all data concerning these operators and the schemes and devices which they use to bilk the public. Such information could be made available to governmental agencies and law enforcement forces fighting for business decency. The scheming promoter who is thrown out of one State will find that his record has preceded him to every other place where he may seek to set up shop.

I am taking the liberty of enclosing a copy of the statement released by Senator KEATING in connection with this bill. I respectfully urge you to give S. 3530 your full support.

Best wishes.

Cordially yours,

LOUIS J. LEFKOWITZ,
Attorney General of New York.

NEED FOR FEDERAL AIR POLLUTION CONTROL EFFORTS

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, several weeks ago I spoke on the floor and discussed my views on the great and pressing need to control air pollution in our Nation's major industrial and metropolitan areas. Although I am by no means expert in this field, I feel strongly that we must correct the all too widely held notion that the air we breathe can also serve as America's wastebasket.

In my remarks on May 24 I spoke of a number of the most common causes of air pollution and of existing Federal, State, and local agencies which are working hard to combat them. I am delighted that these efforts are going forward, and I certainly intend, wherever possible, to be of assistance in this very

vital work. In this statement I paid special attention to the programs on air pollution research carried out by the Public Health Service and of the attitude of the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, which, of course, is responsible for the implementation and coordination of all of the activities of the Federal Government in assisting in the fight against air pollution.

Mr. President, I was very gratified to recently receive a letter from Secretary Flemming of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in which he comments on my remarks on the floor and in which he discusses the problem of air pollution and the types of legislation which are needed to expand our Federal programs in this area. The Secretary clearly asserts that "air pollution problems are not confined to any specific section of our country." He further states that "We think it is important that the Federal Government exercise leadership in the development of measures needed for coping with this problem."

I think this thesis is a sound one and is extremely significant. Certainly the air pollution problem crosses State boundaries and is national in its scope and impact. New York's air this morning may be New Jersey's this afternoon.

Mr. President, the position and attitude of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare on the matter of air pollution control is both constructive and realistic. I commend the Secretary for the leadership which he has taken in this field and ask unanimous consent that his letter to me, dated June 20, be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

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

THE SECRETARY OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
Washington, D.C., June 21, 1960.

HON. KENNETH KEATING,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR KEATING: We have read with interest your statement regarding air pollution in the May 24 issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, a copy of which was forwarded with your memorandum of June 3.

Your statement clearly delineates the fact that air pollution is of national significance, and outlines the need for greater attention to air pollution problems by many groups in our society.

It is important to note that air pollution problems are not confined to any specific section of our country. Air pollution of the type which has been widely publicized as afflicting certain sections of the west coast has been measured in significant quantities, and its effects on vegetation have been recorded now in some 19 States and the District of Columbia. Similarly, one recent study by the Public Health Service has shown the widespread occurrence of 3,4-benzopyrene, a pollutant of suspected health significance, to be present in varying quantities in the atmospheres of over 100 cities included in the survey. All in all, it is fair to state that all of our urban communities of appreciable size have air pollution problems which, of course, may vary in degree and character from one location to another. Inevitably, the air pollution potential nationally may be expected to increase significantly because of our growing population and economy, and increasing urbanization.

We think it is important that the Federal Government exercise leadership in the development of measures needed for coping with this problem. A good start has been made along these lines under the provisions of Public Law 84-159, which authorized a research and technical assistance program in the Public Health Service. It is important that this program be further strengthened. The recent enactment of Public Law 86-493, providing for an intensification of research by the Public Health Service into the health-related aspects of automobile exhausts, will be helpful. We consider it highly necessary, also, that favorable consideration be given to the amendments to the Air Pollution Control Act which we forwarded to the Congress and which have been embodied in H.R. 10696 and S. 3108.

We sincerely appreciate your interest in and concern about the overall problem of air pollution. We, too, are much concerned with the hazard to health and well-being which is posed by air pollution.

Sincerely yours,

ARTHUR S. FLEMMING,
Secretary.

AGRICULTURAL PROGRAM

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to express my thanks and appreciation to the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] for again reminding us of his leadership through the several Congresses relating to the establishment of a world food bank or an international food and fiber reserve under the general provisions of the Charter of the United Nations. I am well aware of the activities of the Senator from Montana, because I was one of his cosponsors on that measure, and it was my privilege to participate in the hearings to which the Senator from Montana has referred in the Committee on Foreign Relations when the proposal of the Senator from Montana, the Senator from Minnesota, and others, along with the proposal of the late Senator from North Carolina, Kerr Scott, was also before us.

I have commented on the statement of the Senator from Montana because the measures to which he has referred, and which we have had before us in several Congresses, and other related measures, some of which, by the way, have been passed by the Congress, are now back in headline news.

In the Midwest on June 30, while speaking at Minot, N. Dak., and extending his assistance to the Republican candidate for the U.S. Senate against the Democratic candidate, Mr. QUENTIN BURDICK, the Vice President of the United States outlined his views relating to agricultural policy. I have in my hands a copy of the address of the Vice President. Many parts of his speech I find reassuring. Many parts I find at least interesting from an historical point of view. Many parts I find very general, loosely drawn and without any specific nature.

For example, the Vice President of the United States said:

Putting it bluntly, there has been a political stalemate between the administration and Congress over the past 5 years. The majority in Congress has persisted in refusing to face up to the farm problem, and it continues to support obsolete solutions which were conceived for an entirely different period and for different problems.

After those pointed remarks towards the majority, the Vice President made a generous, kindly remark about the administration. He said:

The administration, on the other hand, has sought solutions which were in effect a reversal of previous policies. The result has been that Congress has refused to approve the administration's program, but has not come forward with one of its own which the administration could accept.

Mr. President, the fact is that the majority has passed five farm bills since 1953 and five farm bills have been vetoed. The fact is that the majority has been compelled, because some of the provisions of the farm legislation were expiring, to renew these provisions with administration-supported modifications leading into what we call the flexible price support program, including the reduction of controls over production and marketing, which has been basic to the agricultural philosophy of the administration.

The philosophy of those of us of the majority has not been sustained, because we have not had the two-thirds vote necessary to override the vetoes. The philosophy of the administration on agricultural economics is the prevailing law of the day. Its effect is clear; its effect is unmistakable. There are fewer farms and fewer farmers; there is lower farm income, higher farm production, accumulated surpluses, an increase in farm mortgages at the rate of \$600 million a year, a tremendous increase in the Government's holdings of surplus commodities; and a fantastic increase in the cost of the operation of the Department of Agriculture even though there are fewer farmers and fewer farms. That is the result of the administration's farm program.

It will do us no good at this late date to argue the merits and demerits of the administration's farm program. That question has been decided by the farmers themselves. Most of them have rebuked it, and those who have not will have their opportunity to do so in the months ahead, specifically, in November. I have a feeling they will then make manifestly clear their views relating to the administration's farm program. At least, I am sure that will be so in the Midwest.

What I should like to comment upon are the proposals of the Vice President relating to the expansion of the rural development program, strategic food reserves, commercial uses of surpluses of agricultural commodities, and the international food and fiber program.

I find all of these proposals most interesting. I find all of them issues which some of us have fought for in the Congress for years. Each and every one of these suggestions has been resisted by the administration as if it were consummate evil. The Vice President of the United States has purloined, so to speak, a number of proposals such as that of the Senator from Montana (Mr. MURRAY), and he now claims them as his own.

For a period of time the administration refused to recognize even the existence of these agricultural children—for example, emergency food reserves—but

now they would like to claim them as blood sons.

Let me start with the rural development program. I quote from the Vice President's message. Mr. Nixon said in Minot, N. Dak., appealing essentially to farmers:

The rural development program, which has been so successful, should be expanded so that the marginal farmers can supplement their income and not be forced to move from the rural communities in which they live.

That is a noble expression of philosophy and policy, but an expression of the philosophy and policy that is adhered to by this administration in token proportions only.

Let me give the facts. The rural development program was initiated in 1955 and passed by this Congress. It was supposedly expanded by the administration to 30 rural counties by September 30, 1957—30 counties out of the thousands of counties in the United States.

In 1960 there are still 30 counties in this pilot program. It started as a pilot program. It continues as a pilot program. With only 30 rural counties in the pilot program, still the Vice President of the United States, speaking to the farm people of North Dakota, said that the rural development program which has been so successful should be expanded so that marginal farmers can supplement their income.

I agree it should be expanded. I have been an advocate of its expansion. I have quizzed representatives of the Department of Agriculture repeatedly about its expansion, and they have refused to move. Their feet are imbedded in political concrete, and their imagination with regard to farm programs is without substance. The effect is that the rural development program remains only a pilot program, instead of being pushed forward as a positive aid and improvement to the farm economy.

I would suggest to Mr. Nixon that the people of North Dakota are well aware of the needs of agriculture. Where Mr. Nixon should have taken his message was to the Secretary of Agriculture. Where Mr. Nixon should have taken his message and suggestions was to the President of the United States. Mr. Nixon is a member of the "Eisenhower team." He has been a loyal player on the "team." He says he is going to run on the record of the administration. He is a part of it.

I must say for Mr. Benson, for whom I have had many words of criticism, that I must say a word of praise at this time. He likes to keep the record straight. In recent months the Vice President, carefully checking back in his files, has found that the Secretary of Agriculture is a political liability in many areas of the country, if not all. Looking forward to his hoped-for but not-to-be-realized occupancy of the White House, the Vice President has suggested that he has a program different from that of Mr. Benson, that he disagrees with Mr. Benson, that he disagrees with the administration. But I should like to say, for the integrity of the Secretary of Agriculture, that he is unwilling to let such

a tricky answer, such a tricky proposal, be pulled on the American people. He is not for such a slick deal. He says that Mr. Nixon has been part and parcel of the program. He says Mr. Nixon was one of the architects of the program. He cannot imagine Mr. Nixon's not supporting it, because he helped to design it.

I compliment Mr. Benson for his words of integrity, his words of honesty, and his clear and unqualified statement. The Secretary of Agriculture is not about to let RICHARD MILHOUS NIXON, the Vice President of the United States, avoid responsibility for the disastrous policies which this administration has followed.

Mr. President, the family farm yardstick credit bill, S. 2111, which the Senator from Minnesota and others introduced, under title V, proposes a positive action program for the development of family farms in 500 counties having the largest low income farm population. Under this title, means are provided to insure adequate credit facilities to implement farm and home plans and to increase the income-producing ability of farm units; to assist in securing part and full time employment opportunities for farm people; to provide vocational training to adults, both in farm and home management and in other farm and non-farm activities in order to maximize family income and productivity of family labor; and to provide industrial dispersion in rural areas in the interest of increased employment and national security. This administration's Department of Agriculture submitted an adverse report on the family farm yardstick credit bill. It said it was opposed to all titles of the bill.

Regarding the Family Farm Development Act, title V, the Department report said: More experience is needed.

Mr. President, this administration is addicted to slow learning. By the time it gets enough experience to do something about a problem, the problem has consumed the people who have been beset with the problem.

So, Mr. Nixon's advice on the necessity of a rural development program fell on ears that had heard these soothing words many times. The farm people in North Dakota are fully aware that their needs are not being met. I think they will respond accordingly.

What is the next point Mr. NIXON made in his address? He said:

Our major aim and our major effort must be, however, not to reduce production but to expand markets for farm products and to increase consumption.

That is a noble thought, with which I fully agree:

There are three proposals in this area that I think are among those that are worthy of consideration. Governor Rockefeller, in his recent appearance in North Dakota, proposed that a year's supply of food for the Nation be set aside against the eventuality of an atomic attack. This is a sound and constructive proposal and I would only add that because a 1-year or a 2-year reserve would represent an enormous permanent storage burden in its present form, a research program should be undertaken to find economically feasible ways to convert surplus grains into storable form.

Mr. President, this is called the strategic food reserve program. Is it new? The proposal has been made in Congress. Here are the facts:

Back on February 8, 1955, the Senator from Minnesota proposed a national food and fiber policy.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a press release issued by me relating to the proposal.

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

SENATOR HUMPHREY PROPOSES NATIONAL FOOD AND FIBER POLICY

Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota, called upon the Congress today to adopt a national food and fiber policy setting guideposts for wise use of America's abundance.

Senator HUMPHREY introduced a resolution asking establishment of a national policy for the production and utilization of food and fiber so as to make full economic use of the productive capacity of U.S. farms to improve domestic nutrition and clothing standards, and buttress the foreign policy of the United States. Cosponsors include Senators Neuberger, Lehman, Scott, Langer, McNamara, Murray, Mansfield, and Neely.

"The great productive ability of American farmers and farm families should be put fully to work in the interest of national security and the maintenance of the health, efficiency, and morale of the American people," Senator HUMPHREY declared.

He described the resolution as a companion to one previously introduced calling for establishment of an American family farm policy, saying both were intended to clarify objectives "in the national interest," and to serve as a yardstick for future legislation aimed at achieving such objectives.

The new resolution declares it the policy of the Congress that:

1. The means of obtaining sufficient food for an adequate diet and clothing for an adequate standard will be placed, so far as possible, within the reach of every person in the Nation;

2. The food and fiber products on American farms and not needed for fully adequate domestic consumption will be put to work to implement U.S. foreign policy through facilitating—

(a) The inauguration of universal public general and vocational education systems in friendly nations not now having them,

(b) more rapid economic development that will expand markets and increase consumer purchasing power in friendly nations,

(c) the elimination of the threat of starvation and famine; and

(d) increases in the security and income-earning capacities of farm families in friendly nations;

3. Adequate safety reserves of farm commodities and of food and fiber products will be developed and maintained;

4. Extreme price fluctuations in the international market for farm products will be prevented and production will be kept expanding; and

5. American farm families will be assured of adequate income to maintain a standard of living equivalent to those afforded persons dependent upon other gainful occupations, while maintaining full production on the family farms of the Nation, conserving and improving the Nation's farm soil and water resources, and meeting all costs of production and capital replacement.

The resolution calls upon the President to incorporate in the Economic Report required by the Employment Act of 1946 a program for carrying out the policy, together with such recommendations for legislation

as he may deem necessary or advisable in connection with the program.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I have before me the proceedings of the Senate for February 27, 1956. At that time the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] joined me in offering what we called the national security reserve amendment. The amendment is found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 102, part 3, page 3355. The debate is found on pages 4168, 4169, 4170, 4172, and 4175. This proposal was incorporated in the Agricultural Act of 1956, to provide for a national security reserve of food, to meet emergency conditions in the United States.

The Agricultural Act of 1956 provides in section 201(b) in part as follows:

(2) The Secretary shall submit to Congress within 90 days after the enactment of this act detailed programs, with recommendations for any additional legislation needed to carry out such programs * * * (3) for strategic stockpiling of foodstuffs and other agricultural products (A) in the United States and (B) outside the United States as authorized in section 415 of the Mutual Security Act of 1954.

The Secretary of Agriculture submitted his report, required by the act, and it came to us in January 1957.

On the subject of a strategic food reserve, a safety reserve, the Secretary said:

Strategic stockpiling of food for emergency use in the event of nuclear attack upon this country would present extensive difficulties and involve substantial costs. The inadequacy of suitable warehousing facilities, the difficulties of management and rotation of supplies, and other problems such as to make stockpiling on a large scale undesirable if it can be avoided without undue risk to the population.

Instead of borrowing the idea from Mr. Rockefeller, I say with all due modesty that Mr. Nixon borrowed it from the Senator from Minnesota and the Senator from Oregon. He borrowed it from the law of 1956, to which his own administration has said, "No, no, that cannot and will not be done."

I shall not burden the RECORD with the debate of 1956. I have made reference to it, and it is available for all to see. I merely want the Senate to know that the proposal was offered as a floor amendment, that it was adopted, and that the legislative history is crystal clear.

The Family Farm Program Development Act, S. 2502, introduced by the senior Senator from Minnesota and others, authorizes and directs the Secretary of Agriculture, among other things, to submit a domestic food and fiber program for the United States, including provisions for a national security reserve of food and fiber products designed to protect people of the United States against shortages of such products in the event of war or other national emergency.

The bill also directs the Secretary to submit an international food and fiber program. It directs the Secretary to submit to Congress a comprehensive study of the food needs of the free world and a plan by which the United States

could join with other surplus-producing nations in meeting these needs. I say this particularly, and most respectfully, to the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY].

The Family Farm Program Development Act also offers a method "whereby the farmers themselves have a greater opportunity to choose the kind of farm program that they want—that is what Mr. Nixon says he supports.

What was the attitude of the Department of Agriculture on the domestic food and fiber program and the international food and fiber program in this bill?

The Department of Agriculture recommended against every one of the provisions of the bill. The programs proposed were in conflict, the Department said, and the Bureau of the Budget said, with the President's program.

Mr. Nixon cannot be on the "Eisenhower team" on Sunday, and get off the team at Minot, N. Dak., on Monday.

If he is going to take credit for Mr. Eisenhower's popularity, or to share in Mr. Eisenhower's popularity, he will have to share in responsibility for the undesirability of some of the administration's programs and for the adverse comment made by the administration on more worthy program proposals.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pertinent sections of the bill to which I have referred, together with the report of the Department of Agriculture, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

TITLE II—DOMESTIC FOOD AND NUTRITION PROGRAM

SEC. 201. (a) The Secretary of Agriculture (hereafter called the Secretary) is authorized and directed to formulate annually and submit to the Congress on or before February 1 of each year a domestic food and fiber program for the United States, both immediate and long range, together with budgetary estimates for carrying out such program in the first year and in subsequent years of operation.

(b) Any food and fiber program submitted by the Secretary pursuant to subsection (a) shall include provisions for—

(1) expanding and liberalizing the national school lunch program (carried out under the National School Lunch Act) and the special milk program for children (carried out under the Act of July 1, 1958 (72 Stat. 276));

(2) a food allotment program under which the nutritional needs of low income persons, the unemployed, the aged, and the handicapped will be more adequately fulfilled; and

(3) a national security reserve of food and fiber products designed to protect people of the United States against shortages of such products in the event of war or other national emergency.

TITLE III—INTERNATIONAL FOOD AND FIBER PROGRAM

SEC. 301. (a) The Secretary is authorized and directed to cause a study to be made for the purpose of determining the annual fiber, food, and nutritional deficiency in the world and submit a report of such study to the Congress annually on or before February 1 of each year. He shall include in such report—

(1) recommendations as to the fair and feasible share of that deficiency which should

be met from food products produced in the United States;

(2) recommendations for making food and fiber products produced in the United States available to aid in meeting such deficiency; and

(3) estimates of the annual cost of carrying out such program.

(b) The program specified in subsection (a) shall be planned as a long-term program in order to facilitate the effective use of food products made available in the recipient countries. Such program shall be planned in such a manner as to be consistent with the international objectives of the United States and so as not to interfere with the commercial trading activities of friendly exporting countries; but planned so as to afford maximum economic benefit to the recipient countries.

TITLE IV—ADJUSTING SUPPLY AND DEMAND

SEC. 401. (a) Whenever the Secretary determines that the supply of any agricultural commodity exceeds effective demand at a fair price, he shall establish for each such farm commodity a farm commodity program development committee to be composed of representative producers of such commodity. Each such committee shall be composed of members elected from their own number by the producers of such commodity and shall be established and operated in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary.

(b) Whenever any such farm commodity program development committee recommends it, the Secretary is authorized to conduct a referendum of the producers of such commodity to determine whether they favor a national marketing quota for such commodity as outlined by the Secretary after the consultation and guidance of the commodity committee. If two-thirds or more of the producers voting in any such referendum vote in favor of such a program, the Secretary shall submit to the Congress a national marketing program for the commodity concerned in conformity with principles hereafter outlined in this title, together with estimates of the annual costs of each such program.

(c) The national marketing quota for any marketing year in the case of any farm commodity for which a marketing program is effectuated pursuant to subsection (b) shall be an amount of such commodity which will move in domestic and foreign markets in such marketing year, as determined by the Secretary, at a fair price for such commodity, taking into account the amount of such commodity to be utilized pursuant to any program effectuated under title II and III of this Act.

(d) With respect to any national marketing quota program submitted to the Congress under subsection (a), the Secretary shall—

(1) establish the necessary production adjustment and orderly marketing control procedures for the commodities concerned, including the necessary incentives or penalties to effect compliance with the program;

(2) establish procedures for transferring sales quotas among producers in the same area, and among different areas; and

(3) utilize, as may be necessary for the effective administration of such program, any alternative income stabilization methods, individually or in combination, including but not limited to crop loans, marketing premium payments, marketing agreements, marketing orders, surplus diversion purchases, purchase agreements, export incentive payments, export equalization payments, stabilization pools, or income deficiency or compensatory payments direct to farmers, in order to achieve the fair price objectives of this legislation at the lowest possible cost to consumers and taxpayers: *Provided, however,* That in no instance shall any individual

farm operator receive total Government payments of more than \$5,000 for such purposes in any one marketing year, or more than \$25,000 in crop loans.

(e) The term "fair price" as used in this section means, with respect to any commodity, the price which will yield returns on capital and labor (on representative family farms) comparable to nonfarm earnings, as determined by the Secretary on the basis of costs and returns collected and published annually by the United States Department of Agriculture for typical family-operated commercial farms.

(f) If the Secretary determines that the fair price for any commodity encourages competition from synthetics or tends to otherwise significantly reduce domestic consumption or export of such commodity, or in the case of oilseeds the products thereof, he may allow the commodity to move through the market at a competitive price and pay the difference between the competitive price and the fair price as a compensatory payment directly to the producer.

(g) Unless any such marketing program submitted to the Congress under provisions of this title is disapproved by concurrent resolution of the Congress after sixty days after submission by the Secretary, it shall be placed into operation; and all other previously existing price-support provisions for such commodity shall be suspended for the period for which such program is in effect.

(h) The Secretary shall use funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation for the purposes of implementing this title.

TITLE VI—LOW PRODUCTION FARMS

SEC. 601. (a) The Secretary is authorized and directed (1) to review and report to the Congress the progress of the rural development program in solving the production and income problems of low production and low income family farms, and (2) to submit to the Congress, within six months after the date of the enactment of this Act, further recommendations for dealing more effectively and more rapidly with these problems, and (3) to submit estimates of the costs of carrying out such recommendations.

(b) The Secretary shall, with respect to any recommendation submitted pursuant to subsection (a), consider, but not be limited by—

(1) the use of increased supervised credit to help speed farm reorganization and to help achieve more efficient sized and better organized farm units;

(2) the establishment of special services, including individual farm and home management guidance;

(3) the feasibility of payment of special grants to assist families with poor economic futures in agriculture who may desire to seek more gainful opportunities; and

(4) better protection for the benefit of families or persons who gain their living primarily as hired farm workers; and

(5) stimulation of further industrial development in underdeveloped rural areas; and

(6) the desirability of extending the United States Employment Service to rural areas and providing counseling service to people living in rural areas.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the Vice President had something to say about the commercial uses of agricultural commodities. It was a very splendid statement.

I may say to Mr. Nixon that his speech had statesmanlike qualities to it. The speech contained some wonderful features. There is only one thing wrong with it. It is all fluff and no substance. It has no follow through. If Mr. Nixon could not convince his own administration, how does he think he will convince

the clear thinking people of North Dakota? If he could not convince his own President, Secretary of Agriculture, and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, how does he expect to convince the general constituency? The power has been in the hands of the administration to do everything which Mr. Nixon has recommended, but the administration has refused to act on every count. Yet the Vice President of the United States now says that he has something new to offer. It is about as new as Ben Franklin's Almanac.

Relating to the expansion of the commercial uses of farm commodities, I quote:

I believe the amount of effort we are presently devoting to research for expanding the commercial uses of farm products is inadequate. It is an established practice in business to allot funds for basic research which bear a proper relationship to the overall magnitude of the problem to be dealt with. It doesn't make sense to spend only \$16 million a year on finding new uses for agricultural products when we are spending \$5 billion a year in financing and storing surplus farm products.

Mr. President, what is the record? In the 1st session of the 86th Congress, the Senate passed a bill, S. 690, to provide for research into the increased use of agricultural products for industrial purposes. The bill was introduced on January 27, 1959. Its sponsors were the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIER], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE], the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], and me.

The Department of Agriculture submitted an adverse report on the bill, stating:

We support the objectives the bills are designed to achieve, but oppose their enactment.

In other words, the Department supported the objectives but opposed anything being done about them.

S. 690 passed the Senate on July 27, 1959. The bill is now in conference, and the administration has been blocking it at every step of the way. I suggest most respectfully to the distinguished Vice President that he use his eloquence, his persuasive logic, and his unique rhetorical ability upon the administration. It has passed the Senate and House in a form which requires a conference. It could be enacted in this Congress. I suggest that the help of the Vice President will be mightily appreciated.

Finally, within the limitations of my time, I quote further from the speech of the Vice President:

There is a third area which provides by far the best opportunity for making our food surpluses a national asset rather than a liability as they tend to be today. I refer to the use of our foods in the humane, as distinguished from the commercial market abroad.

Then the Vice President points out:

The first step would have been to call a conference of all the surplus-producing nations, including the Soviet Union. These nations would then work out a joint proposal for a multilateral program under which the food surpluses of all nations which desired to participate would have been turned

over to United Nations agencies for distribution to the hungry people of member nations.

Mr. President, that proposal is not new. A World Food Board was proposed immediately after World War II by Lord John Boyd-Orr, the first Director General of the World Food and Agriculture Organization. It was widely supported by nations around the world, but failed at that time because of the hesitancy of the United States and Great Britain to give it their support.

An International Commodity Clearinghouse was later proposed by the so-called Committee of Exports of the Food and Agriculture Organization and the International Federation of Agricultural Producers.

In 1954 the International Federation of Agricultural Producers, meeting in Nairobi, Kenya, adopted a report declaring:

The matter of a world food reserve should be kept under active consideration and to that end, the Committee recommends that the Secretariat prepare a study indicating the nature of the machinery needed to implement the plan and the obstacles that have stood in the way of attainment of this objective and giving all possible suggestions as to how such obstacles might be overcome.

The study was prepared in thorough detail. Necessary subsequent action to put the findings into building a concrete program has not been taken.

In 1955, in the 1st session of the 84th Congress, the following resolutions were submitted:

Senate Resolution 85, World Food Bank. Sponsors: Scott of North Carolina, and MURRAY.

Senate Resolution 86, International Food and Raw Materials Reserve. Sponsors: Murray, Humphrey, Case of South Dakota, Javits, Douglas, Hennings, Hill, Jackson, Kefauver, Kerr, Kilgore, Lehman, Long, Magnuson, Mansfield, Morse, Mundt, Neeley, Neuberger, Scott, Sparkman, Stennis, Young of North Dakota.

Hearings on these proposals were held May 28, and 29, 1956, before a special subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations. I was chairman of this subcommittee. Witnesses for the State Department, the Department of Agriculture, and the Department of Interior, all testified in strong opposition to these measures. The Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Economic Affairs testified that: "It is hard to visualize how an operation of this nature could be 'businesslike.'"

The Assistant Secretary of Agriculture stated "we see no need" for the proposals.

On July 18, 1956, the Committee on Foreign Relations reported Senate Resolution 316. This resolution expressed the sense of the Senate that the President should explore with other nations the establishment of an International Food and Raw Materials Reserve under the auspices of the United Nations.

There was strong objection to the resolution by the administration. It was stated at the time that we should not act. The Republican administration had every opportunity to do so, but it prevented any exploration of the possibilities

of the suggestion, and discouraged official discussions of it.

I might add that the mutual security authorization bill of 1956, as passed by the Senate, included a request to the executive branch to take the initiative in negotiations for the establishment of a World Food Bank or an International Food and Raw Materials Reserve. I offered that amendment. It was adopted. Due to administration opposition, this section was deleted from the bill in the conference. The administration firmly refused to act.

I may say to the Vice President that I was a delegate to the United Nations and handled the subject of international food reserves for our Government in the United Nations. I wanted an international food and fiber organization, such as the Vice President now talks about. However, the State Department, the President, and the United States delegation to the United Nations opposed it.

I went to see the Secretary of State and the representatives in the State Department and insisted that the Government of the United States quit dragging its feet on the use of our surplus foods for international purposes and to relieve suffering. As a result, a compromise was effectuated. The compromise resulted in a resolution favoring the establishment of national food reserves, with the United States pledging both food for the reserves and financial assistance to implement the building of storage facilities. Compared with an international reserve or world food bank, this was a poor compromise. Unfortunately, even this compromise plan has never been put into effect.

So I conclude in the limitation of my time. I have here the testimony of the representatives of the State Department and of the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture. They have all opposed what Mr. Nixon proposed at Minot, N. Dak.

Mr. President, we cannot work both sides of the street with honor. We cannot in Congress and we cannot in the executive branch oppose the use of agricultural commodities for a world food program and then parade out in the public domain, before the American people, and get huge headlines as if it were a brand new program and that we are for it.

Mr. President, I call the attention of the Senate to an editorial in the Washington Post this morning. It is entitled, "Surplus Food and Hunger." I am amazed. I have the greatest respect for that fine newspaper. But the editor seems to think that the concept of a strategic food reserve is new. He said it is a new proposal of the Governor of New York; that the international food and fiber organization concept is new.

Mr. President, the only thing new about this is that at long last a responsible official in the administration is belatedly getting political religion and is coming around to acceptance of these sound proposals.

Mr. Nixon today is proving that when he was a member of the Eisenhower team, he did not fight for this proposal; he did not work for this proposal. He is

proving that when he is out looking for votes, when he is out promoting his own candidacy, when he is promoting the well being of his own party, he accepts these proposals. He marches out to the American people and says: "We need strategic reserves of food. We need to keep a supply of food in reserve. We need an international food and fiber reserve. We need a world food bank. We need an expansion of commercial uses of agricultural commodities. We need to expand the rural development program."

Mr. President, everything we have fought for, everything for which many of us in the Senate have worked, he now makes a part of his public platform.

I suggest that the true test of political integrity, the true test of political responsibility, when one is in a position of authority, is the exercise of that authority to fulfill his commitments. The administration has reneged on its commitments, commitments made in the campaign of 1952. An administration spokesman must now recognize either that he is playing politics with those issues today, or that the administration has been wrong during the past years.

I hope Mr. Nixon will continue to make speeches. I hope he will come to the concept of the soundness of the proposals which are being advanced by some of us. I may say that if he wants a really good speech on agriculture, I shall place one in the RECORD today. He can make this speech in Minnesota, because it went over well the last time I made it in Minnesota.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the speech I delivered to the Farmers Grain Union Terminal Association, at St. Paul, Minn., on December 15, 1953, be printed at this point in the RECORD. I suggest to Mr. Nixon that the next time he writes a speech, he should not skip some paragraphs and so leave out some of the proposals we have developed.

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

THE FARMER'S "BILL OF RIGHTS"

(Address by Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Democrat of Minnesota, at the 16th annual dinner of Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association, St. Paul, Minn., Tuesday, December 15, 1953)

Mr. Thatcher, Senator Young, other distinguished guests, and ladies and gentlemen:

It is indeed a pleasure and an honor to address this 16th annual banquet of the Grain Terminal Association—a great enterprise symbolic of the growth and progress of agriculture in the Midwest, and symbolic of what farm people can do working together.

It's an inspiring and thrilling sight to look out over this vast gathering of farmers from throughout the great breadbasket of the Midwest.

This is America—the solid, determined, dependable America—the deep roots of democracy, embedded firmly in the soil.

America owes a tremendous debt of gratitude to its farmers, the farmers of the past and of the present.

Every farmer in this auditorium, yes, every farmer in the Nation, can be justly proud of the great contribution American agriculture has made, and is still making, to our country's growth and progress.

Agriculture is basic to life itself. It is the lifeline of food and fiber, without which we cannot survive.

Farmers were among our Nation's founders. They paved the way for creation of our great Nation of today, by producing in ever-increasing abundance the essentials of our survival—the food and fiber we needed for a growing and struggling nation of free people.

The struggle for food comes before all else. By the ever-increasing efficiency of America's farmers, in providing food not only for themselves but for others about them as well, they have made possible the release of manpower to create a mighty industrial as well as a rich agricultural empire in our new world.

But agriculture has contributed more than food and fiber to our Nation. It has contributed much to our basic strength of moral character, our hardiness, our respect for family ties. It has contributed our American pattern of family farming, with its broad base of independent landholders as a firm foundation upon which democracy could survive and grow.

Is it any wonder, then, that I say America owes a great debt of gratitude to its farm people?

Farmers today, however, are seriously concerned about the future. They have every right to be concerned. They see strangely familiar symptoms of economic trouble. Farm prices have been falling too far and too fast. The parity ratio—the relation of what a farmer receives to what he must pay—has gone steadily downward. It has slumped to a national average of 90 percent, the lowest since 1941. It's even lower in many States, and for many important commodities.

Farmers aren't the only ones concerned about these danger signs. The President and Congress are concerned. The business community is growing increasingly concerned. Why? Because we have learned that agricultural income and national prosperity go hand in hand. We have learned that depressions start on the farm. We have learned that the economic problems of agriculture are not just farm problems, but everybody's problems.

Agriculture is still basic to America's economy. Without a sound, efficient, abundant, prosperous agriculture, America's dynamic economy cannot long maintain its expanding pace of higher living standards and greater comforts of life for all.

We have learned that lesson in the past—the hard way. We must never forget it.

There is a public interest responsibility toward agriculture that cannot be ignored.

Our Government early recognized the public's interest and the Nation's welfare in a strong agriculture, in a family-farm type of agriculture, by opening up vast public lands to homesteading in order to encourage agricultural expansion and farm ownership.

By making such opportunities available, the Nation was repaid many times the value of its investment in agriculture's future.

And, if you'll pardon an aside, I very much doubt if the moral fiber of our pioneering fathers was corrupted by accepting that homestead subsidy of free land.

As our Nation embarked upon its industrial development, it was business and industry—not agriculture—that first shunned the risks of the "free market," and asked for aid and protection by law—the tariffs, the grants and subsidies, the power of regulating production—and competition—to assure reasonable profits.

As a new aristocracy of industrial barons developed in our country, their influence upon Government resulted in public policy being designed more and more to serve their own ends—at the expense of American agriculture, and the American workingman.

Our economy grew out of balance, and weaker became the foundation upon which it all was based.

The rich grew richer, and the poor grew poorer, until the bubble had to burst.

I need not, I am sure, remind you at length of the great depression. Most of us remember all too well that tragic period in our economic and political history.

Agriculture, as usual, felt its impact first, longest, and hardest.

Agriculture was and is today the bellwether of our economy. It is where the symptoms first strike, then spread to the main streets, the factories, and the homes of all America, rural and city alike.

Out of that depression of the twenties and thirties, we learned that the cost of depression is far greater, in money and human misery, than any cost of maintaining a sound and prosperous nation.

From the despair of the great depression, agriculture united in a historic fight for rightful recognition of the importance of its role in American life. It brought forth a great concept so in keeping with the principles of American democracy that it has earned a permanent place in America's economic life—the parity concept, of equality for agriculture.

All of the efforts down through the years by our great organizations of farmers became solidly pinpointed toward one major purpose:

The clear declaration of public policy that prices and income of farmers should be maintained on a basis of parity with industrial wages and industrial prices.

None of us should ever forget the fight it took to establish the parity concept of equality for agriculture as the law of our land.

The great voices of that earlier historic battle for farm parity—the voices of the agricultural statesmen of that day, Ed O'Neal of the American Farm Bureau Federation, Louis Taber of the Grange, and yes, the great voice of your own hard-hitting Bill Thatcher—these voices refused to be silenced. They knew they were right. They knew they were not only fighting for farmers. They knew they were fighting for the sound economic welfare of America, for the country they loved.

It wasn't an easy fight. Powerful forces were arrayed against them. A strange coalition of the uninformed, the ill-advised, the men of little faith and little vision, looking backward instead of ahead, was moulded together and manipulated as a "front" against agriculture.

Let me make myself clear: Fairminded Americans—and I think most Americans are fairminded—have never been against decent prices and fair and equal treatment for agriculture, or for anyone else. But always in any society, there are a few who refuse to look beyond their own money-counting tables, regardless of the public interest that may be involved.

It is always these vocal few who raise the entirely false cry of Government interference with "free enterprise," when their own toes are stepped upon in order to assure the benefits and blessings of free enterprise to all the rest of us.

But all the misleading attempts to distort agriculture's just plea for equality failed.

We became realists about our economy, and the world we live in.

We recognized that there no longer exists a complete free exchange of goods and services, a complete "free market." Instead, we faced up to the fact that we work and live in the midst of protective regulations by Government, firm prices administered by business, fixed costs established by accepted standards of fair wages and reasonable profits in other segments of our economy. Federal reserve regulations, utility and transportation rate fixing, tariffs

to protect industry, minimum wage laws, the fair trade practices act to eliminate unfair price cutting, and subsidies to shipping firms, airlines, and newspapers are but a few of many examples.

The farmer has never lost his spirit of independence, his willingness to work, and work hard.

But the world about him has changed. The ways of farming have changed. The world in which he must compete for survival has changed. Manmade changes have hemmed him in on all sides by a complex, legislated economy, in which he has too often become the forgotten man.

None of us can thwart the tide of change. The hands of Time can never be turned backward. Our task is to keep abreast of change, to keep pace with the progress and the problems it creates, and to look to the future.

If the farmer must compete in a legislated economy, to ask him alone to exist by the simple standards of a bygone generation is like asking our superhighways of today to be governed by traffic rules of the horse-and-buggy days. Only confusion and tragedy can result.

In a democracy dedicated to serving all the people, what is wrong with farmers asking the Government—their Government—to remember that they, too, must be able to keep pace with the times, and must have traffic rules that do not leave them by the wayside as everyone else zooms past on the highway of modern life and modern living?

Government—your Government—has the obligation, under our Constitution, to promote the general welfare—not the welfare of the few at the expense of the many.

Congress recognized that obligation in declaring it to be the policy of our country that prices and income of farmers should be maintained on a basis of parity with other segments of our economy. With full parity as its goal, our Government launched a courageous and historic series of national farm programs aimed at achieving that objective.

From time to time those programs have been changed, improved, and adapted to agriculture's changing needs—but always the same objective has been spelled out—the objective of parity prices and parity income.

Let me say right now, that it has taken nonpartisan support from the great farm States of our Nation to maintain our strides toward the objective, and to withstand the powerful pressure that would divert us. It has taken the wholehearted support of men who know and understand agriculture, and men with plenty of gumption to stand up and be counted—sometimes against their own colleagues—like my good friend, the distinguished Republican Senator MUR YOUNG of North Dakota. I was proud to fight shoulder to shoulder with him in the great battle of 1949 for the Russell-Young amendment, to keep our farm program from being directed away from its historic objective.

We have made progress—tremendous progress—under the stabilizing influence of our national farm programs.

Hand in hand with the concept of fair returns for agriculture came other great strides forward in American farm life—reasonable credit, sound conservation, rural electrification. We've tossed out the kerosene lanterns, and brightened the rural countryside with electricity. We've eased the drudgery of farm life by bringing the blessings of modern conveniences and modern power to the farm. We've checked the depletion and waste of America's potential productivity, by lifting the face of the rural countryside through sound conservation farming. We've strengthened the opportunities for farm ownership, by a credit structure geared to agriculture's needs. We breathed new life, new hope, new opportu-

nity into a prostrate rural America—and with it, we breathed new strength and new stability into the entire American economy.

From such gains we can never turn back. Yet the real job has just begun. We are still far from our goal, far from the original objective of equality which agriculture started out to achieve. And there are still forces at work to divert us from that objective, both through misguided differences of opinion over methods of achieving it, and deliberate intent to keep us from achieving it. Together, they make a formidable foe.

By devious means, they seek to divide and divert the farm unity of this country. They try to turn consumers against farmers, to turn farmers against labor, and labor against farmers, and to even turn farmers against farmers—to split your own household against you.

They are failing on one front. American labor is still the farmer's best friend. They are your customers, yet they know you are their customers, too. They too haven't forgotten grim lessons of the past; and they are worried about dangerous symptoms of the present. They want farmers to have decent prices and decent incomes, just as they want such goals for themselves. They know that only in a well-balanced, expanding economy, can higher living standards be maintained for all. Farmers need more of such understanding among consumers.

But the forces historically aligned against you have gained on another front. They have split the ranks of agriculture itself.

At a time when unity of purpose is needed in agriculture as never before since the great crusade of 1933, new leadership of some major farm groups has wavered from the very objectives upon which their own organizations grew great and powerful. In the heat of controversy over how such objectives can best be achieved, willingly or unwillingly, they have allowed themselves to be diverted from the objectives themselves.

Where now are the voices of Ed O'Neal and Louis Taber, forceful voices crying out for full parity, for full equality of economic opportunity for agriculture?

Thank God the great voice of Bill Thatcher has never been stilled, has never wavered, has never been sidetracked from the main line of agriculture's fight for full economic equality.

You can be thankful, too, for the vigorous leadership of Jim Patton as president of the National Farmers Union.

Every farmer stockholder of GTA can be proud of the great record of achievement and service of this cooperative grain marketing organization. It has done more than serve you well. It has fought for you. Along with the Farmers Union, with which it is affiliated, it has always been in the forefront of the struggle for a square deal for all farmers.

Agriculture needs such vigorous champions today.

Agriculture would do well, today, to hark back to the wise words of Ed O'Neal in 1941, when he prophetically said:

"This issue raised is very clear . . . that issue is whether the parity objective is to be a reality for American farmers, or whether it is to be merely an illusive mirage, constantly dangled before the eyes of farmers, but which they are never permitted to attain."

Now, as then, that is the issue.

The issue is joined; the battle lines are being drawn.

On the one hand, we have those lacking faith in democracy, men of little vision and less confidence in America's ability to maintain a dynamic, expanding economy. They are the flexers, holding to a philosophy of scarcity, an outmoded philosophy of survival by jungle laws alone.

On the other hand, we have those holding firm to the conviction that government in a

democracy must promote the general welfare, with equality of economic growth and progress.

Between these groups is a large segment of the American population which, unfortunately, fails to fully realize how much everyone is involved. They have taken our abundance for granted. America has never suffered scarcity. As a result, many haven't stopped to realize, perhaps, how our abundance has kept prices to consumers reasonable. A smaller percentage of our income is required to purchase food and clothes in America than anywhere else on earth, freeing more money for purchase of homes, automobiles, television sets, and other products keeping the wheels of industry and commerce spinning. All of us should be concerned about what makes that abundance of food possible. We should be looking ahead, too, at our population growth of 2,700,000 a year—new people who have to be fed and clothed and provided with jobs. They, too, have a stake in this struggle.

The issue is not whether the present farm programs are perfect.

It is whether we hold firm to the basic objective of those farm programs—the right of farmers to equal economic opportunity—while seeking to improve our means of achieving it.

The challenge is to go ahead, rather than turn backward.

With our eyes firmly fixed on the same historic goal, there is much more that we can and must do—and do now.

We must point closer to the income objectives set forth time after time in our farm legislation, the take-home pay the farmer receives. We must raise our sights, rather than lower them, toward effective devices to achieve full parity.

We need to extend price protection to the major income-producing perishable commodities, as well as the storage products. To achieve such price protection, we must use the methods or combination of methods most effective for each commodity. A diversified agriculture may call for a diversified approach. On those commodities where the price support system has worked well, both to the benefit of the producer and the consumer, let there be no tinkering or tampering. For those commodities, particularly in the perishable field, where experience may reveal the need for improved methods of price protection, let us have the courage and the imagination to try new methods. This is within the American spirit. We are not hidebound by doctrine or theory. We are a practical people. As such, all of us want to see food used, not wasted.

We need longer-range assurance of stability for agriculture. The American farmer justly deserves a long-range policy he can depend upon. Temporary extension of legislation, year by year, does not represent a policy; it represents only expediency. Constant uncertainty as to the long-range agricultural policy is within itself a source of instability within the marketplace. Farmers must not be left to the discretionary whims of any Secretary of Agriculture. Discretionary authority will always mean indecision and uncertainty; mandatory protection under the law means certainty and stability. The time is at hand to quit treating agricultural policy as if it were a biennial political football, to be kicked around every election year.

Effective price protection, of course, is just a foundation.

We need to develop new outlets and uses for our food and fiber. We need to learn to live with abundance, and use it wisely for the greatest good of humanity. To protect and expand areas of freedom in this world, we must think of full stomachs as well as full cartridge belts.

We need expanded international trade, but we need, at the same time, commonsense

protection against certain groups of farmers having to suffer economic losses amounting to more than their fair share of the burden of maintaining our foreign trade policies. I refer specifically to the increasingly serious problem of competing barley, rye, and oat imports from Canada. I want to commend both Senators Bill Langer and Milt Young for their leadership in seeking the proper use of the protective administrative devices Congress has had the wisdom to provide for such a situation, a fight in which I have given my wholehearted support.

We need assurances that production restrictions shall not be placed upon any important food commodity at any point below the total of domestic consumer need, plus normal exports and an adequate safety reserve, including a special reserve for use in strengthening our foreign policy. In acreage restrictions on wheat, we need recognition of the differentials in types and qualities, some of which are in short supply while others are in surplus. Wheat is not just wheat; it has many varieties used for different purposes. Durum is an example of a variety of which we need more, rather than less.

We need adequate incentive premiums to convert diverted acres under production restrictions to soil-building conservation practices, rather than to other competing and soil-depleting crops.

We must make greater progress in conservation. We must harness the destructive force of excess water, and convert it to constructive use. We must extend rural telephone service to farm homes of America, just as we have extended electric lights and power. We must continue our progress in research and marketing efficiency.

Obviously, there is much that can be done to improve our farm legislation—without taking away any of the advantages it now offers. It is in that spirit Congress must approach its task of writing firm, constructive, long-range farm legislation at its forthcoming session. And, it is in that spirit, I am sure, that my Senate colleagues of the great agricultural Midwest and South will stand firmly together, regardless of party.

American agriculture, at long last, has come of age.

It accepts responsibility to be concerned about the well-being of all the American people.

Farmers ask only what is rightfully theirs, by their heritage as American citizens: The right of equal treatment and equal respect, under the law of our land.

I know that is your conviction. I know it has long been mine. But it is time that all the American people recognized and accepted that right of equality for agriculture. It's time they accepted it as in the best interest of the entire Nation—not just for the benefit of farmers alone.

Tonight marks the 162d anniversary of our Nation's Bill of Rights. As a nation, we are dedicated to preservation of these rights of all the people, rights we hold to be inalienable. We guard and protect these rights zealously. They are the very cornerstone of our democracy.

But, perhaps it is time that we, as a nation, also dedicate ourselves to preservation of certain rights for the American farmer, as the custodian of the very basis of our national life.

I propose as a standard from which agriculture should never again retreat this "farmer's bill of rights":

1. The right to full equality of economic opportunity.
2. The right for improved standards of rural living.
3. The right of reasonable protection against natural hazards.
4. The right to extend agricultural free enterprise through cooperative action.

5. The right to public cooperation and assistance in saving the soil.

6. The right to preserve the social and human values of family farming.

7. The right to decent land tenure which would encourage the desirable goal of farm ownership.

8. The right to a democratic voice in his own farm programs.

9. The right to benefits of an expanding world trade.

10. The right to a long-term program of food storage to encourage abundance.

Much could be said about each of these fundamental rights for agriculture. They involve the right to a fair share of the national income for agriculture through more reasonable assurance of fair rewards and adequate incentives for those who efficiently and abundantly provide for the food and fiber needs of the Nation. They mean modern schools, roads, housing, and health facilities and services in rural areas, equal to those afforded city folks. They mean protection against forces beyond agriculture's own control, through adequate farm credit facilities geared to agriculture's needs; through crop insurance, within the farmer's ability to participate; through disaster aid when needed to protect both the public and the individual interest; and through price support programs designed to contribute stability to our entire economy, and to protect the farmer from being left at the mercy of speculators.

The bill of rights for agriculture means the right of farmers to self-help through forming cooperatives for marketing farm products, purchasing farm supplies, and providing essential services, such as extending the benefits of electricity and telephones in rural areas, with legal protection against efforts to curtail the effective functioning of such farm cooperatives. They mean the right of aid in conserving the Nation's agricultural resources—our productive lands, water supplies, and forests—so that these resources will be permanently useful for the benefit of generations to come.

They mean adequate landlord-tenant arrangements for sharing the income that the soil produces, with adequate opportunity for tenants to advance up the ladder toward farm ownership. They mean an effective voice for the farmer in his own destiny such as farmer participation in both administration and development of farm programs through democratically elected farmer committees, and self-determination of the needs of adjusting production to a reasonable balance with demand through voluntary farmer referendums. They mean facilitating the flow of farm exports to broaden the base of our farm economy.

The farmer's bill of rights means greater public recognition of the wisdom and necessity for maintaining at adequate levels our storage food banks of feed and food reserves safeguarding the Nation from any eventuality. They mean public policies making more effective use of the abundance farmers are capable of producing, policies enabling the farmer to see his food used wisely, rather than be wasted; to see the output of his land and his toil make its utmost contribution toward stamping out hunger and deprivation at home and abroad, and serving as the humanitarian arm of the Nation's foreign policy, in our efforts to create a better and more peaceful world.

These, I believe, are basic rights of American agriculture.

They are not new rights. They are not rights of special privilege, gained through misuse or abuse of tremendous power over the lifelines of the Nation's food supply.

Rather, they are rights of historic precedent, earned by the great and continuing contribution of agriculture to American life—the fulfillment of the Nation's needs in

peace or war, in good times or bad, at personal profit or personal loss.

They are rights set forth as public policy, time after time, in the objectives of legislation enacted by the Congress of the United States.

They need reiterating now only as a guiding beacon of light, cast upon the darkness of confusion surrounding current controversy over America's farm policy.

They must be just as zealously guarded, against forces which seek to destroy them, as we guard other historic rights, privileges, and responsibilities of freedom in our democracy.

That, I believe, should be American agriculture's rallying point for unity today—and the Nation's challenge to fully exemplify the meaning of democracy as equal opportunity for all.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I have listened with interest to the distinguished Senator from Minnesota. I have listened to many assaults on Mr. Benson, the Secretary of Agriculture, during the past few years. As one who has always admired Secretary Benson as a thoroughly honest and devoted public servant, I reserve the right to disagree, and do disagree, with the assaults which have been so frequently made upon him.

In order that those who may read today's RECORD and may observe the speech made by my distinguished friend, the Senator from Minnesota, may also have some idea of the agricultural accomplishments under the Republican administration from 1953 to 1960, I ask unanimous consent that a statement under that title, by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], be printed in the RECORD following these remarks. The Senator from Vermont is the ranking Republican member of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Reserving the right to object—although I do not intend to object—let me say that I hope the Senator from Connecticut will permit me to observe that I listened quite closely to the remarks of the Senator from Minnesota; and I came to the conclusion that if Mr. Nixon is elected President of the United States, Mr. Benson will not continue as Secretary of Agriculture.

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

AGRICULTURAL ACCOMPLISHMENTS UNDER THE REPUBLICAN ADMINISTRATION, 1953-60

(By U.S. Senator GEORGE D. AIKEN, of Vermont, ranking Republican member, Senate Agriculture and Forestry Committee)

1. Total agricultural assets are at an all-time high of \$208.2 billion as of January 1, 1960.

2. Owner equities on January 1, 1960, were \$37 billion above January 1, 1953, and hit a new peak of \$184.2 billion.

3. Farm ownership is at a record high, and there is a smaller proportion of tenants than ever before.

4. Farm foreclosures are near an all-time record low.

5. Total financial assets of farmers, including farmer cooperatives, have risen from \$16.7 billion in January 1953, to \$19.4 billion, January 1, 1960.

6. Farm debt amounts to only 11½ percent of the value of farm assets.

7. The standard of living on farms is the highest in history, measured in terms of electrical appliances, automobiles, and other conveniences owned by farm families.

8. Repeal of Federal taxes on gasoline used in tractors and other machinery saves farmers \$60 million a year.

9. Farmers in 1954 were benefited by the largest tax reduction in history.

10. Per capita farm income rose from \$838 in 1950 to \$960 in 1959.

11. Well-administered emergency livestock feed programs have helped farmers and ranchers overcome effects of drought, floods, and other natural disasters.

12. Approximately \$600 million a year has been extended in disaster and drought aid since 1953. Such aid enabled families to stay on the land.

13. The Water Facilities Act was amended to provide for direct and insured loans for certain soil and water conservation activities in all States to conserve the Nation's water and soil resources. Prior to this amendment, the act had applied to 17 western States only.

14. Upon the Republican administration's recommendation of July 31, 1953, Congress authorized (in the Watershed and Flood Prevention Act of 1954) State and local agencies to undertake flood-prevention work and agricultural phases of water management in watersheds.

15. Legislation has been passed which has held down the accumulation of surpluses by the Government by an amount estimated to total \$14 billion through adjustment in price supports, Public Law 480, and the soil bank.

16. A major reorganization of the Department of Agriculture was effected in 1953 to improve the quantity and quality of its services to the farmer.

17. The bipartisan National Agricultural Advisory Commission was established in 1953 to review agricultural policies and work with the administration in developing and administering farm programs.

18. Social security coverage was extended to farmers in 1954, ending 19 years of discrimination.

19. The Rural Electrification Administration continues to meet the growing demand for electric and telephone service in rural areas, including the expanding needs of rural industry. More than one-third of all REA electrification loans have been made since January 1953. During this 7½-year period, about 925,000 new consumers have been added to the lines of REA-financed electric systems. In calendar year 1959, five out of six of these were nonfarm consumers. An estimated 1 million subscribers have received new or improved telephone service since January 1953 as a result of the REA telephone loan program. Electric loans in fiscal 1960 amounted to more than \$200 million; telephone loans exceeded \$100 million.

20. The rural development program is raising living standards of those on the lowest rung of the economic ladder through the cooperation of the Federal Government and local authorities and private leadership. Work is progressing in 30 States and Puerto Rico.

STABILIZATION

21. The payment-in-kind export program for grain and cotton came into being in 1956 and 1958. This program resulted in higher prices to producers. This also resulted in fewer commodities coming to CCC—a saving to the Government.

22. The new uniform grain storage agreement rates in effect July 1, 1960, will mean saving between \$85 million and \$100 million yearly. The 19-percent lower storage rates generally represent a net saving to farmers who use commercial facilities.

23. More than \$20 billion worth of food and fiber was moved out of storage and into use at home and abroad in less than 7 years

through disposal programs designed for the needy and drought and storm relief and to help the free nations throughout the world.

24. More than 28 million acres of farmland have been taken out of production by the conservation reserve program of the soil bank and put to soil conserving uses. These acres would have otherwise added to surpluses, whereas participating farmers are now adding to their income, thus making unprecedented strides in the conservation of soil, water, forests, and wildlife resources.

CREDIT

25. Total credit extended farmers by the Farmers Home Administration during fiscal 1960 is estimated at \$310 million, compared with \$228.7 million in 1953. Arrangements were made in 1959 for FHA credit to more fully meet the needs of part-time farmers. Loans totaling \$12 million will be made in rural development counties in 1960; the 1959 total was \$10.2 million.

26. The agricultural credit system was made more responsive to farmers' needs. The Farm Credit Administration was made an independent agency.

EXPORTS

27. The food-for-peace program was set in motion by President Eisenhower and is enabling the United States and other food-exporting nations to better share their abundance with people in the free world. It is helping to feed hungry people, is supporting economic development of friendly countries, is providing additional outlets for U.S. farm production, and is helping to develop future markets.

28. Exports of farm commodities grew from \$2.8 billion in 1953 to an all-time high of \$4.7 billion in fiscal 1957, and for the past 3 years have averaged about \$4 billion per year. Exports in fiscal 1960 are estimated at \$4.5 billion, the second highest total on record.

29. The agricultural attaché system was returned to USDA from the State Department to make more effective efforts to expand foreign markets for farmers.

FOREST SERVICE

30. Operation Outdoors was set up to expand family recreational facilities in the national forests. In 1953, 35.4 million people visited the national forests; in 1959 the number was 81,521,000. The Forest Service has built 7,036 new family units for camping and picnicking and rehabilitated 8,973. It has also built 23 new winter sports areas, 38 new swimming places, and 10 new organization campsites.

31. A new milestone was reached by the Forest Service in 1959 when for the first time 2 billion trees were planted, double the 1958 record.

32. Timber cut in national forests is at the rate of 8.3 billion board feet, the highest on record. The yield of the national forests is being sustained and constantly increased. The income from these sales largely offsets the cost of running the national forests.

33. National forest receipts passed the billion dollar mark in 1958. It took 50 years to collect this amount from use fees and the sale of forest resources. In 1959 receipts hit \$142.7 million. At this rate it will take less than 10 years to collect the second billion dollars.

34. Progress has been made in reducing forest fire losses and in 1957 they were reduced to an alltime low.

MARKETING

35. The special milk program was inaugurated in 1954. The program in 1960 operated in 83,000 schools and child care institutions, where nearly 2.4 billion half pints of milk helped improve diets of our children.

36. The school lunch program absorbs large quantities of plentiful foods and improves diets of 13 million participating chil-

dren. Fiscal 1960 purchases totaled \$540 million. Complete meals in 1960 were increased more than 1 billion over the 1 billion served in 1951.

37. About 60 million people in 83 foreign countries have been receiving food and fiber donated by the United States. Over 4 million American people are sharing in our abundance through donations of surplus foods.

38. In periods of oversupply, 906 million pounds of meat products, poultry, and eggs worth \$388 million were bought for the school lunch program, welfare institutions, and needy people. Cattle, hog, poultry, and egg prices were thus bolstered without the Government getting into the meat business.

39. Producers of dairy products, one of the mainstays of agriculture, will receive estimated cash receipts of \$4.7 billion in 1960, an alltime high.

40. A major consumer health protection measure, the Poultry Products Inspection Act, went into effect January 1, 1959. During the first year nearly 5 billion pounds of poultry were examined and certified as wholesome.

RESEARCH

41. Appropriations for agricultural research have been increased by 117 percent since 1953. Much of this has gone into successful research to find new uses for our farm abundance, and to develop new crops for current needs.

42. Research workers in 1959 discovered the mechanism of plant growth. In a major breakthrough they isolated a pigment that controls germination, flowering, and seed formation.

43. Important new facilities were established to insure future agricultural progress and livestock health. Among these is the Plum Island Animal Disease Laboratory, Long Island Sound, where diseases foreign to our country are being studied for control purposes. Native diseases will be studied at the new National Animal Disease Laboratory at Ames, Iowa. Victories have been registered in the battle against two serious livestock diseases—screw-worm infestation in cattle in the Southeastern United States and vesicular exanthema in hogs.

44. New concepts in eradication of insect pests have resulted from the successful use of radiation in the sterile-male method against screw-worms in Florida.

45. Success was achieved in the campaign to help wipe out an outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease in Mexico which, had it spread, would have meant incalculable losses for United States stockmen.

46. The drive to eradicate brucellosis from the United States passed a milestone in June 1960, when New Hampshire became the first State completely free of the disease. Twenty-four other States have almost eliminated the disease. (Brucellosis is a primary threat to the Nation's cattle; in man it is known as undulant fever.)

SOIL CONSERVATION

47. The Great Plains conservation program was established in 1956 and is operating in 351 countries. A total of 12 million acres was covered by cost-sharing contracts as of May 1, 1960. The long-range purpose is to minimize drought, flood, and wind erosion damage in the western States once embraced in the Dust Bowl.

48. The number of soil conservation districts assisted in 1959 totaled 2,865 compared to 2,493 in 1952. The land of 21 States, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands is covered by soil conservation districts.

49. In recognition of the Nation's mounting need for water conservation, this Department has stressed protection of watersheds. As of June 1, 1960, 236 local watershed projects in 45 States were receiving assistance. Authorizations for planning assistance had been extended to 549 projects in 48 States.

50. The importance of water to farm and city people has been stressed by this administration. The first Soil and Water Conservation Advisory Committee was established, and meets regularly to plan for the future.

51. The internal revenue law was amended to permit farmers and ranchers to deduct from their taxes expenditures made for installing certain soil and water conservation practices.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I say this in the politest way and with the greatest courtesy and respect; but a fascinating culmination of this kind by my distinguished friend, the Senator from Minnesota, on the farm issue, intrigues me no end.

When I heard that the Senator from Minnesota and I were to engage in debate today on this subject, I thought that, like two valiant gladiators, we would exchange thrusts and would parry off the blows and would shake the world with some hard and enduring truth.

But, Mr. President, I am a little disappointed.

First, The Senator from Minnesota mentioned the fact that, contrary to what the Vice President may have said, a Democratic Congress had passed five farm bills. Certainly the Vice President has taken that into account, because in his statement he said:

Putting it bluntly, there has been a political stalemate between the administration and the Congress over the past 5 years.

Farm bills have been passed, and then they were vetoed; and then they came back to Congress, and then there were not sufficient votes to override the vetoes. That is a peculiar situation, particularly in a Congress of this kind, where there are two troops on that side for every one we have on this side. They do not need any votes from this side, but we must keep all ours and must have all of them in town all the time in order to sustain the President's veto.

So evidently these agricultural programs were not so prizeworthy or so world shaking that they could command enough support in a Democratic-controlled Senate or House to get by the President's veto.

The Vice President has justly dealt with that situation, and has not gone beyond the record.

My distinguished friend, the Senator from Minnesota, stated that the Vice President went to North Dakota, to aid a Republican candidate. Well, certainly he did not go to North Dakota to hurt him; that is for sure. But we should mention the fact that the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY), who is a candidate, also went to North Dakota—unless I have misread all the contemporary press. No one quarrels about that.

My regret is that I could not disengage myself from all this business long enough to go out and help the candidate in North Dakota—assuming that he would like to have me come. I am not at all sure that he might. But assuming that he would, and assuming that I could have gotten loose, I would have been glad to go.

I am informed that the distinguished Senator from Missouri also went. So the score is 2 to 1.

We have been very modest about it; but that is all part and parcel of the political atmosphere in which we live.

The Senator from Minnesota mentioned industrial research. I have to ask my distinguished friend, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Young], who is something of a mentor to me on matters agricultural—except when I disagree with him. But it seems to me there have been requests from the Department of Agriculture for funds for industrial research. The Senator from North Dakota serves on the Appropriations Committee and on the legislative Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I shall ask my distinguished friend from North Dakota what happened to those requests by the Department of Agriculture for adequate funds with which to deal with industrial research.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. As a frequent critic of Secretary Benson, I wish to say this to his credit: I do not believe any Secretary of Agriculture in the history of the United States has done more for research than has he. For most if not all of the last 7 years the Congress has refused to appropriate all of the funds for industrial research and other research requested by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, there are only one or two other allusions I wish to make.

In his speech in Minot, N. Dak., the Vice President alluded to what the platform committees will do when they deal with the agricultural planks. Then the Vice President said:

Before doing so, I should like to state my basic attitude toward this and other problems confronting the Nation today. It would be easy for me to make promises to America's farmers that I knew I could not keep, to advocate programs that I knew wouldn't work, or to put forth proposals that I was sure the Congress would not adopt.

Mr. President, if you can find for me in the English language words that could more candidly express the attitude of a candidate than those, I do not know quite where you would find them.

The Vice President went on—and I think the statement he made was a very fair and equitable one. He said:

From a purely political standpoint, it might be enough for the Democrats to blame the program on the Secretary of Agriculture and for the Republicans to blame it on a Democratic Congress.

That is one of the niceties about this thing: We can throw our charge at Ezra Benson, or we can throw it at the other side, and they can throw it at us. After all, they are permitted to do so.

It reminds me of a story about a young private who was in a plane over the Korean front for the first time, flying his first mission, along with a tough, old sergeant. As the enemy flak began to go through the fuselage of the plane, the young boy, getting his first baptism of fire, turned white, and began to cringe, and said, "Sarge. Sarge. They're shooting at us."

The old sergeant said, "Sure; they're allowed to."

So in this business one is allowed to shoot; and I am always glad when my

friend, the Senator from Minnesota, takes off on this subject. But we always have to roll him back a little and provide the record.

The Vice President said:

I think the American farmers and the American people deserve better than patent demagogery and political fakery.

Mr. President, that is a good, rugged statement, and I stand by it. The American farmer does deserve better, because there is no question but that for years we made a political football of the farm problem.

I ask the distinguished Senator from North Dakota whether there is any politics about a bushel of wheat or corn. I do not know that any one of these bushels is either Republican or Democratic. Of course, it is neither; there is no politics about it. So we ought to spend most of our time on a keen economic approach and an analytic endeavor to find the answer, instead of scolding all up and down the line, fulminating against Benson, fulminating against the Vice President because he went to Minot, N. Dak., and then, of course, scolding a little because it would appear that we might have borrowed an idea from the other side.

I think the Senator from Minnesota ought to get up today and just praise the Vice President to the sky. He should say, "Here is a man of humility. Here is a man with candor and understanding. Here is a man of open heart, because he saw a good idea that maybe somebody advanced some time ago on this side, and suddenly we find he adopts it. That shows the breadth of his understanding. It shows the extent of his political forbearance, a man of great heart, a man of candor, eminently qualified, by every moral and spiritual yardstick, to be a great President of the United States."

Instead of that, he scolds him for having borrowed this idea. Goodness me, I go around borrowing ideas. I do not always remember the source; but if the idea is pretty good and I cannot remember the source, I borrow it, anyway.

We speak about Public Law 480. The Vice President mentions it, and what we must do in order to expand operations in this field. So that brings into view the question of who was the original parent of the old Public Law 480 idea.

You know, Mr. President, I am the modest and shy type. I do not claim much parentage over legislation. I am afraid if they ever read the RECORD on me back home and say to me, "What did you put on the law books?" the chances are I shall say, "I spent most of my time keeping bad legislation off the law books and taking off those books some that already got there." If anybody ever wants to erect a monument to me, let him do it on that basis, rather than on things inscribed on parchment for which perhaps I would have no pride some years later.

Referring to Public Law 480, I see the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] present in the Chamber. He had a great record in the House of Representatives. He is a great student. He comes from South Dakota, the neighboring State to

which Mr. Symington, and Mr. Kennedy, and the Vice President, and Mr. Rockefeller all journeyed. I should say to my distinguished friend, Mr. Young, you are being honored in 1960. I hope you will invite me to join the galaxy. If I can find time, I shall come out there, and course up and down the great spaces of North Dakota, where the air is clear, where there are no exhaust fumes from automobiles, where, if one learns abdominal breathing, he can breathe deeply. They live longer out there.

It comes to my mind it must have been 7 or 8 years ago that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] came up with the idea of the matter of foreign currencies in connection with a situation which existed in Korea at the time. He is a modest person, but I am going to ask him to say now what that situation was out of which the whole foreign currency idea came.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Illinois probably is overly generous. The Public Law 480 idea was based on the idea of selling surplus commodities in exchange for foreign currencies. The junior Senator from South Dakota, as a member of the Armed Services Committee, early in 1953, I believe it was, heard General Van Fleet tell about the distressed conditions in Korea, where there was a shortage of food and an abundance of paper money. The price of food was skyrocketing because the Korean farmer had become a soldier. General Van Fleet said the Chinese war prisoners were being fed a better diet than the Korean soldiers were getting. It occurred to me to ask him why that was. He said it was because, under a Geneva Convention, we had agreed that prisoners of war should get a diet that was not less than what the lowest ranking soldier would get. We were seeing that the prisoners of war were well fed, and we had no responsibility in that regard toward the Korean soldiers.

I introduced a bill which proposed that we sell Korea some of our surplus commodities and take their paper money, with the idea of using the Korean money afterward to employ soldiers, after the war, to rebuild the economy of Korea by building roads, and so forth.

So far as I know and understand from research in the Congressional Library, that idea was the first proposal that surplus commodities be sold for foreign currencies. The idea was picked up and incorporated in a bill in which several members of the Agricultural and Forestry Committee joined, which was the bill that became Public Law 480.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Now I am going to ask the distinguished Senator from North Dakota whether it is or is not a fact that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPEL] probably formalized these proposals out of which distribution of food surpluses for foreign currencies come.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Yes. Public Law 480 was one of the best farm programs ever enacted by Congress. The first sponsor was the senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPEL], and I believe it was cosponsored by practically all, if not all, of the members of the

Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, including myself.

Mr. DIRKSEN. There is no further response necessary, but I want to borrow a leaf from the page of the book of the Senator from Minnesota. His State almost became my second home, because I went up there and enrolled at the University of Minnesota. I fully intended to stay there, graduate from law school, hang out a shingle in Hennepin County, in Minneapolis, and engage in the practice of law. The war intervened and took me off the campus. So one never knows what is going to happen to him in this world. That is the reason why I have such an affinity with the Senator. It makes us kinfolks. That is why my affection for him is as high as the sky and as deep as the sea. That is why we could take a leaf out of his lesson book.

He was scolding because all this was done and had been announced to the whole wide world, and evidently the world has been niggardly in its approbation and credit. The distinguished Senator from South Dakota pioneers an idea. It points up one weakness we have. The distinguished Senator from Kansas visualizes a great idea. The distinguished Senator from South Dakota has been giving great leadership in the farm field. But, somehow, we just have not bragged about it. We have not boasted about our ideas and our achievements in that field at all. We have that necessary fecundity of imagination to pioneer a program, but we are the shy and retiring type. We are forever hiding our light under a bushel. But it seems to me there is a Scriptural admonition not to hide one's light under a bushel. So let the lights be pointed upward. Let them shine brightly so all the people can see them. Before election day they will be advised where the real imagination, the real courage, the real achievement in the whole farm program happens to be.

Then, of course, our brethren on the other side can ventilate their frustration to their hearts' content.

I think my beloved friend is a little frustrated. Think of it—five farm bills and five vetoes, and then not enough Senators, even on his own side of the aisle, to override a veto. Of course, that is likely to engrave frustration on even the most redoubtable person.

He is a humble fellow. I love him. I salute him. I trust as he goes forward he will pin the accolade on the Vice President and say, "A noble person with great grasp, deeply unselfish, because when a great idea comes along which is in the interest of the country he does not have the slightest hesitancy in applying his efforts for the good of the people and for the good of agriculture."

So, for a moment, I think we shall let the case rest. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I sit here in amazement and wonderment at the unique ability of the distinguished minority leader, a gentleman for whom I have sincere affection and friendship. I cannot help thinking of what a tremendous impact he could make if he had a good case. Really, based upon the threadbare material with which he has

had to work, namely, the record of this administration in the field of agriculture—he has been entertaining at least to his own political kinfolk. I have noticed the cheering section which was generously and, I am sure, carefully arranged. I noticed that the questions and answers, if not well rehearsed, at least had the appearance of spontaneity.

I feel we ought to compliment the minority leader. I have great respect and admiration for his qualities of rhetoric and elocution. He presents an argument which is smooth, soothing, and mellow—but not convincing. Were he selling some delicacy, I think he would present a master job of salesmanship. It is sweet. When one listens to it, it sounds very entrancing and it sounds very engaging. The only trouble is that when one reaches out to touch it, it is like the candy floss at the county fair—it simply is not there. It has the appearance of substance, but it fades away under careful examination.

I will say to my good friend the Senator from Illinois—

Mr. DIRKSEN. Does the Senator mind if I come to his side?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Please come over. Please come over. [Laughter.]

I will say to the Senator, there is more rejoicing in heaven over the repentance of one sinner than for a meeting of the faithful. If this is an indication of any degree of repentance of action, then in truth we are delighted. Even if it does not so indicate, we are delighted to have the Senator on our side, because he is a fine gentleman.

Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois has given us a good dissertation upon history. It was sketchy. It was not in detail. In terms of the broad sweep of history of the last decade, it had a degree of relevancy.

The Senator has gone into the parenthood of Public Law 480. I am forced to say that historically his findings are within a degree of being factual, except that there were a number who were claiming the child.

I wish to say, however, there were others of us in the fight. For example, my colleagues will recall that in 1953 I presented to the Committee on Foreign Relations a proposal for the use of soft currencies for the purchase of American surplus foods under the Mutual Security Act, at the time when Mr. Stassen was the Director of what was called the Foreign Operations Administration. I had Mr. Stassen's office prepare the amendment I suggested. When I brought it to the Committee on Foreign Relations, immediately there was a great protest that the administration opposed it. I pointed out that it had been prepared by one of the officers of the administration. There was a special meeting of the Committee on Foreign Relations, to see to it that the amendment was not attached to the bill.

This was during that short period of time when the Republicans were in control, in the 83d Congress. It was a very brief interlude in the progress of this Nation.

I wish to make it crystal clear that no Democratic bill was ever reported during

that time. A Senator could introduce any bill he desired, but it was reported under the name of a member of the Republican Party, which was then the majority party. That is as it should be. I am not complaining about that. At the present time we are not quite that disciplined in our action.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am delighted to yield. It is a pleasure.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I may be called away from the Chamber before this fascinating dissertation comes to an end, but I always think about Ezekiel, the great missionary. After the Lord taught him to see the light he said he went among the people and, "I sat where they sat."

I am something of a missionary in this field. Of course, when I go out upon a missionary journey I have to go where there are sinners, so I came to this side of the aisle. [Laughter.]

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to say to this modern day Ezekiel that he did not need to leave the promised land on the other side of the aisle. There were plenty of cash customers on his side of the aisle, before he came to work these precincts. Nevertheless, we are delighted to have the companionship of the minority leader. I repeat, we respect his capability, his qualities, and his ability to do well with a limited case.

I also compliment the minority leader for another thing. I always like to listen to his stories, even when they are not pertinent. [Laughter.]

I believe that Congress needs a light touch occasionally, a demonstration of a sense of humor. The minority leader has done us a great favor. It is particularly helpful for him to tell a story when there is nothing else to say. It has a way of taking one's mind off the subject matter, if there is a subject matter. In this instance, the minority leader has done well.

We give the minority leader an "A" in history—no, a "B" in history. He did not tell all of it.

We give him an "A" in story telling. He has been superior, excellent, smooth, and soothing in elocution, in rhetoric, in diction, and in oratory.

However, when it comes to the record, he fails. Zero. The reason he fails is that the record of the administration is best described by the Vice President's own statement, which was quoted by the minority leader. I ask Senators to listen to the quotation from Mr. Nixon. He ought to know about the subject, because he and others have been the practitioners of what I am about to quote:

I think the American farmers and the American people deserve better than this kind of patent demagogery and political fakery.

That is the epitaph which will be put upon the political tombstone of this administration, "Here lie those who were past masters of demagogery and political fakery, at least as they relate to the farmers."

Who promised at Kasson, Minn., that farmers should have 90 percent of parity? Who was it who promised not only 90 percent of parity but also 100

percent of parity, and then added, in small print, as to the 100 percent of parity, "in the marketplace"?

Who said, from the public platforms, "The Democrats are giving you too little."

Who was it who made the golden promise? I say that Adlai Stevenson was outpromised 10 percent in one afternoon before 100,000 farmers in southern Minnesota.

Who was it who broke that promise? It was this administration.

Who was it who said that Secretary Benson was one of the greatest Secretaries this country ever had?

I repeat, Mr. President, I have not been assailing the Secretary of Agriculture this afternoon. I have been praising him for pulling to his bosom the Vice President of the United States and saying, "This is one of our men. This is one of the architects"—as he said—"of the administration policies."

Mr. Nixon said in 1954 at Des Moines, Iowa, on April 21:

I predict that the verdict of history will be that the Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson has been one of the greatest Secretaries of Agriculture in our history, and that he was the friend of the farmer in the program he advocated and put into practice.

Mr. President, where was the Vice President of the United States when the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] was fighting for, working for, testifying for and arguing for his international food and fiber program? Where was the Vice President of the United States when the Congress put into action by law the request to the administration for a plan and legislative recommendations for a national security reserve. Where was this articulate, courageous, statesman-like gentleman?

The minority leader said of the Vice President:

Here is a man of humility. Here is a man of candor. Here is a man of open heart.

But was he a man who told the truth about agriculture? The Vice President has spoken up on any issue at any time he wished to. He has spoken on all sides of it. The Vice President did not lift his voice for a single one of the measures in behalf of which he now goes to the peoples of North Dakota, South Dakota, Minnesota, and all the other people of the Nation. He did not lift his voice for the World Food Bank. He did not say a word for industrial uses of agricultural commodities.

I will not let the Republican administration off the hook on this subject. They claim they have asked for greater funds for industrial use research. But the fact of the matter is that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and the U.S. Senate have approved legislation in this area, saying that the Research Service of the Department of Agriculture has not done an adequate job in research on the industrial uses of agricultural commodities, and the administration has opposed the legislation. Nobody knows that better than the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] who was the main author of this bill, and, may I add, the distinguished

Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], who on two occasions, I recall, has also sponsored legislation in this area, and I compliment him for it.

Mr. President, the Secretary of Agriculture of this administration has fought against strategic food reserves while talking always about surpluses, surpluses, surpluses. Now the Vice President has gone into North Dakota, where there are great farm people, and said:

We need a year's food supply.

I say that the Vice President of the United States was mighty late in his conversion to truth. Of course, one should not be too critical. Perhaps I should be praising him. I shall praise him.

But I will also say that the United States of America cannot wait 8 years for a man to find out what he should know in the first year. The United States of America cannot wait for the next 8 years, if a Republican is put in the White House, to find out what all other people already know. The United States of America cannot afford to have a President who catches on only after a need has been written into law, ignored by his administration, and then, when he is fighting for his political life out on the hustings, talk about demagoguery.

The true test of political leadership is whether one acts when he is in a responsible position.

The true test of political leadership is not the speech on the stump but the work in the office.

The true test of political leadership would have been passed by the Vice President if he had spoken out in the election year of 1954 when we were fighting for a world food bank. Did he speak out? No. He supported the administration.

Did he speak out in favor of strategic food reserves in 1956 when he was on the ticket as a Vice Presidential candidate?

No. He supported the administration's position.

What have they done about rural development in the counties of marginal agricultural production? There have been only 30 counties in the whole United States since 1955 under the program, he says it is a success that may be expanded a little.

The record speaks for itself. Any time that my Republican colleagues wish to campaign for reelection by the American people on the issue of agriculture, we welcome the challenge. What a joyful experience this will be.

And I welcome the Vice President of the United States into a belated acknowledgment of some of the economic facts of life. If he believes what he now says, then indeed he ought to apologize for what he has failed to do, because the greatest sin is not the sin of commission, but the sin of omission. At a time when American agriculture has suffered, when it has lost over \$20 billion in income, when thousands of farmers have been driven from the land, when mortgage indebtedness has skyrocketed, when farm people have been put through the economic wringer, where has Mr. Nixon been? He has been supporting policies of economic oppression. He has been

supporting economic injustice. Now when it looks as if he might have a chance, at least, to be on the ticket, he is out telling the people of America of the wonders of the new findings of this administration. He now says that he is going to recommend this program to the Republican Platform Committee.

All he will have to do is to take the Democratic Platform of 1956, have it copied, and sent airmail-special delivery, and we can predict the result. It will be there too late, and they will be able to do with this what they have done with other good recommendations—write it into the platform; ignore it in action.

I think the Vice President's speech has been adequately analyzed. While it had the interesting quality of being all things to all people, it had very little to offer except that which my colleagues in the Senate have already offered and which this administration has rebuked, vetoed, refused to act upon or shunted aside. That to me is not a demonstration of political responsibility; that is political fakery.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I believe it would be appropriate to insert the address of the Vice President made at Minot, N. Dak., on June 20 as a part of the very illuminating discussion that has been carried on by my distinguished friend from Minnesota and myself. I ask unanimous consent that the address of the Vice President at Minot, N. Dak., on June 20, 1960, be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

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

The farm problem has been kicked around like a political football for so long that we have lost sight of some truths of which we should be reminded. In talking about what is wrong about our farm problem we should not forget what is right.

We should be eternally grateful to America's farmers that our problem in this country is one of plenty rather than scarcity. The productivity of our farmers is directly responsible for our being the best fed, best clothed people in the world, with the highest standard of living any people have enjoyed in history.

The productivity of our farmers also is responsible for the greatest advantage we have over the Soviet Union in the economic competition in which we are engaged. Six million American farmers and farmworkers produce approximately the same amount that 50 million agriculture workers produce in the Soviet Union. Until Mr. Khrushchev is able to close this gap he will have no chance whatever to catch up with the United States in the over-all production.

Having in mind those things that are right about our farm problem, let us consider those things that are wrong. Putting it in its simplest terms, our difficulties stem from the fact that we produce more food and fiber than we can consume. The net effect of our Government programs, as far as the basic crops are concerned, is to make this problem worse rather than better. The sizes of our surplus and the costs to the taxpayer continue to go up and farm income continues to go down.

How did we get this way? There are two basic causes—the first generally recognized, the second often overlooked.

During World War II we needed and adopted a program to increase agriculture production to meet war needs. Today the need no longer exists but the program which was adopted to meet it continues.

A second factor which has aggravated the problem is the production explosion which was brought about by the technological revolution on the farm. Today, for example, in the production of basic crops, one man can do the work that it took two to do 20 years ago. And in the same 20-year period, productivity per acre has almost doubled.

As a result, the American people have developed the capacity of feeding themselves, supplying large foreign markets and still accumulating mountainous surpluses, with a smaller percentage of the population engaged in agriculture than has been the case in any society in history.

Why haven't we been able to make more progress in solving this problem to date?

Putting it bluntly, there has been a political stalemate between the administration and the Congress over the past 5 years.

The majority in Congress has persisted in refusing to face up to the farm problem and it continues to support obsolete solutions which were conceived for an entirely different period and for different problems.

The administration, on the other hand, has sought solutions which were, in effect, a reverse of the previous policies.

The result has been that the Congress has refused to approve the administration's program but has not come forward with one of its own which the administration could accept. Consequently, America's farmers and the American people continue to be stuck with the present program which everybody agrees should be changed.

This stalemate must be broken. That is why the President sent a message to Congress earlier this year in which he indicated that within certain guidelines he would sign any bill which offered a reasonable chance to achieve a solution.

Until the Congress acts or refuses to act on the President's recommendations we will not know the exact nature of the problem that will confront the next President and the next Congress. But of this we can be sure: Whatever action the Congress takes, the farm problem is the most difficult domestic issue confronting the American people in this campaign. It will be the responsibility of both candidates for the Presidency to offer new solutions to this problem which will break the 5-year stalemate which has existed between the Executive and the Congress.

While it would not be proper for me to comment on those phases of the President's program currently being considered by the Congress, there are other areas in which there is no possibility that the Congress will act. I should like to spell out tonight some of the approaches in those fields which I have asked the Republican platform committee to consider in its deliberations.

Before doing so, I should like to state my basic attitude toward this and the other problems confronting the Nation today. It would be easy for me to make promises to America's farmers that I know I couldn't keep, to advocate programs that I knew wouldn't work, or to put forth proposals that I was sure the Congress would not adopt.

From a purely political standpoint, it might be enough for the Democrats to blame the program on the Secretary of Agriculture and for the Republicans to blame it on the Democratic Congress.

I think the American farmers and the American people deserve better than this kind of patent demagogery and political fakery. The programs I shall discuss now and during the course of the campaign will be designed not to create a good issue for the election but to find a workable solution for the problem. The American farmer deserves better than simply to be caught in the crossfire of a political name-calling contest.

There are five general guidelines that I believe we should follow in developing an agricultural program.

Because the Government shares the responsibility for getting the farmer into his present troubles, the Government must share the cost for getting him out of that situation.

The solution of the farm problem does not lie in simply doing more of what we have been doing since our present programs have aggravated rather than solved the problem.

We should reject any program which would put the farmer in a Government strait-jacket in which what he plants, how much he can sell, and the price he receives is determined by bureaucrats in Washington.

While the parity price program on which we have placed such great reliance in the past has proved useful in stabilizing farm prices, we must recognize that a parity formula at its best treats the symptoms and not the cause of the farm problem.

A method must be developed whereby the farmers themselves have a greater opportunity to choose the kind of farm program they want.

Let us turn now to some of the specific proposals which I have asked the Republican platform committee to consider. I want to emphasize at the outset that these proposals are not intended to be all inclusive. For example, I shall not discuss the problem of parity at this time since it is currently before the Congress. But, the proposals I shall make are ones designed to deal with the causes and not just the symptoms of the farm problem.

To help the farmer to get out of the cost-price squeeze, we must wage an effective fight against inflation. In a period of inflation with surpluses overhanging the market, the prices of the products the farmer grows are the last to go up and they never catch up with the prices of the things he buys. There should be a sharply expanded program of research in the marketing of farm products, designed to reduce the gap between what the farmer receives for his crops and what the consumer pays for his food.

To bring supply more directly into relation with demand, we must recognize the necessity for taking acreage which produces crops in surplus out of production. In administering this program, we must take every possible precaution to avoid creating ghost towns in the traditionally agricultural areas. The rural development program, which has been so successful, should be expanded so that marginal farmers can supplement their income and not be forced to move from the rural communities in which they live.

Our major aim and our major effort must be, however, not to reduce production but to expand the markets for farm products and to increase consumption. There are three proposals in this area that I think are among those worthy of consideration.

First, Governor Rockefeller, in his recent appearance in North Dakota, proposed that a year's supply of food for the Nation be set aside against the eventuality of an atomic attack. This is a sound and constructive proposal and I would only add that because a 1- or 2-year reserve would represent an enormous permanent storage burden in its present form, a research program should be undertaken to find economically feasible ways to convert surplus grains into storable form.

Second, I believe the amount of effort we are presently devoting to research for expanding the commercial uses of farm products is inadequate. It is an established practice in business to allot funds for basic research which bear a proper relationship to the overall magnitude of the problem to be dealt with. It doesn't make sense to spend only \$16 million a year on finding new uses for agriculture products when we are spending \$5 billion a year in financing and storing surplus farm products.

There is a third area which provides by far the best opportunity for making our food surpluses a national asset rather than a liability as they tend to be today. I refer to the use of our foods in the humane, as distinguished from the commercial, market abroad.

It has been estimated that a third of the world's population, approximately a billion people, go to bed hungry every night. Everybody agrees that it doesn't make sense to have huge surpluses at home and millions of hungry people abroad. How can we bring our surplus food and hungry people together?

The United States has been doing a great deal in this field. In the past 6 years, under Public Law 480, over \$9 billion of surplus food has been distributed to people in other countries who could not afford to purchase this food in the commercial market.

There are two potential objections to the program. Since it is unilateral in character we do not get the credit that we might from our generosity because of the criticism in some countries that the sole purpose of the program is to further selfish U.S. objectives in the cold war.

Second, we have good friends and allies, the Canadians, Australians, French, and Argentines who produce the same foods that we have in surplus. This means that whenever our surpluses are distributed without adequate regard to the effect on the normal commercial markets, the effect is potentially disastrous as far as these countries are concerned and in the long run would be detrimental to our own interests as well.

Immediately prior to the summit conference the President, in discussions with his staff in which I participated, developed a proposal which meets these objections and which can lead to a major breakthrough in getting surplus food to hungry people abroad. He was considering presentation of this proposal for the first time at the summit conference in Paris.

The first step would have been to call a conference of all the surplus producing nations, including the Soviet Union. These nations would then work out a joint proposal for a multilateral program under which the food surpluses of all nations which desired to participate would have been turned over to United Nations agencies for distribution to the hungry people of member nations. The recipients of the United Nations food would be those unfortunate people who still are unable to supply themselves with an adequate diet either by their own agriculture efforts or by exchange of goods. The distribution would be handled in such a manner as not to disturb commercial markets.

Since Mr. Khrushchev's actions in Paris have ruled out the U.S.S.R.'s participation in such a program at this time, the only course of action left open to us is to explore with other surplus producing nations their attitude toward joining us in such a program.

Let me emphasize that I do not suggest that this proposal is a cure-all for the farm problem or for the world's problems. It does, however, have these obvious merits: It will not be harmful to our friends and allies since they will participate in the program. It will not be subject to the criticism directed against unilateral U.S. aid since it will be administered through the United Nations. It will be in the best American humanitarian tradition in expressing concern for and offering assistance to less fortunate people. It will serve the cause of peace and freedom by giving hungry people the food which will help provide them with the necessary energy to build independent, free societies which can resist foreign domination from any quarter.

The proposals that I have discussed tonight are not presented as a complete farm program. They do indicate my conviction

that we should not dig in and fight the battle over farm policy in the entrenched positions which we have occupied over the past 5 years. Beating Secretary Benson around the head on the one hand or damning the Democratic Congress on the other will not help the farmer.

This is the toughest and biggest domestic problem confronting America today. Its solution requires the most creative and imaginative thinking the Nation can produce.

If we approach the problem with that spirit, we will be able to develop a program which will command the support of the overwhelming majority of America's farmers and of the American people, regardless of their partisan affiliation.

OREGON COLLEGES

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, recently the president of the University of Oregon, O. Meredith Wilson, spoke to the Colleges for Oregon's Future statewide committee, of which I am happy to be a member.

In this speech, President Wilson spoke dramatically of the real meaning of education to contemporary America and to our future. In order that his outstanding address may be more widely read, I shall ask unanimous consent that his speech be printed in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I know that I speak for many citizens of our State in expressing regret that President Wilson will be leaving the University of Oregon shortly to become President of the University of Minnesota. We shall miss him, but Oregon's loss will be Minnesota's gain.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the speech be printed at this point in my remarks.

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

COLLEGES FOR OREGON'S FUTURE

(By O. Meredith Wilson, president of the University of Oregon and president-elect of the University of Minnesota)

All historians have taken pleasure in classifying. For convenience they overlook a great deal of contradictory detail in order to describe a period in time as the age of enlightenment, or of Renaissance; or the Middle Ages. In a similar way particular eras have been associated with the ascendancy of great states or persons. So we have Hellenic and Roman ages; a period of Spanish grandeur under Ferdinand, Isabella, and Charles V; French ascendancy under Louis the XIV, the Sun King; British rise and power during the 18th and 19th centuries, interrupted briefly by a Napoleonic era. Not until the end of World War I did anyone but an American seem to take us seriously and Russia, except by Russian historians, was generally dismissed as a matter of secondary concern, a factor of less than first rate importance in the intrigues and balances of power among Western European states, until 1917.

Today our historians, still with a penchant for classification, are searching for a name that fits our time. In the twenties we confidently thought this to be the era of American dominance. The depression shook our confidence. The Second World War restored our pride. Then, suddenly, the Soviet Union emerged. The shambles of war were less deterrent to the Russians than Stalingrad was an inspiration. In less than 10 years, by ruthless determination, they overcame handicaps of war devastation, industrial underdevelopment, a shortage of tech-

nical personnel, and our lead in atomic science. Now in 1960 half the world either accepts or fears the possibility that this is Russia's century.

Under the circumstances, it is instructive to read again Alexis de Tocqueville's amazing analysis and prophecy, written 126 years ago:

"There are at the present time two great nations in the world which started from different points, but seem to tend toward the same end. I allude to the Russians and the Americans. Both of them have grown up unnoticed; and while the attention of mankind was directed elsewhere, they have suddenly placed themselves in the front rank among the nations, and the world learned their existence and their greatness at almost the same time.

"All other nations seem to have nearly reached their natural limits, and they have only to maintain their power; but these are still in the act of growth. All the others have stopped, or continue to advance with extreme difficulty; these alone are proceeding with ease and celerity along a path to which no limit can be perceived. The American struggles against the obstacles that nature opposes to him; the adversaries of the Russian are men. The former combats the wilderness and savage life; the latter, civilization with all its arms. The conquests of the Americans are therefore gained by the plowshare; those of the Russian by the sword. The Anglo-American relies upon personal interest to accomplish his ends and gives free scope to the unguided strength and common sense of the people; the Russian centers all the authority of society in a single arm. The principal instrument of the former is freedom; of the latter, servitude. Their starting point is different and their courses are not the same; yet each of them seems marked out by the will of heaven to sway the destinies of half the globe."

Our instruction from this passage is incomplete unless we are patient enough to draw from it its more subtle lessons.

When Tocqueville viewed America, he found everywhere a restless energy, a faith in the country and its future, and an aggressive will of common men to make democracy work. None of the men he met were equal to the giants of our Revolution and our Constitutional Convention, but they better prove the power of ideas because, as common men with an uncommon idea, they were ready to move the world.

Tocqueville's observations about the Russians are less easily understood. For 60 years, their vast territory and potential power were ineffective; but then they, too, were moved by an idea; it was in 1917 that the Communist idea became the controlling force in Russian national policy. Since that date history has been a test of strength between the idea of "76" and the idea of "17". At stake has been, and is, the future of our civilization. Since the contest is essentially between two ideas, it is obvious that it is the mind of man that is the critical resource in our present struggle. But in a more particular way, the issue is one of minds.

Tocqueville contrasted the United States and Russia by saying our conquests were gained by the plowshare; theirs by the sword. In a symbolic sense this observation was true and at the time useful. But the symbolism clouds our vision now, and tempts us toward a bucolic nostalgia when what we require is a rebirth of conviction that can support both effort and sacrifice.

Seen in retrospect, the cutting edge of our plowshare has been improved by an experimental industry that hardened the steel and sharpened the blade. It was multiplied to become a gang plow and attached to a diesel driven tractor. While implement manufacturers were adding seeders, combines, cotton pickers, and a host of almost human machines to the farmer's arsenal of conquest, plant geneticists were developing

hybrids to increase yield and to resist plant infestation; and chemists were transforming corn and carbons into fuels and fabrics that nature had never contemplated. In the new symbolism, Tocqueville's plowshare must be replaced by the ferrule or the classroom, for the conquests of America have been made by education.

The central role of education in American progress is clearly seen by every foreign observer. In our recent visit in Latin America it was constantly stated as axiomatic that our material progress was the result of education; and that their material progress would depend upon their ability to imitate or improve upon our example. The King of Nepal visited our campus on the sixth of May. When he spoke to our guests, his lead sentence was: "We need not tell you how important education is in making democracy more purposeful and meaningful, for your great country is an example of this meaning."

It is characteristic and good that we ask "Why Johnny can't read," for we cannot afford to be satisfied. But we have dwelt upon our faults, failing to notice that the rest of the world marvels that for every Johnny there are 99 of his friends that read very well. As a result, we have depreciated education and made our educators whipping boys while our neighbors have sought ways to emulate what our educators have done. Somehow we need to become big enough to be self-critical without becoming self-debasing. And perhaps a different view of Russia may help.

Tocqueville remarked that Russian conquests were made by the sword. This observation was also symbolic. And it may be remembered that for 70 years after Tocqueville, Russia's conquests were a precious few, and that in 1905 she was humiliated by a little known and unappreciated country, Japan. It was not until after the Communist revolution of 1917 that the Russian blade was tempered and sharpened for modern conquest. At that time the Leninist government seized control of a disorganized government, an underdeveloped economy, and an uneducated people. They thought of themselves as a peoples revolutionary government—as a 20th century parallel to our men of 1776. Quite naturally they studied our experiment to see what had made possible our success.

Initially the common Russian was not likely to deride our country, but rather asked the American traveler how our Revolution was coming, as though 142 years made no difference, and we were still brother revolutionaries. Even the leaders of doctrinaire communism had great respect for our material achievements and carefully studied our methods. They soon recognized that the proximate cause of the amazing American achievement was education. And Russia learned this lesson well. She established 5-year plans for the Kulaks, and 5-year plans for heavy industry, but she began to organize a lifetime plan of education, on the assumption that without education all her other plans must fail.

The dreadful power of the Nazi invaders that swept into the Ukraine in World War II and pushed east to the Volga before they were stopped at Stalingrad destroyed Russia's best hydroelectrical installations, reduced her most highly developed industrial area to rubble, and blackened the fields and leveled the buildings in her most productive agricultural region. Russia's economic situation in 1945 was desperate. She could well have said, "We can afford no money or time for preparation now. Every Russian must produce today!" But Russia had been completely persuaded that United States progress had been the child of education. Her response to disaster was not, "We cannot afford education," but rather "Only education can restore us to a competitive position. No

sacrifice is too great, and no other program so important that it should be permitted to interfere. We can afford nothing else until we afford education."

She did not quibble about tuition fees; rather, she paid her brightest students to go to college. Between 1945 and 1957 Russia refashioned her sword for conquest, shaped it for space flight, equipped it with an atomic warhead, powered it with rocket fuel, and made possible a thrust or parry at 9,000 miles; sent a sample to circle the sun; and this month announced that one sword can be carried undersea by nuclear engines, while another large enough to carry men patrols the immediate band of outer space. This transformation of the Russian sword, like our earlier transformation of the plowshare, has been done with the sliderule and the classroom. Today Russia's real instrument of conquest, which Tocqueville symbolized as a sword, is education.

If, therefore, we return to the historian with the penchant for classification, we may well say, "This is not the age of the United States, nor of Russia, nor the nuclear age, nor the atomic age, but rather the age of education." The angry threats of Khrushchev as he left Paris should remind us that today we can leave nothing to chance; nor can we depend on good will or the ameliorating force of natural human kindness. The present international climate is cold indeed. And we must prepare ourselves against the most grim possibilities. When we arrange for historical classification we may talk as though this were the age of education, but we must act as though it were the final hour. And we should recognize that we will never again be in a position to afford anything if we do not afford education now.

My preoccupation with international affairs is born of our present crises. However, there are other considerations that require the same prescription. This fall Oregon will present to its private and public colleges 12 percent more candidates than last year. We are entering the baby boom era. On occasions we may have tired our listeners with warnings about the capital costs and instruction costs attendant on this sudden expansion.

For the moment, therefore, consider this population explosion as a sociologic rather than an educational issue. When the students in the enlarged graduating classes walk away from high school this spring, where will they make good their commencement? What or whose jobs will they take? When the numbers have doubled (1970), will those who are given no additional training be carrying their weight or being carried? For a generation we have experienced an increase in adolescent crime. Our folkways tell us idle hands are the devil's workshop. Our experience tells us that an unoccupied mind gathers trash more quickly than classics, and that both good literature and good music are educated tastes.

If you do not face the issue of costs and provide a welcome at college for these increasing numbers, where will you entertain them? How will you finance the men who must watch them on street corners, or feed them in the additional McLaren and Hillcrest schools that we will require?

Perhaps we should reexamine our assumptions about what a society can afford. Certainly so long as we live we can afford what is necessary to survive; and this requires defense; and defense is education. But a country as well developed as ours should require more of life. We should also ask that the life we save be worth living. That would imply that the leisure hours, those beyond the 40- or 35-hour workweek, be worthy of rational men.

At this point we return to first principles and the language of our Founding Fathers. We require more than life. We require liber-

ty and the pursuit of happiness. The first of these requires wise men, for liberty is possible only among men of sound judgment and good will. We may be born free, but we are not born wise. And the freedom with which we are born is the first casualty in a society that chooses to be ignorant. The second, the pursuit of happiness, cannot be confused with the cheap satisfaction of appetites or the idle titillation of our animal sensations.

Yet we seem dangerously bent on a life of pleasure which would make a mockery of our early high hopes. Happiness is born of achievement and is inextricably bound up with satisfactions of the mind. The pursuit of happiness from which a proud culture might emerge, depends upon man seeing the mind as that part of God's image which is born in him, as that feature which alone separates him from the rest of the animal kingdom. It is man's mind that distinguishes him as human; intellectual satisfaction is at the core of human happiness. It was this happiness that Jefferson expected us to pursue; its pursuit is the best guarantee that life will be constructive; that delinquency will be avoided. Such happiness is the product of a cultivated mind. It, too, requires education.

Much the same case could be made for Oregon in economic development as the King of Nepal has made for his kingdom. Oregon's economy is still in the process of development. Her day is in the future. Our Governor, at the university assembly on May 10, wisely identified Oregon's economy with her educational effort.

When a university is obligated to acquire a new man or to replace an old one, there is an inescapable financial obligation. The fixed figure required to fill the place with an ordinary man would be 80 to 90 percent of the cost required to fill the post with a man of distinction. The ordinary man is not nationally visible, nor does he have leverage on national foundations or other granting agencies. The experience of the university has been that expenditure of additional funds to assure quality personnel in teaching posts, when made in critical areas, has actually brought more money into the State than would be necessary to pay the additional costs of quality.

As an example, five men appointed at the university in the last 3 years were replacements or additions for whom the fixed budget item would have totaled approximately \$10,000 less than we determined to pay in order to bring distinguished people to critical areas. Each of these men brought large teaching, research and training grants to the campus; one alone bringing over \$500,000 worth of grants in a period of less than 18 months. Their effect on the remainder of the staff and the growing interest in research increased university grants from approximately \$300,000 annually to \$1,500,000 in the past year. This last figure excludes certain fixed income which makes the audited program supported by external funds in excess of \$2 million.

The investment in quality, in other words, was not an expense but a distinct advantage to the State of Oregon measured only in money. A much more important consequence of search for quality in critical areas is the assurance that our young men and women are stimulated and inspired by brilliant minds. Their own appreciation of what is possible is expanded, and your and my expectation from them can be increased. The difference in the costs of run-of-the-mill and distinguished education is very small and the rewards are tremendous.

But Oregon's social, economic, and cultural development, as well as her security, are tightly bound to our national welfare. And our strength and vitality in each of these areas depends on how well we prepare

the minds of our people. Ours is the age of education. We live in an hour of decision. We are engaged in a race not only between us and Russia, but also between education and disaster. Herein lies the full meaning of our discussion of colleges for Oregon's future.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS, 1961

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11776) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask that the first committee amendment be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The first committee amendment will be stated.

The first committee amendment was, on page 2, line 12, after "functions;" to insert "not to exceed \$6,000 for emergency and extraordinary expenses to be expended under the direction of the Director for such purposes as he deems proper, and his determination thereon shall be final and conclusive;"

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the independent offices appropriation bill for 1961, H.R. 11776, contains funds for the regulatory commissions as well as for the Office of Civil Defense and Defense Mobilization, Civil Aeronautics Board, Federal Aviation Agency, General Services Administration, Housing and Home Finance Agency with its related corporations, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, National Science Foundation, Selective Service System, and the Veterans' Administration.

As reported to the Senate, the bill totals \$8,414,412,900, which is \$232,345,500 over the House and \$2,984,100 under the budget estimates.

The largest increase over the House is for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, of \$88,985,000, which restores \$915 million as budgeted for this important work, and in addition adds \$50 million over the budget estimate for the additional amount authorized by the Space Committee for research and development.

The next largest increase over the House is for the Federal Aviation Agency, of \$37,138,000, which includes \$21,500,000 for new air navigation facilities and \$15,638,000 to assure the operation of newly constructed facilities.

The third largest increase over the House is for the General Services Administration, of \$34,517,500, which provides for new public buildings construction and for operation and maintenance of presently owned buildings and leased space.

Part of this is for projects Nos. 8, 9, and 10, in the District of Columbia.

The next largest increase over the House is for the National Science Foundation, of \$31,600,000, which restores the amounts needed for the support of basic research and scientific manpower.

One further item in which the committee exceeded the budget estimates is for medical research in the Veterans'

Administration, where \$9 million is added to provide medical research of \$26 million.

I wish to point out that for the first time in Veterans' Administration fiscal history, since I have been handling this bill, which has been for many years, medical care for veterans in the United States has reached a sum of more than \$1 billion. It is going up steadily because of the time element involved. Veterans of World War II are reaching the age where they need more medical care. The committee thought that the results from previous funds voted in this field have been very beneficial. The committee also thought that with this staggering bill for the taxpayers to pay, and the fact that research in the past has paid off substantially in the medical plan, the sum of \$26 million for research in some fields of medical care was a very small amount with which to undertake such medical research.

Secondly, in the field of mental health, where we have had some fine results, both in the Health Institutes and in VA, we still find this year, as we found last year, that every other bed in the 173 veterans' hospitals in the United States is devoted to a mental case. The number is going up. That is why we added this amount, because when we have added these funds they have paid off, not only in dividends of alleviating human suffering and of mental care, but also in dollars and cents.

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

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. When I appeared before the committee I made the point about the Northport, Long Island, Veterans Hospital, of which, I know, the Senator has heard a great deal. It is one of the largest neuropsychiatric hospitals in the Veterans' Administration system. It is located at Northport, Long Island. It is greatly overcrowded. We have the word of the area medical director at Boston, Francis B. Carroll, in substantiation of that statement. I laid the facts before the committee. My statement is found at page 612 of the committee hearings.

I know that the chairman is just as much interested in veterans as I am, and I am making no invidious implications of any kind. I should like to ask the chairman whether or not we may hope that the committee will cause its staff to take a long, hard look at this situation in order to see whether the Veterans' Administration should not be stirred into doing something about it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I agree with the Senator from New York. I know how much interested he has been in this subject. There is no question at all about the conditions at Northport. There is no question about the tremendous increase in mental health cases—NP cases, as we call them—in the Veterans' Administration hospitals.

The Veterans' Administration last year set up what it calls a 12-year program for veterans' hospitals such as the one at Northport. Every year we are trying to get about one-twelfth of that program into operation. We can do only so much every year. We are behind in this

activity. This year the priorities dictated that in that program we proceed with the hospital at Martinez, Calif., where there is a badly overcrowded condition, and also with the Cleveland hospital. Then there is also the one at Washington, D.C., which was supposed to have been located at Rockville, but was moved to the Soldiers' Home. Those are in the program this year. I would glean from the testimony that the hospital on Long Island would be included in the next fiscal year program. I believe that in the budget which will be submitted in September, this item will be one of the first included.

Mr. JAVITS. I am grateful to the Senator.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I know the Senator's interest in this matter. In the hearings, at page 717, there is a table of the Veterans' Administration hospitals or facilities which are included in the modernization program. Included is the modernization program, phase 3, at Fort Meade, S. Dak. I should like to ask whether the bill as reported embraces that table.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes; it is embraced in the bill.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. This continues the program that was undertaken under phases 1 and 2. It completes the program. In this way, one of the best NP hospitals is being created. I appreciate the Senator's statement.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The committee added \$12 million under the OCDM for matching funds with State and local organizations on civil defense to cover personnel and administrative expenses. Senators are familiar with this item. We have added it to the bill on three or four occasions. The House has always voted against the program. We have voted for it again, and we expect to go to conference on it. That is what we will have to do again. It includes matching funds. The Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] and I, who heard all the testimony, have not changed our mind from last year. We believe if we are to have a civil defense program, local participation is the guts, so to speak, of a good program. The bill is still under the total budget estimate. As Senators know, although the total amount of the bill is somewhat staggering—\$8,414 million—the bulk of it is for the Veterans' Administration and the space program and the General Services Administration, which is a big organization now; it needs more money every year. It is not added money, because the administration has been assuming more responsibility every year.

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

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator knows that I am very much interested in this program. My Governor, Governor Rockefeller, can be truly described as taking a very leading position in this field. I know how the Senator from Washington feels about it. I know that I do not have to back up his courage in this particular field in the negotiations

in conference, because he has expressed himself very strongly before. I would rather say that I am grateful to the Senator from Washington, and I think it indicates that, although the Senator knows that this is a great deal of trouble in conference, he nevertheless is so convinced of the soundness of the program that he is willing to try again.

Mr. MAGNUSON. There may be some waste in the program on the Federal level. I do not know, of course. However, surely if the program is to be a success, the local people must participate. The Senator from Colorado, I am sure, agrees with me on that point.

Mr. ALLOTT. If the Senator will yield, I should like to say that I do feel the same way. Members of the Appropriations Committee, particularly the Senator from Florida, have expressed themselves over and over again very strongly on this point. So far as I know, at least from listening to the members of the Appropriations Committee, there is not a member who does not feel exactly as the chairman and the Senator from Florida feel about it. We are faced with a responsibility for a civil defense program. All of us feel that the only way we can make it a meaningful program is to bring it down to the local level. We have tried that several times. We tried last year. We expect to try again this year, without any diminution in determination. We are more convinced than ever, after another year's experience, that the only way to have a successful civil defense program is to bring it down to the local level.

Mr. JAVITS. I shall defer to the Senator from Florida. It seems to me that the U-2 incident, the cancellation of the Tokyo visit, the blowup of the summit conference in Paris, should certainly add tremendous arguments to the position taken by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]. I know they will use those arguments to the full. What has been called atomic blackmail is now being rather openly and blatantly used; certainly civil defense is one of the greatest morale answers to it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I am grateful to the Senator from New York. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I regret that I have a "bug," and that I may not be able to speak loud enough to be heard.

First, I think we all owe a debt to the Senator from Washington for his continued able leadership in this field. I am sorry the distinguished junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. Young] is not in the Chamber. I heard his remarks aimed at this program but a couple of hours ago. I thought the most intriguing part in it was his statement that if a great disaster occurred, hundreds of thousands of volunteers would turn out, as they always have. The very gist of the matter is that unless there is someone to give some training, someone who knows what to do, and to have supplies ready in appropriate places, and to have such volunteers, who, of course, will be the body of workers in such a case, to

have them trained and organized there will be disorganized mob action, instead of the highly skilled action which is required.

I certainly support the distinguished Senator from Washington.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I wish to add my support to the chairman and to the senior Republican member of the committee on the question of Federal contributions for civil defense. Although we have gone forward every year a number of years and provided funds, the House has resisted our action. I believe this is one of the items for which we should make provision in these difficult times. I hope that it will be possible to maintain the item in the House this year.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, since I am speaking in such a handicapped condition, I wonder if the distinguished Senator from Washington will let me take up another matter.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Certainly.

Mr. HOLLAND. The largely increased level of payments to subsidized air carriers was a matter of great concern to the committee, as the distinguished Senator from Washington knows. The committee dealing with this subject placed in the report, at the bottom of page 3, under the heading "Payments to Air Carriers," a statement of the committee's opinion on this subject. I feel strongly that Congress needs greater cooperation from the CAB in this matter. Too much granting of flights for feeder carriers which could not possibly carry the expense, much less make a profit, has been the rule in recent years. I think the Senate will find that sentiment very well expressed in the report.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks the section of the report to which I have referred.

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

PAYMENTS TO AIR CARRIERS

LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION

Restoration of \$8,984,000 is recommended by the committee, to provide the full budget estimate of \$68,984,000 for payments to air carriers.

The committee continues to be concerned over the level of payments to air carriers; \$68,984,000 is provided for payments to air carriers for fiscal 1961 and the Board has testified that over \$81 million in carrier payments may in fact accrue.

The committee urges the Board to exert every effort to reverse the trend of increased subsidy. Where feasible, the Board should expedite suspension of trunkline carriers in local service-type markets, freeing the local service carriers from trunk competition, and should insert local service carriers into markets which would be profitable for them but which trunk carriers seek to abandon. To the extent possible, the Board should avoid duplication between subsidized local service carriers; also, to keep to a minimum those local service routes that cannot possibly be made to pay.

The committee believes that a most important contribution to reducing subsidy would be for the Board to permit local service carriers greater flexibility in operations in their assigned markets, permitting them to adjust their operations more freely to traffic volume.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I should like to amplify the statement in the report by the further statement that the recommendation in the report is not intended as an approval of terminal-to-terminal nonstop operations by local carriers in direct competition with unsubsidized trunklines. The result of any such misinterpretation would be that the local carriers would put their energies into such markets instead of into the local markets they were created to serve.

In my judgment, the Board has been too generous in its granting of routes to local service carriers where there is no prospect of their being able to operate profitably. This is reflected dramatically in the figures given the Appropriations Committee in support of the budget request for subsidies. Estimated subsidy accruals for local service operations rose from \$22,567,718 in 1955 to an estimated \$37,504,832 for 1959. What is more dismaying, the estimated accruals for 1960 and 1961, respectively, are \$49,771,000 and \$55,434,000.

Mr. President, it is very evident that the feeder carrier subsidy has gotten clear out of hand. I hope that both the Civil Aeronautics Board and the aviation industry will give attention and strong consideration to our report, which I have sought to supplement at this time.

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

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, the Senator from Florida has hit this matter on the head. It has been called to the attention of the Civil Aeronautics Board several times that perhaps they were not paying enough attention to the gist, the real purpose, of why they exist, and were involving themselves in extraneous activities.

As the report shows, and as the particular paragraph which the Senator from Florida has placed in the RECORD shows, the Board transferred from carrier relations, and specially stressed this year an increased budget.

With respect to the overall appropriation for subsidies, I think we feel, for the most part, that the Board has moved too slowly in trying to cut it down.

The committee, I feel, wants local companies to have small and big cities themselves, and does not want trunklines in cities where they provide only one or two flights a day, or carry relatively few passengers.

The Board, it seems to me, should stop considering the hairline details of these cases and get at its business.

This brings up the general question with respect to all the agencies which are confronted with bigger and bigger backlogs. We provide more and more personnel each year, and still each year they show a bigger backlog. It seems to me that what we should do is to try to get them, fundamentally, to look at their own procedures, to see if they cannot get back to doing the things which have to be done, so as to clear up the backlogs which exist in every one of the agencies.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, before discussing some of the amendments to the bill, I wish to express my deep appreciation for the help of all members

of the subcommittee on the bill. As members of the Committee on Appropriations know, this is a long and difficult bill to consider. It includes many agencies and requires the hearing of complicated testimony and figures. All members of the committee worked diligently on the bill. We heard hundreds of witnesses. The bill includes funds for all the independent agencies of the Government.

I express appreciation for the help of all members of the committee during the long hearings and the marking up of the bill.

I express, on behalf of the committee, appreciation to Mr. Earl Cooper, our very efficient staff member, who handles the bill in the Committee on Appropriations.

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

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The chairman will recall that several weeks ago a delegation of mayors and presidents of railroads came before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, asking for relief by way of subsidies or loans at a low rate of interest.

At that time one of them testified to the huge subsidies, on a comparative basis, which were granted to the operators of helicopters. I notice on page 73 of the hearings that there is a discussion of the amount of money Congress has paid out in subsidies for that operation.

What are the indications as to whether the helicopter operations might become self-sustaining? Or is it likely, from all appearances, that the operation will require a permanent subsidy? The figures on page 73 of the hearings indicate that the Government paid the operators of helicopters \$4,613,000 in 1960, and \$4,858,000 in 1959.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The committee asked the Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board, and the other members of the Board present, a great deal about helicopter operations, along the lines suggested by the Senator from Ohio. The Chairman of the Board pointed out that the subsidy is in about the same amount this year as it was last year and the year before, but that the helicopter operators were providing more service; their operations were bigger. Therefore, we might assume that their operations were becoming more profitable.

Frankly, I do not see much in his testimony, from what he said to us, which will make it more profitable if they continue the type of operation they have in three places. It will be difficult to eliminate the subsidy, since they are now getting new equipment in order to be able to carry more passengers.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator from Washington may recall that the representatives who appeared before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce argued vigorously against the folly of expending large sums of money to provide helicopter service for a few passengers, when we were failing to do anything to aid those who provide mass transportation.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is correct.

In the past 3 years there have been many applications for helicopter operations, but the Board has turned them down. I think some have come from Washington, D.C. These three have been allowed to operate in the three congested centers—namely, Chicago, New York, and Los Angeles.

But surely what the Senator from Ohio has said is absolutely correct—namely, that we should first be thinking of the larger problem. For instance, the airport at Chantilly, Va., will be finished and ready for operation on July 1, 1961. Instead of thinking in terms of helicopter service around Washington, we should be thinking in terms of providing increased means of ingress and egress to the Chantilly airport, so we would not need helicopter service.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes.

I note that at the hearing the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] asked questions about this matter, and, I believe, indicated his doubts about the propriety of what we were doing in this field.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey in the chair). Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. My recollection of the testimony of the Board on the helicopter service is that it still is maintained in only three places. It was initiated originally for the primary purpose of finding out how workable it was, with the idea that the air transportation development in this country was such that we would have to utilize helicopter service.

I know that when it was first begun, I was interested in it, as regards my own State. And I was told they would offer it in three places. They have now tried it for 3 or 4 years, I believe; have they not?

Mr. MAGNUSON. In Los Angeles it has been going on for 6 or 7 years; but we have had it for approximately a 4- or 5-year period.

Mr. ALLOTT. Yes, for a 4-year or 5-year period. As I recall the figures, it has not been shown that they have come any closer to finding ways and means to put it on a paying or an unsubsidized basis. All they promised, as I recall, or held out as a hope was that new developments in regard to the type of helicopter might come close to making it feasible.

I believe there is a limit to what we can do in providing this service.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The fact is that three services are operating—in New York, in Chicago, and in Los Angeles. According to the report made at the hearings, we paid them \$4,858,000 in 1959, to keep them solvent. That figure appears on page 73 of the hearings.

Mr. ALLOTT. I believe the figure the Senator from Ohio has quoted is correct. At that point in the hearing I said:

So that it would be safe to say, as we now look at the helicopter picture, that it will not be expanded to any other cities, but that the three cities—Chicago, Los Angeles,

and New York—are for practical purposes on a continuing subsidy basis.

Mr. GILLILAND. I believe that New York Airways, perhaps some others, are considering some new types of equipment that we are hopeful will make some change in their requirements, so that they will be able to show a downturn.

I believe that the Appropriations Committee or the legislative committee sometime soon will have to take a hard look at this matter and decide whether the possibilities are such that it should be continued.

Mr. LAUSCHE. From the questions put by the Senator from Colorado, I judge that he is skeptical that this program of delivering passengers from the airports to the downtown cities will become financially self-sustaining.

Mr. ALLOTT. That probably correctly describes my state of mind at the moment, yes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments to the bill be agreed to en bloc, and that the bill as thus amended be regarded for the purpose of amendment as original text, provided that no point of order shall be considered to have been waived by reason of this order.

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

The amendments agreed to en bloc are as follows:

On page 2, line 12, after the word "functions", to insert "not to exceed \$6,000 for emergency and extraordinary expenses to be expended under the direction of the Director for such purposes as he deems proper, and his determination thereon shall be final and conclusive"; in line 16, after the word "travel", to strike out "\$24,700,000" and insert "\$25,200,000"; in line 17, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out the comma and "of which \$185,000 shall be available for the Interdepartmental Radio Advisory Committee: *Provided*, That one contract for temporary or intermittent services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), for not to exceed one person, may be renewed annually at a per diem rate of not to exceed \$75", and in line 22, after the amendment just above stated, to insert a colon and "*Provided*, That contracts for not to exceed four persons under this appropriation for temporary or intermittent services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), may be renewed annually, and one such contract, for the services of an expert or consultant for telecommunications, may provide for a per diem rate of not to exceed \$75."

On page 3, at the beginning of line 18, to strike out "\$10,000,000" and insert "\$22,000,000"; in the same line, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out "of which none shall be allocated to the States pursuant to section 205 of said Act" and insert "of which not to exceed \$12,000,000 shall be available for allocation to the States pursuant to section 205 of said Act", and in line 21, after the amendment just above stated, to insert a colon and "*Provided*, That expenditures heretofore made under this appropriation head in reliance upon a certification of the appropriate State official for obligations incurred or expenditures made by a State or subdivision thereof prior to the availability of the applicable Federal appropriation are hereby ratified and confirmed if otherwise proper."

On page 4, line 9, to strike out "\$6,950,000" and insert "\$11,400,000".

On page 5, line 11, after the word "diem", to strike out "\$7,285,000" and insert "\$7,500,000".

On page 5, line 17, after the word "Board", to strike out "\$60,000,000" and insert "\$68,984,000".

On page 6, line 10, after the word "amended", to strike out "\$19,230,000" and insert "\$19,580,000".

On page 6, line 21, after the word "States", to insert a comma and "and the Act of August 28, 1938 (49 Stat. 956), as amended by the Act of August 27, 1951 (65 Stat. 198), is hereby repealed".

On page 9, line 22, after the word "snowshoes", to strike out "\$365,245,000" and insert "\$380,883,000".

On page 10, line 13, after the word "of", to strike out "five" and insert "seven", and in line 17, after the word "appropriation", to strike out "\$152,500,000" and insert "\$174,000,000".

On page 13, line 8, after "(5 U.S.C. 55a)", to insert "not to exceed \$172,000 for expenses of travel", and at the beginning of line 15, to strike out "\$12,935,000" and insert "\$13,135,000".

On page 13, line 19, after the word "vehicles", to strike out "\$7,532,000" and insert "\$7,795,000", and in line 23, after the word "individuals", to insert a colon and "*Provided*, That the Commission is authorized, subject to the procedures prescribed in the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, but without regard to the numerical limitations contained therein, to place six General Schedule positions in the following grades: four in grade GS-18, one in grade GS-17, and one in grade GS-16; and such positions shall be in addition to positions previously allocated to this agency under section 505 of said Act."

On page 14, at the beginning of line 13, to strike out "\$7,415,000" and insert "\$7,600,000".

On page 15, line 13, after "(40 U.S.C. 521)", to strike out "\$160,850,000" and insert "\$169,300,000".

On page 16, line 10, after the word "For", to insert "an additional amount for"; in line 15, after the word "buildings", to strike out "\$144,836,000" and insert "\$171,980,000", and in line 18, after the word "projects", to insert "subject to approval of any such project by resolutions adopted by the Committee on Public Works of the Senate and House of Representatives, respectively."

On page 16, line 24, after the word "Arkansas", to strike out "\$633,250" and insert "\$655,050".

On page 17, line 2, after the word "California", to strike out "\$37,286,100" and insert "\$38,296,900".

On page 17, line 4, after the word "Connecticut", to strike out "\$7,636,400" and insert "\$7,816,400".

On page 17, line 7, to strike out "\$1,094,000" and insert "\$1,119,600".

On page 17, line 9, after the word "Maine", to strike out "\$284,750" and insert "\$297,550".

On page 17, line 10, after the word "Maine", to strike out "\$254,150" and insert "\$261,150".

On page 17, line 12, after the word "Michigan", to strike out "\$874,650" and insert "\$895,050".

On page 17, line 14, after the word "Montana", to strike out "\$586,500" and insert "\$615,600".

On page 17, line 19, to strike out "\$3,224,050" and insert "\$3,283,050".

On page 17, line 20, after the word "Ohio", to strike out "\$3,867,700" and insert "\$3,980,700".

On page 18, line 2, after the word "Tennessee", to strike out "\$9,587,150" and insert "\$10,167,150".

On page 18, line 5, after the word "Washington", to strike out "\$282,200" and insert "\$288,700".

On page 18, after line 5, to insert: "Federal Office Building Numbered Eight, District of Columbia, exclusive of laboratory and other equipment, \$15,794,000;"

On page 18, after line 8, to insert: "Federal Office Building Numbered Nine, District of Columbia, \$21,222,100;"

On page 18, after line 10, to insert: "Federal Office Building Numbered Ten, District of Columbia, \$40,803,500; and"

On page 18, after line 12, to insert "United States Court of Claims and Court of Customs and Patent Appeals building, \$6,491,000"; in line 17, after the word "exceed", to strike out "5" and insert "10", and in the same line, after the words "per centum", to insert a colon and "Provided further, That not to exceed \$5,500,000 of the foregoing appropriation may be used for clearing the site and installing footings for the authorized public building project at Chicago, Illinois."

On page 19, line 2, after the word "otherwise", to strike out "\$25,000,000" and insert "\$19,500,000", and in line 3, after the word "expended", to strike out the colon and "Provided, That not to exceed \$5,500,000 of the foregoing appropriation may be used for clearing the site and installing footings for the authorized public building project at Chicago, Illinois."

On page 19, after line 6, to insert:

"CONSTRUCTION, FEDERAL OFFICE BUILDING NUMBERED 7, WASHINGTON, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

"The appropriation contained in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1959, under the head 'Construction, United States Court of Claims and Federal Office Building, Washington, District of Columbia' is hereby made available for expenses necessary for the preparation of plans and specifications for a building in Washington, District of Columbia, for use of agencies of the executive branch of the Government without provision of space for the United States Court of Claims."

On page 19, after line 22, to insert:

"CONSTRUCTION OF RELOCATION FACILITIES

"For expenses necessary for the construction of relocation facility projects protected against fallout, pursuant to the Public Buildings Act of 1959 (73 Stat. 479), but subject to approval of any such project by resolutions adopted by the Committee on Public Works of the Senate and House of Representatives, respectively, \$3,800,000, to remain available until expended."

On page 20, line 9, after the word "for", to strike out "\$3,716,500" and insert "\$4,240,000".

On page 22, line 13, after the word "facilities", to insert a colon and "Provided further, That during the current fiscal year, there shall be no limitation on the value of surplus strategic and critical materials which, in accordance with section 6(a) of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (50 U.S.C. 98e(a)), may be transferred to stockpiles established in accordance with said Act", and in line 19, after the word "sales", to strike out "or otherwise".

On page 23, after line 12, to insert:

"WORKING CAPITAL FUND

"To increase the capital of the 'Working capital fund' established by the Act of May 3, 1945 (40 U.S.C. 293), \$100,000."

On page 24, line 4, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$13,000,000" and insert "\$13,300,000".

On page 25, line 9, after the word "approved", to strike out "extension and conversion".

On page 26, after line 11, to insert:

"General Services Administration shall not construct any office building for any civilian agency or any Government-owned or partially owned corporation except Federal Reserve banks, nor shall any civilian agency or Government-owned or partially owned

corporation, except the Federal Reserve banks, build any office building until the office building has been authorized by the Congress or its proper committees."

On page 26, after line 19, to insert:

"In disposing of surplus real estate and buildings a reasonable period of time shall be allowed for local governmental units to perfect a comprehensive and coordinated plan of use and procurement."

On page 29, line 15, after the word "only", to strike out "\$19,777,000" and insert "\$20,500,000".

On page 30, line 6, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$4,900,000" and insert "\$5,849,000", and in line 9, after "(5 U.S.C. 2131)", to strike out "\$166,500,000" and insert "\$170,760,000".

On page 30, line 17, after the word "of", to strike out "forty-five" and insert "sixty", and in line 19, after the word "only", to strike out "\$602,240,000" and insert "\$671,453,000".

On page 31, line 1, after the word "law", to strike out "\$107,275,000" and insert "\$122,787,000".

On page 31, after line 8, to insert:

"Not to exceed \$20,000 of appropriations in this Act for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration shall be available for scientific consultations and any emergency or extraordinary expense pursuant to section 1(f) of the legislative authorization for appropriations for the fiscal year 1961."

On page 31, after line 14, to strike out:

"NATIONAL CAPITAL HOUSING AUTHORITY

"Operation and maintenance of properties

"For the operation and maintenance of properties under title I of the District of Columbia Alley Dwelling Act, \$40,000: *Provided*, That all receipts derived from sales, leases, or other sources shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States monthly: *Provided further*, That so long as funds are available from appropriations for the foregoing purposes, the provisions of section 507 of the Housing Act of 1950 (Public Law 475, Eighty-first Congress), shall not be effective."

On page 32, line 12, after the word "services", to strike out "\$160,000,000" and insert "\$191,600,000".

On page 33, line 13, after "(5 U.S.C. 55a)", to strike out "\$8,525,000" and insert "\$9,300,000".

On page 34, at the beginning of line 4, to strike out "\$30,278,400" and insert "\$32,778,400".

On page 35, line 9, after the word "law", to strike out "\$30,000,000" and insert "\$39,000,000", and in line 10, after the word "which", to strike out "\$17,000,000" and insert "\$26,000,000".

On page 43, line 18, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$8,141,000" and insert "\$8,341,000".

On page 43, line 21, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$787,500" and insert "\$800,000", and on page 44, line 18, after "12 U.S.C. 1724-1730", to strike out the comma and "and such other obligations of said corporation shall not exceed \$887,800".

On page 46, line 9, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$1,260,000" and insert "\$1,400,000".

On page 47, line 3, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$477,000" and insert "\$530,000".

On page 49, line 12, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$8,450,000" and insert "\$8,650,000"; in line 19, after "(not to exceed \$1,500)", to strike out "Provided further, That nonadministrative expenses of all kinds regardless of source classified by section 2 of Public Law 387, approved October 25, 1949, including all appraisal fees regardless of source or method of financing shall not exceed \$50,000,000" and, in lieu thereof, to insert "Provided further, That nonadministrative expenses classified by section 2 of Public Law 387, approved October 25, 1949, shall not exceed \$50,000,000", and on page

50, line 1, after the amendment just above stated, to insert a colon and "Provided further, That in addition to the foregoing limitation, there may be apportioned for use, pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, such additional amounts (not exceeding in the aggregate 15 per centum of such limitation) as may be necessary to process workload in connection with mortgage insurance applications which the Commissioner may determine to be necessary to avoid undue inconvenience of hardship to the housing industry and the public."

On page 52, line 6, after the word "services", to strike out "committees of expert examiners and boards of civil service examiners;"

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I send to the desk a point of order statement which I ask to have read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order submitted by the Senator from Indiana will be read.

The legislative clerk read the point of order, as follows:

I make a point of order against the language appearing in lines 12 through 19 on page 26, on the ground that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Chair rule on the point of order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair sustains the point of order made by the Senator from Indiana. The language does interfere with the powers of the agency.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, another Senator was talking to me in regard to another point in the bill. The point of order relates to the General Services Administration building matter, does it?

Mr. CAPEHART. Yes; and the Presiding Officer has ruled that that provision in the bill is legislation on an appropriation bill, and has sustained my point of order.

Mr. MAGNUSON. All right.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, although I do not quarrel with the Chair's ruling on the point of order, I think this matter should not be permitted to pass without calling attention to what the committee was trying to do. Certainly, it was no idle gesture.

The fact is that the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, which is set up for the purpose of insurance of the banks in this country, has already made plans to construct a building downtown. The chairman of the committee [Mr. MAGNUSON] asked the agency, as did I, about this item.

Mr. Coburn said:

Mr. COBURN. Our files show that since 1940 there have been various considerations given to the authority of the Corporation to build. Mr. Crowley, the original Chairman, had it in 1940. The records show that counsel then advised that the Corporation had the right and implied authority to build a building. There was a bill, I think, in 1950. Our legal files show that the principal reason the Corporation came to Congress at that time was to avoid a provision in our present act which says that the Corporation is exempt from all taxes except local real estate taxes. The bill was to avoid the local District real estate tax. At the present time we have decided that it would be appropriate for the Corporation to pay the tax to the District, and, therefore, we see no necessity for asking for legislation.

Let me ask whether the Senator from Washington recalls the amount that was proposed to be spent for construction of the building.

Mr. MAGNUSON. \$11,500,000, I believe.

Mr. ALLOTT. Both the Senator from Washington and I questioned them at some length, in connection with the type of building they proposed to construct. But we could not escape the fact that this Corporation is a Government corporation. It may call the money it uses its own money, but it is not its own money. Under a law enacted by Congress—and I believe it is a good law—the banks of the country are required to pay money into the FDIC, to secure the funds of the depositors. No one quarrels with that; it is good legislation. But when Congress places that burden on the banks, Congress is also in a trust position.

In this appropriation bill, we appropriate funds to support the FDIC. I wish to call this matter to the particular attention of my friend, the Senator from Indiana, because I think it is wrong, after Congress appropriates money to support an agency, to permit the agency to say blithely, "We get our money from our depositors all over the country, and therefore we can build any building we please."

I do not agree; and I certainly intend to call this matter to the attention of the appropriate committee, next year, so that agencies which are dependent on the Government for support, and are using the taxes that are paid by the American people, will not be able to say, "We can build any sort of building for ourselves that we want—either lush or not lush; we can do as we please, according to what we, ourselves, decide."

Certainly that is wrong, and I intend to oppose it vigorously. This is a principle which I think should be brought out on the floor and put before the Senate.

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

Mr. ALLOTT. Yes.

Mr. CAPEHART. I have no quarrel with the idea of enacting legislation which requires that an agency come back to the Congress for an appropriation. My point is that I do not think Members of the Senate should permit that kind of section to be put in an appropriation bill, because the Parliamentary rules that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

I moved to strike it out for the simple reason that I think it would be a bad precedent to have it remain in the bill. I have no quarrel with the able Senator from Colorado, or with anyone else, that enabling legislation should be enacted to require the FDIC or any other agency to go through the Appropriation Committee if it wants to construct buildings; but I do not think we should permit this sort of requirement to be a part of an appropriation bill.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk, and ask to have it stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed, on page 28, line 19, before the period, to insert a colon and the following:

Provided, That of such amount not less than \$150,000 shall be available, subject to the provisions of such section 202, for a loan or loans for the provision of housing and related facilities on any Indian reservation for the benefit of elderly persons who are members of an Indian tribe.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I shall discuss this amendment very briefly. I am sure anyone who is familiar with the conditions under which our Indian citizens live fully recognizes that, of all our American citizens, none face a more dismal future in old age and none are forced to live in worse surroundings than many of our unfortunate elderly Indians. It is for that reason I ask that at least a start be made under this legislation to enable our American Indians to participate in the Government's loan program to help finance resthomes for our elderly citizens. Our Indians have no capacity to provide for themselves the proper kind of housing they will need in their advanced years. Most are Indians without funds or land.

Since this is in the nature of a pilot operation, it seems to me we might provide that on one of these reservations, or in some adjacent area, not less than \$150,000 be made available to ascertain whether or not, through this plan, at long last we can take some steps in the direction of doing justice to our Indian friends. Perhaps more money can be channeled into this program for Indians but my amendment insists only that not less than \$150,000 be set aside for this purpose.

I have discussed the amendment with the chairman and the ranking minority member of the subcommittee. I believe they are prepared to accept the amendment. If so, I have no desire to discuss it further.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the amendment is well taken. The committee had no intention of not covering anyone. If there is any question about covering elderly Indian people on Indian reservations, we shall be glad to take the amendment to conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment, which I ask to have read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed, on page 11, line 6, before the period, to insert a colon and the following:

Provided, That except with respect to grants under obligations incurred prior to the date of enactment of this Act, no part of this appropriation may be used as a grant with respect to any airport wherein any obscene, lewd, lascivious, or filthy book, pamphlet, picture, print, drawing, or other similar indecent or immoral article is made available for sale to the public.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, several weeks ago the Chicago newspapers

carried a story to the effect that the transit board of Chicago had notified concessionaires that their right of occupancy would be revoked in the event they continued selling lewd, lascivious, or indecent literature.

I commented on the floor of the Senate on the action taken by that commission. The objective which they sought was obtainable without interference with the rights granted by the Constitution of free speech or otherwise.

This morning, at a breakfast meeting, I listened to Rev. Billy Graham discuss the experiences which he had in Africa. He related that the good which we have done there through our financial help has, in practically all instances, been either neutralized or destroyed by the character of moving pictures and literature which has been sold to the people of those nations by mercenary interests in the United States. He raised the question of the paradoxical nature of the problem. He stated that, on the one hand, he subscribed completely to the philosophy contained in our Constitution that the right of free speech is indispensable for the proper development of a people and for the proper exercise of the faculties given to the human being by the Lord. But he went on to say that a problem confronts the people of our Nation when we find ourselves, in our desire to maintain the right of free speech, faced with mercenary interests who are using the right of free speech for the publication of literature that is breaking down the moral fabric of our youth.

I thought he was completely right. I am sure Members of the Senate are in a constant quandary as to how we are going to solve this problem.

I do not subscribe to a program of censorship. I do not subscribe to the concept that free speech should be hindered. But I deeply feel that ways and means must be found to cope with this problem, which is causing such a severe impact on the moral fabric and fiber of the young people of our country. The book "The Ugly American" has been frequently mentioned. In some degree it may be exaggerated, but the fact is that the evaluation made of the people of our country is, in a substantial degree, related to the character of the literature and moving pictures we send out which are seen by millions of people.

I have made inquiry about the means of reaching this problem in the air terminals. Either counties or cities receive financial aid from the Federal Government for the building of air terminals. Those air terminals are leased to news and magazine agencies. The concessions granted can be attached with conditions, and the leases can contain a provision that the concession shall come to an end if the lessee or concessionaire uses the premises for the sale or distribution of any obscene, lewd, lascivious, or filthy book, pamphlet, picture, printing, drawing, or any similar indecent or immoral article.

About 2 months ago we appropriated \$25 million to fight juvenile delinquency. It was thought the problem was so severe that the Federal Government would

have to step in and, in a measure, declare that the parents, the ministers, the rabbis, the priests, the schoolteachers, the policemen, the prosecutors, the judges and the parole officers were incapable of handling the problem. I thought it was a serious indictment when we declared that all of these agencies were incapable of developing a moral character in our youth sufficient to face the problems which will confront our youth in life.

Upon reflection, I can well understand the feelings of the mother and father, worried about a daughter, while they are trying to build character, when they view these news agencies, magazines and moving pictures breaking down with their material the very work which the parents are trying to accomplish.

At the proper time, Mr. President, I shall call up my amendment.

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

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. The Senator has not yet called up his amendment?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I have not. I have sent it to the desk.

Mr. KEATING. I am very sympathetic with what the Senator has been trying to accomplish. The situation has worried me a great deal. I have spoken upon the subject on innumerable occasions on the floor of the Senate and at public gatherings.

It seems to me this may be an area in which we can really do something about the problem. I am glad the Senator has brought up the subject.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I thank the Senator very much. I do not believe the Senator was in the Chamber when I related the statement made by Reverend Graham. He said that when he was in Africa, as well as everywhere else he went, he was told that the good we do with our aid we more than break down with the indecent, lewd, and lascivious literature and moving pictures we are sending to those naive and primitive but still clean and wholesome people.

Mr. JAVITS obtained the floor.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President—

Mr. JAVITS. Does the Senator from Colorado desire to have me yield to him?

Mr. ALLOTT. If the Senator will permit, I would like to reply to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I wish to say to my friend from Ohio that I sympathize very greatly with what he is trying to do. I am not quite sure whether the plan the Senator has in mind is workable. Perhaps if the Senator is not offering his amendment now we can discuss it later. There are numerous steps necessary to stop what is going on. I wish to inquire whether the Senator intends to present his amendment now, or later.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I shall present it at a later date.

Mr. ALLOTT. At a later date?

Mr. LAUSCHE. At a later time.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Ohio. I wish to be sure that I retain my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York has the floor, and yields to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I recognize the difficulty, from the technical standpoint, of coping with the problem, in view of what the Supreme Court has said. I feel deeply that we must start giving attention to the problem. I believe under circumstances of this type, as pointed out by the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] we may be able to reach the problem with the language I have in mind, although if we tried to censor the moving pictures or the books the language would not be proper.

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

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. KEATING. That was the only feature about the proposal which in any way worried me. I am in complete accord with the objective of the Senator from Ohio. I doubt whether we can accomplish it by a censorship provision. I doubt that it would be advisable or desirable to do it in that way.

The only difficulty I had in regard to the proposal was with respect to the definition of what would fall within the purview of the Senator's amendment. I hope we can do something about the matter in the bill under consideration. Has the Senator submitted the language to the legislative counsel?

Mr. LAUSCHE. The legislative counsel drew up the amendment. It was stated that my doubt about the ability to do this was not justified, because the amendment does not contemplate directly or indirectly any censorship, but would merely attach a condition to the grant of money.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. Who would make the determination?

Mr. LAUSCHE. It would be the board which allocates the money.

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

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I have the floor. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Like the Senator from Colorado, I am very sympathetic with the objective of the Senator. However, this is a bill which would give to the Federal Aviation Agency the money to maintain the safety of airlines in the United States. The money would be granted under a legislative formula to the different places. I do not know whether we would want to give General Quesada the job of going out and looking at all of the magazines at every airport in the United States, to see what he thought about them. He is the Director. One man is named; that is General Quesada. The CAB would have nothing to do with this.

I think the Senator from Ohio appreciates the practical problem which is involved.

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

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Like other Senators, I am heartily in favor of what

the Senator from Ohio is trying to do, but I sincerely believe what is proposed is not the way to do it. What is a lewd book? We know that the Postmaster General has had cases carried to the Supreme Court.

The language would provide, as the Senator from Washington has said, that General Quesada would have to go to Cleveland, Ohio, we will say, to look at the books on the newsstand—

Mr. LAUSCHE. Or to Boston, Mass.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Or to Boston, Mass. We find there is a great deal of difficulty with respect to differences of opinion.

No one is more sympathetic than I to the objective of the Senator. I hope the Senator will seek to attach his amendment to a legislative act, rather than to an appropriation bill. I think this provision would be incapable of administration if placed in the bill now before the Senate.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I recognize all of those difficulties. I will say, however, that we had better begin to think about the problem. We cannot keep saying, "There is nothing we can do."

I realize that all of my associates recognize the seriousness of this problem.

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

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. KEATING. I emphatically agree with the Senator. It has been brought to my attention that some of the most terrible material which has gone through the mails has been sent as the result of a little boy or a little girl sending in a quarter for a model airplane or something of that kind. This vile material is sent through the mails, and now is being sent through carting companies and by other means. It is a national problem. It is not a local problem. Many unsavory people are fattening their pocketbooks as a result. This is a problem we must face up to.

Fortunately, many fine groups and individuals all over the country are up in arms about this Niagara of smut which is coming through the mails and being distributed on newsstands and by other means. They are complementing the vigorous efforts of the Post Office Department to wipe out this blight of pornography.

In my view, the traffic in obscene material is one of the most serious moral and social problems confronting America today. It has contributed substantially to the rise in juvenile delinquency, in spite of the unceasing war being pursued by authorities at all levels.

I doubt that the general public has any comprehension of how serious this problem has become. It is doubtful that most people realize how extensive this filthy traffic is today.

The fact of the matter is that the pornography and obscenity business in this country has become a half-a-billion-dollars-a-year enterprise. It is big business with capital "B's" and it is high time we called a halt to its filthy machinations.

Of course, as has been pointed out, one of the very real problems involved in curbing these barons of obscenity is

simply the definition of what is pornography. What may represent pornography by the standards of most decent people may not be so classed by the courts, under some recent decisions.

We in Congress must grasp this nettle. I have sponsored legislation to help alleviate this problem, and I intend to pursue actively my studies of other means to put these dirty businessmen out of business. Certainly the proposal of the Senator from Ohio deserves careful consideration by Members of the Senate in the light of the severity of the challenge posed by obscene material.

Mr. President, it is high time Congress got cracking on this whole subject. Some helpful and informative hearings have been held and a great number of legislative proposals have been considered. I hope we can come to grips with some of these ideas. Federal action should and can be taken to effectively supplement the vigorous and wonderful efforts being undertaken by so many groups and individuals on the local level all over the Nation.

Of course, on the local and individual level, it is a matter of demanding strict enforcement of existing statutes, or reporting all violations that come to light. It is a matter of supporting authorities who are trying to do something about keeping this filth out of the hands of our children. In this connection, I want to reiterate my commendation of the Post Office Department, which has spearheaded a nationwide campaign in this field.

Concerted public cooperation and further action by Congress hold the key to stemming this flood of filth which threatens to infect so many of our young people. I am not certain whether the bill before the Senate is the proper vehicle to use in this great cause. I should like to talk with the Senator about it, because he has certainly put his finger on something with which we must come to grips.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLOTT. I will say to my friend from Ohio that I am sure we all have the same purpose. I do not know whether this would represent legislation on an appropriation bill or not. I think the particular amendment would not. That is simply my opinion.

The thought I am proposing to the Senator, I think, might be more effective than the language the Senator has suggested, which I believe would be terrible in effect. One day the administrator might go to the newsstand and might find only books and magazines on Christian charity, but the minute he walked out, or the next day, the newsstand might be filled up with all the trash in the world.

As the bill now reads, such language is omitted. However, I should like to suggest to my good friend for his consideration that contracts for grants under obligations might contain or should contain such a limitation as he suggested, and it seems to me that the proposal to which I refer could easily be a better

and more workable way of getting at the problem.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I thank the Senator from Colorado, and I also thank the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] for his consideration in allowing us to have time for this discussion.

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

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. I am sorry I did not hear all of the discussion of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE]. Today he told me the nature of the amendment he intended to present. I do not know its full scope, but I would like to say I approve and commend the purposes of the Senator from Ohio. I think all Senators should be very much aware of the problem he has presented, not only in this particular set of circumstances, but everywhere in our country. I shall support him.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I thank the Senator from Kentucky very much.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I am going to acquaint the Senate with a situation with which I feel it my duty to acquaint the Senate. It relates to my amendment 60-20-60-B, which has been printed and is before the Senate.

To the amazement of every traveler from foreign countries to the United States and to the amazement of people from other parts of the United States, when one gets into an airport in one of our Southern States and walks through the lobby of that airport, he sees a big bronze tablet which says, "This airport was erected with the aid of funds of the United States of America." Nonetheless he finds in that airport toilet facilities which are separately apportioned for white and colored, as the saying euphemistically goes, and waiting rooms which are classified for white and colored. The arrangement is absolutely fantastic to anyone who does not live in that part of the country and he has difficulty to account for it. As a matter of law the arrangement is completely unlawful, but there it is.

We are pretty familiar with these practices, since we are having a great national struggle concerning them, but I must say it is amazing when the practices and procedures and, indeed, the written directives of a Federal Government agency tolerate the situation. It not only tolerates it but, by implication, tells the applicant for Federal funds exactly how he can get around the fact that the Federal funds are not supposed to be made available for any such facilities.

I shall not take too much of the Senate's time in going into this matter, but for the interest of Senators who are present, as well as those who are not but will want to know how consideration of the amendment will proceed, I should like to make the following statement. I do not actually intend to call up my amendment until after I have made my presentation on it. I have been informed that at that time, when the Senate floor is again available under the rules, a motion will be made to table the amendment. I hope very much the mover of that motion will allow such modest de-

bate and rebuttal as Members may feel moved to make on the question, and I shall seek a yea-and-nay vote after the motion to table is actually made and the debate is concluded. I so state in order that the attachés of the Senate may advise Senators as to the situation and may guide themselves accordingly.

What are the facts? The Federal Government, as is well known, under the Federal Airports Act gives an opportunity to local communities—indeed, to individual operators—to build airports with Federal aid. A practice has grown up in that situation under which I believe the basic policy of the Constitution of the United States and the law of the United States is being frustrated and circumvented in utilizing these funds to build airports within which one then finds completely segregated facilities for dining, restrooms, and perhaps in some cases even other types of facilities. Depending upon whether one is white or Negro, one is allowed or is not allowed to use certain of these facilities.

There is no segregation on airplanes but there is segregation in airports. In view of the fact that this is true, as I said, right under the cover of the activities of a Federal agency, I think it is time to bring it out into the open and to put a stop to it.

How does the Agency tolerate any such situation? What it does is to make a loan for the airport building itself, and to omit in the specifications for the building certain spaces in that building, which are left completely vacant, and for which, indeed, FAA does not put up any loan. Later, or contemporaneously, the local community which is building the airport terminal with Federal aid uses its own funds for the purpose of putting in these particular structures, whether they are restrooms or dining rooms or waiting rooms, and segregates them.

Mr. President, one understands perfectly clearly that the big costs which are involved are the costs for the building. However, once the building is constructed, once the fundamental structure is erected, it does not cost very much to put in these additional facilities. Yet this trick, this practice, which is engaged in results in having local communities which believe in segregation, segregate the facilities. They are segregated in terms of national and international travel, not just in terms of the residents of the community involved.

I said that the Agency, at the very least, tolerates it, and, at the very worst, permits it. How does it do that? I suggest that Senators should look at the regulations of the FAA, the Agency which succeeded the Civil Aeronautics Administration, particularly the regulations which were issued on April 6, 1956. They are found at page 617 of the hearings. The policy statement is entitled "Airports Policy and Procedure Memorandum No. 41." It was issued by the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics originally, but is, in effect, a regulation of the FAA. It provides as follows:

"(3) No Federal-airport program funds will be made available for the development of separate facilities or space in an airport building when such facilities or space are

designed for use now or in the future for separate racial groups."

The purpose and intent of the policy expressed in this programming standards is to prevent the use of Federal funds to further or to increase racial segregation in airport buildings. Under this policy, Federal-aid airport program funds will not be used in the construction or reconstruction of any areas of a building which are intended for use by separate racial groups.

This is the fundamental policy and procedure. At least that is what we are told, according to the policy and procedure memorandum of the FAA.

It goes on to provide—and this is the gimmick:

It will, therefore, be required, prior to the issuance of a grant offer for any project involving a building, that the chief executive officer of the sponsor of each building project clearly state, in writing, whether or not it is the intent of the sponsor that all of the areas and facilities in the building will be available without regard to race, creed, or color, and are intended to be operated on a nonsegregated basis.

If not, it will be necessary that the written statement describe those areas and facilities within the building which are intended for segregated use.

Just think of it, Mr. President. Here is a policy and procedure which provides that no facilities are to be used in such a way as to be segregated. Yet here is a refutation of that policy. This is a refutation of the purpose and intent of the policy expressed in the programming standard, because in the same memorandum we find the statement that it will be necessary that the written statement describe the areas and facilities within the building which are intended for segregated use.

The memorandum goes on to specify just what the written statement is to describe if there is to be this exception and exclusion.

Mr. President, how brazen can one get? Here is an agency which has the fundamental policy that these facilities shall not be segregated; yet for all practical purposes it gives instructions to the individual applicant on exactly how these facilities are to be segregated, in direct violation of the Agency's own policy.

It is inconceivable to me that this should occur right under our very noses; that we should be asked to appropriate \$80 million for this program, yet should be denied the opportunity of correcting this most offensive situation which is being participated in by an agency of the Federal Government.

I will say this—and everyone knows it—that this is just inertia. In other words it was the way it was done in 1955 and 1956, and it just goes on, until someone stops it. I think it is high time to stop it.

I felt it my bounden duty to bring this matter to the attention of the Senate.

I testified before the committee on this subject. Because I know very well the concerns about so-called antisegregation amendments, and how Senators feel about them, I suggested to the committee that if we could get a statement of policy from the Agency as to how they would carry out this program, it might fully meet the requirements of the situation.

That procedure has served very well with respect to other bills. One I know of particularly is the National Defense Education Act. In that case a letter was obtained from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. However, FAA has not budged on this point. Hence the only thing I felt I could do was to propose the amendment, which I will call up, as I said, when I have concluded my remarks.

I have heard arguments against preventing proper restrictions being placed on an agency which would lend itself to this practice. The arguments are, of course, that we do not generally like to offer this kind of amendment if we can avoid it. The answer is that this is such a shocking situation that we cannot avoid it.

The second point is one to which I should like to address myself for a few minutes. It is the question of whether this is the kind of amendment which is found in the Federal aid to public school construction bill as it came to us from the House of Representatives, and which aroused considerable interest here. It was felt that if we kept that amendment in the bill it would result in defeating the whole bill. I have been asked by a number of Senators in connection with my own amendment to the pending bill, "What is the difference between your amendment and the so-called Powell amendment?"

There is all the difference in the world, and it boils down to this. If we deny money in a public school construction situation on the ground that the school has not desegregated, then we are taking action which the Supreme Court has qualified in its decision on the public school desegregation cases.

The Supreme Court has qualified it by saying that desegregation of public schools shall take place with all deliberate speed. In other words, it has qualified it in point of time. Although personally my own views may have some modified application in that situation, I must agree with the Supreme Court's ruling. It is possible to make the argument that the question of all deliberate speed should be left to the courts, and that the question of all deliberate speed should not be decided by a governmental agency which has the responsibility of disbursing funds for school aid.

That is not the case in the present situation, for in the situation before us no time lag is envisioned by any Supreme Court decree or by any law.

In the situation before us, we are frontally lending the loaning power and the authority of a Federal Government agency, whether by implication or directly, to the proposition that what is now immediately unlawful shall be used to perpetuate or to establish segregated facilities within an airport, notwithstanding the fact that they are now and immediately unlawful—not that they will be unlawful if they are not segregated with all deliberate speed, but that they are now and immediately unlawful.

As authority for that statement, I refer to the basic law itself, which is found in title 49, section 1110, United States Code, annotated, which relates to how

these funds are to be loaned, and under what conditions. I shall read the first clause of the law. It is very clear on the subject:

As a condition precedent to his approval of a project under this chapter, the administrator shall receive assurances in writing satisfactory to him that (1) the airport to which the project relates will be available for public use on fair and reasonable terms and without unjust discrimination.

If that is not clear enough, in a case decided very recently in the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, the so-called Greenville case, the court unequivocally states that it is unlawful for a State, or any governmental subdivision thereof, to maintain segregated facilities specifically within an airport. It is the unanimous decision of the circuit court of appeals.

There is no question about the fundamental law which is involved. It was sustained earlier this year in a case involving a segregated airport restaurant in Atlanta, Ga. It was sustained last year in a case involving the Memphis airport. Then we have the Greenville airport case, which is very recent, having been decided only a few months ago. The full text of the Greenville decision is printed at page 618 of the Senate committee hearings. The case is entitled "Henry Against Greenville Airport Commission."

The very point that there are very recent cases, and that this practice is directly and immediately unlawful—it does not have to wait for any deliberate speed, but is immediately unlawful—is used as an argument against my amendment, on the ground that the amendment is not really essential because a suit can be started in every case which involves segregated facilities, in order to enjoin their continuance.

It seems to me that that argument would cause us, just like the rather strange interpretation of the regulations of the FAA, which I read, to be, by implication, parties to a violation of the law and a violation of the Constitution. We would be advancing money which a Government agency is affirmatively using to help—again I say, at the very most indirectly—an illegal establishment of segregated facilities. We would be lending money, but would be telling some individual to go ahead and sue if he did not like what occurred, because we were giving the money knowing it would be used for this purpose.

I think such a use of Federal funds is inexcusable and unforgivable on the part of Congress. There is a host of declarations by the highest officials of the Government that Federal funds must not be used to establish segregated facilities. The President of the United States himself, in my hearing, during one of his campaigns, in a great rally in New York, made that absolute pledge to the American people. I simply do not see how we can possibly get away from it.

When I say this is actually going to happen, I come to another argument which is very strongly urged against my amendment, namely, that my amendment reaches situations in which the Federal Aviation Agency has already

contracted for certain facilities, and that \$500,000 of the \$80 million appropriated by the bill will be used for a terminal building at Birmingham, Ala., and for a similar building at Tallahassee, Fla. In both of those buildings we know now there will be segregated facilities—rest rooms, waiting rooms, and perhaps dining rooms. In both instances, the FAA has already contracted to lend the money.

In respect to that argument, I say two things. It makes it very clear, beyond peradventure of a doubt, that if we appropriate the money, we will be helping to bring about a violation of the law and the Constitution. Second, it is hornbook law that a contract which has in it an element of illegality is an invalid contract. Certainly it is a contract which, as the lawyers say, is beyond the power—*ultra vires*—even of an official of the United States. We have no right to enter into a contract which flies in the face of the law. There is no morality which holds otherwise, in my view.

Finally, the argument is made against my amendment that people have committed funds on the strength of loans they expect to get from the FAA, and therefore they should not be deprived of those loans at this time. That is what lawyers call the estoppel argument. I think there are two answers.

First, we are closing a Federal loophole. We are closing a loophole by which we are quite unwittingly lending ourselves to the continuation and the establishment of new segregated facilities, rather than doing our utmost to eliminate them.

Second, it seems to me very clear that the unfairness of this kind of utilization of Federal funds for this kind of segregation far outweighs the embarrassment to an individual who has put some money into this kind of proposal in the expectation of receiving a Federal loan.

Before I call up my amendment, I should like to conclude with this observation: I have been a Member of the House and Senate for about 13 years. I know of no time when the atmosphere gets quite so chilly, and when people become quite so restless and unhappy, as when this subject is brought up. Whatever may be the deep psychological reasons for it, this is one situation with which we must live in this country. I have always been the first to affirm the sincerity of the convictions of the men and women who take the very opposite view of this situation from mine. I have never hesitated to debate it with them in the public forum and on the floor of either House. But I have always respected their views.

Notwithstanding that, in this day and age, with what we have at stake in the world in terms of our relationships with the overwhelming preponderance of people having skins which are yellow, black, or brown—not white—I simply cannot understand how we can fail to scratch the bottom of the barrel, if we have to, let alone take as obvious an amendment as this one, in a situation in which a traveler to the United States on an international carrier, if that

traveler is himself a person of color, coming to an airport in the southern part of the United States, will find that he cannot sit in a waiting room with Americans; he must go into a separate waiting room for black people; that he may not use the same toilet facilities; and that in some cases he may not use the same dining room. How can we possibly justify that? It would be hard enough to justify it on moral grounds if provision as to the subject were not imbedded in our Constitution and in the law of the land. It seems inconceivable to me that we can justify it when it is actually unlawful, and so declared by the courts, so declared by the law, and so declared by the policy of the FAA itself, which at the same time, in the same memorandum, instructs people how to avoid it. It is inconceivable to me; I cannot understand it.

Finally, we must in some way get at this situation. We have tried to do it. We have had long debate. We are trying to do it now on the basis of the right to vote, as our first effort in this regard. That is all to the good. I hope we will make much progress.

But when as obvious a situation as this one hits us in the face, to use a curbstone term, and when every opportunity is given to the agency itself to do something about it, but it will not move, it seems to me that the situation calls only for the kind of remedy which, in extremis, I have proposed today. There is simply no other way out, and nothing else which can be done, much as any of us would try to do something else about it.

Mr. President, it is for that reason, and on those grounds, and in view of the complete documentation on this situation, which I have submitted both to the committee and to the Senate, that I believe there is nothing else for me to do except propose this amendment.

I believe we have worked out a procedure which will be economical of the time of the Senate and, I hope, of temper, in terms of the debate.

I repeat that I am addressing myself solely to the issue: and I shall not attempt to castigate either the Agency or any individual who is approaching this matter.

But, Mr. President, after so clearly and demonstrably proving the situation, which can be confirmed by observation by any person who goes to an airport in the southeastern part of our country, I felt that, as a Senator, I must try to do something about that situation. That is why I am about to propose this amendment.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. SCOTT. I am impressed by what the Senator from New York has said; and his remarks suggest to me how I would feel if I were to enter the airport at Orly, France, or North Holton, England, or at Bonn, or at Madrid, or at Ciampino, Italy, and there read on a plaque that the airport had been built by means of the use of Federal funds, but that persons of some given nationality

or color or race—which might, for example, include me, as a citizen of the United States—would be required to use facilities separate and apart from those available to other persons who made use of that international airport. In that event, I believe I would get a bad impression.

Travelers in increasing numbers now come to the United States from all over the earth; and they are of many kinds and many races and many nationalities. They come from the very ends of the earth.

I must say that I agree with the Senator from New York that we should not give propaganda material to those who are hostile to what we are proud of in the American way of life. We should not affront either our visitors or our own citizens.

Although I am of the opinion that the law already is clear, and does prohibit the separation of such facilities, nevertheless I recognize the purpose of the amendment of the Senator from New York; and I am glad to announce here that I shall be happy to support it.

Mr. JAVITS. I am very grateful to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. President, I wish to call attention to the fact that there are other airports in which exactly the same situation exists, in addition to the two—the one at Birmingham and the one at Tallahassee—that are affected by the pending bill. In addition, there is the airport at Montgomery, Ala.; the airport at Meridian, Miss.; and the airport at Natchez, Miss. There may be others; but I have cited enough to indicate that this practice is by no means a limited one which has not received much attention.

Mr. President, I now call up my amendment which deals with this matter—it is identified as "6-20-60-B"—and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment submitted by the Senator from New York will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 11, in line 6, it is proposed to strike out the period, and insert a colon and the following:

Provided, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for the liquidation of contract obligations incurred for the construction of airport terminal buildings containing racially segregated dining or other facilities.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 250]

Aiken	Byrd, W. Va.	Curtis
Allott	Cannon	Dirksen
Anderson	Capehart	Dodd
Beall	Carlson	Douglas
Bennett	Case, N.J.	Dworshak
Bible	Case, S. Dak.	Eastland
Bridges	Chavez	Ellender
Brunsdale	Church	Engle
Bush	Clark	Ervin
Butler	Cooper	Fong
Byrd, Va.	Cotton	Frear

Fulbright	Lausche	Prouty
Goldwater	Long, Hawaii	Proxmire
Green	Long, La.	Randolph
Gruening	Lusk	Russell
Hart	McCarthy	Saltonstall
Hartke	McClellan	Scott
Hayden	McGee	Smathers
Hickenlooper	McNamara	Smith
Hill	Magnuson	Sparkman
Holland	Mansfield	Stennis
Hruska	Martin	Symington
Jackson	Monroney	Talmadge
Javits	Morse	Thurmond
Johnson, Tex.	Morton	Wiley
Jordan	Moss	Williams, Del.
Keating	Mundt	Williams, N.J.
Kerr	Muskie	Yarborough
Kuchel	Pastore	Young, Ohio

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, now that more Senators are present than were present previously, I wish to take 2 minutes to explain the amendment. After that I shall be perfectly ready to vote, and I shall ask for the yeas and nays.

The amendment seeks to prevent the Federal Aviation Agency from making available grant funds for the construction of airport terminals, within which there will be segregated facilities—facilities within the shell furnished by the Federal grant, substantially, which may be used for segregated dining rooms, restrooms, and waiting rooms.

Mr. President, Senators will observe upon their desks a mimeographed memorandum explaining the amendment, which carries the whole argument I have made.

The law under which the agency functions says very clearly that these grants are to be made "without unjust discrimination." The Airports Policy and Procedure Memorandum of the agency specifically states the policy is not to have segregated facilities among the facilities financed by its grants, yet in the same memorandum the people are told exactly how to go about accepting some of the grants so that the facilities can be segregated. It is very blatant, Mr. President. The memorandum is to be found at page 617 of the record of hearings before the committee. It is very clear that if one wants to provide segregated facilities the Agency tells one exactly how to go about getting the grants and still providing segregated facilities.

Mr. President, it is inconceivable in this day and age that we should lend ourselves to any such illegal operation. Certainly the court will enjoin any such thing at any airport, but that means it is necessary to take each situation to court. We should not provide Federal money, in the way of grants, to perpetuate a situation which the courts would enjoin as illegal—which the courts have enjoined as illegal as recently as the case decided in April of this year, which is referred to at page 610 of the hearings before the committee upon this subject.

Mr. President, I cannot see how in good conscience we can fail to restrict the expenditure of funds of the Federal Government on grants in respect of a matter of this character, and how we can allow any foreign or domestic traveler to come into an airport, read

the plaque on the front of the building which says it is built with Federal funds, go in, and find, if he is a person of color, be he an Indian or a Ghanaian, or a person from anywhere else in the world, that he is restricted as to where he may go, where he may sit, and what facilities he may use in that airport. It is for that reason, because we could not get a change in policy from the Agency, that I proposed the amendment.

Accordingly on my amendment I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New York.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I cannot let this occasion pass without expressing my approval of the amendment of the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS]. It seems to me that terminal buildings are organic buildings. One sees the Federal shell outside, which is supposed to be nonsegregated, and then the local or State area inside, which is segregated. This is a purely artificial method used to defeat the purpose of the law.

We remember that Solomon had a similar problem when two mothers contested for a child. Solomon's proposal was to cut the child in half and award one-half to one mother and the other half to the other, which resolved the controversy rather quickly.

A terminal building is almost as organic as a child, and this attempt to have locally segregated areas inside a building which is federally financed is equally an effort to defeat the purpose of the law. So I very much hope that the amendment of the Senator from New York will be agreed to.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I shall be very brief. The committee went into this subject in some great detail. It is not as simple as the description of the Senator from Illinois, because it is an appropriation bill and involves contracts that have been made previously.

The amendment should be proposed to the Federal Airport Act. I strongly favor the purpose of the amendment. This is my 24th session in Congress and I have voted for every single bill of this type. In fact, I have introduced many of them before some Senators who are sitting here today arrived. So, reluctantly, because we have had two legal opinions on this subject, I must oppose the amendment.

Lawsuits against the Government would be filed. Five small airports for which contracts were made are at present involved. I assure the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] and all other Senators that any amendment presented to the legislative committee involved which would require future contracts to contain clauses of the kind proposed by the amendment of the Senator from New York, would have the committee's approval.

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

Mr. MAGNUSON. In present contracts provision of the type suggested is

included, but the amendment of the Senator from New York involves going back to a few small contracts that were made in instances in which local authorities went ahead and built airports. Sometimes the contractors were paid monthly and sometimes they waited until the airport was completely constructed to request Federal grants. In a couple of cases that happened.

No one has been more zealous in the cause of antisegregation than has the Senator from Washington, but the present bill is not the place for this type of action. The proposal should be put on the calendar of the committee considering the Federal Airport Act. As I said, under present contracts I am assured provision is made for the situation described. I brought the subject to the attention of the committee, and the committee has instructed me to move to table the amendment, which I must reluctantly do.

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

Mr. MAGNUSON. I announce that I shall move to table the amendment of the Senator from New York.

I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. I thank my friend for his courtesy in yielding to me. I will take only 2 minutes. I regret very much to conclude that this is a clear-cut moral issue and that there is no justification that I can see for the letter of Mr. Lowen representing the CAA which appears in the record at page 617 of the hearings. It seems to me that the situation described in the letter is a clear evasion of law. I regret very much that in their wisdom my colleagues have concluded that they do not wish to be recorded on this issue. I would like the record to show that I support the Senator from New York.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks two letters from Daggett H. Howard, General Counsel of the Federal Aviation Agency to the chairman of the committee, one dated May 20, 1960, and the other dated June 22, 1960, on the legal aspects of this problem.

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

FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY,
Washington, D.C., May 20, 1960.

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Independent
Offices and General Government Matters,
Appropriations Committee, U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This letter is in response to the questions asked by the subcommittee at the hearing on May 17, 1960, concerning a proposed amendment to H.R. 11776 offered by Senator JAVITS, and is also in response to your request that the General Counsel of the Federal Aviation Agency provide the subcommittee with his written views as to the legal implications of the proposed amendment.

We appreciate very much the opportunity to submit to the subcommittee our thoughts on some of the legal problems which may arise if the amendment to H.R. 11776 proposed by Senator JAVITS is enacted into law.

At the outset, we wish to express our sympathy with the aims of Senator JAVITS. We think those aims are highly commendable. However, it should be made clear that the Federal Aviation Agency does not now provide funds for the development of segregated facilities in airport buildings. Our policy in this respect is set out in 14 C.F.R. 550.24(i) (5) in the following language:

"(5) No Federal-aid airport program funds will be made available for the development of separate facilities or space in an airport building when such facilities or space are designed for use now or in the future for separate racial groups."

We have given considerable thought to the practical problems involved if Senator JAVITS' proposed amendment is adopted. Assuming its validity, it would have the effect of denying some important safety items to the public using airport facilities over a large part of our country. For example, the Federal Aviation Agency would be prohibited from expending funds for the construction of control towers where such towers are to be a part of an airport building falling under the restrictions in Senator JAVITS' proposed amendment. Moreover, the Agency would be prohibited from providing funds to house weather reporting and communications activities in any part of such an airport building.

Aside from the obvious fact that the proposed amendment may be substantive legislation in an appropriations act, we have more serious questions regarding its legality. The funds called for in H.R. 11776 are to meet existing contractual obligations, not obligations which may arise in the future. We believe the proposed amendment would result in lawsuits against the Federal Government on the basis that an existing valid contract is property and that property rights are protected by the Constitution whether the obligor is the United States or others. The United States is subject to the due process clause of the Constitution; and, in its contractual relations with others, the U.S. rights and duties are governed generally by the law applicable to contracts between private individuals.

Even if the proposed amendment were not objectionable on legal grounds, we feel it is inherently unfair to those who have expended their funds in reliance upon financial participation by the United States, as well as disruptive of needed airport development.

Sincerely yours,

DAGGETT H. HOWARD,
General Counsel.

FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY,
Washington, D.C., June 22, 1960.

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
Chairman, Interstate and Foreign Commerce
Committee, U.S. Senate, Washington,
D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: A member of your staff has inquired as to our views on a reworded version of the proposed amendment to H.R. 11776 offered by Senator JAVITS. You will recall that I answered certain questions asked by the committee on the earlier version in my letter to you of May 20, 1960. The new language we were asked to consider reads as follows: "Provided, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for the liquidation of contract obligations incurred for the construction of airport terminal buildings containing racially segregated dining or other facilities."

We do not feel that the changes in language cure the proposed amendment of the defects we noted in our previous comments. It is still my considered legal opinion that the amendment, even as reworded, is of questionable legality and would result in lawsuits against the Federal Government.

As I indicated in my previous letter, such lawsuits could be brought on grounds that an existing valid contract is property.

Accordingly, it is my legal opinion that the practical result of the proposed amendment would be to subject the Federal Government to costly administrative burdens and protracted litigation, without achieving the result Senator JAVITS seeks. The Federal Government would, in the end, be forced to make the payments, in the form of settlement of claims or judgments, even though normal payment from these appropriations were barred by the proposed amendment.

I am convinced that the present grant agreements are valid contracts in this respect, that they are not contracts made in violation of any law, and that it would be a futile gesture for the Federal Government to refuse payment thereunder on the grounds Senator JAVITS seeks to assert through the proposed amendment. If it is the wish of Congress to achieve the objective sought by the Senator, the most appropriate and least troublesome way to accomplish this is by direct amendment of the Federal Airport Act itself.

I might add at this point a few brief words of clarification as to the present law and the policy followed under it by the Federal Aviation Agency. In my previous letter, I set forth the provisions of 14 CFR 550.24(i)(5), which are to the effect that no Federal-aid airport program funds will be made available for the development of separate facilities or space in airport buildings when such facilities or space are designed for use now or in the future for separate racial groups.

I think it might be useful to point out to your committee just how this Agency's policy on this matter works and how it does have the effect of reducing Federal grants-in-aid for airport terminal building projects in which there are racially segregated facilities. For example, let us say that an airport terminal building is to be constructed for \$100,000 and that \$10,000 of this is to go for construction of segregated dining facilities. This \$10,000 item would be completely denied as an allowable project cost. Thus, if the Federal share is to be 50 percent, the Federal grant-in-aid would be \$45,000.

On the other hand, let us assume that an identical terminal building is to be constructed for \$100,000, but the same \$10,000 dining facility is not to be racially segregated. In this case, the 50 percent Federal contribution would be \$50,000.

This policy is strictly applied in all instances by the Agency and has the effect of reducing Federal contributions, as illustrated, whenever a racially segregated facility is involved. I wish to emphasize that we guard against any bookkeeping or other adjustments anywhere else in the program which might otherwise nullify this policy. We are extremely careful not to permit any increased participation in the remainder of the project which could convert this into a mere bookkeeping exercise. The policy has teeth and is strictly administered.

If you or your committee have any further questions, we shall be very happy to answer them.

Sincerely,

DAGGETT H. HOWARD,
General Counsel.

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

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. The Senator from New York, who made the request for the yeas and nays, is present in the Senate, as are most of the other interested Senators.

I would like to call to the attention of the Senate the statement of the General Counsel of the FAA which appears on page 126 of the hearings:

Aside from the obvious fact that the proposed amendment may be substantive legislation in an appropriations act, we have more serious questions regarding its legality. The funds called for in H.R. 11776 are to meet existing contractual obligations, not obligations which may arise in the future. We believe the proposed amendment would result in lawsuits against the Federal Government on the basis that an existing valid contract is property and that property rights are protected by the Constitution whether the obligor is the United States or others. The United States is subject to the due process clause of the Constitution; and in its contractual relations with others, the U.S. rights and duties are governed generally by the law applicable to contracts between private individuals.

I would like to say to my chairman and to my friends in the Senate that there is no Senator—and I am sure the Senator from New York will agree—who supported all measures of this kind any more assiduously than has the senior Senator from Colorado and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] who is the chairman of the committee, and I shall support this type of legislation in a legislative bill. But I do not think this type of provision should be put in the present bill as a limitation on contracts which have already been created.

I followed the argument of the Senator from New York, and I would like to discuss it at greater length. But I think the law needs some beefing up. I will support him and, in fact, I will join him in such proposed legislation, but I do not think this is the place for it.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me very briefly?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I will take no more than 1 minute. Whatever else my reputation may be, I do not think I have acquired a reputation for long-windedness.

I was made aware of the letter of the counsel by the chairman of the committee. I answered it. My answer is found at page 615 of the record. To make it very specific, so Senators will follow my argument, my point was that when a contract of this character was made to provide a grant, the only time the matter came to us at all, because the law now permits the agency to make these contracts, was under an appropriation bill. Therefore, this occasion was the only time I could bring the subject to the attention of the Senate. I have tried to get a change in policy in the agency, and I have been completely unsuccessful for reasons which were completely beyond me. This was the only remedy I had, and the argument as to existing contracts was answered, in my view. The point is that they are ultra vires the United States, because they are unlawful. The courts have said so, and the law says so. The statute allowing the grant says so. That completely explodes the argument and gives us no other way to get out of the situation. Any contracting party can fully

qualify for the grant by not using the subterfuge suggested by the agency itself, namely, having segregated facilities.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I will join with the Senator from New York. We can get at the situation. I know where we can get at it, and get at it in the right way.

Mr. JAVITS. Allow me to say something in fairness to the Senator from Washington and the Senator from Colorado. Those two Senators are more zealous in respect to equal rights to all Americans than they are. I respect the sincerity of their views, though I deeply disagree with them in this discussion.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I move to lay the amendment on the table.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 251]		
Aiken	Ervin	McNamara
Allott	Fong	Magnuson
Anderson	Frear	Mansfield
Beall	Fulbright	Martin
Bennett	Goldwater	Monroney
Bible	Green	Morse
Bridges	Gruening	Morton
Brunsdale	Hart	Moss
Bush	Hartke	Mundt
Butler	Hayden	Muskie
Byrd, Va.	Hickenlooper	Pastore
Byrd, W. Va.	Hill	Prouty
Cannon	Holland	Proxmire
Capehart	Hruska	Randolph
Carlson	Jackson	Russell
Case, N.J.	Javits	Saltonstall
Case, S. Dak.	Johnson, Tex.	Scott
Chavez	Johnston, S.C.	Smathers
Clark	Jordan	Smith
Cooper	Keating	Sparkman
Cotton	Kerr	Stennis
Curtis	Kuchel	Symington
Dirksen	Lausche	Talmadge
Dodd	Long, Hawaii	Thurmond
Douglas	Long, La.	Wiley
Dworshak	Lusk	Williams, Del.
Eastland	McCarthy	Williams, N.J.
Ellender	McClellan	Yarborough
Engle	McGee	Young, Ohio

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] to lay on the table the amendment of the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNING] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] are necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT] is paired with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Alaska would vote "nay," and the Senator from Virginia would vote "yea."

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNING], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] is absent because of death in his family.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] is detained on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 58, nays 29, as follows:

[No. 252]		
YEAS—58		
Aiken	Ervin	Mansfield
Allott	Frear	Martin
Anderson	Fulbright	Monroney
Bennett	Goldwater	Moss
Bible	Green	Mundt
Bridges	Hayden	Pastore
Brunsdale	Hickenlooper	Prouty
Butler	Hill	Russell
Byrd, Va.	Holland	Saltonstall
Byrd, W. Va.	Hruska	Smathers
Cannon	Jackson	Smith
Capehart	Johnson, Tex.	Sparkman
Carlson	Johnston, S.C.	Stennis
Case, S. Dak.	Jordan	Talmadge
Cotton	Kerr	Thurmond
Curtis	Long, La.	Wiley
Dirksen	Lusk	Williams, Del.
Dworshak	McClellan	Yarborough
Eastland	McGee	
Ellender	Magnuson	

NAYS—29		
Beall	Gruening	Morse
Bush	Hart	Morton
Case, N.J.	Hartke	Muskie
Church	Javits	Proxmire
Clark	Keating	Randolph
Cooper	Kuchel	Scott
Dodd	Lausche	Symington
Douglas	Long, Hawaii	Williams, N.J.
Engle	McCarthy	Young, Ohio
Fong	McClellan	
	McNamara	

NOT VOTING—13

Bartlett	Humphrey	Robertson
Carroll	Kefauver	Schoeppele
Chavez	Kennedy	Young, N. Dak.
Gore	Murray	
Henning	O'Mahoney	

So the motion to lay on the table Mr. JAVITS' amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the motion to lay on the table the amendment of the Senator from New York was agreed to.

Mr. ALLOTT. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. HUMPHREY subsequently said: Mr. President, with regard to the vote relating to the tabling of the motion by the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] I was in an informal hearing relating to the report on the food and drug industry of the Federal Trade Commission, with the Chairman of the Commission

and the staff of the Federal Trade Commission. I wish to have the RECORD show that I arrived at the Chamber immediately after the vote was announced. Had I been in the Chamber I would have voted "nay." I regret that I was unable to arrive by the time the vote was announced. I assure my colleagues that I made every attempt to be present.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I understand that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] has an amendment, and that he is willing to have it considered under a time limitation. Therefore, I suggest that the Senator from Ohio now call up the amendment; and I ask unanimous consent that during its consideration there be not to exceed 5 minutes to each side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CANNON in the chair). Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, my amendment is as follows: On page 11, in line 6, before the period, insert a colon and the following:

Provided, That except with respect to grants under obligations incurred prior to the date of enactment of this Act, no part of this appropriation may be used as a grant for the building of any airport facility unless the contract under which the grant is made contains recitals prohibiting the sale or distribution to the public or otherwise of any obscene, lewd, or lascivious book, pamphlet, picture, print, drawing, or other indecent or immoral article; and provided further, that if such materials are so sold or distributed, the recipient of the grant shall become obligated to repay such grant to the Federal Aviation Agency.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, under these circumstances, I could not present my amendment within 5 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask that the Senate be in order.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, about 2 months ago the Transit Authority of Chicago issued upon concessionaires an order that if they sold lewd or indecent material on the newsstands, their rights in possession of the leased property would be terminated.

This morning, at a meeting, I heard Reverend Graham make the statement that while he was in Africa he was told repeatedly that the good we have done with our aid has been more than neutralized by the damage we have done with motion pictures and indecent literature.

I do not think I need argue to my colleagues that a grave problem is confronting the people of our country with respect to mercenaries who are intent upon making profits, even though they are contaminating the moral fabric of our youth.

I recognize that there may be a parliamentary flaw in this amendment; but I suggest to my colleagues that we cannot delay dealing with this vital problem concerning the people of our Nation. We cannot hope to survive if we tolerate

mercenaries who sell materials which we know are destroying the moral fabric of our youth.

I receive many letters from mothers who write to me, "I am worried about my children. You are allowing damaging materials to be sold. Why do not you do something about it?"

There are some who will say this amendment violates the free-speech guarantee in the Constitution. But the amendment does not do so at all. It merely provides that the U.S. Government, as a condition to the making of a grant, demands that the property which will be built out of the grant shall not be used for the purposes which I enumerate in the amendment.

I have consulted the Legislative Reference Service, and have asked the drafter of the amendment whether it would collide with the decision of the Supreme Court that language of this type is uncertain, and therefore not adequate to bring into existence an intended piece of legislation. The adviser in that department said this situation is different, because in this amendment we are not dealing with the constitutional right of free speech, but we are merely attaching a condition as a prerequisite to the obtaining of a grant.

Mr. President, that is my case. I present the amendment to the Senate, for its consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I believe that the minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN] has left the Chamber. A moment ago he suggested that he reserved a point of order against this amendment. I do not know whether he is soon to return or not.

I merely wish to say that I do not suppose there is any Member of this body who has any objection to the motive behind the amendment. I am perfectly willing to take the amendment to conference. Everybody wants to attach something to an appropriation bill, and nobody wants to go to the committees and go through the regular committee procedure. That is the simple way to do it. Sometimes amendments such as the last one we voted on are offered to appropriation bills. Nobody has been more in favor of civil rights than the Senator from Washington has, and I was for it long before some of my colleagues were here; but when an appropriation bill is brought to the floor, we are subjected to embarrassment by being asked to vote on a proposal that does not belong in the bill at all.

Someone has said, "Your friends hurt you more than your enemies do." Everyone is against lewd literature, or at least that should be the case. This is a local matter, of course. Grants-in-aid are sometimes predicated upon local bonds. Airports are operated wholly by local people, and I presume there are local laws. I was once prosecuting attorney in my county. We operated an airport, and we had some laws.

This is a fine amendment. I do not know how it would be enforced, how-

ever. I am sure General Quesada will not ride around in his airplane every day and thumb through articles on the news-stands and see what is there. I do not know that I would want to trust his judgment too much in deciding whether the material was lewd or obscene. What is probably considered to be one thing in Boston might not be considered to be such in Las Vegas.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? I merely want to ask him which way does he mean? [Laughter.]

Mr. MAGNUSON. I think Senators know which way. That is another problem that is involved. No one disagrees with the statement that there is a problem involved. I have seen some airports where conditions are bad; but all we do is give local communities money to help them build airports. Sometimes we do not give them 50 percent. In some years we have not given them anything. But, because the Federal Government gives them money, we want to dig into their affairs and tell them how to run their airports. In the case of Federal aid to education, there would be a big hue and cry around here if an amendment were attached to the bill stating what kind of books were to be used in schools, just because Federal money is spent in that field. I do not want that responsibility. We would be talking States rights from now to Christmas on that one.

I am perfectly willing to accept the amendment. I agree with the Senator from Ohio that perhaps we ought to do something about the problem, but I do not know why we do not do something about these things in the proper place.

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

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. ALLOTT. Was this proposal ever presented to the committee?

Mr. MAGNUSON. No; it was not.

Mr. LAUSCHE. It was not.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator from Ohio has stated it was more forcefully called to his attention only recently.

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

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I think no Senator could conscientiously and honestly say, "I have not worried about this problem." No Senator would dare say it. No Senator would dare go before the public, seeking support, and say he is not concerned about the problem of the sale of indecent literature.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I think everyone has been concerned about it, and I think the Appropriations Committee of the Senate started activity in this field, as relates to the Post Office Department, concerning the abuse of the mails. That activity was started in the committee of which the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] is chairman.

I am not talking about the amendment of the Senator from Ohio as such. I am talking about procedure in the Senate. Senators wait until an appropriation bill shows up, and then Sena-

tors who are in favor of the proposal presented are forced to vote against it because they want to see that orderly procedure is adhered to, and that Senate business is conducted in an orderly way.

There is no objection to the amendment on the part of the Senator from Colorado or the committee. I am willing to take the amendment to conference. I will do the best I can to have the conference adopt some wording along the line the Senator from Ohio has suggested.

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

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

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, has my time expired?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio has 1 minute.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I have 1 minute.

I recognize the strength of the argument made, but I submit to the Senate the time has come when we had better start thinking of ways and means of coping with this problem.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I have the highest admiration and respect for my friend from Ohio. This matter is clearly legislation. It has no place in an appropriation bill. It is affirmative. It gives direction. It is legislative in character. The problem ought to be handled in another way. We seek to do it through hearings, and through the activities of the Appropriations Committee we have carried on a great program in this field. So let us follow the customary and ordinary legislative process, rather than this kind of procedure.

Therefore, Mr. President, I make a point of order against the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair rules that under rule XVI, subdivision 4, the amendment is subject to a point of order, and the point of order is sustained.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I understand the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] has an amendment, on which he is willing to accept a time limitation.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a brief moment?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BUSH. I should like to say to the Senator from Ohio that I think he has raised an exceedingly important issue. I urge him to prepare legislation to deal with his problem in a way that will be acceptable to the Senate. I ask him to let me join him in sponsorship of such legislation.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I thank the Senator very much.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, the Senator from Ohio feels deeply frustrated when he is left with the impression that there is indifference in this body about this problem.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield first to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN]. Then I shall yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator from Washington—

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, who has the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas has the floor. He has yielded to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to the Senator from Vermont, and ask unanimous consent that he may ask a question of the Senator from Washington.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Washington about an item under "Construction and Acquisition."

Under "Construction of Public Buildings," there is a planning item for a courthouse in Montpelier, Vt. Is that correct?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Montpelier, Vt., is included under the construction and acquisition portion of the bill, as well as Derby Line, Vt.

Mr. AIKEN. Is the amount of \$120,000 provided for sites and expenses for the Montpelier project?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Sites and expenses, \$120,000.

Mr. AIKEN. Can the Senator tell us what the amount is for Derby Line, Vt.?

Mr. MAGNUSON. \$37,000 for sites and expenses.

Mr. AIKEN. I thank the Senator from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, for the benefit of other Senators, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a tabulation of the sites and expenses and improvement costs in all the States.

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

Construction and acquisition

	Total		Detail of revised 1961 estimate reflecting proposed GSA amendments	
	In request to House	Revised estimate	Sites and expenses	Improvement cost
1. Construction of public buildings:				
(A) Inside the District of Columbia:				
Federal office building No. 8 (HEW) 2d and D Sts. SW	\$23,840,000	\$16,244,000		\$16,244,000
Federal office building No. 9 (CSC) 19th and E Sts. NW		22,002,100		22,002,100
Federal office building No. 10 (Federal office building) (NASA-FAA) Independence and 6th to 9th Sts. SW	45,090,000	42,583,500		42,583,500
GPO field plant	627,000	627,000	\$627,000	
U.S. Court of Claims and Court of Customs and Patent Appeals Bldg.	7,500,000	6,591,000		6,591,000
Total, inside District of Columbia	77,057,000	88,047,600	627,000	87,420,600
(B) Outside the District of Columbia:				
Decatur, Ark., post office, Federal office building	223,000	223,000	223,000	
Camden, Ark., post office, etc.	745,000	683,650		683,650
Bakersfield, Calif., Federal office building	114,000	114,000	114,000	
San Francisco, Calif., courthouse, Federal office building	43,896,000	38,996,900		38,996,900
Hartford, Conn., courthouse, Federal office building	8,984,000	7,951,400		7,951,400
Wallingford, Conn., post office, etc.	283,000	283,000		
Wilmington, Del., courthouse, customhouse, Federal office building	900,000	900,000	900,000	
Gainesville, Fla., post office, courthouse	350,000	350,000	350,000	
Miami, Fla., Federal office building	8,325,000	7,076,250		7,076,250
Tampa, Fla., Federal office building	998,000	998,000		
Statesboro, Ga., post office, etc.	133,000	133,000	998,000	
Thomasville, Ga., post office, courthouse	1,287,000	1,151,600	133,000	1,151,600
Boise, Idaho, courthouse, Federal office building	702,000	702,000	702,000	
Chicago, Ill., courthouse, Federal office building		5,500,000		5,500,000
Seymour, Ind., post office, etc.	124,000	124,000	124,000	
Augusta, Maine, post office, Federal office building	310,000	310,000	310,000	
Jackman, Maine, border station	341,000	289,850		289,850
Van Buren, Maine, border station	335,000	322,550		322,550
Vanceboro, Maine, border station	299,000	272,150		272,150
Webster, Mass., post office	131,000	131,000	131,000	
Clarksdale, Miss., post office, courthouse	419,000	419,000	419,000	
Tupelo, Miss., post office, etc.	100,000	100,000	100,000	
Billings, Mont., courthouse, Federal office building	612,000	612,000	612,000	
Sweetgrass, Mont., border station	690,000	648,600		648,600
North Platte, Nebr., post office, courthouse	312,000	312,000	312,000	
Reno, Nev., courthouse, Federal office building	469,000	469,000	469,000	
Albuquerque, N. Mex., warehouse	552,000	469,200		469,200
Bismarck, N. Dak., post office, courthouse	3,793,000	3,323,050		3,323,050
Toledo, Ohio, Federal office building	4,650,000	4,065,700		4,065,700
Tulsa, Okla., post office, Federal office building	2,495,000	2,495,000	2,495,000	
Westerly, R.I., post office, etc.	274,000	274,000	274,000	
Charleston, S.C., Federal office building	248,000	248,000	248,000	
Sioux Falls, S. Dak., post office, etc.	515,000	515,000	515,000	
Memphis, Tenn., courthouse, Federal office building	11,279,000	10,577,150		10,577,150
El Paso, Tex., border station	1,342,000	1,155,700	100,000	1,055,700
Ogden, Utah, courthouse, Federal office building	870,000	870,000	870,000	
Derby Line, Vt., border station	37,000	37,000	37,000	
Montpelier, Vt., post office, courthouse	120,000	120,000	120,000	
Dayton, Wash., post office, etc.	332,000	301,100		301,100
Richland, Wash., post office, courthouse	582,000	582,000	582,000	
Cheyenne, Wyo., post office, courthouse	1,127,000	1,127,000	1,127,000	
Total, outside District of Columbia	99,148,000	95,212,850	12,628,000	82,684,850
Total, construction of public buildings	176,205,000	183,260,450	13,155,000	170,105,450
2. Extension and conversion of buildings:				
Nogales, Ariz., border station	509,000	509,000	509,000	
Detroit, Mich., inspection headquarters	1,029,000	925,050		925,050
Wyandotte, Mich., post office, etc.	114,000	114,000	114,000	
Johnstown, Pa., post office, etc.	280,000	280,000	280,000	
Philadelphia, Pa., post office, courthouse	6,814,000	5,825,500	224,000	5,601,500
Total, extension and conversion of buildings	8,746,000	7,653,550	1,127,000	6,526,550
3. Unspecified projects	49,000	5,218,000	5,218,000	
Total 1961 estimate	185,000,000	196,132,000	19,500,000	176,632,000

NOTE.—Revised May 6, 1960.

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

Schedule 5. Projects approved by House and Senate Public Works Committees on the basis of reports submitted pursuant to sec. 11(b) of the Public Buildings Act of 1959 for which no funds are specifically provided in 1961 bill

[See explanation in Senate report]

	Total estimated cost	Site and expenses	Improvement cost
Georgia: Winder, post office, Federal office building.....	\$659,000	\$104,000	\$555,000
Hawaii: Honolulu:			
Post office, courthouse.....	23,500,000	1,270,000	22,230,000
Quarantine station and clinic.....	1,887,000	157,000	1,730,000
New Mexico: Albuquerque, post office, courthouse.....	10,700,000	2,045,000	8,655,000
Ohio: Cleveland, courthouse, Federal office building.....	47,921,000	5,176,000	42,745,000
South Dakota: Pierre, Federal office building.....	3,415,000	456,000	2,959,000
Total (6 projects).....	88,082,000	9,208,000	78,874,000

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the question of passage of the bill.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] may offer his amendment, that the Senate have 30 minutes to discuss the amendment, and that the time be equally divided between the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. ALLOTT and Mr. MUNDT addressed the Chair.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield first to the Senator from Colorado, and then I shall yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, with regard to the literature, I think the chairman of the committee made the point very clear. What happens when such amendments are presented to the Senate is that Senators are put in the position of voting against some things in which they believe, but which have no place in the appropriation bill.

I say to the Senator from Ohio that my own interest—and I am sure this is true with respect to the interest of the Senator from Washington and of many other Senators—has not been confined to trying to stop the distribution of lewd literature in the last day or the last week. My interest has been evident over a period of years. There have been Supreme Court decisions, troubles in regard to drafting proposed legislation, and troubles in regard to the enforcement of the law. We have had many problems.

I think it is improper to present these amendments to the Senate and to try to attach them to appropriation bills.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to my friend from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. May I have the attention of the Senator from Ohio, please? I am sure the Senator will be able to sleep better tonight when he learns of the fact that the Senate Committee on Government Operations today unanimously reported from the committee a bill dealing with the problem of obscene literature. We had before the committee two measures, one introduced by the

distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] and one which I introduced. One would provide for a White House conference. My bill would provide for a continuing commission to make a study of this problem and make recommendations effectively to deal with the problem across the board. The bill was unanimously reported. The Senator may be assured that we will be given an opportunity to deal with this problem in the present session of Congress.

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

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. In closing my remarks, I was willing to present my argument in 5 minutes, but though I took such little time, while I was speaking my colleagues were yelling "Vote! Vote!" I do not think that is worthy conduct.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I join the Senator from Ohio in expressing the hope that we can all vote upon the measure before the session of Congress adjourns. The bill relating to obscene literature has been reported, and it will be upon the calendar before the end of this week.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Texas yield the floor?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, for myself and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] 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 CHIEF CLERK. On page 28, line 19, it is proposed to strike out "\$5,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$50,000,000".

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Does the Senator from New Jersey desire the yeas and nays on his amendment?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the amendment I have offered would raise from \$5 million to \$50 million the funds for the program of direct loans to private nonprofit groups for housing for our elderly citizens. I was

glad to accept the limitation of time, because the Senate has already very forcefully demonstrated that it recognizes the need for this sort of program.

Last year, in recognition of the fact that those citizens in this country to whom we owe the most are getting the least, we authorized \$50 million for a loan program for housing our senior citizens. This year the housing bill, as passed by the Senate, raised the authorization from \$50 million for the revolving loan fund to \$75 million. Notwithstanding the authorization, appropriations were not provided last year to implement the program.

This year the House passed and the Senate committee proposes \$5 million, describing this as money to be used for a pilot project. I respectfully suggest that a pilot project of study and development is not needed. We know the need. We have demonstrated our recognition of these needs in many ways. The RECORD is replete with the recognition that those who have the lowest incomes, our older folks, simply do not have the money to pay the higher rents which are necessary when the housing is developed under the regular commercial interest rates.

This program, if put into operation, would provide housing with monthly payments nearly \$20 less than would be possible with conventional financing.

For example, under FHA financing, a \$10,000, 40-year mortgage would result in monthly payments of \$54.80. Housing under this direct loan program would permit private nonprofit corporations to provide comparable facilities for \$36.50 a month, or \$18.30 less than under FHA.

The FHA program which we have for senior citizens is limping along because the interest rates which are charged produce rents which are out of reach for millions and millions of our older citizens.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the letter which was addressed to the Committee on Appropriations by members of the Subcommittee on Problems of the Aged and Aging, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH]. It vividly documents the need for the amendment I am proposing.

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

JUNE 3, 1960.

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
Chairman, Independent Offices Subcommittee,
Committee on Appropriations, U.S.
Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: A major unmet need of the elderly is the provision of safe, sanitary and congenial housing at a rental which older persons can afford. This conclusion was reached by the Senate Subcommittee on Problems of the Aged and Aging, of which the undersigned are members, after extensive hearings in Washington and in seven cities across the country. National experts in the field of aging, local administrators working with older persons in their home communities, and hundreds of older citizens themselves were heard. The subcommittee also

conducted extensive staff studies and made personal visits to the homes of older persons: In roominghouse areas, in homes for the aged, in public housing developments, and in privately owned facilities. Everywhere the conclusion was the same. The retired aged of the Nation have common problems which include low income, a need for independent living, and meaningful social activity to avoid loneliness and frustration.

As a result of these findings, the subcommittee recommended that the Congress take action, in this session, to appropriate funds authorized by the direct loan program (sec. 202, Housing Act of 1959) to assist private, nonprofit groups to provide housing and related facilities for the elderly. After seeing the nature of the problem at first hand in the course of a year's study, the subcommittee felt that the \$50 million authorization, which as not even appropriated last year, is a negligible revolving fund in relation to the need. However, it would be helpful as a stimulating demonstration. The subcommittee recommended that the authorization be raised to \$100 million and that this amount should actually be appropriated for use in fiscal year 1960. It called upon the Federal agencies to act quickly on this program.

The undersigned members of the subcommittee strongly urge that the Committee on Appropriations recommend appropriation of the full \$50 million authorization this year as a significant start to meet the housing requirements of many of America's low-income senior citizens.

The subcommittee invites your attention to the following:

1. There are now 16 million people over the age of 65 and in just 20 years there will be 24 million. Even more significant is the fact of a rapidly growing number of those over the age of 75. There are now almost 6 million over 75 and in 20 years there will be close to 9 million over 75, the majority of whom will be women and a very large number of them will be single or widowed. One of every three, 60-64, has a parent or close relative to be concerned about.

2. Half the couples over the age of 65 have less than \$2,500 a year in income. Six million people are thus below the minimum standard of living for a couple in a city today. In addition; 2 million single, or widowed persons, have less than \$1,500 a year in income. In total, there are approximately 8 million people over the age of 65 today who cannot afford decent housing and still obtain proper nutrition, adequate medical care or necessary recreation.

3. The average benefit for a person presently on social security is \$72 a month. The average benefit for a couple is \$120 a month. An aged widow now receiving social security must subsist on an average of \$56 per month.

4. In 1959, two out of every five spending units whose head was over 65 had liquid assets of \$200 or less. Two out of three had less than \$2,000 in liquid assets to handle emergencies or cover daily living expenses.

5. Many elderly have health problems which create special housing needs. Although the number of people over 65 is 8.9 percent of the population, they have 40 percent of all cases of heart disease. Eight out of ten of the elderly have one or more chronic conditions as reported by the National Health Survey. They have approximately 55 percent of all the chronic conditions which limit mobility. But the millions of older citizens who no longer enjoy robust health "neither want or need the full-time attention of an institution."

6. They often own and live in houses that are too old and too big for them, or rent single rooms too small for them in roominghouses.

7. A higher percentage of older persons are found in slums, either because urban

blight has covered a familiar neighborhood or because the low incomes of the elderly prohibit better housing. Slum clearance activities in turn produce other hardships as older people are forced to vacate the only housing they can afford.

As we all know, the mere citation of statistics hardly begins to portray the urgency of the need. Some illustrations from the testimony of the subcommittee may be helpful to the Committee on Appropriations in considering this matter. In its visits, the members of the subcommittee talked to an aged widow who lives in a roominghouse area. She pointed out that she and the other elderly tenants in the building were virtually homebound. She said:

"We are free to go out in the daytime, but can't even sit on the benches in the sun because of the people who are drinking, and it's dangerous for us to go out of our rooms in the evening because of the hoodlums who are around. Even the doctor won't come in the evening. He turns down calls saying that it isn't safe for a well-dressed man to come alone to our neighborhood."

A citizen in a small community told us: "I think we need a lot of housing—something must be done about it. I know of many cases where several older folks are living in just one room—cooking, eating, sleeping—and when they get sick they have no place to go."

Older persons want to be independent, they want to live alone. A white-haired widow told us:

"Every time a social worker comes to us she tells us to go and live with our children. Our children have their own problems. No man wants his mother-in-law to come and live with him, and no woman wants her husband's mother to join the family because she wants to be mistress of her own home. Therefore, we would rather have a place of our own."

Dr. Russell Lee of the Lee Clinic, San Jose, Calif., testified before the subcommittee in San Francisco on five problems, and he put housing in first place. Dr. Lee said:

"This country can ill afford the perfectly awful facilities that are provided for older people today. Many of these are just human cesspools. They have designed some of the most magnificent facilities in the world for the care of older people and they exist now. Everybody, rich and poor, who gets older should be able to live in a home of that quality. We are amply able to do it with our financial resources."

Mrs. Marjorie Borchardt, president of the Senior Citizens Association of Los Angeles, said, "Housing in the Los Angeles area is the greatest problem." Many senior citizens have to pay more than half of their income to get housing. Describing the living conditions, Mrs. Borchardt testified:

"Many thousands of them live in light housekeeping rooms where they cook, eat, and sleep, and many of them have to use the same toilet and bath facilities. So far, private enterprise in Los Angeles County has not provided the adequate low-rent housing."

We could cite many more examples from our testimony, our letters, and from our personal visits. However, the major point that we wish to emphasize is that the housing produced under the FHA mortgage insurance program generally is so costly that it can hope to serve only a small segment of the elderly housing need and too often the least urgent segment. An effective, bold program must be undertaken to provide housing for the elderly at a rental that millions of them can afford, particularly private rental housing.

Congress recognized the necessity for expanding Federal action to meet this national problem. The Housing Act of 1959, which was finally passed after two Presidential vetoes, retained the \$50 million di-

rect loan provision, included in the two earlier bills. Nevertheless, the President did not request an appropriation for this program in his fiscal 1961 budget. The House Appropriations Committee has recommended that only \$5 million be appropriated for the coming fiscal year on the grounds that only a pilot program should be initiated at this time. This recommendation ignores the statistical and human data gathered by the subcommittee showing the extent and urgency of the need. In addition, various welfare, labor, and religious groups already have plans under way for construction of special housing facilities which are being held up by the lack of capital at reasonable interest rates. (See following letter as example.) There is an immediate necessity for carrying out the \$50 million direct loan program without delay.

To illustrate the potential benefits of the direct loan program and the relatively low rate of interest it produces: At the present time the rate of interest applicable to the direct loan program is 3½ percent. This represents a cost of \$3.65 per month for every \$1,000 of a mortgage over a 40-year period. Under the regular FHA mortgage guarantees of 5½ percent, the cost would be \$5.48 per \$1,000 per month over a 40-year period. Thus, on a \$10,000 mortgage there would be a saving to the individual in the rent that he pays of \$18.30 per month. For millions of senior Americans this sum represents the difference between dignified, healthful living and a demeaning slum existence.

The difficulties involved under present high interest costs were portrayed eloquently by Monsignor W. F. Suedkamp, secretary of Catholic Charities of the Archdiocese of Detroit. In testifying on the experience of the Carmel Hall project in Detroit, he indicated that the total debt service on Carmel Hall, if it were mortgaged today, would be a 7¼ percent per \$1,000 for each year on the unpaid balance. This was made up of interest at 5¼ percent, amortization expenses of 1½ percent, and FHA insurance at one-half percent. He stated:

"It does not solve the low cost housing problems. The debt service charge is so high that if a nonprofit organization was to borrow money to build housing for the aged, they would have to charge exorbitant costs to live in a newly created facility."

He added:

"I think the solution is a direct lending program from the Federal Government similar to the one used in college dormitory programs."

In his testimony before the Subcommittee on Housing of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency in Washington, on May 17, Monsignor Suedkamp described his pioneering and nationally renowned work at the Kundig Center. Here 80 persons who might otherwise have been in public institutions continue to live in the community in the main stream of life without being public charges. They pay their own way; the maximum charge is \$75 a month covering room, board, social and medical needs. Their parish facilities provide a centralized living room and dining room, giving rise to what is often called a campus residency program for low income, not completely independent elderly right in the community. Monsignor Suedkamp indicated that if the direct loan funds were actually available, the Kundig Center could replace its old worn-out buildings and expand its facilities.

Another witness, Mr. Martin Fine, vice-chairman of the Miami Housing Authority and of the Governor's Advisory Committee on the Aged in Florida, testified that he had studied the applications of 300 people for low rental housing. Seventy-six percent of these people had an average monthly income of \$84.35. They were living in substandard rooms with high rents or doubled up with

relatives or friends. Among the other applicants, 7 percent lived in trailers, 5 percent were facing eviction, and 4 percent required first floor accommodations for health reasons. He reported that there are now 600 applications for a 64-unit low income project in Miami. Work on other projects for the elderly could be undertaken immediately under a low interest direct loan program.

While there is no single solution to the housing needs of the elderly, the problem clearly is now of such magnitude that substantial action must be taken at this session on the direct loan program. The Congress can inspire a great nationwide effort on behalf of the poorly housed aged and solve an increasingly critical problem for many aged Americans through the appropriation of the \$50 million authorized in the direct loan program.

Respectfully,

PAT McNAMARA,

Chairman.

JOHN KENNEDY.

JOSEPH CLARK.

JENNINGS RANDOLPH.

EDINA COVENANT CHURCH,

Edina, Minn., April 29, 1960.

Senator PATRICK V. McNAMARA,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR McNAMARA: In a recent conference with the Reverend John M. Mason, who is head of the social welfare department of the Evangelical Lutheran Church (now the American Lutheran Church), we have learned of the direct Federal loans for housing the elderly, a bill which was recently passed by Congress. This is to be made available to nonprofit organizations, and is explained briefly in a "Summary of the Housing Act of 1959," pages 4 and 5, copy of which I have in my possession.

We are planning to build a 40-bed home for the elderly (or nursing home), just as soon as financing can be arranged. Our organization is the Colonial Acres Homes, Inc., a nonprofit, nondenominational home, of which I am to be administrator and chaplain. Members of the corporation are from my church and family who are interested in this type of ministry.

We have purchased a 7-acre site, which has been approved by the village council for such a purpose.

We understand that this bill must be signed by the President before appropriations can be made, presumably sometime in May. We would appreciate having information as to when this might be, as we are very anxious to make formal application for such financing. Would you kindly forward to me any information regarding this that you may have? We would appreciate this very much.

Very sincerely,

A. ELTON PALMQUIST,

Pastor.

EUGENE A. HAGBERG,

Assistant Pastor.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I hope the promise which went out across the land, found in the authorization we passed, will be honored by the acceptance of an amendment which will provide money to put the program into effect, to provide the first real opportunity for the United States to provide decent housing for the millions of low-income elderly families at costs they can afford.

The increase I am proposing here is itself a very modest response to an overwhelming need. It seems to me that this is the least we can do to let the millions of our elderly families know we no longer intend to neglect their very serious needs.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, it is my pleasure to rise today in support of the amendment of the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS]. Appropriations for the purpose of providing housing for the elderly of our Nation is a must in this session of Congress. Additional public action is necessary to answer this growing problem. Stimulation of construction, taking into account the needs and capabilities of our elderly people, is necessary. The problem of housing the elderly is an acute one—especially among those of low and moderate incomes and those in need of some form of physical assistance.

Today there are 16 million Americans over the age of 65. This represents 9 percent of our population. With each passing year, this total increases, both absolutely and in relation to the total population.

Medical research has resulted in an increase in the length of life of the average person. With this increase in life span have come new and pressing problems which must be faced up to and answered.

The immediate popularity of smaller sized residences has made it less likely that families today have space for their parents in their own apartments and homes. Thus, fewer and fewer older persons live with other people, and more are required to live by themselves. Detailed statistics show that in housing a disproportionate number of our older citizens live in one room, while at the other end of the curve, an approximate number live in units of eight and more rooms. Large houses draw immensely on the strength and incomes of the elderly, both of which are declining in this segment of our population. The conditions under which the elderly live are generally poor. These are, it must be noted, the people who maintain their own homes.

The conditions under which almost one-third of the rest of the older people of our Nation live are certainly not better. Most of them live with their families or friends in a household of limited size or with younger people, resulting in physical or psychological problems for all concerned. Conditions of contemporary urban living are not conducive to a three-generation household.

Older persons have their own special housing needs. Architects and housing constructors have found that less steps, low bathtubs which are easier to get in and out of, handrails, and so on, are essential to the well-being of these people. The physical and social needs of older people have long been ignored. Commendable efforts to correct this situation are being made by private groups and certain States, but much more remains to be done.

Under the Housing Act of 1959, authorization for direct loans to nonprofit groups for rental housing for the elderly was set at \$50 million. Under the bill being discussed today, only \$5 million

would be appropriated to this revolving fund. In the light of the pressing needs of the elderly, this amount is far too little. I am therefore more than happy to lend my support to the amendment of the Senator from New Jersey. I hope it will be agreed to.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I am grateful to the Senator from Minnesota for his remarks.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I congratulate the distinguished junior Senator from New Jersey on the amendment which he has offered to appropriate the full authorization for direct loans to nonprofit groups to provide housing for the elderly.

The Senate Subcommittee on Problems of the Aged and Aging received eloquent and urgent testimony in Washington, and in seven cities across the country, from experts, from administrators, and from older persons themselves as to the need for decent housing for senior citizens at a rental which they can afford.

I could quote at great length from our testimony with respect to the low incomes of our senior citizens, the desperate living arrangements which so many of them are forced to accept, and their health problems and the kind of housing which is suitable for them.

But I shall only take the time now to stress as emphatically as I can that after seeing the problem at firsthand I know \$50 million for direct loans at low rates of interest is a tiny figure in relation to the need. It is the least that we can do now.

There are many religious and other groups throughout the country which would apply immediately for funds to build suitable, respectable housing for the senior citizens of this country at rentals they could afford if the interest charges were not prohibitive, as is the case today.

The Congress can take a great step forward on behalf of the poorly housed aged of this Nation by appropriating, at this session, at least the \$50 million authorized in the Housing Act of 1959.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I thank the Senator from Michigan.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I am indeed privileged and proud to be a cosponsor of the amendment. I think the committee is to be congratulated for recognizing the principle involved.

I say this most respectfully, Mr. President, the amount of \$5 million is a mere mockery compared to the needs of the aged and aging in this country today. After all, we are not appropriating money for public housing as such. All we are seeking to do is to allow the sincere people who are dedicated to the welfare of the aged and aging to borrow money to build houses to accommodate these elderly people in reasonable comfort. We are asking for an interest

rate which is comparable to the interest rate on college housing.

If we recognize the needs, and properly so, of our students attending our colleges, why should we turn our backs on the aged who cannot help themselves? The proposed amendment is an encouragement to people in private industry who will build these homes, and it provides the opportunity to borrow the necessary money at reasonable rates of interest to accommodate aged people.

When we consider the vast and increasing elderly population in this country, \$5 million is a meager amount when compared to the need. We desperately need more money, and I urge Senators to pour out their hearts on this amendment, recognize the need, support and vote for it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I thank the Senator from Rhode Island. I say also that the Subcommittee on the Aged had ample authority and evidence that there are groups throughout the country who are ready to apply now for money under this proposed loan program if we appropriate the money into the revolving fund.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, as a member of the Subcommittee on Problems of the Aged and Aging, and as a member of the Subcommittee on Housing of the Banking and Currency Committee, I would like to add my support to the amendment of the Senator from New Jersey, which is cosponsored by the Senator from Rhode Island. Both of those committees have made studies of the problem, and I am confident that their recommendation that this appropriation should come up to the amount of the authorization is sound. I hope the Senate will support the amendment.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to join with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] in the arguments made this afternoon. I think they are unanswerable. Last Saturday afternoon I spoke to several thousand elderly people in the Civic Auditorium in San Francisco, Calif., at a conference of the aged, and I wish to report to the sponsors of this amendment that during this conference there was considerable discussion of the problem of finding adequate housing for the aged. A deplorable condition exists in Portland, Oreg., the largest city in my State, with regard to the housing condition of the aged.

A survey has been made, and the survey shows that we are forcing or requiring many of our aged people to live in such conditions that it is a disgrace to us as a free people that we permit such conditions to exist. I hope the chairman of the committee, who I know is one of the strongest supporters we have for the aged and aging of this country, will see fit to take the amendment to conference.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I will be glad to yield to the Senator from Texas, though I promised to yield first to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, I understand that the amendment offered by the Senator from New Jersey provides resources for the building of homes for the aged.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Exactly.

Mr. FREAR. Is it proposed that the loans should be in the form of mortgages?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Loans would be provided to nonprofit groups which, of course, would have the security.

Mr. FREAR. How much is the Senator requesting?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. The amendment calls for \$50 million to go into a revolving fund.

Mr. FREAR. Is the money to be appropriated on a repayment basis?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. On a repayment basis; and I am sure the experience will be the same as it is under the college housing program, where every penny on every loan has been paid back.

Mr. FREAR. I think I must agree with the Senator from Rhode Island that this is a most worthy amendment that the Senator from New Jersey has offered, although perhaps it is not in a very large amount for the number of aged that we have and the deplorable conditions under which they live scattered throughout the United States. However, I must compliment the Senator from New Jersey on a good beginning.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I thank the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I wish to commend the Senator from New Jersey for the active interest he has manifested in this subject ever since he came to the Senate, and, for that matter, I presume, since he was a Member of the House of Representatives. I think this is a very constructive step. In view of the fact that we have \$18 billion or \$19 billion of loans on housing, \$50 million is a mighty small amount for this group of people which represents a large percentage of the population in this country. There is no one in the Senate who is more diligent or more effective in his work for the aged people than is the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and I wonder if we could get the chairman's consent to take the amendment to conference, and to fight for it in conference. I ask him if we could not have the committee accept the amendment, waive the yeas and nays, and go on to the passage of the bill.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I should be more than glad to accept the amendment. I wish to put it in the bill. The committee approved a bill authorizing \$50 mil-

lion, and the Director of the Housing Administration, who has been against this proposal, set up some other loan features for so-called elderly housing, so that they would not have to go after this provision. All that has been done, as the Senator from New Jersey has said, in all this time is to provide approximately 4,000 units in the whole country for these people.

So the House of Representatives suggested that we start with \$5 million to make a pilot plant study, so that the program could get under way. The House inserted such provision in the bill, which Congress passed.

Mr. Mason appeared before the committee and said, "I want you to take out that provision. I don't believe in it."

The Senator from Washington asked him:

Senator MAGNUSON. And you say the administration does not believe in that?

Mr. MASON. That is right.

Senator MAGNUSON. Well, who are you working for?

Mr. MASON. Well, we work for both the Congress and the executive branch of Government.

I said, "Congress has passed a law, has it not?"

Yes; but I do not believe in it.

So I am glad to take the amendment to conference. I think we should. It is well pointed out that the money will be placed in a revolving fund. I can tell the Senate why the provision is not liked. These loans are provided at a lower interest rate than what lenders can receive now, and it is spread over a longer period of time for elderly people. That is why it is not liked.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Will the Senator agree that it is the only practical interest rate at which we will get a housing bill?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I agree.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Will the Senator from New Jersey agree to my suggested procedure?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I agree.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Will the Senator from Washington also agree?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I agree.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask that the order for the yeas and nays be vitiated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the order for the yeas and nays is rescinded.

The question is on the amendment of the Senator from New Jersey. [Putting the question.]

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

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 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.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it 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 Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. LUSK], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNING] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. LUSK], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNING], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] would each vote "Yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] is absent because of death in his family.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are detained on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 75, nays 8, as follows:

[No. 253]
YEAS—75

Aiken	Douglas	Johnson, Tex.
Allott	Dworshak	Johnston, S.C.
Anderson	Eastland	Jordan
Beall	Engle	Keating
Bible	Ervin	Kerr
Bridges	Fong	Kuchel
Brunsdale	Frear	Lausche
Bush	Fulbright	Long, Hawaii
Byrd, W. Va.	Green	Long, La.
Cannon	Gruening	McCarthy
Capehart	Hart	McClellan
Carroll	Hartke	McGee
Case, N.J.	Hickenlooper	McNamara
Case, S. Dak.	Hill	Magnuson
Church	Holland	Mansfield
Clark	Hruska	Martin
Cooper	Humphrey	Monroney
Dirksen	Jackson	Morse
Dodd	Javits	Morton

Moss
Mundt
Muskie
Pastore
Prouty
Proxmire

Bennett
Butler
Cotton

Bartlett
Byrd, Va.
Carlson
Chavez
Ellender
Gore

Randolph
Saltonstall
Scott
Smathers
Smith
Sparkman

NAYS—8

Curtis
Goldwater
Thurmond

NOT VOTING—17

Hayden
Henning
Kefauver
Kennedy
Lusk
Murray

Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Wiley
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough

Williams, Del.
Young, Ohio

So the bill (H.R. 11776) was passed.

Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon 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. CANNON in the chair) appointed Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. HILL, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. SALTONSTALL, and Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota conferees on the part of the Senate.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—
ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 2822. An act for the relief of Low Wing Quey (Kwai);

S. 2886. An act for the relief of Nikoliya Lazic;

S. 2918. An act for the relief of Boris Priestley;

S. 2942. An act for the relief of Eugene Storme;

S. 2964. An act for the relief of Kang Sun Ok;

S. 2991. An act for the relief of Ah See Lee Chin;

S. 3016. An act for the relief of Walter F. Beecroft;

S. 3038. An act for the relief of Jung Hi Pak;

S. 3049. An act for the relief of Oh Chun Soon;

S. 3091. An act for the relief of Pasquale Mira;

S. 3130. An act for the relief of Anne-Marie Stehlin; and

S. 3235. An act for the relief of Cecilia Rubio.

GENERAL GOVERNMENT MATTERS
APPROPRIATIONS, 1961

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1673, H.R. 11389, the general Government matters appropriation bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 11389) making appropriations for the Executive Office of the President and sundry general Government agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the passage of the bill.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I announce that the Senate will still have for consideration the State, Justice, and judiciary appropriation bill; the civil functions appropriation bill; the military construction appropriation bill. Do I correctly understand that this bill was marked up this afternoon?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. There will also be the mutual security appropriation bill, and a supplemental appropriation bill. That makes five appropriation bills to be considered in the next 2 weeks.

JOHN R. BARKER

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1670, S. 2388, a bill relating to the separation and retirement of John R. Barker.

The bill is noncontroversial. One of the most beloved, able, and respected Members of this body is desirous of having the bill passed today, because he is leaving on an official mission of the Senate. The leadership is always glad to cooperate with the distinguished junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN], because he has always cooperated with the leadership.

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

The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. The bill (S. 2388) relating to the separation and retirement of John R. Barker.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senate will proceed to consider the bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the bill is passed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a point of order. The Senator from Delaware was on his feet, asking for an explanation of the bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I asked for an explanation of the bill. I thought we might have an explanation before its passage. I think the Senate should reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the vote by which the bill was passed will be reconsidered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, an explanation of the bill is as follows:

Mr. Barker was employed in the postal service from 1914 to 1918, as a rural carrier; from 1920 to 1922, as a substitute carrier; from 1922 to 1934, as postmaster; from 1934 to 1936, as substitute clerk. He was removed from duty on July 18, 1936, for alleged political activities. He was charged with transporting persons to the polls on election day and with being elected a delegate to a county political convention.

With respect to the first charge, the facts are that Mr. Barker did transport members of his own family to the polls and in addition five other elderly folks who were unable to walk and who had requested transportation of him. As to the second charge, Mr. Barker has stated:

I did not attend the caucus which selected the delegates and after the caucus I did not attend the convention to which elected.

The removal action in his case occurred prior to the enactment of the Hatch Political Activity Act of 1939. Both the Post Office Department and the Civil Service Commission state that Mr. Barker's removal "for political activity" would not be warranted under that act as it stands today so certainly was not justified prior to its enactment.

Correction of the reason for his removal will carry with it entitlement to the benefits of the civil service retirement law which would otherwise be denied to him. On the basis of his verified service, enactment of this measure would accord Mr. Barker an annuity of \$54 per month commencing the first of the month in which the bill is enacted. The Civil Service Commission indicates that he may have some additional creditable service which if true would increase his annuity accordingly.

I do not have any more information on which I can plead guilty to the Senator from Delaware. When I was asked to have the bill considered, I thought the beloved Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN] would be here to explain it. But he must leave tonight on an official mission at the request of the Senate. Today is the last day he will be in attendance in the Senate. I thought the request was very reasonable. I was advised there was no opposition to the bill.

No Member of the Senate has worked more faithfully and courteously with the leadership, both in the Senate and in committee, than the distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN].

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

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Civil Service Retirement Act, John R. Barker, who served as an employee of the Post Office Department from August 15, 1920, to July 19, 1936, shall be considered to have been involuntarily separated from such service for reasons other than removal for cause. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the benefits payable pursuant to this Act shall be paid from the civil-service retirement and disability fund. No annuity shall be paid, by reason of the enactment of this Act, for any period prior to the first day of the month in which it is enacted.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. ALLOTT. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

MRS. BETTY L. FONK

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1616, H.R. 4964.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 4964) for the relief of Mrs. Betty L. Fonk.

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

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the purpose of the proposed legislation is to pay to Mrs. Betty L. Fonk, of Bloomington, Ind., the sum of \$5,000 as compensation for personal injuries and expenses resulting from an accident involving a United States Army vehicle in Frankfurt-am-Main, Germany, on June 22, 1955.

Mrs. Betty L. Fonk, the dependent wife of Sgt. Alvin Fonk of the United States Army and then herself a civilian employee of the Army, was struck and injured by a United States vehicle on June 22, 1955, at Frankfurt, Germany. The vehicle was assigned to the United States Army and Air Force European exchange system and was driven by an employee of that organization in the scope of his employment. The report of the Department of the Army to the committee on the bill indicates that subsequent investigation established that the proximate cause of the accident was the negligence of the driver of the vehicle.

The measure was reported unanimously by the Committee on the Judiciary. It was introduced at the request of one of the most able, respected, and popular Members of this body, the dis-

tinguished Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I give notice that, if it is agreeable to other Senators, we may proceed to the nominations in the Civil Aeronautics Board, the Federal Maritime Board, and the Federal Communications Commission before the Senate adjourns this evening.

Meanwhile, I ask that the Executive Calendar be called beginning with routine diplomatic and Foreign Service nominations.

ROUTINE DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE NOMINATIONS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the nominations in the routine diplomatic and Foreign Service.

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the diplomatic and Foreign Service.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask that the nominations in the routine diplomatic and Foreign Service administration be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

UNITED NATIONS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations to the United Nations.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask that the nominations to the United Nations be confirmed en bloc; but before they are confirmed, I call attention to the fact that two most distinguished Members of this body, highly experienced in the field of foreign relations, the beloved Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and the respected Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], are on the list; as also is our friend, Francis O. Wilcox, who served so intelligently on the staff of the committee on Foreign Relations before he was advanced to the position of Assistant Secretary of State.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations to the United Nations are confirmed en bloc.

GOVERNOR OF GUAM

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Joseph Flores, to be Governor of Guam.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

NOMINATIONS TO THE CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD, FEDERAL MARITIME BOARD, AND FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. With respect to the nominations to the Civil Aeronautics Board, the Federal Maritime Board, and the Federal Communications Commission, reports were filed only last Monday. Although I have no objection to their consideration now, I understand that members of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce wish to make some remarks.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. If the Senator from Washington will notify the Senators that we desire to consider the nominations, we will take them up this evening, because I am getting inquiries as to why I am delaying them.

Mr. MAGNUSON. But they have not been on the calendar more than a couple of days.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The nomination of Vice Admiral Wilson to the Federal Maritime Board has been on the Executive Calendar for almost 2 weeks.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. That nomination was reported on June 10.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Today is June 22.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The nomination of Robert E. Lee to be a member of the Federal Communications was reported on June 15.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Some of the nominations have been here for 10 days, some for 12 days.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Ten days is a very short period of time for nominations to be on the calendar in the Senate.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, is there any objection?

Mr. MAGNUSON. No; but I am speaking for some of the members of my committee. Some of them wish to make some remarks.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I am giving notice for the benefit of all.

The Senator from Wisconsin is interested in some of the nominations. Is he ready to proceed?

Mr. PROXMIER. Yes; at any time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Very well.

First, let us pass the General Government matters appropriation bill.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McGEE in the chair). Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

THE HOUSING RECORD OF THE REPUBLICAN ADMINISTRATION

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, recently the Senate passed the 1960 housing bill.

I should like to call the attention of my colleagues to the progress in this important field during the past 7½ years, as reported by the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL].

The housing record under our Republican administration reveals that more families now own or are buying their homes than at any time in our history. It is of particular significance to note the great progress also made in urban renewal, slum prevention, and better housing for elderly people.

I ask unanimous consent that this fine report be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

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

THE HOUSING RECORD OF THE REPUBLICAN ADMINISTRATION, 1953-60—A STATISTICAL REVIEW IN SUMMARY FORM

(By U.S. Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, Republican, of Massachusetts)

More houses built than during any similar period in history—nearly 9 million new dwellings, 25 percent more than in the preceding 7 years.

More people now own their own homes than at any similar period in history—three out of every five American families are homeowners compared to slightly more than one out of two, 10 years ago.

More housing for elderly people, and more done to house elderly people than any similar period in history—more than 20,000 private or public units especially designed for the elderly built or started in the last 3 years.

More housing for college students than any similar period in history—more than 37,000 dormitory units for students, teachers, and nurses in training, financed with loans, compared to 13,000 units before 1953.

More American cities engaged in urban renewal than any similar period in history—436 communities—more than double the previous number—have 750 renewal projects under way—four times as many as before 1953.

More done to help localities plan for sewers, water systems, schools, than any similar period in history—advances made to plan 1,300 public works projects involving a total construction cost of nearly \$2 billion.

More cities and metropolitan areas engaged in planning for the future than any similar period in history—with grants made for comprehensive planning in 90 metropolitan areas and urban regions and in 1,140 smaller towns throughout the country.

HOUSING RECORDS BROKEN

During this administration, the Nation has experienced an amazing growth of homeownership—more families now own, or are buying their own homes than ever before, 62 percent—compared to 55 percent in 1950. The number of homes owned by their occupants has risen to more than 30 million in the past decade, an increase of over 30 percent.

Since January 1, 1953, until April 30, 1960, housing records have been broken in all directions, testimony to a dynamic as well as well-ordered, well-balanced economy.

Since the beginning of 1953, the number of homes and other dwelling units (apartments, etc.) constructed or started is close to 9 million—compared to 7,100,000 in the 7 postwar years before 1953.

Value of this construction since the beginning of 1953 totals \$133 billion, nearly double the dollar value of new homebuilding in the preceding years. Another \$45.5 billion has been spent on home maintenance and repairs.

The Federal Housing Administration alone insured more than 2¼ million mortgages on

homes to a value of \$24.3 billion and, in addition, insured more than 9 million FHA property improvement loans.

Turning to the field of federally assisted low-rent housing, the number of (PHA) units started was 127,000.

The administration's anti-inflation policies have paid off in housing. Construction costs in the last 7 years have risen only 16 percent, compared to 66 percent in the preceding 7 years.

During the 7 years of the Republican administration, construction was started on well over 1 million new dwelling units annually, reaching the near record of 1,553,000 units in 1958 under the revised, more complete census system of reporting.

NINETEEN HUNDRED AND FIFTY-NINE A RECORD HOUSING YEAR

These figures cover a 7-year period. But how about the recent past? 1959 was a big year for housing.

More money—\$23½ billion—was spent on home construction than ever previously recorded, which does not include a further \$7 billion spent for maintenance and repairs.

The Federal Housing Administration in 1959 wrote insurance on 549,600 housing units—the highest number for any year since FHA was established.

HOUSING FOR THE ELDERLY

One of the proudest achievements of the present administration is that it inaugurated the first Federal measures to help elderly people to get good housing.

In his state of the Union message in 1956, President Eisenhower asked the Congress to revise Federal housing laws "to meet the needs of the growing number of older people." From his proposals came a three-part program written into the Housing Act of that year.

One part of the program that is having spectacular acceptance relates to the provision of private rental housing for elderly persons by nonprofit groups such as churches, labor unions, fraternal groups, and similar associations.

As a result of President Eisenhower's recommendations, and the implementing action by the Congress in the Housing Act of 1956, such nonprofit groups have been able to obtain attractive FHA-insured mortgages—and applications have been rolling in.

In 1959, the administration carried the program a step further by sponsoring legislation to facilitate building FHA housing for elderly rental projects on a profit basis as well as the previous nonprofit basis.

As a result of these two developments, we find beautiful projects being constructed in all parts of the country.

Consider this abbreviated list of projects now in being:

Royal Oaks Manor (Presbyterian), California; Carmel Hall (Roman Catholic), Detroit, Mich.; Michigan Christian Home Association, Grand Rapids, Mich.; OEA Senior Citizens, Omaha, Nebr.; Bethel Methodist Home, Ossining, N.Y.; Evangelical Lutheran Good Samaritan Society Home, Hobart, Okla.; St. James House of Bayton (Episcopal), Bayton, Tex.; Douglas Gardens (Jewish), Miami, Fla.; Vine Court, Church Homes, Inc., Hartford, Conn.

As of April 30, 1960, more than 71 projects with nearly 9,000 living units were either completed or on the road to completion. Meanwhile, scores more were moving up into the pipeline and the number of applications coming in can be counted in the hundreds.

However, this is only one part of the program.

Other changes were made. For example, low rent public housing projects were opened to single elderly persons, 65 or older. Ever since 1937 single persons had been denied admission to such projects.

Further, elderly families were given priority of admission; and the Public Housing Administration was authorized to help local authorities build or remodel dwellings specifically designed for the elderly.

As a result, more than 12,000 units of public housing designed especially for the aging have been added to the public housing supply in 3 years—in addition to the housing of many thousands of elderly families in standard units.

NURSING HOMES

In 1959, the administration sponsored legislation to make FHA insurance available for the first time for nursing homes.

This proposal had been long in preparation. Shortly after its passage, hundreds of applications were being received by Housing Agency field offices. Unofficial sources report 2,000 or more interested sponsors hope to use the program aids to expand skilled nursing care throughout the country to provide care for the aging and for other invalid or semi-invalid persons.

URBAN RENEWAL

Before the Eisenhower administration, the term "urban renewal" was unknown. It is a new concept for solving the longstanding problem of urban deterioration and decay of our urban areas through combined use of public and private efforts in the urban community. This is not just clearing slums—it is also restoring and preserving good areas and preventing new slums from developing.

More than 1,000 towns and cities throughout the country now have comprehensive local plans, known as workable programs for community improvement, to solve their major housing, planning, traffic, and land use problems through a coordinated attack. No such total community programs existed before 1954.

At the President's recommendation, the Congress has authorized since 1953 \$1½ billion in Federal grant funds to aid towns and cities to redevelop and rehabilitate their slum and blighted areas—three times as much as was authorized before 1953.

Under the present administration, the number of towns and cities carrying out renewal projects has more than doubled, totaling 436, and the number of projects is more than 750—four times the number initiated before 1953.

SLUM PREVENTION AS WELL AS CURE

Federal assistance on these earlier projects, moreover, was provided only for clearing slums already in existence.

There were no provisions for preventing slums from coming into existence. So the battle was a losing one from the beginning. It was as if we had built a hospital filled entirely with operating rooms, but with no place for patients to get well and forestall an operation.

A Republican administration and Congress in the historic Housing Act of 1954 initiated an entirely new approach to the slum blight problem—the total approach.

This total approach included the following:

Special provisions for mortgage insurance under FHA.

Section 220 for new building or rehabilitation in urban renewal areas.

Special provisions for mortgage insurance under FHA section 221 to provide low cost housing for families displaced from urban renewal areas.

Special grants for urban planning assistance.

Special grants for demonstration projects that would enlarge our fund of knowledge on urban renewal problems.

Since the problems connected with slum blight are all-inclusive, the approach to them to be effective must also be all-inclusive. Any integrated campaign must be based on a "workable program" initiated by the local

community. Such a program should cover all aspects leading to urban decay—the enforcement of local housing and building codes, the rehabilitation of housing and neighborhoods, the upgrading of municipal services, the effective planning for the orderly growth and development of the community.

Communities adopt a workable program as a condition of receiving Federal financial assistance in the urban renewal field.

NEW SOLUTIONS FOR OLD PROBLEMS

Among studies made during 1959 was a survey in depth of the relocation housing program (sec. 221), designed to provide privately built housing for moderate and low income families displaced from their homes by urban renewal, code enforcement, and other forms of public action.

Since its inception in 1954, a total of 105,378 units has been certified as eligible for section 221 FHA mortgage insurance; in 1959 the number certified was 17,915. No such relocation housing assistance existed before 1954.

A search for solutions of another type took place in 18 locations throughout the country by way of the "test tube" demonstration grant program. No such grants were authorized before 1954.

The purpose of this program is to create practical "know-how" in the field of urban renewal. Through assistance given to carefully selected pilot projects, its aim is to enlarge our fund of knowledge and produce practical information of use to cities everywhere.

SUBURBAN SPRAWL

Another farsighted program introduced by this Administration in 1954 is the planning program designed to help metropolitan areas combat the new phenomenon in American life known as "suburban sprawl."

This was the first such constructive Federal legislation of its kind, and at the end of 1959 there were 94 urban and metropolitan areas receiving planning assistance.

In addition, through another provision of the 1954 Housing Act, more than 1,000 small municipalities were also receiving assistance.

THE TREATY WITH JAPAN—STATEMENT BY SENATOR MORSE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a radio statement I made on the Japanese treaty.

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

RADIO BROADCAST OF SENATOR WAYNE MORSE,
JUNE 22, 1960

Fellow Oregonians, as a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, it has been my duty to study carefully the recent events in Japan which led to the cancellation of the President's visit to that country.

Actually, the riots and demonstrations which have been so widely publicized were not aimed at the President himself, but at the mutual defense treaty negotiated by our State Department and the Japanese administration headed by Premier Kishi.

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee has had this treaty under consideration for some time. On the face of it, and viewed from the time several months ago when it was negotiated, it would be hard to see why anyone in Japan would be opposed to it.

The treaty puts an end to the American status as conqueror of Japan in World War II. Unfortunately, this important aspect of it has been almost ignored both in Japan and in the United States. But under the treaty which is presently in effect and which remains in effect until the new one is ratified, the United States keeps military bases in

Japan not so much because of the free choice of that nation, but because we are occupying Japan as a result of her defeat in World War II. That is where our present right in Japan comes from—the right of conquest.

As a matter of fact, under the existing treaty, our troops in Japan even have the power to put down riots and insurrections of the very kind the world has witnessed there in the last month. Of course, we have not exercised that power, because to do so would return Japan to the status of an American military satellite in much the way Hungary was kept under the Russian thumb in 1956.

The new treaty puts an end, however, even to the right to use American forces in that way. It puts an end, also, to the earlier requirement that Japan must depend upon the United States for its military defense, a requirement we had imposed because we wanted to root out Japanese militarism once and for all.

What we are ready to do now is to restore Japan to full sovereignty and equality among the nations of the world. It is quite true that we want to continue our military bases in that country. We also want to continue stationing troops there. But we are now ready to enter into an agreement for this purpose which will be an alliance between equals. The rights we would have in Japan under it would be the same as the rights we have in Western European countries, not rights gained by conquest but by mutual agreement.

That is why I say that taken alone, it would be hard to see why anyone in Japan should object to this treaty, particularly since the old system remains until the new one is ratified.

But something important happened between the time the treaty was negotiated in January and the time for its ratification. That something was the U-2 spy plane episode.

For the first time, the nations around the perimeter of the Communist world, nations whose territory we wish to use for American military outposts, learned that America was using them for purposes which were unknown and unsuspected by the people of those nations, and possibly even by their governments. They were being used for a type of nonviolent invasion of Communist territory.

Beyond that, the Soviet Union threatened immediate retaliation against those bases if they were ever used that way again. This threat put every country with which we have a military treaty right on the spot with its own people. It was a powerful blow in the war of nerves. America has been telling these nations which lie on the edges of the Communist world that they are in danger of being overrun by Communist aggression, and that they need our help in their defense. Now, the Communists were telling them that they are indeed in danger and will be the first to feel the missiles and bombs if they continue letting themselves be used as American military outposts.

This turn of events had particular impact in Japan. Since the end of World War II, American occupation of that country has had for a major objective the elimination of the warlike militaristic class in Japan which embarked on the conquest of Asia in the 1930's and 1940's.

We wrote into Japan's new Constitution a renunciation of war as a means of gaining a foreign-policy objective. We literally drummed into the Japanese people the idea that war was wrong, that it was futile, and that Japan should renounce it.

Reports to our Foreign Relations Committee indicate that we were remarkably successful in that educational campaign. Public opinion in Japan, and I do not mean opinion whipped up by Communist demonstrations, but opinion generally is highly pacifistic.

After the U-2 spy flight, therefore, this new treaty no longer looked like an advance for the Japanese, so much as it looked like a 10-year commitment to assume the risks of American actions taken in our own defense. Of course, we say, with truth, that what we do in our own defense is also in defense of the entire free world. But Japan and these other countries have been threatened with taking the consequences. That puts an entirely different light on the treaty, so far as they are concerned.

Of course, it was most unfortunate that ratification of the treaty coincided with the President's plans to visit Japan. Had the full extent of the opposition to the treaty been realized, his visit should have been planned later, or not at all. Having to cancel it at the very last minute gave the appearance of a great diplomatic setback, and it is being so interpreted all over the world.

But the treaty itself has been ratified by the constitutional processes of both parties, and has become effective. In supporting and voting for the treaty in the Senate, I pointed out, however, that it leaves much undone and unsettled. In the first place, many powerful groups in Japan are already urging that it be renegotiated. The Government headed by Premier Kishi is an ultraconservative group within a conservative party in Japan. It was a rightwing group with which we have been dealing. There is much opposition within his own party to Kishi, and it did the United States and our new treaty no good to be associated with his domestic liabilities. It is doubtful that he will remain in office much longer, and, under a new government, we may well be faced with demands that the treaty be revised. So there is that reservation as to its reliability to keep in mind.

A second reservation to keep in mind is the fact that it is simply one more element in our military containment policy. It deals with a link in our military defense perimeter around the Communist world. It is purely military. It makes no specific provision for the peaceful handling of disputes which might lead to war. It says nothing about trade or cultural relations with this most powerful non-Communist nation in all of Asia. Being purely military, and depending upon leadership in Japan which may not long be in power, it is a treaty which leans upon a weak reed, in my opinion, and should not be burdened with too much confidence that it will promote American interests in Asia.

A third reservation I have about it is the fact that it is bilateral. It involves only ourselves and Japan, and outlines what this country would do in case of an attack upon Japan. But what about all the other nations which would be affected by an attack upon Japan? What about our other allies in Asia, whose vital interests would be hurt by an attack upon Japan? There is no mention of them in the treaty. The only obligation is upon ourselves.

Of course, toward the close of World War II, our allies passed to us their power of attorney, in effect, and gave the United States the right to speak and act for them in all matters affecting the occupation of Japan. We have assumed their functions to the point where we do not even know for certain what their views and reactions are to this bilateral military treaty we have entered into with Japan.

A fourth reservation regarding it is the fact that it makes no mention of the status of Formosa. Never, in any negotiations we have conducted with Japan, have we touched upon the sovereignty of Formosa. Keep in mind that Japan was the last nation to hold formal sovereignty over Formosa. As a practical matter, it is now the home of the refugee government of China. But its status and its future are by no means settled. I continue to believe that should be done by

international conference, preferably through the United Nations. Before long, Red China will be a nuclear power. When that day arrives, we will be in a very precarious position if we are still assuming the unilateral task of defending an area whose sovereignty has never been established by international law, but which territory certainly does not belong to the United States.

Finally, I regret that the treaty does not bring the United Nations directly into situations that could lead to war in the Far East. It recognizes the general responsibility of the U.N. but does not provide that the U.N. shall have direct participation in a dispute which threatens to bring about war.

In my opinion, these repetitious mutual defense treaties—and we are now involved in them with a total of 46 countries—do not promote peace. They are war treaties, not peace treaties. They make no provision for avoiding war, they only assure that if another country gets involved in war, we will come in on their side. I would prefer to see these treaties include sections outlining the steps that would be taken to prevent war, before they come to the part about the United States coming to the defense of someone else.

GENERAL GOVERNMENT MATTERS APPROPRIATIONS, 1961

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11389) making appropriations for the Executive Office of the President and sundry general Government agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during the further consideration of this bill there be allowed not to exceed 10 minutes on any amendment and not to exceed 30 minutes on the bill, with the available time to be equally divided.

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

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, this bill provides funds for the Executive Office of the President, which includes the White House office, the Bureau of the Budget, the Council of Economic Advisers, the National Security Council, and the President's Advisory Committee on Government Organization. The bill also includes funds to be appropriated to the President for the emergency fund for the President, national defense, and funds for the expenses for management improvement, and funds for the American Battle Monuments Commission, the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, and the Subversive Activities Control Board.

A new agency, added this year, is the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, which was authorized last September.

The bill, as reported to the Senate by the Senate Appropriations Committee, calls for appropriations in the total amount of \$14,397,500, which is \$610,000 more than the amount voted by the House of Representatives, but is \$230,000 under the budget.

Three amendments are recommended.

One amendment would restore \$200,000 to the Bureau of the Budget, for its full budget estimate.

Another amendment would add \$310,000 for expenses of management improvement, to bring that fund up to

\$470,000. The fund is used to study and bring about solutions to management problems and to make administrative improvements in the legislative branch, a matter on which a study is now in progress.

The third amendment is for the President's Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. That Commission began last year with \$50,000, under the supplemental appropriation bill. It requested \$175,000 this year; but the committee felt the Commission should start conservatively, and therefore the committee provided for \$100,000, by means of an amendment. The House has not yet considered this item.

I know that my friends in the Senate who are members of this Commission will submit an amendment, and will have something to say about it.

Frankly, the committee did not know a great deal about the new organization, and is a little gun shy of new items. So the committee proposed that we let the Commission get started. The committee did not have the benefit of a great deal of testimony about the Commission; and the House committee has not had any testimony at all about the Commission.

So I am sure the Senate will be glad to hear from these members of the Commission.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] and myself, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendments are first to be considered.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, it may be that our amendment is in the nature of a perfecting amendment to one of the committee amendments. So I suggest that the chairman of the committee ask that that committee amendment be subject to this amendment.

Mr. MAGNUSON. First, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be agreed to en bloc and that the bill as thus amended be considered as original text, for the purpose of amendment, provided that no point of order be considered to have been waived by reason of this order.

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

The committee amendments agreed to en bloc are as follows:

Under the heading "Title I—Executive Office of the President—Bureau of the Budget—Salaries and Expenses", on page 3, line 24, after the word "exceed" to strike out "\$50" and insert "\$75", and in line 25, to strike out "\$4,900,000" and insert "\$5,100,000".

Under the heading "Funds Appropriated to the President—Emergency Fund for the President—Expenses of Management Improvement", on page 6, line 9, after the word "branch", to strike out "\$40,000" and insert "\$350,000".

On page 6, after line 12, to insert:

ADVISORY COMMISSION ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL
RELATIONS

Salaries and expenses

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Act of September 24, 1959 (73 Stat. 703-706), \$100,000.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I am glad to have the amendment submitted by the Senator from Maine considered at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment submitted by the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], on behalf of himself and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 6, in line 18, it is proposed to strike out "\$100,000" and to insert in lieu thereof "\$175,000".

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator from Maine yield to himself?

Mr. MUSKIE. Two minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, this amendment relates to one of the subjects touched upon by the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON].

The purpose of the amendment is to increase the appropriation for the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations from the committee's recommendation of \$100,000 to the amount requested by the Commission and approved by the Bureau of the Budget; namely, \$175,000.

I wish to make two points, briefly, in order not to consume too much time, and to leave the maximum amount of time for any questions which Senators may have.

The first point is that the Commission was created last year, by the Congress. The field of intergovernmental relations is an extremely broad one. In submitting its budget, the Commission bore in mind that it would be impossible to cover this entire field. So its objective has been to select within this broad field an area with which it could conceivably deal in the coming year.

The Members of the Commission include three Governors, three Members of this body, three Members of the other body, and a large number of distinguished public officials and public representatives from all over the country.

Within the last 2 weeks the Commission met in Washington, with almost a full attendance, and approved a program for the coming year.

The Commission proposes to do the necessary work in three ways:

First of all, by soliciting private research organizations for such assistance as they can provide without governmental expense.

Second, to employ consultants on a part-time basis, from time to time, for special projects.

Third, to develop a very small staff, consisting of only three professional people, relative to the Commission's work, to work on a continuing basis.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time the Senator from Maine has yielded to himself has expired.

Mr. MUSKIE. I yield myself 1 more minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine is recognized for 1 more minute.

Mr. MUSKIE. I point out that the budget which has been recommended is a minimum one, not a maximum one in any degree whatsoever.

If the Commission's funds are cut to \$100,000, it is very unlikely, in my judgment, that the product of its work over the next year will be worth even the \$100,000. I consider the \$175,000 a minimum.

We have distinguished Governors and Senators and outstanding people from all over the country serving on the Commission; and I believe we should give them the minimum tools they will require.

The other point I wish to make is that the House of Representatives has not had an opportunity to consider this item. So the figure which we shall send to conference will be the maximum one the conference can consider.

Therefore, I suggest that the \$175,000 figure is the minimum which we should send to conference.

I have discussed this with the chairman of the committee, and he has agreed to accept the amendment for that purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The additional time the Senator from Maine has yielded to himself has expired.

Two minutes remain available to the proponents of the amendment.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I should like to concur in all that the distinguished Senator from Maine has said.

The three Members of the House of Representatives and the three Members of the Senate who are members of the Commission agree that \$175,000 is the minimum requirement for the efficient functioning of this Commission.

Therefore, I urge the Senate to adopt this amendment, as offered by the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE] and myself.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the remaining time in opposition to the amendment yielded back?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of the time available to those in opposition to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Maine.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SPARKMAN. 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.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 8, in line 11, it is proposed to strike out "\$260,000", and to insert "\$410,000."

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes, which I believe is the maximum time available to the proponents. However, I do not intend to use all that time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, the purpose of the amendment would be to increase the amount of funds made available to the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission by \$150,000.

When the committee held hearings on the provision, the amount requested was

\$260,000, which was exactly the amount the committee allowed; but on June 1, a supplemental request was submitted of \$150,000, and that amount was not added by the committee.

The Commission is in the final stage of negotiations, or perhaps negotiations have been completed—I believe they have been—whereby Poland is making a large foreign claims settlement.

The effect of the \$150,000 would be to enable the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission to function at its present level. No new employees would be provided for.

I believe, in view of the great load being thrown on the Commission as a result of the Polish settlement, the Commission is entitled to this amount.

I point out this amount does not represent \$150,000 that the Federal Government ultimately will have to pay. Poland, in its settlement, agrees that this much will be a charge against the Polish Government. In other words, this amount is a part of the claim itself.

The additional money will enable the Commission to function effectively and efficiently, and carry on with its present staff. I think, by all means, the amount should be allowed.

I hope the chairman will agree to take the amendment to conference, because when the bill passed the House this estimate was not available, and the House had no opportunity to pass upon it. As a matter of fact, when the hearings were held, the information was not available.

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

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. Is there any reason why this request could not be submitted in the regular way, and provided for in a supplemental bill?

Mr. SPARKMAN. This is the regular bill. It was submitted to the committee in time to get into the bill. It seems to me this is the time to do it.

Mr. ALLOTT. I do not recall any testimony on it.

Mr. SPARKMAN. On page 118 of the hearings will be found a statement submitted by the chairman after the testimony had been received. The subject was before the committee. As a matter of fact, when the testimony was had before the committee originally, it was stated that this settlement was likely to happen; that it was imminent. The committee was warned it was imminent. Then, on June 1, the point was reached where it was necessary to handle the large claims settlement.

Mr. President, the Polish settlement will be a large one. The Commission needs the staff. If the Commission does not get this additional money, it will have to disband its staff. Most likely we shall be called on later to provide a staff.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Commission will not have to disband the staff.

Mr. SPARKMAN. It will have to cut it in half.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I know that staff pretty well. They do not have to disband at all. They are going to add to the staff.

Mr. SPARKMAN. No. The \$150,000 will not be used to add any more employees to the staff. It will merely provide the Commission with funds to carry on with its present staff.

I ask the chairman of the committee to take it to conference, so the House and Senate conferees can decide it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. We have the Chairman of the Commission, in this case, Mrs. Pace, before the committee every year, and every year they keep telling us they are going to complete their work, and every year they want more, and every year they keep coming back.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am sorry I cannot tell the Senator what the Polish claim amounts to. There is a figure running in my mind, but I do not know how much it is.

Mr. MAGNUSON. \$9 million.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I believe it is more than that. It is a big claim, and one that certainly ought to be settled.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Czechoslovakian claim is \$9 million.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes. I think the Polish one is much bigger than that.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Polish claim is not mentioned.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The item is presented on page 118 of the hearings.

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

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes.

Mr. ALLOTT. The Senator has referred to a letter from Mrs. Pace. I should like to read from that letter:

Faced with the foregoing facts and probabilities, the Commission feels that a reduction in its present skilled staff would not be in keeping with orderly good government and efficient administration. Should any or all of these programs come into being, the maintenance of our present staff would suffice to no more than enable the Commission to provide for the preparation of appropriate notices, regulations, claims applications and instructions, and to provide for their dissemination to roughly 150,000 potential claimants.

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

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I yield some time to the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN].

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I think what the Senator from Colorado has just read bears out the statement that it is not contemplated to add personnel, but to maintain the present personnel.

It seems to me the reasonable thing to do is to take the amendment to conference. In the meantime the committee staff can verify the facts. I think I can truthfully say that there has been a large claim settlement negotiated with Poland which ought to be handled by the Commission. Providing the additional sum of \$150,000 will enable the Commission to maintain the present staff.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Every year this group is supposed to get to the end of its business. I do not have time to refer to the testimony given in previous years, but every year they say they are going to get closer to completing their business. Every year they come back and want to keep the present staff. One

year the staff got down to 200. We thought they were going to complete their work, but then they said there was more business and they wanted to keep the existing staff.

The effect of this amendment would be to add employees to the staff, because the Commission was supposed to reduce the number on the staff. Now they are supposed to get out of business in 1962, but if the Senator will read the testimony, he will see that they are not sure they can make it by then.

Mr. SPARKMAN. My understanding is that the present staff is only 59. It is not a big staff.

Mr. MAGNUSON. It is bigger than necessary.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Now the Polish claim is going to be added to the work.

Mr. MAGNUSON. It does not require any more employees.

Mr. SPARKMAN. We are collecting millions of dollars for American citizens.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That does not require a big staff. Forty could handle it.

Mr. SPARKMAN. It would be cut to 29.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Parkinson must have been thinking about this place when he wrote his book. He must have had this place in mind.

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

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As one who has considered these matters for a number of years, I can state that the agency always wants more money and always wants to extend its work. There always seems to be more and more work coming in. If we give them a reasonable amount this year, the claims may be settled. If we provide them with a large personnel, while I am not a betting man, I have the feeling that next year they will try to hold some of their people and say they still have a great deal of work to do.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield 2 minutes to me?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from New York.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I support fully the amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama to provide additional funds for the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission. It is my firm conviction, based on my study of problems in this field, that there is ample justification for giving the Commission the full amount it has requested.

I am sympathetic to the view expressed by the committee in its report that this \$150,000 should not be added "until more definite need may be shown later in the fiscal year." I realize that it is impossible to predict with complete certainty what will happen with regard to pending legislation and agreements in this field.

However, I feel that the evidence is sufficient, and the need so great, that we can take the little chance involved here and provide these additional funds. If we do not do so, it is possible that much of the vital work of the Commission will be delayed and the claims of many worthy people endangered.

Mr. President, according to the evidence presented to me, there are two

principal reasons why this additional \$150,000 is urgently needed by the Commission.

First, the workload estimate for the Czechoslovakian program has turned out to be inaccurate. Twice as many claims have been filed as were anticipated.

I ought to point out that the Czechoslovakian claims program is not financed by public funds. It is financed with proceeds of vested Czech property. Originally, it was anticipated that some 1,500 to 2,000 claims would be filed under this program. In actual operation, nearly 4,000 claims have been filed, but the magnitude of the original underestimation was not realized until the budget request for fiscal 1961 was completed.

The work of the Commission on the Czechoslovakian claims has been made doubly difficult by the failure of the Czech Government to cooperate in providing needed information and documentary evidence. As a result, the Commission has had to follow other roundabout processes to get this data—processes which have been long, slow, and difficult.

Mr. President, I am quite familiar with the very real human problems involved in these claims. Many fine people would be deprived of expeditious settlement of just claims if the already expanded workload of the Commission were further complicated by a lack of personnel and funds to pursue this work.

A second reason why these additional funds are needed is that three additional claims programs requiring immediate action by the Commission may soon come into being.

First, it appears highly probable that the Polish lump-sum settlement agreement will be signed within the next few weeks. Unfortunately, this will be too late for the Commission to make a supplemental request for funds to carry out this extensive program.

Already some 17,000 potential claimants have registered with the Commission in anticipation of the completion of the agreement. Obviously, many more claims will be filed in the future when the treaty with Poland is actually included.

Under the terms of the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949 the Commission is authorized to begin work upon the signing of an agreement without the need for further enabling legislation. Thus, although the Commission would have the authority to proceed expeditiously on these claims, they will be unable to do so if they do not have the personnel and staff to do the job.

In other words, the failure of the Congress to provide sufficient wherewithal will mean the postponement for some time of the restoration to thousands of Polish-American citizens of money to which they will become entitled. I certainly do not wish to be party to any such delay of justice.

Second. A second contingency upon which the need for more money rests is congressional approval of pending war claims legislation. Such legislation has already passed the House of Representatives and is under active consideration

right now by the Trading With the Enemy Act Subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee, of which I am a member. I am hopeful—and confident—the Senate will be given an opportunity to complete action on this vital legislation before the end of this session.

It is reliably estimated that from 30,000 to 50,000 claims will be filed when this bill becomes law. That will constitute the largest claims program in history and obviously will require an expansion of the Commission staff.

The long legislative delay in approving this program makes it imperative that we avoid any undue administrative delay in processing the claims which will be filed. The job cannot be done adequately and with justice to all concerned unless operating funds are available immediately for the Commission to use. If we do not provide the needed funds now this work may be delayed for a year—which is precious time in view of the many years during which this legislation has been stalled.

Again, Mr. President, I do not wish to be party to any such delay of justice.

Third, We must also remember that proposed legislation to place the administration of the supplemental payment of Philippine War Damage Commission awards in the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission is on its way through Congress. H.R. 12378 has been reported favorably by a subcommittee of the House Foreign Affairs Committee and may in the near future gain the approval of Congress.

It is understood that many thousands of payees may be involved as a result of this legislation.

Mr. President, all the evidence I have studied indicates that the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission has done an efficient and effective job with limited personnel and limited funds. At the present time only 47 persons are employed, including the Commissioners.

It is my understanding that under the original budget request the Commission would be forced to reduce the present staff from 47 to 20 by the end of the fiscal year. The Commission feels that if it is given the additional funds included in this amendment, it can retain its present staff of 47 and carry on adequately with its work until the 87th Congress has an opportunity to provide additional assistance.

Mr. President, the work of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission should be of great interest to every Member of this body, because it involves principles of simple justice and human problems which concern thousands of American citizens. In many cases these people cannot afford to have the settlement of their claims delayed. In other cases, delay may mean that justice will be denied for various reasons.

Because there is ample evidence that the workload of the Commission will be increased a great deal in the near future and because a clear case has been made of the need for proper personnel and funds to meet these new demands, I feel this amendment should be adopted. By adding these funds, we can insure that fair treatment will be accorded thou-

sands of Americans in obtaining money which is rightfully theirs.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, this amendment would add \$150,000 to the appropriation for the operations of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission.

I understand that this amendment has the approval of the Bureau of the Budget.

There are a number of reasons why the Commission budget should be increased if the Commission is to efficiently carry out the duties expected of it.

In the first place, the original budget request would require the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission to reduce immediately its staff of 47 to 29.

This would be understandable if the work of the Commission was similarly decreasing.

On the contrary, however, the workload facing the Commission will be increasing, rather than decreasing.

Within the very near future it is expected that the United States and Poland will sign a war claims agreement to reimburse Americans for losses in Poland.

Already about 17,000 potential claimants have registered with the Commission in anticipation of this program.

Unless the Commission is able to keep its well-trained staff and to hire necessary additional help the processing of these claims probably would have to wait another year or until a supplemental appropriation bill can be passed next year.

The Polish claims alone can mean reimbursement of \$60 million to American citizens. Certainly \$150,000 is a small amount to help process these claims.

In addition, two other war damage claims bills are progressing rapidly in Congress, and these would add many more thousands of claimants to the workload.

The Commission is expected by the public to process all claims speedily and efficiently.

It seems to me only common sense that the Congress give the Commission the tools it needs to do the job we ask of it.

A little foresight now in providing the needed \$150,000 will permit the Commission to keep its trained staff intact and ready to perform.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on the amendment has expired.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I understand the Senator from Alabama desires to modify his amendment.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I modify the amendment to change the amount to \$100,000, it being my understanding that the chairman is willing to take the amendment to conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has a right to modify his amendment.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Alabama, as modified. [Putting the question.]

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I wonder if my good friend from Washington is willing to yield to me so that I may ask a few questions?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Am I correct in my understanding that the appropriations for the White House Office have been increased by \$177,500 over the last year?

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator from Illinois is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time is being yielded by whom to whom?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I am not proposing an amendment. I simply wish to ask some questions.

Mr. MAGNUSON. This is from the time on the bill, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time is yielded on the bill?

Mr. MAGNUSON. As much time as the Senator desires.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator is correct. The budget for the White House was \$2,221,000 in 1960, and it is \$2,398,500 this year, an increase of \$177,500, plus \$100,000 for alterations and repairs.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Plus \$100,000 above the 1960 figure for the so-called management improvement?

Mr. MAGNUSON. No. The management improvement goes with the Bureau of the Budget, for the studies and projects within the agencies.

I did not provide all of the figures, but the amount has been steadily increasing year after year.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Illinois invited attention last year to the fact that the budget has gone up year after year after year. I wished to ask these questions to indicate that the budget for the White House Office is still going up.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should like to ask some questions about the right arm of the President, the Bureau of the Budget. Do I correctly understand that the Bureau of the Budget requested for itself an increase of \$435,000?

Mr. MAGNUSON. It did.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The committee has granted that amount?

Mr. MAGNUSON. The committee granted the increase upon the basis that the Bureau of the Budget made a case as to extra workload and things of that nature. The budget for the Bureau of the Budget, like that for the White House, has been gradually going up.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Not too gradually.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It has been going up quite rapidly.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The request is for the hiring of 22 more people, is that correct?

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I noticed, in the Independent Offices appropriation bill for 1961 which has been passed, that the General Accounting Office, which is the agency of the Congress corresponding to the Bureau of the Budget, which is the agency of the President, has an appropriation for the coming year of \$600,000 less than its appropriation for last year.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is correct. The budget for the General Accounting

Office is smaller. Mr. Cooper reminds me that the General Accounting Office is the only agency covered in the entire bill which will receive a smaller appropriation.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does the distinguished chairman of the committee have the same high opinion of the General Accounting Office and of the Comptroller General, Mr. Joseph Campbell, as the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I have a very high opinion of him.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not necessary that we have an agency such as this to check upon the waste within the executive departments?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I think the General Accounting Office does a fine job in this respect. It has saved us a great deal of money.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It seems to me the General Accounting Office has saved us many times its appropriations in the amounts recovered from excessive contract prices.

Mr. MAGNUSON. If we have an opportunity, some day we should analyze those figures. I think the figures would be somewhat startling as to the amount of money the General Accounting Office has saved the Government, and the amount we have spent to keep the agency operating.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am very glad the Senator from Washington has made that statement. I hope, when the next appropriation bill comes before the Senate, we may have a better sense of proportion and that we may build up the General Accounting Office, the head of which was appointed by the present President, because of its fine work. Personally, I am distressed by the increase in the appropriation for the Bureau of the Budget.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I am not sure the Senator from Washington mentioned this, but the budget would permit the hiring of 33 additional employees by the Bureau of the Budget, and would provide a complement of 468 employees, which represents a 27 percent drop since 1947. In other words, the Bureau of the Budget today has 27 percent less staff than it had in 1947.

Mr. DOUGLAS. There have been some redistributions of functions. I believe it is true that certain groups connected with the Bureau of the Budget have been split off. If we consider the record from 1952 on, since 1952 there has been an increase.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The budgets have been going up ever since 1952.

Mr. DOUGLAS. So the figures which the Bureau of the Budget may have supplied to our good friend from Massachusetts I think are disingenuous. Those figures go back to 1947. That is a comparison of horse and apples, rather than the same Bureau of the Budget.

I believe the record shows that so far as the present Bureau of the Budget is concerned the increases have been very great from year to year, exactly as have been the expenditures for the White House Office and for certain other items.

Mr. President, I shall not offer any amendment. I shall not make any fight with respect to the bill or with respect to these items. I simply say that I am distressed by the increase in expenditures both for the Bureau of the Budget and in connection with certain other functions of the White House, particularly in view of the constant cry for economy which comes from both. It seems to me it might be appropriate if a symbolic protest, at least, were made.

I thank the Senator from Washington for yielding.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Washington yield; and, if so, to whom?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I am also concerned about the constant increase in the expenditures of the Executive Branch, particularly the Bureau of the Budget, as mentioned by the Senator from Illinois. One point the Senator did not raise is it appears from a study of the bill that there will be an increase in the per diem for members of the Bureau of the Budget. The increase requested is from \$50 to \$75.

I know that many other agencies have a rather high limit of \$50 per diem, including the National Security Council, the President's Advisory Committee on Government Operations, and others. I am somewhat at a loss to understand why the representatives of the Bureau of the Budget require an additional \$25 per diem to carry out their duties, particularly when it represents an increase of 50 percent in the authorized per diem from last year, in addition to the tremendous increase in the budget.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I will say to my friend from Nevada that I thought the Bureau of the Budget made a very good case in that regard. This is for payments of consultants. The request is to change the per diem from \$50 to \$75. Most of the Government agencies provide \$75. Actually we should have a uniform provision.

In this particular case reference was made to some expert consultants. The committee agreed that these consultants should receive such an amount of money.

They do not anticipate paying all consultants \$75, but to get the quality of people needed, \$50 is not enough and they will pay the maximum only when it is fully justified.

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

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. To supplement what the Senator from Washington has said, 17 agencies of our Government pay between \$75 and \$100; 52 agencies pay up to \$56.56. When the Bureau of the Budget asks for an increase from \$50 to \$75, they are simply asking for the same authority that 17 agencies of the Government now have.

May I point out that we talked about the number of positions. In 1947 the Bureau of the Budget had 599 positions; in 1952 it had 515; they now have 435. The bill will increase the number to 468, which is still under the 1947 and 1952 figures.

Mr. MAGNUSON. But the amounts have gone up.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The amounts have gone up.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I think, rightly so, they have farmed out some.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I will not deny that.

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

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield such time as I have remaining to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLOTT. I would like to say to my friend from Wyoming and others that I wish to reunderline and underscore the statement made by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL]. Since 1947 the Bureau of the Budget has dropped 27 percent in its number of employees. It is true that the cost has gone up, but I think so far as I am concerned, because I felt that this matter had to be approached critically, I was satisfied with the statement that was made. I think the chairman was also, as he has indicated.

I thank the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL]. I think the chairman should be complimented on the very fine job he has done with these two bills. It is an extremely complicated area. Many different commissions and bureaus are involved, and his great knowledge, gained from many years of experience, and his constant attention to it, has resulted, I think, in a rather good bill.

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

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. McGEE. I have been much interested in this particular point in the discussion of the bill, for the reason that I have been in correspondence in the last few days with the Director of the Bureau of the Budget. I commented on June 17 on the increases of the salaries of the Bureau's employees at the same time that the administration was taking a dim view of raising the salaries of other Federal employees. In a letter today, I discussed the question of his total budget figure and the bureaucratic proliferation which caused it to be so large.

The fact remains, as the committee has discovered, that the costs of running the Bureau of the Budget have gone up. The chairman has wisely observed that these are necessary increases. But that is the point some of us have been making for months, that the necessary costs of meeting our responsibilities have gone up in many other areas of government. I cannot put up with the one-eyed bookkeeper who uses one standard of judgment for his own house and tries to exercise quite a different set of standards for the rest of the agencies of the Government. For that reason I think the RECORD should show that the exchange between myself and the Director of the Budget Bureau on a matter of his Bureau appropriations shows a double standard.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my correspondence with the

Director of the Bureau of the Budget on this particular facet of the problem be included at this point in the RECORD.

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

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D.C., June 17, 1960.

HON. GALE W. MCGEE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MCGEE: The UPI wire service quotes you as saying, during the debate on the Federal employees pay bill today, that Bureau of the Budget employees had received since 1953 "nearly double" the amount of pay raises as employees in four other agencies of Government.

While the Bureau of the Budget has no information as to the identity of the other four agencies to which the Senator refers, you seem to have been misinformed.

The employees classified under the general schedule of the Classification Act had an average grade of GS 10.2 in fiscal year 1953. By fiscal year 1960 this average has risen only to 11. This rise reflects promotions made under the provisions of the Classification Act and the rules of the Civil Service Commission. Causing this rise are such factors as the additional numbers of super-grade positions granted by the Congress, new Civil Service Commission qualification and hiring standards (e.g., increases in college entrance level grades and secretarial grades), and the hiring of higher level specialists in the accounting and management fields. Moreover, the Civil Service Commission has periodically inspected the personnel management practices of the Bureau and has approved them.

Another factor should not be overlooked. While the grade average was increasing by only this small amount, the size of the Bureau's staff has dropped from 485 in 1953 to 435 in 1960. This in itself has necessitated a change in the composition of Bureau staff if we were to perform adequately the functions assigned to us with the reduced staff.

Finally, the Bureau's own internal standards for eligibility for grade promotions are considerably more restrictive than even the Whitten amendment would require. That amendment sets a minimum standard of 1 year for professional grade to grade promotions, whereas the Bureau's internal standard in the intermediate and higher grades is from 1½ to 3 years.

We hope that these facts will correct any misunderstanding which may have been responsible for your remarks during the Senate debate.

Sincerely yours,

MAURICE H. STANS,
Director.

JUNE 21, 1960.

HON. MAURICE H. STANS,
Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive
Office of the President, Washington, D.C.

DEAR DIRECTOR STANS: Your letter of June 17 has aroused my curiosity. In the first place and in order that you may consider the full text of my address on the Bureau of the Budget, I am enclosing the appropriate clipping from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. As you will understand when you have read my remarks, the facts which you cite in your letter have not only failed to correct what you term "any misunderstanding which may have been responsible" for my comments but have raised new questions.

My statement was the result of a comparative study of the actual expenditures for 1953, as printed in the 1955 budget, and the proposed expenditures in the 1961 budget. I was interested to find out whether the

agency which had been responsible for so many economies in important programs was setting the spartan example which one would expect.

In 1953, the Bureau of the Budget had \$3,492,140 with which to operate. Its employees were among the highest paid in Government with an average civil service grade of 10.2 including typists and clerks. This is the agency that supposedly puts the others on the rack and forces fund requests down to reasonable levels. The following table represents the hard fact of the Bureau's record:

Bureau of the Budget—Budget

	1953	Proposed, 1961	Percent increase over 1953
Personal services.....	\$3,215,385	\$4,319,500	34
Other expenses.....	276,755	780,500	183
Total.....	3,492,140	5,100,000	46

At the outset, I wish to recognize that there have been well-deserved increases in the pay scales for Federal employees. According to the sources I have consulted, the average number of employees officially charged to this Bureau will be approximately the same in 1961, 458, as it was in 1953 when it was 464.

While this figure has remained static on paper, there has been a vast increase in duplicating personnel in the Executive Office of the President.

In addition to the Bureau personnel, we now have two new offices which are performing Budget Bureau work: The Advisory Committee on Government Organization with a \$50,000 budget, and a Special Projects Group with a \$1,500,000 budget. Together these agencies have 114 employees. The Organization group's function is to identify major organizational and management problems and suggest corrective action. The Special Projects Group's purpose is to give the President staff assistance on problems which cannot be considered the responsibility of an existing agency. Examples cited are coordination of the Nation's scientific effort, foreign economic policy, and coordination of public works planning.

Since this work has for years been done in the Bureau of the Budget, I wonder what the reasons are for this proliferation?

As further proof of the extent of the Bureau of the Budget's spending spree in its own interest, I cite the 183 percent increase in expenses other than salary, and call particular attention to the substantial increases in items such as travel and other contractual services and equipment. The following table illustrates my point:

Items with major increases	1953	1961	Percent change
Travel.....	\$28,719	\$120,000	319
Communication service.....	43,281	60,000	39
Other contractual service.....	2,662	45,500	1,600
Equipment.....	11,114	63,000	466
Total.....	85,776	288,500	235
Grants, subsidies, and contributions.....	—	278,800	(¹)
Other.....	190,979	213,200	11
Total.....	276,755	780,500	183

¹ Contributions for Federal retirement fund.

While I am not a budget expert, I am unable to see why there should be an increase in cost averaging 235 percent in the items I have enumerated separately.

To further inform myself as to the need for vastly increased funds, I looked carefully at the Bureau's budget analysis by divisions.

The following tabulation shows the changes in division costs:

	1953	1961	Percent change
Field service.....	\$206,408	(¹)	-----
Office of Accounting.....	(²)	\$248,700	-----
Budget review.....	376,130	534,300	+42
Legislative reference.....	145,404	207,000	+42
Management and organization.....	320,707	616,500	+92
Statistical standards.....	380,622	441,400	+16
Program divisions:			
Commerce and finance.....	343,269	433,500	+26
International.....	196,367	334,700	+71
Labor and welfare.....	364,962	453,500	+24
Military.....	382,662	578,700	+51
Resources and civil works.....	347,241	538,200	+55
Administration.....	428,968	710,500	+66
Obligations, prior years.....	—	3,000	-----
Total.....	3,492,140	5,100,000	+46

¹ Abolished fiscal year 1954.

² Estimated fiscal year 1956.

It is my understanding that the new Office of Accounting was created by expanding a group previously in the Management and Organization Division of the Bureau of the Budget. This is of interest because the Management and Organization group cost has increased by 92 percent, even after giving birth to a new division.

The President also seeks \$50,000 for the special Advisory Committee on Government Organization in addition to the Bureau of the Budget expense of \$616,500 to perform a like function. I do not know of one substantial reorganization plan of more than a routine housekeeping nature that has emerged in the last few years.

This shows a mutation in bureaucratic breeding; evidently in accordance with Parkinson's law. The division with the responsibility has 92 percent more money to operate than it had in 1953, and it is shorn of its accounting improvement work and has the help of a new and special executive agency.

The International Division has its budget up 71 percent from 1953. In keeping with the administration's outlook on labor and welfare, that division has not fared so well. At least here I see something representative of the administration's philosophy. The Resources and Civil Works Division's budget is up 55 percent, and this I can only presume is to assure that less will be spent on resource development.

I call particular attention to the 66 percent increase for administration. Compared with the total agency budget for the respective years this item, which was previously 12 percent of their total expenses, now accounts for 14 percent. Is it not supposed to be true that with the growth of an agency, its cost of administration as a percentage of overall costs decreases?

Wherever one turns there is evidence that Parkinson's law is in operation.

Historically, the Congress has given the President the funds he believes he needs for the agencies composing the Executive Office of the President. I do not for a moment contend that the role of Government is unimportant or that the President should be denied adequate staff. The record of administration stewardship seems to reveal, however, painful economy in the important programs upon which the health of our economy depends and substantial increases in expenditure elsewhere.

Counting the Bureau of the Budget and its two duplicating executive office agencies, there is a 90-percent increase in their cost of operation. As I said on the Senate floor on June 17, salaries that have been increased by Congress have been given another 100 percent padding by back-door grade increases. In addition, back-door increases

totaling 22 percent have been made in the number of personnel.

What happened to the administration's crusade for economy? Where is it being practiced? Is it in less schools for our children, less roads to transport the products of private enterprise, less meaningful defense from our enemies, or less resource development for our people?

In my recent floor statement I characterized the Bureau of the Budget's record as "one-eyed bookkeeping." I did so because I believe it is the job of the Bureau to perform its functions with one eye on the national interest and the other on the ledger. The light of comprehension has long since vanished from the eye which should have been fixed on the national interest during this administration. The result has been budgets which starved and stultified programs which were in the public interest while encouraging a byzantine bureaucratic proliferation in such staff agencies as the Bureau of the Budget. One-eyed bookkeeping may contribute to the kind of record this administration wants, but I don't think it fools the people.

I would be grateful if you would comment on the questions which I have raised; and I promise to give your reply very careful attention.

Sincerely,

GALE W. MCGEE,
U.S. Senator.

Mr. MCGEE. In my letter I have pointed out that, in addition to the very large pay increases granted to Bureau of the Budget employees by the process of high grade level increases, the Bureau has also indulged in forms of bureaucratic proliferation which brings some of the "facts" which Mr. Stans has cited in his letter into question.

In the first place, a comparison of the actual expenditures for 1953 and the proposed expenditures for 1961 reveals that there has been an overall increase of 46 percent in the expenditures of the Bureau. The increases in expenses not related to high salaries have been even more startling than the salary increases. These additional expenses have increased 183 percent since 1953.

In addition to these rather dramatic changes in the size of the appropriations sought for the Bureau itself, we now have two new offices which are performing work previously performed by the Bureau. These are the Advisory Committee on Government Organization with a budget of \$50,000, and the Special Projects group with a budget of \$1,500,000. Together these two agencies employ 114 persons. Since their functions seem to be very similar either to those previously performed by the Bureau or to functions still performed by the Bureau, it is interesting to note that the addition of 114 persons to the work force of the Bureau of the Budget itself makes it apparent that there are many more persons doing the work of the Bureau of the Budget than there were in 1953. If we added the budget for these two new agencies to that of the Bureau, there has been a 90-percent increase in the cost of operation since 1953.

Congress has usually been rather lenient with the President's requests for funds which he desires for the agencies which make up his Executive Office. Certainly this is as it should be because it is very important that the President

have an adequate staff. My complaint about the two central facts that the Bureau pays larger salaries than other agencies and that it has indulged in a very substantial proliferation is that this has all occurred during what the administration has chosen to call a crusade for economy.

I think the Bureau of the Budget ought to perform its function with one eye on the national interest and the other on the ledger, but it seems that the light of comprehension has long since vanished from the eye which should have been fixed on the national interest during this administration. The result has been budgets which starved and stultified programs which were in the public interest while encouraging this byzantine bureaucratic proliferation in such agencies as the Bureau of the Budget. This is one-eyed bookkeeping. It is all the more ironic to find that it has occurred in the very agency which has the task of putting other agencies on the rack and forcing their fund requests down to reasonable levels.

The Bureau of the Budget performs a staff function. Certainly its function is necessary, but I think this administration deserves to be asked whether we have to pay so much more to have this function performed when we are so consistently asked to economize in the areas of education, defense, and resource development.

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

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. CANNON. The Senator from Colorado stated that since 1947 the personnel had been reduced by 27 percent. I wonder if he has the figures as to the percentage of cost increase during that same period?

Mr. ALLOTT. I do not have them with me. All I have before me are the hearings. I repeat these figures from page 4 of the hearings.

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.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Do both sides yield back all remaining time?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield back whatever time I have remaining.

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield back whatever time we have remaining.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it 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 Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Tennessee

[Mr. GORE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. LUSK], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], is absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. LUSK], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPP] is absent because of death in his family.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] are detained on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPP] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 81, nays 1, as follows:

[No. 254]

YEAS—81

Aiken	Frear	Martin
Allott	Fulbright	Monroney
Anderson	Goldwater	Morse
Beall	Gruening	Morton
Bennett	Hart	Moss
Bible	Hartke	Mundt
Bridges	Hayden	Muskie
Brunsdale	Hickenlooper	Pastore
Butler	Holland	Proxmire
Byrd, W. Va.	Hruska	Randolph
Cannon	Humphrey	Russell
Capehart	Jackson	Saltonstall
Carroll	Johnson, Tex.	Scott
Case, N. J.	Johnston, S. C.	Smathers
Case, S. Dak.	Jordan	Smith
Church	Keating	Sparkman
Clark	Kerr	Stennis
Cooper	Kuchel	Symington
Cotton	Lausche	Talmadge
Curtis	Long, Hawaii	Thurmond
Dirksen	Long, La.	Wiley
Dworschak	McCarthy	Williams, Del.
Eastland	McClellan	Williams, N. J.
Ellender	McGee	Yarborough
Engle	McNamara	Young, N. Dak.
Ervin	Magnuson	Young, Ohio
Fong	Mansfield	

NAYS—1

Douglas

NOT VOTING—18

Bartlett	Gore	Kennedy
Bush	Green	Lusk
Byrd, Va.	Hennings	Murray
Carlson	Hill	O'Mahoney
Chavez	Javits	Robertson
Dodd	Kefauver	Schoeppel

So the bill (H.R. 11389) was passed.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendments and request a conference thereon with the House of Representatives, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. HILL, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. SALTONSTALL, and Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

RETIREMENT OF SENATOR MARTIN, OF IOWA

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I remind the Senate that today is the last day in the Senate for TOM MARTIN, our colleague from Iowa.

He is leaving us, by retirement, after a long and dedicated career in Congress—16 years in the House of Representatives and 6 years with us here in the Senate.

During his long career he has repeatedly demonstrated devotion to his constituents in Iowa and to the principles which he espoused early in life. He has proved to be a loyal and hard-working public servant.

In his trip overseas with the American Battle Monuments Commission and later to work in Europe for the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, and in the days that lie ahead, we wish him the best of luck, health, and happiness. [Applause, Senators rising.]

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I extend to the distinguished Senator from Iowa, who is retiring, a sincere welcome to Texas. If he should ever change his residence from Iowa, we invite him to come to Texas.

In World War I Senator MARTIN attended the first Officers Training Camp at Leon Springs, in Texas, and became one of the first commissioned officer graduates of that camp. He served with distinction in World War I, and frequently attends the Leon Springs Officers Training Camp graduates' annual reunion in Texas.

Senator MARTIN owns two fine farms in Brazoria County, Tex. This is in the historic area where Stephen F. Austin, the father of Texas, planted the first Anglo-American colony in Spanish Texas in 1821. Senator MARTIN's farms are on some of the grants made to Stephen F. Austin's "Old Three Hundred," being the first 300 Anglo-American families to settle in Texas.

With his interest in this area of the first Anglo-American colony in Texas, in the westward expansion of the American people into Texas, Senator MARTIN has an interest in historic ground in our State. So we welcome him whenever he visits our State; and should he ever decide to change his residence, we will welcome him to Texas even more cordially.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, California has more islands than Iowa has. If TOM MARTIN should decide, after retirement, that he would like to come to California, we will welcome him there, because we are certain, in the light of his retirement, that he will not run again for the U.S. Senate.

He has been a great Member of the House of Representatives and is a great Member of the Senate. I know he is retiring in order to have an opportunity to go home to Iowa and visit with his family.

But, Tom, if you decide you want to come out to California, come right along. You can join the Iowa Society of California, because its membership exceeds the total population of Iowa. [Laughter.]

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, in the first place, we do not like to have Senator TOM MARTIN leave us. However, now that he has seen fit to leave us, we are glad to look back upon his past record. He has been an excellent Senator. He was a member of my committee. I wish he were back there now.

Wherever he goes in the future, I know he will continue to do good work, as he has done in the Senate.

If he decides to come to South Carolina, he knows, without my telling him, that he will be welcome. We will give him sunshine and a pleasant beach upon which to play at the same time.

INCREASED PAY FOR POSTAL AND CIVIL SERVICE EMPLOYEES

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, information continues to pile up in support of the action taken by Congress last week to increase the pay of our postal and civil service employees.

The latest data in support of a pay raise came to the committee from the National Civil Service League. As everyone knows, the league is nonpartisan in its views; its membership is representative of private industry; its purpose is better government at the national and lower levels.

The data presented to the committee by the league is startling, to say the least. For example, in comparing present salaries with those of 1939, it shows that a GS-5 has fallen 13.7 percent behind, a GS-9 is 28.9 percent behind, a GS-11 is 32.4 percent behind, and a GS-15 is 67.1 percent behind. Other figures are just as shocking.

In view of these figures the 7.5-percent increase Congress approved last week is modest indeed.

Mr. President, I invite the attention of those in the administration who are presently engaged in reviewing the pay bill for and on behalf of the President to the data to which I have just alluded. In order that it may be available for all to see and study, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the body of the RECORD immediately following my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I am confident a careful

review of these data will serve to alert even the most doubtful to the justification of and need for an upward adjustment in the pay of Federal employees as provided in the bill now on the President's desk.

EXHIBIT 1

ANALYSIS OF TABLES RELATING TO PURCHASING POWER OF GOVERNMENT SALARIES 1939 AND 1960

The attached chart describes the purchasing power value of classified and certain statutory salaries of the Federal Government in 1960 in comparison with corresponding schedules in 1939. The "stable" year 1939 is often referred to for such purposes since immediately thereafter salary structures, along with many other elements of the economy, were disrupted by the war. They have not since been brought into even the limited degree of balance that obtained in 1939.

A somewhat similar comparison of salaries in general was made recently by the National Industrial Conference Board and presented in their series, Road Maps of Industry, No. 1267, April 8, 1960. It was titled "The Two-way 'Squeeze'—1960" and describes the impact of Federal income taxes and inflation on income between 1939 and 1960. The attached chart does not go quite as far as the NICB comparison in that the latter includes social security taxes. This chart reflects only changes in the Consumer Price Index of the Bureau of Labor Statistics and Federal income taxes. Inclusion of State and local income taxes, social security or equivalent deductions, and the like, would enlarge the indicated gaps still further.

For reference as to what has been taking place in wage board salaries, which are designed to keep pace with business and industrial practice at comparable levels, a comparison is included of the schedule median wage board rate of 1960 and 1943. Approximately half of the wage board employees are above and half are below this point. Hence it is commonly used as a general indicator. A comparable figure for 1939 was not available. The wage board increases reflect the general sharing of blue collar employees in the growth of national productivity beyond merely holding even with the increases in the cost of living.

Among the points apparent from the chart are:

1. GS grades 1 and 2 have had increases which give them slightly more purchasing power today than they had in 1939. However, they seem to have fallen behind what has been taking place in wage board schedules for blue collar workers. This may in part explain the difficulty of recruiting at the GS-1 and GS-2 levels.

2. From GS-3 to 15 there is progressive deterioration percentagewise as well as in dollar terms, with most of the grades falling behind their corresponding 1939 positions by 20 to 60 percent. For equivalence, a civil servant at the beginning of CAF-14 in 1939 would have to be paid midway between GS-17 and 18 today.

3. A precise comparison cannot be made of the supergrades 16, 17, and 18 for 1939 and 1960 because they were not authorized until 1949. However, since there was a rough equivalent to a supergrade in 1939 with a salary level of \$9,000 the comparison of today's supergrades is made with that. The 1960 supergrades have much less purchasing power than did their 1939 counterpart.

4. Congressmen have come within 12 percent of holding their own between 1939 and 1960, although it is rather generally recognized that their 1939 level was too low. Assistant Secretaries on the same basis have fallen behind substantially but have also fared better than many levels of the classified service.

TABLE 1.—Purchasing power of Government salaries, 1939 and 1960

1939				April 1960				Lost through price increases since 1939 ²	1960 Federal income taxes ³	Income needed in 1960 to equal 1939 purchasing power	Percent discrepancy of 1960 salary with 1939 schedule
Grade or title	Classification Act starting rates	Federal income taxes ¹	Income after taxes	Grade or title	Classification Act starting rates	Increase since 1939					
						Amount	Percent				
CAF-1.....	\$1,260	0	\$1,260	GS-1.....	\$2,960	\$1,700	135	\$1,417	\$4	\$2,681	+9.4
CAF-2.....	1,440	0	1,440	GS-2.....	3,255	1,815	126	1,619	83	3,142	+3.5
CAF-3.....	1,620	0	1,620	GS-3.....	3,495	1,875	116	1,822	173	3,615	-3.4
CAF-4.....	1,800	0	1,800	GS-4.....	3,755	1,955	109	2,024	254	4,078	-8.6
CAF-5.....	2,000	0	2,000	GS-5.....	4,040	2,040	102	2,249	344	4,593	-13.7
CAF-6.....	2,300	0	2,300	GS-6.....	4,490	2,190	95	2,586	487	5,373	-19.7
CAF-7.....	2,600	0	2,600	GS-7.....	4,980	2,380	92	2,924	627	6,151	-23.5
CAF-8.....	2,900	0	2,900	GS-8.....	5,470	2,570	89	3,261	767	6,928	-26.6
CAF-9.....	3,200	0	3,200	GS-9.....	5,985	2,785	87	3,598	920	7,718	-28.9
CAF-10.....	3,500	0	3,500	GS-10.....	6,505	3,005	86	3,936	1,078	8,514	-30.9
CAF-11.....	3,800	0	3,800	GS-11.....	7,030	3,230	85	4,273	1,235	9,308	-32.4
CAF-12.....	4,600	\$15	4,585	GS-12.....	8,330	3,730	81	5,156	1,647	11,388	-36.7
CAF-13.....	5,600	47	5,553	GS-13.....	9,890	4,290	77	6,244	2,267	14,064	-42.2
CAF-14.....	6,500	76	6,424	GS-14.....	11,355	4,855	75	7,224	2,856	16,504	-45.3
CAF-15.....	8,000	124	7,876	GS-15.....	12,770	4,770	60	8,857	4,012	20,745	-62.4
Supergrade equivalent.....	9,000	156	8,844	GS-16.....	14,190	5,910	58	9,945	4,919	23,708	-67.1
Assistant Secretary.....	9,000	156	8,844	GS-17.....	15,375	6,375	71	9,945	4,919	23,708	-54.2
Congressman.....	10,000	188	9,812	GS-18.....	17,500	8,500	94	9,945	4,919	23,708	-35.5
Wage board median ⁴	1,789	33	1,756	Assistant Secretary.....	20,000	11,000	122	9,945	4,919	23,708	-18.5
				Congressman.....	22,500	12,500	125	11,034	4,356	25,202	-12.0
				Wage board median ⁴	4,722	2,933	164	1,203	65	3,024	+35.8

¹ Family of 4. 10 percent deduction allowed.² Increase in Consumer Price Index 1939 to April 1960 was 112.45 percent; from June 1943, 68.5 percent.³ Family of 4. Standard deduction allowed GS-1 to 11; 10 percent deduction allowed for persons above that level. \$3,000 additional deduction for Congressman, as authorized by law.⁴ Schedule median wage board rate; equivalent to GS-4. Data not available for 1939; 1960 comparison is with June 1943.

AMENDMENT OF MINERAL LEASING ACT OF FEBRUARY 25, 1920

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1612, H.R. 10455; with the understanding that there be 20 minutes of debate, the time to be equally divided between the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the author of the bill, and the distinguished minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H.R. 10455) to amend the Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That this Act may be cited as the "Mineral Leasing Act Revision of 1960".

SEC. 2. Sections 17, 17(a) and 17(b) of the Act entitled "An Act to promote the mining of coal, phosphate, oil, oil shale, gas, and sodium on the public domain", approved February 25, 1920, as amended (30 U.S.C. 226), are further amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 17. (a) All lands subject to disposition under this Act which are known or believed to contain oil or gas deposits may be leased by the Secretary.

"(b) If the lands to be leased are within any known geological structure of a producing oil or gas field, they shall be leased to the highest responsible qualified bidder by competitive bidding under general regulations in units of not more than six hundred and forty acres, which shall be as nearly compact in form as possible, upon the payment by the lessee of such bonus as may be accepted by the Secretary and of such royalty as may be fixed in the lease, which shall not be less than 12½ per centum in amount or value of the production removed or sold from the lease.

"(c) If the lands to be leased are not within any known geological structure of a producing oil or gas field, the person first making application for the lease who is qualified to hold a lease under this Act shall be entitled to a lease of such lands without competitive bidding. Such leases shall be conditioned upon the payment by the lessee of a royalty of 12½ per centum in amount or value of the production removed or sold from the lease.

"(d) In the event that the issuance of oil and gas leases becomes consistent with the military use of San Nicolas Island within a twelve-year period following the determination that has been made with respect to that island in accordance with the provisions of section 6 of the Act of February 28, 1958 (Public Law 85-337), the applicants whose applications for oil and gas leases on San Nicolas Island are presently pending before the Secretary shall be entitled to leases without competitive bidding, upon payment of the costs of retaining their applications in active status as determined by the Secretary, and provided that San Nicolas Island has not been classified as a part of any known geological structure of a producing oil or gas field.

"(e) All leases issued under this section shall be conditioned upon payments by the lessee of a rental of not less than 50 cents per acre for each year of the lease. Each year's lease rental shall be paid in advance. A minimum royalty of \$1 per acre in lieu of rental shall be payable at the expiration of each lease year beginning on or after a discovery of oil or gas in paying quantities on the lands leased.

"(f) Competitive leases issued under this section shall be for a primary term of five years and noncompetitive leases for a primary term of ten years. Each such lease shall continue so long after its primary term as oil or gas is produced in paying quantities. Any lease issued under this section for land on which or for which, under an approved unit or development plan, actual drilling operations were commenced prior to the end of its primary term and are being diligently prosecuted at that time shall be extended for two years and so long thereafter as oil or gas is produced in paying quantities.

"(g) No lease issued under this section which is subject to termination because of cessation of production shall be terminated

for this cause so long as reworking or drilling operations which were commenced on the land prior to or within sixty days after cessation of production are conducted thereon with reasonable diligence, or so long as oil or gas is produced in paying quantities as a result of such operations. No lease issued under this section shall expire because operations or production is suspended under any order, or with the consent, of the Secretary. No lease issued under this section covering lands on which there is a well capable of producing oil or gas in paying quantities shall expire because the lessee fails to produce the same unless the lessee is allowed a reasonable time, which shall be not less than sixty days after notice by registered or certified mail, within which to place such well in producing status or unless, after such status is established, production is discontinued on the leased premises without permission granted by the Secretary under the provisions of this Act.

"(h) Whenever it appears to the Secretary that lands owned by the United States are being drained of oil or gas by wells drilled on adjacent lands, he may negotiate agreements whereby the United States, or the United States and its lessees, shall be compensated for such drainage. Such agreements shall be made with the consent of the lessees, if any, affected thereby. If such agreement is entered into, the primary term of any lease for which compensatory royalty is being paid, or any extension of such primary term, shall be extended for the period during which such compensatory royalty is paid and for a period of one year from discontinuance of such payment and so long thereafter as oil or gas is produced in paying quantities. The Secretary shall report to Congress at the beginning of each regular session all such agreements entered into during the previous year which involve unleased Government lands.

"(i) If, during the primary term or any extended term of any lease issued under this section, a certified statement is filed by any mining claimant pursuant to subsection (c) of section 7 of the Multiple Mineral Development Act of August 13, 1954 (68 Stat. 708), as amended (30 U.S.C. 521), whether such filing occur prior to this Act or hereafter, asserting the existence of conflicting unpatented mining claim or claims upon which diligent work is being prosecuted as to

any lands covered by the lease, the running of time under such lease shall be suspended as to the lands involved from the first day of the month following the filing of such verified statement until a final decision is rendered in the matter.

"(j) The Secretary of the Interior shall, upon timely application therefor, issue a new lease in exchange for any lease issued for a term of twenty years, or any renewal thereof, or any lease heretofore issued in exchange for a twenty-year lease, such new lease to be for a primary term of five years and so long thereafter as oil or gas is produced in paying quantities and at a royalty rate of not less than 12½ per centum in amount or value of the production removed or sold from such leases, except that the royalty rate shall be 12½ per centum in amount or value of the production removed or sold from said leases, as to (1) such leases, or such parts of the lands subject thereto, and the deposits underlying the same, as are not believed to be within the productive limits of any producing oil or gas deposit, as such productive limits are found by the Secretary to exist on the effective date of this Act, and (2) any production on a lease from an oil or gas deposit which was discovered after May 27, 1941, by a well or wells drilled within the boundaries of the lease, and which is determined by the Secretary to be a new deposit; and (3) any production on or allocated to a lease pursuant to an approved unit or cooperative agreement from an oil or gas deposit which was discovered after May 27, 1941, on land committed to such agreement, and which is determined by the Secretary to be a new deposit, where such lease, or a lease for which it is exchanged, was included in such agreement at the time of discovery, or was included in a duly executed and filed application for the approval of such agreement at the time of discovery.

"(k) For the purpose of more properly conserving the natural resources of any oil or gas pool, field, or like area, or any part thereof (whether or not any part of said oil or gas pool field, or like area, is then subject to any cooperative or unit plan of development or operation), lessees thereof and their representatives may unite with each other, or jointly or separately with others, in collectively adopting and operating under a cooperative or unit plan of development or operation of such pool, field, or like area, or any part thereof, whenever determined and certified by the Secretary of the Interior to be necessary or advisable in the public interest. The Secretary is thereunto authorized, in his discretion, with the consent of the holders of leases involved, to establish, alter, change, or revoke drilling, producing, rental, minimum royalty, and royalty requirements of such leases and to make such regulations with reference to such leases, with like consent on the part of the lessees, in connection with the institution and operation of any such cooperative or unit plan as he may deem necessary or proper to secure the proper protection of the public interest. The Secretary may provide that oil and gas leases hereafter issued under this Act shall contain a provision requiring the lessee to operate under such a reasonable cooperative or unit plan, and he may prescribe such a plan under which such lessee shall operate, which shall adequately protect the rights of all parties in interest, including the United States.

"Any plan authorized by the preceding paragraph which includes lands owned by the United States, may, in the discretion of the Secretary, contain a provision whereby authority is vested in the Secretary of the Interior, or any such person, committee, or State or Federal officer or agency as may be designated in the plan, to alter or modify from time to time the rate of prospecting and development and the quantity and rate

of production under such plan. All leases operated under any such plan approved or prescribed by the Secretary shall be excepted in determining holdings or control under the provisions of any section of this Act.

"When separate tracts cannot be independently developed and operated in conformity with an established well-spacing or development program, any lease, or a portion thereof, may be pooled with other lands, whether or not owned by the United States, under a communitization or drilling agreement providing for an apportionment of production or royalties among the separate tracts of land comprising the drilling or spacing unit when determined by the Secretary of the Interior to be in the public interest, and operations or production pursuant to such an agreement shall be deemed to be operations or production as to each such lease committed thereto.

"Any lease issued for a term of twenty years, or any renewal thereof, or any portion of such lease that has become the subject of a cooperative or unit plan of development or operation of a pool, field, or like area, which plan has the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, shall continue in force until the termination of such plan. Any other lease issued under any section of this Act which has heretofore or may hereafter be committed to any such plan that contains a general provision for allocation of oil or gas shall continue in force and effect as to the land committed, so long as the lease remains subject to the plan: *Provided*, That production is had in paying quantities under the plan prior to the expiration date of the term of such lease. Any lease hereafter committed to any such plan embracing lands that are in part within and in part outside of the area covered by any such plan shall be segregated into separate leases as to the lands committed and the lands not committed as of the effective date of unitization: *Provided, however*, That any such lease as to the nonunitized portion shall continue in force and effect for the term thereof but for not less than two years from the date of such segregation and so long thereafter as oil or gas is produced in paying quantities. The minimum royalty or discovery rental under any lease that has become subject to any cooperative or unit plan of development or operation, or other plan that contains a general provision for allocation of oil or gas, shall be payable only with respect to the lands subject to such lease to which oil or gas shall be allocated under such plan. Any lease which shall be eliminated from any such approved or prescribed plan, or from any communitization or drilling agreement authorized by this section, and any lease which shall be in effect at the termination of any such approval or prescribed plan, or at the termination of any such communitization or drilling agreement, unless relinquished, shall continue in effect for the original term thereof, but for not less than two years, and so long thereafter as oil or gas is produced in paying quantities.

"The Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized, on such conditions as he may prescribe, to approve operating, drilling, or development contracts made by one or more lessees of oil or gas leases, with one or more persons, associations, or corporations, whenever, in his discretion the conservation of natural products or the public convenience or necessity may require it or the interests of the United States may be best subserved thereby. All leases operated under such approved operating, drilling, or development contracts, and interests thereunder, shall be excepted in determining holdings or control under the provisions of any said Act.

"The Secretary of the Interior, to avoid waste or to promote conservation of natural resources, may authorize the subsurface storage of oil or gas, whether or not pro-

duced from federally owned lands, in lands leased or subject to lease under this Act. Such authorization may provide for the payment of a storage fee or rental on such stored oil or gas, or, in lieu of such fee or rental, for a royalty other than that prescribed in the lease when such stored oil or gas is produced in conjunction with oil or gas not previously produced. Any lease on which storage is so authorized shall be extended at least for the period of storage and so long thereafter as oil or gas not previously produced is produced in paying quantities."

Sec. 3. Section 27 of said Act, as amended (30 U.S.C. 184), is further amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 27. (a) (1) No person, association, or corporation, except as otherwise provided in this subsection, shall take, hold, own, or control at one time, whether acquired directly from the Secretary under this Act or otherwise, coal leases or permits on an aggregate of more than ten thousand two hundred and forty acres in any one State.

"(2) A person, association, or corporation may apply for coal leases or permits for acreage in addition to that which is permissible under paragraph (1) of this subsection, but the additional acreage shall not exceed five thousand one hundred and twenty acres in any one State. Each application shall be for forty acres or a multiple thereof and shall contain a statement that the granting of a lease or permit for the additional lands is necessary to enable the applicant to carry on business economically and that it is believed to be in the public interest. On the filing of such an application, the coal deposits in the lands covered by it shall be temporarily set aside and withdrawn from all forms of disposal under this Act. The Secretary shall, after posting notice of the pending application in the local land office, conduct public hearings on it. After such hearings the Secretary may, under such regulations as he may prescribe and to such extent as he finds to be in the public interest and necessary to enable the applicant to carry on business economically, permit the applicant to take and hold coal leases or permits for additional acreage as hereinbefore provided. The Secretary may, in his own discretion or whenever sufficient public interest is manifested, reevaluate a lessee's or permittee's need for all or any part of the additional acreage and may cancel any lease or permit covering all or any part of such acreage if he finds that cancellation is in the public interest or that the coal deposits in said acreage are no longer necessary for the lessee or permittee to carry on business economically or that the lessee or permittee has divested himself of all or any part of his first ten thousand two hundred and forty acres or no longer has facilities which, in the Secretary's opinion, enable him to exploit the deposits under lease or permit. No assignment, transfer, or sale of any part of the additional acreage may be made without the approval of the Secretary.

"(b) (1) No person, association, or corporation, except as otherwise provided in this subsection, shall take, hold, own, or control at one time, whether acquired directly from the Secretary under this Act or otherwise, sodium leases or permits on an aggregate of more than five thousand one hundred and twenty acres in any one State.

"(2) The Secretary may, in his discretion, where the same is necessary in order to secure the economic mining of sodium compounds leaseable under this Act, permit a person, association, or corporation to take or hold sodium leases or permits on up to fifteen thousand three hundred and sixty acres in any one State.

"(c) No person, association, or corporation shall take, hold, own, or control at one time, whether acquired directly from the Secretary under this Act or otherwise, phosphate

leases or permits on an aggregate of more than ten thousand two hundred and forty acres in the United States.

"(d) (1) No person, association, or corporation, except as otherwise provided in this Act, shall take, hold, own or control at one time, whether acquired directly from the Secretary under this Act or otherwise, oil or gas leases (including options for such leases) on land held under the provisions of this Act exceeding in the aggregate more than two hundred forty-six thousand and eighty acres in any one State other than Alaska. In the case of the State of Alaska, the limit shall be three hundred thousand acres in the northern leasing district and three hundred thousand acres in the southern leasing district, and the boundary between said two districts, shall be the left limit of the Tanana River from the border between the United States and Canada to the confluence of the Tanana and Yukon Rivers, and the left limit of the Yukon River from said confluence to its principal southern mouth.

"(2) No person, association, or corporation shall take, hold, own, or control at one time options to acquire interests in oil or gas leases under the provisions of this Act which involve, in the aggregate, more than two hundred thousand acres of land in any one State other than Alaska, or in the case of Alaska, more than two hundred thousand acres in each of its two leasing districts, as hereinbefore described. No option to acquire any interest in such an oil or gas lease shall be enforceable if entered into for a period of more than three years (which three years shall be inclusive of any renewal period if a right to renew is reserved by any party to the option) without the prior approval of the Secretary. In any case in which an option to acquire the optionor's entire interest in the whole or a part of the acreage under a lease is entered into, the acreage to which the option is applicable shall be charged both to the optionor and to the optionee, but the charge to the optionor shall cease when the option is exercised. In any case in which an option to acquire a part of the optionor's interest in the whole or a part of the acreage under a lease is entered into, the acreage to which the option is applicable shall be fully charged to the optionor and a share thereof shall also be charged to the optionee as his interest may appear, but after the option is exercised, said acreage shall be charged to the parties pro rata as their interests may appear. In any case in which an assignment is made of a part of a lessee's interest in the whole or part of the acreage under a lease or an application for a lease, the acreage shall be charged to the parties pro rata as their interests may appear. No option or assignment hereafter made, or renewal thereof hereafter granted, shall be enforceable until notice thereof has been filed with the Secretary or an officer or employee of the Department of the Interior designated by him to receive the same. Each such notice shall include, in addition to any other matters prescribed by the Secretary, the names and addresses of the parties thereto, the serial number of the lease or application for a lease to which the option is applicable, and a statement of the number of acres covered thereby and of the interests and obligations of the parties thereto and shall be subscribed by the holder of the option or his duly authorized agent. An option which has not been exercised shall remain charged to both parties until notice of its expiration, relinquishment, or surrender has been filed, by either party, with the Secretary or any officer or employee of the Department of the Interior designated by him to receive the same. In addition, each holder of any such option shall file with the Secretary or an officer or employee of the Department of the Interior as aforesaid within ninety days

after the 30th day of June and the 31st day of December in each year a statement showing, in addition to any other matters prescribed by the Secretary, his name, the name and address of each grantor of an option held by him, the serial number of every lease or application for a lease to which such an option is applicable, the number of acres covered by each such option, the total acreage in each State to which such options are applicable, and his interest and obligation under each such option. The failure of the holder of an option so to file shall render the option unenforceable by him. The unenforceability of any option under the provisions of this paragraph shall not diminish the number of acres deemed to be held under option by any person, association, or corporation in computing the amount chargeable under the first sentence of this paragraph and shall not relieve any party thereto of any liability to cancellation, forfeiture, forced disposition, or other sanction provided by law. The Secretary may prescribe forms on which the notice and statements required by this paragraph shall be made.

"(e) (1) No person, association, or corporation shall take, hold, own or control at one time any interest as a member of an association or as a stockholder in a corporation holding a lease, option, or permit under the provisions of this Act which, together with the area embraced in any direct holding, ownership or control by him of such a lease, option, or permit or any other interest which he may have as a member of other associations or as a stockholder in other corporations holding, owning or controlling such leases, options, or permits for any kind of minerals, exceeds in the aggregate an amount equivalent to the maximum number of acres of the respective kinds of minerals allowed to any one lessee, optionee, or permittee under this Act, except that no person shall be charged with his pro rata share of any acreage holdings of any association or corporation unless he is the beneficial owner of more than 10 per centum of the stock or other instruments of ownership or control of such association or corporation, and except that within three years after the enactment of this Act no valid option in existence prior to the enactment of this Act held by a corporation or association at the time of enactment of this Act shall be chargeable to any stockholder of such corporation or to a member of such association so long as said option shall be so held by such corporation or association under the provisions of this Act.

"(2) No contract for development and operation of any lands leased under this Act, whether or not coupled with an interest in such lease, and no lease held, owned or controlled in common by two or more persons, associations, or corporations shall be deemed to create a separate association under the preceding paragraph of this subsection between or among the contracting parties or those who hold, own or control the lease in common, but the proportionate interest of each such party shall be charged against the total acreage permitted to be held, owned, or controlled by such party under this Act. The total acreage so held, owned, or controlled in common by two or more parties shall not exceed, in the aggregate, an amount equivalent to the maximum number of acres of the respective kinds of minerals allowed to any one lessee, optionee, or permittee under this Act.

"(f) Nothing contained in subsection (e) of this section shall be construed (i) to limit sections 18, 19, and 22 of this Act or (ii), subject to the approval of the Secretary, to prevent any number of lessees under this Act from combining their several interests so far as may be necessary for the purpose of constructing and carrying on the business of a refinery or of establishing and constructing, as a common carrier, a pipeline or railroad

to be operated and used by them jointly in the transportation of oil from their several wells or from the wells of other lessees under this Act or in the transportation of coal or (iii) to increase the acreage which may be taken, held, owned, or controlled under section 27 of this Act.

"(g) Any ownership or interest otherwise forbidden in this Act which may be acquired by descent, will, judgment, or decree may be held for two years after its acquisition and no longer.

"(h) (1) If any interest in any lease is owned or controlled, directly or indirectly, by means of stock or otherwise, in violation of any of the provisions of this Act, the lease may be canceled, or the interest so owned may be forfeited, or the person so owning or controlling the interest may be compelled to dispose of the interest in any appropriate proceeding instituted by the Attorney General. Such a proceeding shall be instituted in the United States district court for the district in which the leased property or some part thereof is located or in which the defendant may be found.

"(2) The right to cancel or forfeit for violation of any of the provisions of this Act shall not apply so as to affect adversely the title or interest of a bona fide purchaser of any lease, interest in a lease, option to acquire a lease or an interest therein, or permit which lease, interest, option, or permit was acquired and is held by a qualified person, association, or corporation in conformity with those provisions, even though the holdings of the person, association, or corporation from which the lease, interest, option, or permit was acquired, or of his predecessor in title (including the original lessee of the United States) may have been canceled or forfeited or may be or may have been subject to cancellation or forfeiture for any such violations. If, in any such proceeding, an underlying lease, interest, option, or permit is canceled or forfeited to the Government and there are valid interests therein or valid options to acquire the lease or an interest therein which are not subject to cancellation, forfeiture, or compulsory disposition, the underlying lease, interest, option, or permit shall be sold by the Secretary to the highest responsible qualified bidder by competitive bidding under general regulations subject to all outstanding valid interests therein and valid options pertaining thereto. Likewise, if, in any such proceeding, less than the whole interest in a lease, interest, option, or permit is canceled or forfeited to the Government, the partial interests so canceled or forfeited shall be sold by the Secretary to the highest responsible qualified bidder by competitive bidding under general regulations. If competitive bidding fails to produce a satisfactory offer the Secretary may, in either of these cases, sell the interest in question by such other method as he deems appropriate on terms not less favorable to the Government than those of the best competitive bid received.

"(3) The commencement and conclusion of every proceeding under this subsection shall be promptly noted on the appropriate public records of the Bureau of Land Management.

"(i) Effective September 21, 1959, any person, association, or corporation who is a party to any proceeding with respect to a violation of any provision of this act, whether initiated prior to said date or thereafter, shall have the right to be dismissed as such a party upon showing that he holds and acquired as a bona fide purchaser the interest involving him as such a party without violating any provisions of this act. No hearing upon any such showing shall be required by the Department unless evidence prima facie in its files indicates a possible violation of the Mineral Leasing Act on the part of the alleged bona fide purchaser.

"(j) If during any such proceeding, a party thereto files with the Secretary a waiver of his rights under his lease (including particularly, where applicable, rights to drill and to assign) or if such rights are suspended by the Secretary pending a decision in the proceeding, whether initiated prior to enactment of this act or thereafter, payment of rentals and running of time against the term of the lease or leases involved shall be suspended as of the first day of the month following the filing of the waiver or suspension of the rights.

(k) Except as otherwise provided in this Act, if any lands or deposits subject to the provisions of this Act shall be subleased, trusted, possessed, or controlled by any device permanently, temporarily, directly, indirectly, tacitly, or in any manner whatsoever, so that they form a part of or are in anywise controlled by any combination in the form of an unlawful trust, with the consent of the lessee, optionee, or permittee, or form the subject of any contract or conspiracy in restraint of trade in the mining or selling of coal, phosphate, oil, oil shale, gas, or sodium entered into by the lessee, optionee, or permittee or any agreement or understanding, written, verbal, or otherwise, to which such lessee, optionee, or permittee shall be a party, of which his or its output is to be or become the subject, to control the price or prices thereof or of any holding of such lands by any individual, partnership, association, corporation, or control in excess of the amounts of lands provided in this Act, the lease, option, or permit shall be forfeited by appropriate court proceedings."

SEC. 4. (a) Upon the expiration of the initial five-year term of any noncompetitive oil or gas lease which was issued prior to the enactment of this Act and which has been maintained in accordance with applicable statutory requirements and regulations, the record titleholder thereof shall be entitled to a single extension of the lease, unless then otherwise provided by law, for such lands covered by it as are not on the expiration date of the lease, withdrawn from leasing. A withdrawal, however, shall not affect the right to an extension if actual drilling operations on such lands were commenced prior to the effective date of the withdrawal and were being diligently prosecuted on the expiration date of the lease. No withdrawal shall be effective within the meaning of this section until ninety days after notice thereof has been sent by registered or certified mail to each lessee to be affected by such withdrawal.

(b) As to lands not within the known geologic structure of a producing oil or gas field, a noncompetitive oil or gas lease to which this section is applicable shall be extended for a period of five years and so long thereafter as oil or gas is produced in paying quantities. As to lands within the known geologic structure of a producing oil or gas field, a noncompetitive lease to which this section is applicable shall be extended for a period of two years and so long thereafter as oil or gas is produced in paying quantities.

(c) Any noncompetitive oil or gas lease extended under this section shall be subject to the rules and regulations in force at the expiration of the initial five-year term of the lease. No extension shall be granted, however, unless within a period of ninety days prior to the expiration date of the lease, an application therefor is filed by the record titleholder or an assignee whose assignment has been filed for approval or an operator whose operating agreement has been filed for approval.

(d) Any lease issued prior to the enactment of this Act which has been maintained in accordance with applicable statutory requirements and regulations and which pertains to land on which actual drilling operations were commenced prior to the end

of its fixed term and are being diligently prosecuted at that time shall be extended for two years and so long thereafter as oil or gas is produced in paying quantities.

SEC. 5. The Act of February 25, 1920, as amended (30 U.S.C. 181 and the following), is amended by adding a section 42 thereto to read as follows:

"No action under the Administrative Procedure Act to review a decision of the Secretary involving the application for, issuance, cancellation, or forfeiture of or title to any oil and gas lease shall be maintained unless such action is commenced or taken within ninety days from and after the final decision of the Secretary relating to such matter. No such action to review such a decision of the Secretary heretofore rendered shall be maintained unless the same be commenced or taken within ninety days from and after the effective date of this Act."

SEC. 6. The last sentence of section 30(a) of the Act of February 25, 1920, as amended (30 U.S.C. 187a), is amended to read as follows: "Upon the segregation by an assignment of a lease issued after the effective date of this Act held beyond its primary term by production, actual or suspended, or the payment of compensatory royalty, the segregated lease of an undeveloped, assigned, or retained part shall continue for two years, and so long thereafter as oil or gas is produced in paying quantities."

The provisions of this section 6 shall not be applicable to any lease issued prior to the effective date of this Act.

SEC. 7. (a) Section 1 of the Act of February 25, 1920, as amended (30 U.S.C. 181), section 2 of said Act (30 U.S.C. 182), and section 21 of said Act (30 U.S.C. 341) are amended by the insertion of the words "native asphalt, solid and semisolid bitumen, and bituminous rock (including oil-impregnated rock or sands from which oil is recoverable only by special treatment after the deposit is mined or quarried)" immediately after the words "oil shale," in the first sentence of each section. The provisions of section 21 of said Act (30 U.S.C. 241) shall be applicable to leases issued under this section, except that no person, association, or corporation shall acquire or hold more than seven thousand six hundred and eighty acres in any one State.

(b) If an offer for a lease under the provisions of section 21 for deposits other than oil shale is based upon a mineral location, the validity of which might be questioned because the claim was based on a placer location rather than on a lode location, or vice versa, the offeror shall have a preference right to a lease if the offer is filed not more than one year after the date of approval of this Act.

(c) A lease under the multiple use principle may issue notwithstanding the existence of an outstanding lease issued under any other provision of this Act.

SEC. 8. No amendment made by this Act shall affect any valid right granted under the law as it existed prior to such amendment.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 minutes.

I take this time primarily to pay tribute to two members of the committee. The preparation of the bill has been a long and tedious process. It involves the amendment of the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920.

Much of what is contained in the House bill, which is now before the Senate, was in S. 2983, which was originally introduced by the distinguished senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY].

In my opinion, for a long period of time—in fact, practically since 1935—Senator JOSEPH O'MAHONEY has been the

great authority in the United States on the subject of mineral leasing. He was the author of a mineral leasing bill as far back as 1935.

During the many years that he has been a member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, there has never been a time when he has not been interested in the subject of mineral leasing. Therefore, we were desirous to complete work on the bill while we might still have the advantage of his great knowledge and technical skill in the drafting of mineral leasing legislation.

I would certainly be remiss if I failed not only to mention his authorship of the bill which we have used as a model on which to build, but also to pay tribute to the fidelity with which he has worked on it.

I think it worth reminding the Senate that Senator O'MAHONEY, as a very young man, worked with the late Senator Kendrick on the original oil leasing bill passed by the Senate. It is rare that an individual should live through a whole cycle of legislation, as the Senator from Wyoming has been able to do. I pay high tribute to him.

Mr. President, I take this opportunity also to thank the able Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] for the part he played in the drafting of the bill. It is always possible for a minority to cause trouble, if it desires to do so. The able Senator from Colorado worked steadfastly in trying to report a good bill. He did not agree with everything in it, and I did not agree with everything in it. But we tried to find a meeting place. We took time to make certain that the final bill was satisfactory. I compliment the Senator from Colorado sincerely on the part which he played in the preparation of the bill.

Mr. President, the bill involves some new developments. There is a title provision on tar sands. There is a possibility that tar sands may become more important. The rules and regulations which have been applied on oil and gas may become usable in the field of tar sands.

So we shall have a 10-year lease, instead of a 5-year lease and a 5-year extension.

We shall have some increases in rentals, which will be of benefit to the reclamation fund, the public school funds, and so forth.

The members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs who worked upon this measure are indeed grateful for the fine work which has been done.

Mr. ALLOTT. First, Mr. President, I desire to thank the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] for his very kind remarks. Only those who have worked in this field can comprehend, I am sure, how extremely complicated it is.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] introduced the original bill, I believe, and he was very active. After he became ill, earlier in the year, it was my privilege to work with him on occasion, and also to work with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON].

I believe this bill will bring new revenue to the United States, and I believe the bill is a step forward.

I have forfeited what I believe should be one feature of future legislation—namely, a recording act to be applicable to this field. I had offered such a measure. But because of the complication involved in working it out, I decided that rather than prejudice the overall good to be gained by the bill, I would withdraw my amendment; and I have done so.

I express my appreciation to the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and to the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] for their extremely fine work on the bill.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. On page 2 of the report, paragraph 3 states, in effect, that the bill substitutes a fixed 10-year lease term for the present 5-year term with automatic right of renewal for a second 5-year term. Will the right to renew carry with it the identical rental that is set forth for the first year of the 10-year term; or if a 5-year renewal is required, will there be a restudy, with the intent of ascertaining whether the rent should be raised when the renewal is made?

Mr. ALLOTT. To some extent paragraph 3, on page 2 of the report, from which the Senator from Ohio has been reading, is in error. If the Senator from Ohio will examine page 6 of the report—

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I question whether it is in error. I believe it is misleading.

Mr. ALLOTT. Yes; let us say it is misleading.

If the Senator from Ohio will examine page 6, he will see there has been a substitution of a single 10-year primary lease term.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Where on page 6?

Mr. ALLOTT. At the bottom of the page.

I now read that part of the report:

Lease terms: Substitution of a single 10-year primary lease term in the case of non-competitive leases (i.e., leases held on lands which are not within the known geological structure of a producing field) for the present 5-year term with right of renewal will, it is believed, simplify administration and reduce costs both to the Government and the industry.

Similarly, allowance of an added 2-year term for existing and future oil and gas leases, if actual drilling is being diligently prosecuted at the end of the primary term, will provide impetus toward exploration for oil and gas and reward those who do so diligently.

To answer the second part of the Senator's question, let me say that the Senator from New Mexico, who is now on the floor, has very, very consistently taken the position, since this began—and perhaps he would like to discuss it—that the United States was not getting sufficient rentals from these properties, for which the rentals are prorated back to the States, for the purpose of education and roads. As a consequence, there is a new paragraph on minimum rentals. It is dealt with on page 6 of the report,

beginning in the middle of the page, under the subhead "Minimum Rentals."

Mr. ANDERSON. Let me say to the Senator from Ohio that instead of a 5-year lease and an automatic 5-year extension, there is now to be a single 10-year lease, but no extension of that 10-year lease. The total periods, in short, are identical.

The amendment merely means that there will be one 10-year period—not 5 years followed by a second period of 5 years, with the result that additional bookkeeping would be required.

Mr. LAUSCHE. In other words, the bill does not provide for a 10-year lease and then a 5-year extension; is that correct? Of course, the act originally provided for a 5-year lease and a 5-year extension.

Mr. ANDERSON. That is correct; there is not to be a 5-year extension of the 10-year lease.

Mr. LAUSCHE. In other words, the lease is to be 10 years, and no 5-year extension.

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes; and I am very glad the Senator from Ohio has called attention to that point, because in the absence of this legislative history, someone might have construed this measure as meaning that there would be a 10-year lease and a 5-year extension. However, there will be no such extension.

Mr. LAUSCHE. How about the increase in the rents?

Mr. ANDERSON. The original provision was for 50 cents the first year, nothing the second year, nothing the third year, 25 cents the fourth year, and 25 cents the fifth year.

This measure provides for a substantially higher rental than the old one, and it should substantially increase the receipts. But in the opinion of the members of the committee, the increase represents only the drop in the value of the dollar.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Can the Senator tell me what motivated the proposal to change the law?

Mr. ANDERSON. The Department of the Interior had all kinds of troubles; and therefore a study had been made as to the desirability of changing the law.

The Department of the Interior wanted to establish higher rentals; and in dealing with the whole thing, we arrived at this measure.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Does the Department of the Interior approve this proposal?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes; all of it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read the third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question now is, Shall it pass?

The bill (H.R. 10455) was passed.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the bill was passed be reconsidered.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I move to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I move to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, request a conference thereon with the House of Representatives, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. DWORSHAK, and Mr. ALLOTT conferees on the part of the Senate.

RELEASE OF RECAPTURE PROVISIONS IN CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN REAL PROPERTY TO THE CITY OF LITTLE ROCK, ARK.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1632, Senate bill 3319.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title, for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 3319) to authorize the Administrator of General Services to release the recapture provisions contained in the conveyance of certain real property to the city of Little Rock, Ark., and for other purposes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, this bill is being taken up with the concurrence of the leadership, at the request of the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], who has informed us that the prior objection entered to the measure by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] has now been removed, and that the Senator from Oregon is perfectly willing to have the bill brought up at this time.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is this the Stella School District bill?

Mr. MANSFIELD. No.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I believe it was on yesterday that the distinguished Senator from Oregon came to me and stated he would not interpose any objection to this bill.

All agencies of the Government favor the bill. It is simply a bill in aid of progress. If this reservation is released, the city will be able to, and plans to, issue bonds for the improvement of the airport.

I trust that the bill will be passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the

question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 3319) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) subparagraph numbered (2) of the concluding paragraph of the first section of the Act entitled "An Act making appropriations for the military and nonmilitary activities of the War Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1937, and for other purposes", approved May 15, 1936 (49 Stat. 1292), is hereby repealed.

(b) The Administrator of General Services is authorized and directed to execute and deliver to the city of Little Rock, Arkansas, without consideration, such instrument as he shall determine to be required to release effectively to that city all right, title, and interest heretofore reserved to the United States or any department or agency thereof in or with respect to the land described in section 2 of that Act (49 Stat. 1292-1293) in compliance with the condition imposed by that subparagraph.

Mr. MORSE subsequently said: Mr. President, a few minutes ago the Senate passed Senate bill 3319, Calendar No. 1632.

I ask unanimous consent that at the appropriate point in the debate a memorandum I had prepared on S. 3319, showing it does not violate the Morse formula, be inserted in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MORSE

S. 3319 proposes to authorize the General Services Administration to release the recapture provisions contained in the 1936 conveyance of certain airport property by the Federal Government to the city of Little Rock, Ark., pursuant to Public Law 598 of the 74th Congress.

The 1936 conveyance contained the following reversionary clause:

"In time of national emergency, upon request of the Secretary of War, the municipality shall turn over complete control and operation of the entire Little Rock Municipal Airport and the property thereon, without rental or other charge, to the United States of America, for such use and for such length of time as the emergency shall require, in the discretion of the Secretary of War."

During World War II, the Army recaptured the land in question and in 1951, the General Services Administration transferred the land back to the city of Little Rock by quitclaim deed subject to the above-quoted reversionary provision.

The Little Rock Municipal Airport Commission now desires to develop the airport and to finance the development through the issuance of revenue bonds. However, bond attorneys have advised the commission that they cannot issue a legal opinion approving airport revenue bonds for Little Rock because of the national emergency recapture clause mentioned above.

S. 3319 proposes to release the reversionary clause without consideration.

COMMENTS

In a letter dated June 8, 1960, the Department of the Air Force states:

"The Department of Defense has no foreseeable future requirement for that portion of Adams Field described by Public Law 598, 74th Congress, and accordingly has no objection to the release of the recapture provisions on the area conveyed by that public

law. If an unforeseen requirement for an airfield should develop, it is believed that Little Rock Air Force Base could accommodate the mission."

The release of the recapture provision of the 1936 law and the improvement of Little Rock Municipal Airport pursuant to the issuance of revenue bonds will be in the interest of the Federal Government and of national defense. Because of this important benefit to the Federal Government the proposed release is not objectionable under the Morse formula.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to consider executive business, to consider the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no reports of committees, the nominations on the calendar will be stated.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana will state it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. In view of the fact that the chief opposition, as I understand, will be directed against the nomination to the Civil Aeronautics Board and the nomination to the Federal Maritime Board, would it be possible to have the Senate consider both of them, en bloc?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection—

Mr. GRUENING. I object.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Then, Mr. President, we now have before us the nomination of John S. Bragdon, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board for the remainder of the term expiring December 31, 1960. We have not acted upon that nomination.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for a quorum call be rescinded.

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

The question is on the confirmation of the nomination of John S. Bragdon, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board for the remainder of the term expiring December 31, 1960.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the nominations of Vice Adm. Ralph E. Wilson, of Maryland, to be a member of the Federal Maritime Board for a term of 4 years expiring June 30, 1964, vice Clarence G. Morse, and the nomination

of John S. Bragdon, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board for the remainder of the term expiring December 31, 1960, vice James Durfee, considered the same, reported favorably thereon, and recommended that the nominations be confirmed.

Mr. President, the nominations were reported jointly by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. The report is dated Friday, June 10, 1960. In connection with the report at that time I filed my individual views, dissenting to the confirmation of the nominations of these two gentlemen.

Though I agree with the majority view that Adm. Ralph E. Wilson and Gen. John S. Bragdon have distinguished military records and were competent witnesses before our committee, I cannot concur with the recommendation that their nominations be confirmed. This administration, and others before it, have found it easier to tap retired career officers for public service than to search further for qualified civilians. There is no doubt in my mind that in this country's great maritime and aviation industries there are many outstanding men who would be willing and honored to hold appointments on these Boards—men who have spent their lives in the business, who know it intimately, and who have the respect and confidence of their associates.

In a famous 1948 letter President Eisenhower dwelt upon the importance of keeping civilian power in the hands of civilians. He said:

It is my conviction that the necessary and wise subordination of the military to civil power will be best sustained and our people will have greater confidence that it is so sustained when lifelong professional soldiers, in the absence of some obvious and overriding reasons, abstain from seeking high political office.

The President was, of course, talking about running for political office but in its true meaning any high appointive office is also a high political office. The President went on to say:

In the American scene I see no dearth of men fitted by training, talent, and integrity for national leadership.

Mr. President, it must be perfectly plain to everyone that the great maritime industry of this country and the great aviation industry of this country do not have to look to retired military men, to men who have spent 30 or 40 years in a military office, in order to fill the civilian regulatory agencies.

Mr. President, the gravamen and the basis of my complaint against both of these nominations is that I do not believe we ought to fill these civilian regulatory agencies with retired military men. I am against that practice. I assert that these great industries have talent enough to provide the kind of leadership needed by the civilian regulatory agencies. The President of the United States was correct when he said that we should not select men who have spent their lifetimes in the military service to serve in these high political offices.

Mr. President, this letter clearly appreciates the distinction between both the civilian and military mind and the role that mind should play in our form of government.

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

Mr. ENGLE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. CARROLL. I say to the able Senator from California that I am willing to hear much more of the individual views of the Senator from California and I am perfectly willing to wait if the Senator desires to express himself further, but it seems to me that this is not solely a question of whether a man should come from the military or from the industry to be regulated.

I read from the Senator's individual views:

There is no doubt in my mind that in this country's great maritime and aviation industries there are many outstanding men who would be willing and honored to hold appointments on these Boards.

In my opinion it is not a question of whether men may have a military background or whether these men should come from the industry which must be regulated under law. It seems to me the basic issue is: Who will really protect the public interest?

In some cases a man who has devoted himself, for example, to service in the Navy, who may be an admiral, may not know much about the public welfare. If he has devoted his life to Annapolis and to the Navy, he may not know much about the public interest or economics of maritime States as it affects the public interest.

I hope the Senator from California will not base his argument upon that thesis. I agree with the Senator that in a civilian economy we should not appoint too many of our retired military officers. Rather than to say the appointments should come from the industry or from the military, I hope the Senator from California will direct his remarks to those qualified people who ought to be appointed to serve in the public interest.

Mr. ENGLE. The Senator from Colorado makes a good point. We should not send the foxes to guard the hen-houses. That is what we have done time and time again. We have selected men from the industries to be regulated and have sent them to serve on the boards which do the regulating. We have sent the foxes to guard the henhouses.

I am dealing tonight with the philosophy of selecting military men to serve on civilian regulatory agencies. I protest that upon the same ground the President of the United States expressed in his letter in 1948.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ENGLE. I am glad to yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I have conferred with the Senator from California. I understand if we can work out an agreement to vote tomorrow at a specified time we can proceed with the debate this evening, giving Senators assurance that there will be no rollcalls this evening.

As I understand the situation, the Senator from California and those who are associated with him desire to have yeas-and-nays votes on the two nominations; is that correct?

Mr. ENGLE. That is correct.

Mr. GRUENING. Three yeas-and-nays votes on three nominations.

Mr. ENGLE. The Senator from California would like to have a yeas-and-nays vote on the confirmation of the nominations of the two military men. These nominations were reported en bloc by the committee. They are in one sack. I would be willing to vote on the nominations together, but I understand that some Senators wish to separate the nominations, and that is perfectly all right with me. That would require two yeas-and-nays votes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I am trying to take this proposal one step at a time. I thought that was what the Senator told me, and I simply stated what I believed the Senator told me.

Mr. ENGLE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from Alaska apparently states another position.

I have talked with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIER], who is downstairs eating dinner. The Senator says he would like to have about 5 minutes on the nomination, which especially interests him and would be willing to have action without a rollcall.

If the Senator wishes a yeas-and-nays vote, that will be perfectly all right with me. All I am trying to do is to ascertain what is in the minds of the Senators so I can relay that information to their colleagues. Some have engagements, and some wish to leave.

What I would like to do at this time, so far as the Senator from California and those associated with him are concerned, is to ask unanimous consent that when we conclude our session today, that we stand in adjournment until 9:30 tomorrow morning, and that at 9:30 tomorrow the Senator from Montana be recognized for not to exceed an hour and a half, in order to enable him to make a very important speech on foreign policy that he plans to make; that following that speech there be 10 minutes allotted to each side in connection with the two nominations in which the Senator from California has manifested an interest.

As I understood, he would be willing not to have any debate tomorrow, but I think if we had 10 minutes to each side, we could then proceed to a yeas-and-nays vote on the first two nominations shown on the calendar.

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

Mr. ENGLE. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. In order that we can have an understanding of the parliamentary situation, as I understand there are nominations of two military men on the executive calendar. Other appointments are coming up for consideration. I think one is that of Robert E. Lee. Are there more than that?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I am not aware of anymore. I do not know what will be reported tomorrow, but there are no others on the calendar now.

Mr. CARROLL. That is the point. In other words, what we shall consider are the military appointments, if I may use that expression, and the appointment of Robert E. Lee. Are there other appointments?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. What I am speaking of now is the appointment to the Civil Aeronautics Board and the appointment to the Federal Maritime Board. I am carrying out what I thought was agreeable to the Senator from California, that we have whatever discussion Senators wish to have tonight, as late as they wish to have it, and that in the morning we call up these nominations. The Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE] said he would be prepared to vote without any discussion. I thought we should have 10 minutes to each side, so that all Senators would know they should be prepared to vote, by, say, 11:30.

Mr. CARROLL. The able Senator from Texas made some reference to the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIER].

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIER] said before he left that he did not want a rollcall vote on the nominations in which he was interested, but that he would like to have 5 minutes to speak. I told him we were ready to proceed, and he said he would speak later tonight or early tomorrow. He is not here. I will speak to him as soon as he comes or as soon as I can reach him.

Mr. ENGLE. As I understand, the agreement is 20 minutes for each nomination, 10 minutes to each side for the three?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I do not wish to get into the third nomination until the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIER] is present. He is representing himself. I have sent word to him. He is unable to be here at this moment.

Mr. ENGLE. The Senator from Texas proposes an agreement of 20 minutes on each nomination with 10 minutes allotted to each side?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Twenty minutes on each nomination, to be equally divided between the proponents and the opponents.

Mr. CARROLL. Reserving the right to object, I think it is perfectly clear, at least in my own mind, that we shall pass upon the nomination of the two nominees this evening; if not, we will vote tomorrow upon them, if necessary. But the question in my mind is whether there will be action on any other appointments on the Executive Calendar tonight, or will we discuss that subject tomorrow?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I never intended that other appointments be considered tonight.

Mr. CARROLL. The majority leader has made it very clear.

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

Mr. ENGLE. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. As I understand, it is proposed that there be allotted 20 minutes on each nomination?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Yes, a total of 40 minutes.

Mr. GOLDWATER. With 10 minutes to be allotted to each side.

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

Mr. ENGLE. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. Is it intended that there should not be a morning hour tomorrow?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. No, we shall have a morning hour after we have disposed of the nominations.

For any of those who are still in doubt, we shall have a morning hour after we have disposed of the Executive Calendar, which is normal routine.

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

Mr. ENGLE. Yes, I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. I should like to address myself to what seems to me a very important principle, which does not refer to the qualifications of any of the candidates. I am not opposing them as individuals. It is—or should be—a democratic principle that the Congress, 2 weeks before adjournment, a few months before a national election should not confirm men who will thereby be fastened on the next administration for a period of years.

The next President might be from the majority party in Congress. I do not wish to see him tied down to an appointment that has been made by the present administration. I should like to free the majority from the responsibility of having to keep in office a Commission member who has been appointed by the outgoing administration. I believe it is sound principle of democratic procedure that such appointments should not be confirmed at this time. The President should have the opportunity to make interim appointments 2 weeks from now after this Congress adjourns. And when the new Congress convenes and we have a new President, the new President will be able to make such appointments as he desires and not be committed to the appointments of his predecessor, of appointees who will remain in office for 5, 6, or 7 years.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] has made a very persuasive argument in expressing his viewpoint. I just wish to be sure other Senators who desire to speak will have the privilege to do so tonight. I am sure that no Senator wants a quid pro quo. I am not trying to get votes. Senators are for or against the nominations. I am trying to arrange the program so that every Senator can express his views.

The Senator from Wisconsin said he may not need but 2 or 3 minutes, but overnight we may have some others who would like to discuss the nominations.

I would like to modify my request by including the third nomination on the calendar in the agreement, subject to the same consideration—namely, that we have 20 minutes for the nomination, to be equally divided, 10 for and 10 against.

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

Is it my understanding now that the arguments for and against these nominations will be made tonight?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. They will be made whenever the Senators wish to make them. I will keep them here all night if they wish to remain.

Mr. LAUSCHE. But tomorrow we will have 20 minutes, to be equally divided on each of the appointments?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. That is correct.

Mr. CARROLL. That is, on each of the appointments in the three categories. The agreement has nothing to do with the appointment of Mr. Murphy, which may come up later.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I speak of the program for tomorrow. Under the rule another nomination could not be considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the proposed agreement as modified by the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON]. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the proposed limitation is agreed to.

The unanimous-consent agreement reduced to writing is as follows:

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Ordered, That effective on June 23, 1960, at 9:30 o'clock a.m., when the Senate convenes, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] be recognized for 1½ hours to address the Senate.

Provided further, That, following the above address, during the further consideration of the nominations of John S. Bragdon, to be a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board, Vice Adm. Ralph E. Wilson, to be a member of the Federal Maritime Board, and Robert E. Lee, to be a member of the Federal Communications Commission, debate shall be limited to 20 minutes on each nomination, to be equally divided and controlled by the majority and minority leaders.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Let it be understood that we shall come in at 9:30 in the morning. The Senator from Montana will be recognized for not to exceed an hour and a half. Then we shall proceed to the three nominations referred to, and we shall have a maximum of 60 minutes of debate, which may or may not be used, 20 minutes on each nomination. Then we will have a morning hour, and then we will proceed to other subjects which I have listed.

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

Mr. ENGLE. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. As I understand what the majority leader has just said, there will be no more yea-and-nay votes tonight?

Mr. ENGLE. That is the understanding the Senator from California has, and I am certain that is what is intended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is the understanding of the Chair.

Mr. ENGLE. That is precisely what the Senator from California understood, in order that Senators who have other engagements may attend to them and that this debate may proceed.

Mr. President, I wish to thank the distinguished majority leader, who proceeded with his usual fairness and his usual expedition in this matter.

INDIVIDUAL VIEWS OF MR. ENGLE

As I have stated, the letter from President Eisenhower clearly appreciates the distinction between the civilian and the military mind, and the role that mind should play in our form of gov-

ernment, and yet we are called upon to confirm for high political office a professional military man, Adm. Ralph E. Wilson, and at the same time as head of the Maritime Administration, a retired admiral.

I ask the Senate to think of this. We have a retired admiral as chief administrator of the Maritime Board. Now they want to appoint another admiral to the Board and to make him the Chairman of the Board. I assume that if one cannot salute, he had better not go down to that Board, because after the admiral is appointed, he will have all of his friends, his old executive officers and others, in his office. They will come in. They will be there. They will be helping him. They may be competent people in the military.

Here again we will have transferred out of the Pentagon and into the civilian regulatory agency the personnel of the Pentagon. As I have said before, it is plain that we will have a little Pentagon in the civilian regulatory agencies of this Nation. I am against it. I assert that the time to stop it is now. We should not have retired military officers operating civilian regulatory agencies. That is the reason I filed the minority views. That is why I propose to ask the Senate to vote on whether or not it intends to support this kind of procedure.

We are called upon to confirm the nomination of General Bragdon to be a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board while at the same time the head of the Federal Aviation Administration is another retired general. In other words, we will have an admiral as the chief administrator of the Maritime Administration. We will have an admiral as the Chairman of the Maritime Board. We have a lieutenant general of the Air Force operating the Federal Aviation Administration. Now we are asked to put a retired major general on the CAB.

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

Mr. ENGLE. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. McGEE. As the Senator knows, we stood together on this matter in committee. He is rendering a great service in calling the attention of not only our colleagues but of the public in general to the emerging importance of this very serious question.

It brings into focus our whole concept of public service. It is not a new matter at all to raise the point that it is becoming more and more difficult to attract competent people from private life into public service. Therefore, it seems to me that there has been a growing tendency—even in the brief time that I have been here—to pick up castoffs as a matter of convenience, who are willing to come into public service. I do not make that characterization in a disrespectful sense.

Here we have a group of men who are retired military personnel. They receive retirement pay, upon which they can depend for their income. Therefore, they are in a position to accept Government service at a very questionable level of pay. The result is that with

those of us in Congress who are asked to select this kind of personnel, with the pressure on us from the Bureau of the Budget to save money and save more money and save still more money, it becomes a matter of convenience to turn more and more civil branches of our Government over to retired military personnel.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield there for just a moment? The Senator is making a very significant point. This is what has happened. We set up a retirement system for the military. They get out at a very young age. They are full of vigor and full of beans. They want to go to work. They have retired, but they do not want to sit around. They are fairly competent people. They have been in the military for 30 or 40 years. So they go into the civilian regulatory agencies. They do not know anything about those agencies. I have talked with the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], and I have suggested to him that the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate should review this retirement practice, because these people are getting out too early. They receive good retirement pay as military officers, and they are able people, and they are still fairly young. So we turn them loose. Naturally, they are standing around in squads, and they are being picked up and sent into the regulatory agencies, and those agencies are given a military orientation, which we ought not to have in the Government.

How do we stop it? We can stop it by changing the retirement system and utilizing the services of these people longer in the place where they are trained to serve their country. I am for that.

I am not against the military people. I think they are competent men. However, I believe in utilizing them in the field in which they have been trained, and for which the taxpayers have paid thousands of dollars to give them the kind of training that makes them valuable in these fields. So the Senator from Wyoming has stated the case precisely. These retired men are standing around waiting to be appointed.

I yield further to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. McGEE. While we are speaking about the encroachment on the public life of retired personnel, I believe it is only fair that we should note on our national horizon at the moment a situation which a House committee has already noted, namely, that the same encroachment is also occurring in the private sector of American life.

I do not have the figures with me tonight, but it is my recollection that the House committee's study of this same question disclosed that more than one out of four retired military personnel have now entered into boards of control and governing positions with civilian corporations. So whereas we might take certain risks as less than a serious invasion, nonetheless, it represents a pattern which the Nation will have to face up to in the judgment of the junior Senator from Wyoming. That pattern is the encroachment of military men in all

elements of the American economy, of the American social strata, and of the American capital structure at the present time.

That is why I think it is an especially astute performance by the Senator from California to bring this matter to our attention. Nothing is more sacred in our constitutional framework than the way in which our founding fathers leaned over backward to make sure that there would be a separation of military influence from our civilian government, and provided for an exception only in the event of extreme national emergency; and then, of course, as we know, the President becomes the active Commander in Chief of the military.

Unless we rise with vigilance, we will surrender the civilian function of our Government for reasons of convenience, or because we have become too busy with our other concerns. The pressure to get away before the July conventions of the two political parties is merely another surface case in point of what we are doing in the name of convenience or expediency despite our responsibility as national legislators.

I need only remind my colleagues of what happened in Germany in the 1920's, where one by one the people surrendered more and more functions to the military. From this tendency the Germans harvested nazism. The same thing happened in Italy in the 1920's, which is another case in point. A similar parallel is shown by what happened in Japan with the rise of the war lords, and by the situation which prevails in Russia today. I need only remind Senators of what happened in those cases to show the danger to which the Senator from California is directing his attention tonight.

It is time for our country to become mindful of the danger, though it may be inconvenient, though it may be time-consuming, though the hour is late in the evening, though the sacred hour of adjournment may be near.

I join with the Senator from California, with all the sincerity I can command, to point out to our countrymen the danger of idle surrender to the military mind the civil functions of our Government.

Mr. ENGLE. I appreciate the statement of the Senator from Wyoming. We have a further problem with retired military personnel. I have already referred to the fact that they are getting out of the military at a very early age and are heading all over the country. The Senator from Wyoming has pointed out that they are going into private industry. They have gone into private industry in great numbers.

I have no objection to their making a living wherever they can, after they have retired from the military. But they go into the defense industries. Within recent months, in hearings held before the House Committee on Armed Services, and also the Senate Committee on Armed Services, a question has been raised about the propriety of a general getting out of the Pentagon and walking into a major defense industry having contracts with the Federal Government. The question which has been raised is

whether the particular general, captain, or admiral would be talking across the line to his old comrades, who still remain in the Pentagon, and improperly influencing the decision of the Government with reference to matters vital to the national defense.

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

Mr. ENGLE. I will yield in a moment.

This is a problem which is hard to handle. I grant that. However, I think something should be done to make certain that there is a hiatus between the time a man leaves his uniform in the Pentagon and the time he takes a job with a major defense contractor, in order to handle their business, when their major business is with the Federal Government in defense contracts of one kind or another. However circumspect that officer may be, the implication of impropriety may exist. There is no way to avoid it. We ought to have a period of time in which that cannot occur. I hope the committees of Congress will recommend that kind of legislation. It bears directly upon the question raised by the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE].

Now I am glad to yield to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I merely wanted, more or less, to keep up with this subject. From the colloquy I have heard this evening, I am prompted to become of the opinion that a retired officer's pay continues when he takes a civilian job. It has been my understanding that General Quesada, for example, gave up his retirement pay when he entered the civilian service of his Government.

Mr. ENGLE. That is correct; he did; but not all retired officers do that. Further than that, let me tell the Senator about General Quesada.

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

Mr. ENGLE. The Senator brought up the name of General Quesada as an example of propriety. Let me put this statement plainly on the RECORD. General Quesada resigned his commission in order to take the position he now has, because the law under which he was appointed provides that no retired officer ever could serve in that civilian post. So he resigned his commission and received the appointment to the position he now holds.

Then in came a bill to reinstate him in his retired position and his retirement pay. I did not object to it. But that is what happened.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. ENGLE. I will yield further; I merely wish to say that General Quesada is an example of what happens in this kind of situation.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I was afraid that that was at the root of the Senator's objection.

Mr. ENGLE. No, it is not. It is not at the root of my objection at all. When the nomination of General Quesada was before the Senate for confirmation, I voted to confirm it. However, I said at the time that I had grave misgivings about Congress violating the law it had enacted in confirming the very first time

the nomination of a retired military officer to fill that civilian position. I raised that question then, but I have no personal animus toward General Quesada. I have cited his case only as an example of what has happened. I will deal further with it in a minute.

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

Mr. ENGLE. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Will the Senator from California tell me how many retired officers or retired military personnel, who are serving on Government commissions, boards, and bureaus, are at the same time receiving retirement pay?

Mr. ENGLE. I do not know; I have not made inquiry about that.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Would the Senator say that the great majority of them are, or would he say that very few of them are?

Mr. ENGLE. As I say, I do not know; I have not checked into it.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I wanted to eliminate, if I could, point by point, the objections. If the Senator does not know how many retired military personnel are receiving retirement pay and at the same time are receiving pay in civilian posts of the U.S. Government, we must assume, then, that the fact that they might be receiving such pay does not enter into the Senator's objection.

Mr. ENGLE. I would have to say that General Quesada's appointment to the Federal Aviation Administrator would enter into it. He receives a very substantial salary.

Mr. GOLDWATER. That is beside the point. I believe the Senator would agree that men who serve their Government should be paid. In fact, I think the Senator voted, the other day, for an increase in Federal pay on the basis that we should pay more in measure with what civilian employees are receiving in comparable positions.

I remind the Senator that probably more former Representatives and former Senators than retired admirals, generals, and colonels are filling bureau posts. I have never heard any great hue or cry raised because a man who has been unsuccessful in seeking reelection is appointed as the head or a member of a commission.

Mr. ENGLE. There is one thing that can be said. The Republicans always take care of their lame ducks.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Unfortunately, in the past 30 years we have not had as many lame ducks as have the Democrats.

Mr. ENGLE. That is certainly true. When you had them, you had them in droves.

Mr. GOLDWATER. We have imposed regulations on duck hunting and issued duck hunting stamps. If ducks are to be protected, I think lame ducks should be taken care of, too.

Mr. ENGLE. I am not against that. I would not have voted against any of them. However, those who have served for years in Congress are probably the most competent men in these fields. They are much more competent than the businessmen who are brought in to fill the offices and who stay for 2 years.

There are three schedules working in civilian jobs in the Pentagon today: one coming, one working, and one going.

One thing is certain. When men like Dewey Short are brought in, they serve for many years. Dewey Short, a Republican, served on the House Committee on Armed Services. He knows his business. He has been to the wars for a long time. He knows the problems of his particular agency, the Department of Defense. I think there is a great difference between civilian employees and military employees. Dewey Short is a civilian, too. He is one illustration; I could cite others.

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

Mr. ENGLE. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. In the colloquy between the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE] and the Senator from California, a question was raised, and I think very properly so, as to why the Government cannot attract people from the civilian walks of life to these posts; or, to put it another way, why we cannot attract an abundant number.

The Senator from California has just expressed the main reason in his seeming contempt for businessmen—and I would have to include professional men in that category. I do not know where we are going to get all the civilians who are needed.

Mr. ENGLE. I never said that. Do not charge that to me; do not put those words in my mouth.

Mr. GOLDWATER. If the Senator from California will read the RECORD tomorrow, he will understand what I am talking about. This has been a source of much trouble. I may say that the Republicans will probably resort to the same tactics the Democrats have. The trouble has been that many of them do not like to give up their private lives and earnings to make a contribution to their Government and become servants of the people.

Can we not clear up this question by agreeing that most Americans are honest, whether they are civilians, whether they are politicians, whether they are a part of the military?

I believe that one of the big troubles in getting this type of men, men whom the Senator and I would like to see in the important Government posts, is that they do not want to have their lives brought into it. They do not want to give up the things for which they have worked hard throughout their lives. They do not want to be made the subject of ridicule. They do not want to come into a situation in which they get no help. Chiefly, they do not want to be subjected to the constant attacks on them which indicate that they might not be honest.

I think the Senator from California, in his colloquy with the Senator from Wyoming, was getting at the heart of the trouble we are experiencing in getting such persons to come to Washington.

They simply do not want to come here and take all of this guff. They do not want to give up what they have worked for all their lives in order to come here to work.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, I did not yield to the Senator for a speech.

Mr. GOLDWATER. If the Senator does not wish to yield further, I will take my seat and wait. I will make my own speech.

Mr. ENGLE. That will be fine.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I thought the Senator from California might be willing to engage in debate. If he is not, I will take my seat. I have nothing else to do.

Mr. ENGLE. If the Senator from Arizona has a speech to make, he can make it when I have finished. I will be finished in due time.

What I am seeking to do is to have businessmen and civilians appointed to these positions. That is what I am trying to have done.

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

Mr. ENGLE. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. When the Senator said he would like to have businessmen fill these posts, he meant that he would like to have businessmen who will stay on the job and show a little dedication and devotion to it, and not come here for 1 or 2 years and then go back to their own businesses, as they have under this administration.

Mr. ENGLE. That is correct.

The Senator from Arizona implied that I was making some reflection on businessmen because I said there was one squad coming, one squad working, and one squad going.

There has not been a Secretary of Defense during this administration, except the present one, Secretary Gates, who had any real training for the position.

Mr. Gates has had training, and I respect him for it.

But we have not had the kind of service we should get from the business community, if we wish to call it that, because most of those who have been appointed do not remain long enough.

I was dealing with the matter of military officers in the civilian jobs. My objection is that after nearly a quarter of a century or half a century of military service, these men do not have the training and they do not have the mental orientation to take on these civilian regulatory agency jobs and run those agencies as they should be run. That is the basis of my objection.

I like military men, including my distinguished friend, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], who is a brigadier general in the Air Force Reserve. I like them, and I think they do good jobs in places where they should be.

But, again, I say the Federal Aviation Agency presents a good illustration of a government agency in which military men have moved into the key, control positions. A brigadier general has been named Assistant Administrator of the Agency's Office of Plans and Requirements, with the responsibility for "advising the Administrator of the FAA on matters of aviation policies and objectives, and long-range Agency plans and operational capabilities."

I am saying that as soon as a general is brought into such a position, he brings in his old executive officer, who has also

retired, or perhaps is in a military post, somewhere; and very soon the agency is loaded with military officers.

I know it will be said, "Just compare the numbers; there are not very many of them"—less than 200, or something of the sort.

But the point is that they sit at the top, just like the brigadier general who has the responsibility for advising the Administrator of the FAA on matters of aviation policies and objectives, and long-range Agency plans and operational capabilities.

Will someone tell me why a brigadier general out of the Air Force should be holding that job—in a civilian regulatory agency—which is dealing with civilian flying and civilian aviation in this country?

In the Office of the General Counsel, the chief attorney for general law, in the General Legal Services Division, is a colonel. The Deputy Chief of the FAA Office of International Coordination is a Navy captain; in the same office the head of the Aviation Intelligence Branch, International Field Service Division, is a lieutenant colonel. In the Technical Assistance Division of the same organization there are a commander and a lieutenant colonel. A colonel is Deputy Chief of the Accounting Division of the Federal Aviation Agency.

They are at the top, and they give the orders; and when they go to see General Quesada, every morning, they say, "Yes, sir."

Key positions in the Office of Personnel and Training are held by a brigadier general, a colonel, and a lieutenant colonel.

Again, I ask, why should a military officer hold a key position in the Office of Personnel and Training in the Federal Aviation Agency, which deals with civilian and commercial aviation in the United States? I will tell you why: There is a retired lieutenant general up there running the shop; and he wants fellows who understand the structure of military command at the head of his various departments; and he wants no argument from them. He wants a "yes, sir" and a "how are you this morning, General?" and all that.

That is why we are getting the kind of administration down there that we are getting.

The very important Office of Plans and Requirements has, in addition to the brigadier general mentioned above, a Navy captain—which is a pretty good title—four colonels, and three lieutenant colonels.

These fellows are not sitting down at the bottom. Instead, they are at the top of the pyramid.

The Bureau of Research and Development, a most important bureau, is almost completely under military domination, I am informed. The Bureau of Flight Standards has two lieutenant colonels, and the Bureau of Air Traffic Management has a brigadier general, a Navy captain, seven colonels, and a lieutenant colonel.

This is the Bureau of Flight Standards for this civilian regulatory agency; and these jobs are not routine jobs. They

are key positions in what Congress intended to be an essentially civilian agency. These men influence and mold policy in the field of civilian aviation.

Why do I bring up this issue? Here is an illustration of it: We put in a lieutenant general as head of the Federal Aviation Agency; and he called in his old comrades at arms, and they are running that agency today. Today in the Federal Aviation Agency we have a "little Pentagon."

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield for a question?

Mr. ENGLE. In a moment.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Excuse me.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, why do I bring this up? I bring it up because now an admiral is nominated to be Chairman of the Federal Maritime Board, and because we have a major general nominated to go on the Civil Aeronautics Board, and because there already is an admiral who is the Maritime Administrator. I assert that if this program continues, we shall have military men spread throughout all these civilian regulatory agencies, because the pattern is plain; it is clear to see. Can there be any dispute about it?

Now, I yield to the Senator from Arizona, for a question—but not for a speech.

Mr. GOLDWATER. My question will be very short. The Senator from California is a pilot, and he has a good understanding of the problems of aviation. Will the Senator say the Federal Aviation Agency, as it is now constituted, is not doing a better job than the job done before the FAA, as it is now constituted, came into being?

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Long of Hawaii in the chair). Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. ENGLE. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. But the Senator from California has not answered my question.

Mr. CARROLL. I should like to have the Senator from California yield now, because I wish to help answer the question—although I know the able Senator from California can answer it.

The question is not whether those now in that Agency are doing a good job.

I can say that in all respects General Quesada's service appears excellent. I can say the same for his staff.

But I now go back to the grassroots of democracy in my own State. I do not want retired military men running the public utility commissions of my State. I do not want generals at the head of the regulatory bodies of my State—not because there is something wrong with the military, but because we did not train them for that work. They are fine Americans, but we trained them for a specific purpose. They have served that purpose by the time they retire.

Ours is not a military government.

So we prefer the policy of having civilians who understand our problems exercise their prerogatives in our grassroots democracy in our interest. I repeat, in

my State we do not want retired military men to be at the head of the public utilities commission or other public agencies. We do not want generals or other military men in our regulatory bodies. They were not trained for that purpose. They were trained to serve in military capacities, not to serve in civilian agencies close to the economic and political problems of our people. These military men were trained to serve in military capacities for the defense of the Nation. We salute them for this service and provide adequate and abundant provisions upon retirement.

My relations with the Federal Aviation Agency have been satisfactory with General Quesada. I would be willing to pat him on the back. Perhaps we may need here and there a general or an admiral for some extraordinary civil function.

But the real issue here is the supremacy of the civilians over the military.

I wish to say to the able Senator from California that I do not wish to indulge in a personal discussion about specific generals and admirals.

Indeed, this is a philosophical discussion. In a democracy such as ours, where the power is vested in the people—under the Constitution of the United States and, in my State, under the constitution of Colorado—all power is vested in all the people, not solely in the military.

If I may refer to the administration—either the present administration or any administration: There seems to have been too much influence by the military, since World War II. I served in both wars—as an enlisted man in the First World War, and as an officer in the Second World War. But there appears to have been much influence by the military; and I think the time has come—as the able Senator from California is now arguing—to effect a change. The Senator from California is not arguing against particular individuals. But he is arguing against the nomination and the predominance of the military in the civilian agencies of the Government. I commend the Senator from California for it.

Mr. ENGLE. I thank the distinguished Senator.

Now I will proceed to answer the question of the Senator from Arizona. I think in the field of commercial aviation the FAA is doing a fair job. But it ought to, considering the financial help we are giving it at the present time. I think in the field of private aviation that agency has not done as good a job, and the private pilots of the country will say so.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator allow me one sentence.

Mr. ENGLE. I yield for one sentence.

Mr. GOLDWATER. It will be a short one. I agree with the Senator that safety in the air has vastly improved under the FAA. I disagree with him that the FAA is unfair to the private pilots, but I shall deal later with that subject.

Mr. ENGLE. I am delighted to have the remarks of the Senator from Arizona. I have proposed some changes in the operations of the Federal Aviation Agency in the field of regulation of private and business aviation. I applaud

the effort to secure air safety. I support it. I support it with reference to commercial aviation. I support it with reference to private aviation. But there is no use having a bull in a china shop; and whenever we have a general operating an agency, that is what we get.

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

Mr. ENGLE. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. Is it not a question of whether a general runs an agency or a general runs the country? This is what some of us warned in 1952. We have had a general running this country since. There were generals running many countries throughout Latin America. What has happened? We can now look back 7 or 8 years. It is not because they are unpatriotic. It is not because they are not men of ability. It is because they are compartmentalized and do not fully understand the workings of democracy. All one has to do is look at history in Latin America, where general after general has fallen. Who can deny that democracy has suffered many setbacks?

I think the able Senator from California, perhaps even more than he fully understands, is making a splendid argument tonight to strengthen our own Government by urging us to return to sound historic constitutional government, that is civilian supremacy over the military.

We do not mean there is some insidious inference by reason of his being an admiral or a general. They are all fine Americans. That is not the question. A question of age-old philosophy is involved. The question at issue is whether the citizens of this Nation shall fully control their civilian government.

May I say to the able Senator from California, because I know his time is limited, this same decision had to be made at one time, in 1951, when a President of the United States had to remove a general who was trying to set a policy that might lead the Nation into war. It was a very difficult decision, but again, the supremacy of civilians in our form of government was the issue.

I think the Senator from California has now again emphasized it. It is not that we could not take an admiral here or a general there on some emergency occasion, but we cannot have a pattern where the military begin to support and appoint one another. Why? Because they are not fully qualified for much of anything else. They were never associated with individuals in political and economic life. Military life is primarily what they have known. May I say to the Senator from California this is why generals take colonels. This is why colonels take lieutenant colonels. That is why lieutenant colonels take majors. They do not know anyone else. They never have associated much with anyone else. They have been brought up by the American people to serve the Nation, and they have served it well, but not in this particular capacity.

I thank the Senator from California for yielding.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so I may clear up one point?

Mr. ENGLE. I yield for a question.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The Senator from Colorado has the Senator from Arizona a little puzzled when he says that in 1951, which I think is the year he mentioned, a President had to relieve a general because he might lead us into war. Which general was that?

Mr. CARROLL. The Senator knows what general he was. Why does the Senator ask that question?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I would like to have the Senator state it.

Mr. CARROLL. Was the Senator here at that time?

Mr. GOLDWATER. No, I was not.

Mr. CARROLL. What country was the Senator in?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I was in Arizona.

Mr. CARROLL. The Senator was in this country.

Mr. GOLDWATER. That is correct.

Mr. CARROLL. The Senator knows what happened in that case.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Yes. Who was he?

Mr. CARROLL. General MacArthur.

Mr. GOLDWATER. We were in a war.

Mr. CARROLL. Yes, we were in a war, but we were not going to let that general determine the scope of the war.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I thought we were in a war. The Senator from Colorado may think it is something else, but when people are shooting at us and we are shooting at them, it is a war. If the Senator is referring to General MacArthur leading us into war, I point out that we were already in a war. That general won it once, and we denied him that victory.

Mr. CARROLL. The Senator is talking like a general now, and not like a Senator.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, I refuse to yield further.

Mr. CARROLL. Will the Senator get time on his own so I can answer?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I do not have any time.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, I refuse to yield further.

Mr. CARROLL. The Senator from California cannot leave it here. Someone must have control of the time in opposition.

Mr. ENGLE. I have a right to talk until I wear out, and I may do it.

Mr. CARROLL. This is very important—

Mr. ENGLE. I do not want this discussion to get into a row over whether President Harry Truman was right in firing General MacArthur. I think he was, but I do not want to get into that argument. I want to stop any more generals getting into civilian agencies.

Mr. CARROLL. Will the Senator tell me who has control of the time in opposition?

Mr. ENGLE. They will have time after I get through, and that may be midnight.

Mr. CARROLL. Will the Senator yield, if there is no control on time? He cannot let this end where it is. If the

Senator will permit me 1 or 2 minutes, I understand—

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, I am going to be forced to say to my dear friend from Colorado that I would prefer not to have the argument about MacArthur interspersed into my statement. If he will let me complete my remarks, which will take about 10 minutes, I will be glad to yield to him, and then he and the Senator from Arizona can thresh this out to their hearts' content.

Mr. CARROLL. Will the Senator from California permit me 1 or 2 minutes to answer the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. GOLDWATER. Go ahead.

Mr. ENGLE. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. CARROLL. I understand the natural affinity one general has for another, but what I tried to get through to the Senator from Arizona—I am sure he was in Arizona at the time, and therefore knew what was happening—was that the constitutional question involved at that time was whether a general could determine foreign policy, under the Constitution. The issue was raised by the President of the United States, who dismissed him, because, as he said, the civilian leadership in our form of government was supreme. I leave it to history as to whether or not we avoid world war III because of President Truman's decision.

We cannot have generals running us, under the Constitution, and we cannot have generals running the public regulatory bodies of this Nation. I was under the impression that was the point the Senator from California was trying to make.

It is my own personal opinion that there are too many colonels and too many brigadier generals in the U.S. Senate coming out of World War II, because they also have a strong affinity with the military.

I thank the Senator from California for yielding.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The Senator is talking to a colonel, I am sure he knows.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, there is no denying that men who achieve high rank in our armed services are with few exceptions well qualified for certain positions. Industry has recognized this fact by employing many of them in responsible positions as soon as their retirements become effective.

I approve of that. Nevertheless, career officers have been trained for almost all of their adult lives in the military ideals of discipline, obedience, fulfillment of a specific mission, and arbitrariness of decision essential to maintain their hierarchy. While these qualities are virtues in the Armed Forces, they are likely to be handicaps when the nominee is called upon to perform the quasi-judicial, promotional, and regulatory functions of the agencies. The professional military man has had little or no training or experience in the economics of intensely competitive industries.

In fact, Mr. President, the military men do not know anything about it. They do not know anything about politics, either. Someone may write an

editorial, and though it may be a kindly editorial it may contain a little criticism. These military men would jump 40 feet.

General Quesada, to whom reference has been made, appeared before our committee not long ago. He was livid about some editorials. He handed them to the committee members, in high dudgeon with indignation. I read them. They were very mild editorials. They said that he was a fine man, that he had good intentions, that he was trying to do the best he could, but that he was making a mistake. He said, "These are pressure groups. These are terrible people." He denounced them.

I said to the general, "There is not a man sitting around this table, either Republican or Democrat, who has run for public office who would not be willing to reprint these editorials in his campaign literature."

But the general did not like them. He had not been told that to his face as a military officer. He could not stand it. He was thinskin.

The military man has never had sufficient exposure to business and its practices to form any sort of personal philosophy so that he can carry out his intended role or so that Congress and the Executive can evaluate his ability to perform that new role. Not at all. It is very different and very strange for a military man to serve in an agency, since he may be battered on this floor. We stand up and tell them off. We will knock the brass until it litters the Chamber. They do not like it. They cannot take it. They are not used to it.

For 40 years these men have been in their command positions. They said "Yes, sir" to the captains when they were lieutenants. They said "Yes, sir" to the majors when they were captains. They said "Yes, sir" to the "light" colonels or lieutenant colonels when they were majors. They said "Yes, sir" to the colonels when they were "light" colonels. And they said "Yes, sir" to the generals when they were colonels. And so on up the line. There was no argument and no backtalk.

In these great civilian agencies, when men have to exchange and barter opinions, when ideas have to stand on their own, they did not like it and they cannot take it.

So they should not be asked to serve in these positions. They will not be, with my consent. I propose to oppose, as I have said before, every one of these nominations, unless there is overwhelming and clear evidence that the man is uniquely qualified for the position.

The Senate is being called upon to give its advice and consent to appointees who will be responsible for regulating multimillion dollar civilian industries in the civilian public's interest.

The committee majority in its report agrees in general with the statements which I have made and expresses concern regarding the nomination of retired military officers to head up civilian regulatory agencies. The committee refused to vote down these nominations on the ground that although we should stop, this was not the place to stop. There was a feeling, I suppose, that picking out

Admiral Wilson and General Bragdon as a stopping place would cast some sort of reflection upon them personally. I do not wish to cast any reflection upon either man. On the other hand, I believe that the way to stop is to stop, and that the Senate should simply refuse to give its advice and consent to the appointment of any more military officers unless, as the President said—I am referring to President Eisenhower—in his 1948 letter, there are "some obvious and overriding reasons." I can find no such reasons in this instance. I believe that the aviation and maritime industries can produce many civilians of long experience in those industries who are thoroughly capable of taking these appointments. I believe that the President should seek out such civilians.

I believe that the Senate should refuse to confirm the nominations of any retired military officers as heads of civilian agencies unless there are some obvious and overriding reasons, and should insist as a matter of principle that the appointments go to competent and recognized civilians.

Mr. President, the report filed by the majority in this instance is a unique report, one of the strangest I have seen in over 17 years of service in the Congress of the United States. The committee report is a report of three paragraphs.

The first paragraph says that the committee reports the nominations favorably.

The second paragraph says:

While we recommend to the Senate favorable action on the nomination of Admiral Wilson to be a member of the Federal Maritime Board and the nomination of General Bragdon to be a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board, we believe it necessary to express some substantial doubts on the wisdom of repeated appointments of retired military officers to high civilian positions, particularly in the administrative and regulatory agencies. Admiral Wilson's military record as well as his appearance before your committee show him to be a man of competence and leadership who has served his country with distinction both in war and peace.

I agree with that statement, Mr. President. Admiral Wilson made a very fine appearance before our committee.

I continue to quote from the report:

The same holds true with respect to General Bragdon. Accordingly, we cannot agree with the individual views that if a line has to be drawn it should be drawn here.

Those were the individual views I filed.

The committee continues to belabor the point:

However, an appointment to an agency is not an honorarium for services performed in the past. Rather, such an appointment should be based on expected future performance in the highly sensitive area of balancing and adjusting competitive forces in the public interest.

Furthermore, and perhaps most important, one of the basic principles of our society is that the control of government, including the policymaking function, should be vested in civilians with the military subordinate. Continued appointments of career officers could destroy the symbol of civilian government as well as promote the unfortunate practical effects associated with almost dominant military influence.

This is not a quotation from my views, Mr. President. This is taken from the report of the majority. This is what the majority said. They said, "You should not do it. It is wrong." They advocated the best reasons why it should not be done. For two-thirds of their report they bewailed the practice. They bemoaned it. They lamented it. They condemned it. They denounced it. They said, "It should not happen again."

I assert, Mr. President, it should not happen now. I ask the Senate to stop it by voting against the confirmation of these nominations at this time.

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

Mr. ENGLE. I yield to my distinguished friend from Alaska.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I wish to commend highly and unqualifiedly the very able expression of an important point of view by the distinguished junior Senator from California.

The situation which he exposes cries for relief. He has pointed out that the regulatory agencies—the Federal Maritime Board and the Federal Aviation Agency—are being loaded with military men. It might be argued that there is some relation between civil aviation and military aviation, between the Navy and merchant marine shipping. But what about such agencies as the Immigration Service, which has been loaded by the present administration with generals from top to bottom? What earthly relationship is there between a military career and immigration? Yet the administration has followed this policy all through.

However, I wish to address myself to another principle which I think is deeply involved, and is, I think, independent of partisanship. I deem it is entirely wrong on the eve of the end of an administration for the Senate to approve appointments that will handcuff and tie the succeeding administration for an indefinite period of years. I say that regardless of whether the retiring administration is a Republican administration that may be succeeded by a Democratic administration or whether the reverse is the case.

There is a certain philosophy about an administration. The philosophy of the Republican administration in its regulatory agencies is different from that of the Democratic administration. As the distinguished junior Senator from California has pointed out, the Eisenhower-Nixon administration has set the foxes to guard the chickens. The principle of having the regulatory agencies protect the public interest has been completely abandoned during the last 7 years.

We have before us, in addition to the appointments to which the distinguished junior Senator from California has addressed himself, the appointment of General Bragdon to the Civil Aeronautics Board, and the appointment of Vice Admiral Wilson to the Federal Maritime Board and other appointments, another appointment to the Federal Communications Commission of Mr. Robert E. Lee. That appointment is a reappointment, to be sure, but it is effective for 7 years.

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

Mr. GRUENING. I yield.

Mr. ENGLE. What the Senator is emphasizing is that the present administration is a dying administration.

Mr. GRUENING. That is correct.

Mr. ENGLE. It is like a piece of ripe fruit. It is ready to fall off the tree. So what are they undertaking to do? They are attempting to put their men into office. For how long? Through the administration of the next President of the United States.

Mr. GRUENING. That is correct.

Mr. ENGLE. Whether the appointee belongs to the Democrats, our side, or belongs to the side of the Republicans. So the practice of which I speak would prevent the newly elected President of the United States, regardless of his party, from choosing his own appointees. The appointees will have been chosen. They will remain for 7 years. That is 4 years plus 3.

I am against the practice. I think it is wrong. I think we ought to turn down every one of them and say, "Let us wait until the people speak, and if they throw this crowd out, we will appoint someone else."

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

Mr. GRUENING. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. GOLDWATER. President Nixon will not object to any of these Republican appointments.

Mr. GRUENING. I am sure he will not.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I believe the Senator is touching on a principle which, regardless of which party finds itself in power, is of the utmost importance. One of the weakening factors of the Republican administration during the last 8 years has been the fact that we were saddled with appointees to schedule 16 jobs, without examinations, by the former President of that administration. Legislation was offered in this body very early in the Republican administration to remove those jobs under this, I think, very valid political assumption that if a man is to be given the job of running the country, if he is to be given command of the executive branch, he should have command of the policymaking levels.

I have been considering seriously legislation to be introduced into the next Congress that would make the schedule-16-and-above jobs subject to the will of the executive branch. I wonder if the Senator could give any expression as to how much support a Republican might gain from the Democratic side on a bill such as that?

Mr. GRUENING. I agree that policymaking positions should be changed with a change of an administration. I would not agree that people who are career people under the Civil Service Commission should necessarily change. But we are dealing here with high officials of regulatory agencies who make policy. I think very definitely, regardless of whether it is the Republican Party coming in or the Democratic Party going out, the principle is impor-

tant. I think this principle should apply to both parties.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. GRUENING. I yield with pleasure.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I agree with the Senator. I am not advocating for one moment that the administration be allowed to disrupt the Civil Service. I do not know whether the GSA rating today that does not require an examination is 16, 17, or 18, but, as I recall, there were a vast number of appointments made just prior to the dying days of the last Democratic administration in the field of GSA-16, without examination. Certainly many people were appointed who were competent, and certainly many people were appointed who did not and do not now reflect the views of the present administration. As I said at the outset, it is a very weak position to find oneself in when one does not find the support of the policymaking, policyforming level.

I think the Senator is touching on a very important point in American politics. I may be old fashioned, but I believe that to the victor belong the spoils, because if the victor is to be successful, he must have the ability to make decisions and have those decisions carried out, not necessarily in these regulatory agencies, because they are appointive and have always been appointive. I refer now to the thousands and thousands of jobs at the policymaking level. If the country is unfortunate enough to wake up the day after election and find itself saddled again with a Democratic administration, then it will have to face up to the same problems that the Republicans had to face when they woke up after election and found themselves in power with thousands of people who hinder their policy decisions.

I think the Senator is making a valuable contribution, and when he wishes to get ready to stop the practice, I would be very happy to help him in the general policy field.

Mr. GRUENING. I would like to modify the dictum of the distinguished junior Senator from Arizona which he has derived from ancient Roman history, that to the victor belong the spoils, by saying that I believe: "To the victor belongs the responsibility."

Mr. GOLDWATER. I think if the Senator does not recognize the first dictum, he cannot enjoy the second, with which I certainly agree.

Mr. GRUENING. I should like to cite, pursuant to these remarks, a very brief paragraph that recently appeared in one of our weeklies, the New Republic, which is entitled, "Why Come to Washington?" I think it is pertinent to the discussion, to the turnover, to the rapid change in personnel here, which is a serious problem. I read from the article:

If anyone wonders why effective members of Federal regulatory agencies are so scarce in this administration, he need look no farther than two recent statements by the President on the departure of agency members.

The first was addressed to the man departing. The President wrote: "You have served tirelessly, loyally, effectively—and

with dedication. For your public service over many years . . . you have earned the appreciation of your fellow citizens and of the administration."

The second comment was made by the President when he was asked why he was not planning to reappoint an agency member. In a tone of annoyance he said: "I think I can get a better man, that's all."

The first statement was addressed to John C. Doerfer, who would be high on any informed person's list of the worst Chairmen of the Federal Communications Commission. Mr. Doerfer made no secret of the fact that he did not believe in regulation of television and more or less openly voted to give valuable channels to those he considered friendly to his party and himself. He quit after taking favors from a broadcaster and being caught in a lie to reporters about the episode.

The man who rated the President's rude dismissal was William R. Connole, said to have been the most effective—indeed the only effective—member of the Federal Power Commission for the last 5 years. Mr. Connole fought alone to stop the rapid rise of natural gas prices, and in two major cases his solitary dissents were vindicated by a unanimous Supreme Court.

Subsequently, when the President was questioned at a press conference as to why he did not appoint Mr. Connole, he said that this man had only one interest, the public interest, and that was the President's indictment against him. So Mr. Connole was not reappointed. He was guilty of the heinous crime of being for the public interest, and that proved unique in this administration. Obviously that could not be tolerated.

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

Mr. GRUENING. I yield.

Mr. ENGLE. We divide these commissions up.

We have them so arranged in such a way that only half of them, plus one, can ever represent one party. Under the present regime, on some of these commissions there would be seven Republicans and six Democrats. Of course, the Republicans represent the big corporations, and the Democrats represent the people. Apparently they made a mistake, and they got one of them on a commission who represented the people, so they threw him off.

Mr. GRUENING. That is precisely correct. That goes to the point that there is a basic difference in the philosophy of the two parties. I happen to believe in one. I have no doubt that our good friend from Arizona believes in another. We are entitled to our opinions.

The issue is this. Here at the close of an administration—the junior Senator from California has referred to it as a dying administration, but I would not say it was necessarily dying; perhaps it is just fading away, because old soldiers—generals—do not die; they just fade away—it seems highly proper that we should not continue to saddle the next administration with an appointee of this administration. It is entirely possible that a Member of the Senate—one of our colleagues—may be the next President of the United States. It may be the distinguished majority leader, the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON]; it may be the distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY]; it

may be the distinguished junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMMINGTON].

I think it would be most unkind to them to compel any of them to live with an appointee of this administration for 7 years, to have as a policymaking member of his administration an official whose point of view would be clearly different from his.

Therefore, I think it should be a matter of policy that at this late stage of the administration we should not confirm any of these appointees. Not to do so would not impair the functions of these agencies, because in 2 weeks or less, when Congress adjourns, the President would have the right to make recess appointments. That would enable the agencies to carry on until January, when a new President will have taken office, and when the 87th Congress will be in session. At that time it will be possible to judge the appointees on their merits and whether their views are in harmony with those of the new administration and confirm their nominations if it seems wise to do so.

Therefore, I shall vote against the confirmation of any of these June appointees, not because I object to them individually—they may be excellent men—but because of the basic principle involved, which goes to the very root of our democratic system.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have included in my remarks at this point in the RECORD an editorial published in Labor entitled, "ENGLE Is Right: 'The Time To Stop Is Now'."

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

ENGLE IS RIGHT: "THE TIME TO STOP IS NOW"

A lively debate in the Senate last week raised the question whether "the military" are taking over the country and, if so, should this be stopped? That subject, in the opinion of this newspaper, is so important that the American people should be thinking seriously about it.

The debate began when Senator CLAIR ENGLE, Democrat of California, acting for the Senate Interstate Commerce Committee, reported on two nominations made by President Eisenhower, approved by a majority of the committee, but opposed by ENGLE.

The nominations were those of Gen. John S. Bragdon to be a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board, and Adm. Ralph R. Wilson to the U.S. Maritime Board. ENGLE emphasized he had nothing against either of them personally, but felt that Eisenhower, a military man himself, was appointing too many professional Army, Navy and Air Force officers to high Government posts.

"Can't we find anyone to serve on the boards and commissions except military men?" Senator JOHN A. CARROLL, Democrat of Colorado, asked. ENGLE said he welcomed that question, and he went on to say:

"If we are not careful, we shall have a little Pentagon in the regulatory agencies. The time to stop is now."

CARROLL pointed out that the regulatory agencies which he has "packed" with military men and others not renowned as defenders of the public interest "handle billions of dollars worth of cases affecting the rights and pocketbooks of the American people." "Yes," ENGLE said, "they have the foxes watching the henhouses."

"If retired military men are the best public servants available," CARROLL commented, "we have come to a strange pass in American

history." ENGLE added that "I object to retired military officers taking these positions, because I do not believe that a lifetime of military service qualifies a man to handle these great civilian regulatory agencies."

Senator GALE W. MCGEE, Democrat, of Wyoming, reminded the Senate that, in addition to the Government, big corporations also are hiring more and more generals and admirals for high and well-paid positions. One reason for all this, he said, is that military officers can retire at ages as young as 45, with good Government pensions. Thus they still are "full of beans" and look for civilian jobs which pay high salaries on top of their pensions. MCGEE said it would be better for them to stay on the military jobs for which they were trained at the taxpayers' expense.

ENGLE named some of the generals, admirals and other high-ranking officers with whom, he said, Government agencies are "bristling." He added that this is largely due to the fact that Eisenhower is bringing his "old buddies" into the Government and they, in turn, provide civilian jobs for their old military buddies.

"It may well be," CARROLL commented, "that the present general will be the last one to become President of the United States. I hope so. The people have had a chance to look at the situation. The time has come to put the military in their place."

ENGLE served notice that from now on, when the President's nominations of military men for civilian posts come up for confirmation in the Senate, he will demand rollcall votes which will put the Senators on record for and against.

Many professional military officers have high character and ability, but they should not be allowed to take over a country which, as the Constitution provided, has always been run by civilians. All history proves that, when military rule comes in, democracy goes out the window.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I shall be as brief as I can in my remarks. I wish to preface my remarks by saying that I share with every American, including the military, the historic concern of the military becoming supreme over the civilian. This was written into our basic laws from the Anglo-Saxon law. There has never been a free people who have not recognized the danger of the military eventually becoming superior to the civilian. In fact, if I recall correctly, in his treatise on the decline and fall of the Roman Empire, Gibbon lists as one of five or six points contributing to that downfall, the fact that the military were gaining power in the government.

However, I cannot allow any discredit to fall upon the military of this country. I cannot bring myself to believe that a military man is first and foremost and always a military man. I believe that he is first and foremost and always a citizen of the United States. I was trying to get through the entire section of our directory this evening, but time did not allow it. I did get through to the State of Connecticut. I find among the Senators of those States 24 men who have served in various branches of the military.

I do not believe anyone will deny that when legislation affecting the Marine Corps comes on the floor a Member of the Senate who has served as a marine feels a little inclined to favor the Marine Corps; or that anyone who has served in the Army, when legislation affecting the Army comes on the floor is a little concerned in that direction. I must ad-

mit that when legislation comes on the floor that pertains to the Air Force, I incline in that direction. I do not say that we have sold our souls to our particular branch of the military.

However, if the argument is to prevail that military men cannot serve their country after they are no longer serving in the military service, I suggest that down through the State of Kentucky there are 24 of us that should not be here. I do not hold with the idea that a military person cannot be of great value to his country.

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

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. I agree absolutely with the statement the Senator from Arizona has just made. I believe that when a retired general or other officer is elected to Congress, he has earned the position, he has gone through the political mill, he has sought the approval of his countrymen at the polls; he has not been in the position merely of commanding support, but he has had to win it, and he has earned it. It is extremely fortunate that we have a retired general of the Air Force Reserve with us in the Senate.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am not a retired general. I am not looking for retirement for many years. Being a Reserve officer is a little different from being a member of the Regular Establishment.

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

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. ENGLE. That is exactly the point. The Senator spoke about going through the Congressional Directory. The Senator does not equate the position of men who were civilian soldiers at some time in their lives with men who spend their lifetime as professional soldiers, does he?

Mr. GOLDWATER. The Senator has been in this body long enough to observe the rightful loyalties of Members of this body to their parent organization. I have watched ex-Marine officers and ex-Marine enlisted men in the Senate vote for Marine programs that I did not agree with. I have watched former Army personnel support the Army. The Senator knows the argument that we have had over the B-70 program. Support for that has been difficult to get because I must admit that the Air Force in the Senate is on the low end of the totem pole.

I say that there is no difference in allegiance between a one-time civilian soldier and a one-time professional soldier.

I wish to read a few names that I have jotted down, without straining my intelligence too much at this late hour, because I must admit that straining it would show many inadequacies.

Winston Churchill was a military person. Franklin D. Roosevelt used to sign himself as "that naval person." Harry Truman has always been very proud of his military background, and rightly so, because he served his country with distinction.

The other Roosevelt, probably one of our greatest leaders, came out of the ranks of the civilians into the ranks of

the military and went back into the ranks of the civilians.

Gen. Charles De Gaulle is giving the world an example of leadership the like of which we have not had in many a year.

As I say, many of our colleagues in the Senate have been members of the military, and I do not believe it affects their ability to legislate, even though those of us who have been in the service may lean a little bit in the direction of our own service.

What is a military person? A military person is first a citizen of the United States. He has spent 18 or 20 or 21 years of his formative years being inculcated with the traditions of America. He goes to the Military Academy or to the Naval Academy or to the Air Force Academy, and is further imbued with these ideas of basic Americanism.

Among my wide acquaintanceship in this country I have found a no more dedicated group of men and women than I have found among professional military men. I find more deep concern in the Pentagon about what is going on in domestic politics than I find among people generally. These men are secondarily military people. Why? Why do some men become ministers? They have a purpose in life. They want to be ministers. It is not to get rich. Some people become politicians. Why? Because some of us feel we can contribute our service better in this direction than we can in any other, certainly not toward becoming materially strong. A soldier or airman or marine or sailor joins his service because he feels that that is the way in which he can serve his country. He serves as a dedicated American. The fact that these persons are getting out of the military service at a younger age than in past years speaks well for the American military system. I would like to see us devise some way of keeping these older heads in for a longer time, perhaps until they are 64 or 65 years of age. However, in the type of military that we have today, possibly the younger age is more desirable.

Mr. President, let us look a little further at those persons. Let me emphasize that I do not know General Bragdon. I do not know whether he was in the Air Force or the Army. I certainly do not know who Mr. Wilson is, or what his rank was in the service. However, generally speaking, in the field of education I do not believe we can find better educated people than we find among the officer personnel of the Armed Forces. Many of those men have attended not only one institution of higher learning, but other institutions of higher learning, as well. Among them are many doctors of philosophy, and many who have studied further in other institutions, so that their education might be broadened. Many of them speak more than one language. They have bilingual or trilingual abilities. Their experience has been very broad.

I do not agree that the career of a military man is narrow any more. I think it was prior to World War II; but since World War II, when military men have been assigned to represent the military

in industry, or have been assigned to colleges, they certainly have had a very broad experience, the like of which it is very difficult to find in industry.

I know a little about the industrial side. I have been engaged in business all my life. It is no wonder to me that industry seeks men from the military. It is not the general rule, but when industry finds a competent man in the military service, he is equally competent with a similarly situated man on the civilian side, if not more competent. We have lost to industry, to our detriment, many fine personnel from the military forces, because industry recognizes their value.

It is difficult for me to understand whether the fear is of the effect which might be felt upon the spending of military funds for this company or that company, or an actual fear that a retired officer, or a number of retired officers, might be able to build up, in effect, a military regime which at some time could charge out on white horses and take over the country. I do not fear that happening, so long as we have the protection of civilians in the Department of Defense and the diligent observation and protection provided by Congress.

The other question that arises—and I know that none of us believe this—is, Is a man honest or dishonest? It has been inferred, certainly by statements coming, not from this body, but from some Members of the other body, that some military appointments might actually constitute dishonesty; that the appointees are motivated by dishonesty. I do not believe they are. I think we will find the same percentage of dishonesty in the military group as will be found in veterans' organizations, in this body, or in any other body. On the whole, by far, the great majority are perfectly honest persons.

I am sorry the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL] has left the Chamber. Earlier he said that citizens should run our agencies; that citizens want well-run agencies. I dislike to disagree with the Senator because we agree on so many points, but this may be one on which we will disagree for some time.

I think a perfect example of what can be done by, not necessarily the military personnel, but a person who is disciplined, is in the FAA. I can imagine the chaos which would exist if the same type of discipline were applied to bureaus and organizations which did not need it. However, speaking as one who has had 30 years of experience in flying—I have said this before on the floor, and I dislike to repeat it—until General Quesada took charge of the FAA, I can describe the flying conditions in this country as almost chaotic. Why thousands of persons have not been killed on the airlines, I do not know. I have observed infractions of the rules which would take me hours to relate. I have observed insufficient systems and inadequate systems. But under the chairmanship of General Quesada in the FAA, I think we have a new program which will lead to greater safety.

I well know that many private pilots disagree with me, but I believe the steps

which General Quesada took were necessary steps. He had to take them. I would have agreed with him had he been an admiral, a doctor, a lawyer, or a merchant. When a man has flown, as I have, for 30 years, and has never been asked to show, first, his license; second, his medical certificate; third, a certificate of proficiency in the aircraft he is flying; or fourth, an instrument ticket indicating his proficiency to fly on instruments, I say it is time for some kind of strong action.

I do not like Government regulations. I do not like to have the Federal Government interfering. But this is one good example. The Constitution provides that the Federal Government shall have the power to regulate commerce between the States.

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

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. ENGLE. How much safer would the Senator have been while flying if he had to show a private pilot's license, if he had to show a medical certificate, if he had to show a certificate of competency in the aircraft he was flying, and if he had to show an instrument ticket?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I think I would have been a much safer pilot. I can remember times when I have flown aircraft in which I had not been for a year or two. It is not that I would not have been safe, but I had not been in the aircraft for a long period of time.

I have friends who fly under instrument conditions but who do not have an instrument ticket. They have trained themselves. On occasions, I have known persons who obtained a medical certificate merely by picking up the phone and saying, "George, my time is up. Send me a card." One can get a card for a few dollars. But such a person might have had diabetes or a heart attack in the meantime.

I maintain that while these requirements are just as distasteful to me, as a pilot, they will nevertheless promote safety; and particularly in the minds of the people there will be instilled a desire for safety.

We are seeing in this country today a rather unusual thing. I have no better friends than those who fly the airlines of the Nation. But I am in complete disagreement with them when they strike over the matter of whether a check pilot is to look over the shoulder of the pilot or the shoulder of the copilot. To me, that is like bank presidents striking over the question of the kind of pen they will use. This step was taken in the interest of safety. No pilot likes to be checked. None of us likes to take an examination for a driver's license. But we must do it. I think this is a step in the right direction.

Today we have a new type of flight procedures for flying across the country. I am amazed, on every flight I make, at the ease with which we can report our positions with complete accuracy. The agencies know where we are located in the air.

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

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. ENGLE. Does the Senator know that at present there is one Federal employee in some phase of this business, whether in the FAA, the Federal Communications Commission, or elsewhere, for every airplane there is in the United States?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I was not aware of that; but if the Senator wants to make an issue of it, I point out that there are almost 13,000 Federal employees to take care of 400,000 Indians. The Senator is pointing out a practice which is wrong. I agree that there are too many employees.

Mr. ENGLE. All the Indians are not up in the air.

Mr. GOLDWATER. This condition exists throughout our Government.

No; some of our Indians are not up in the air; but some Indians would be better in the air than some pilots.

I conclude by stressing again the point that there is no reason to become upset when it is suggested that retired military personnel be appointed to Federal positions. Most of them are young men, excellently trained. There is no reason why they should not be assigned to such positions if their country has need of them. I think they are highly competent persons. I would be the first to raise a question about their assuming appointive positions if they indicated a strict adherence to military discipline and could do damage to the Government. But the men I know—and there are many of them—are interested, first, in the United States. Perhaps, far down the line, they are interested in the military.

Mr. President, I hope that tomorrow, when we vote on these nominations, we will vote on them as being primarily the nominations of devoted citizens, not the nominations of persons who might have been members of this service or that service at one time or another.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I announce the possibility that the following bills may be considered tomorrow:

Calendar No. 1553, H.R. 2565, to promote effectual planning, development, maintenance, and coordination of wildlife, fish and game conservation, and rehabilitation on military reservations.

Calendar No. 1588, 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.

Calendar No. 1580, H.R. 8229, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an exemption from income tax for supplemental unemployment benefit trusts.

Calendar No. 1415, S. 2581, to amend the act of June 1, 1948 (62 Stat. 281), to empower the Administrator of General Services to appoint nonuniformed special policemen.

Calendar No. 1267, S. 2131, to amend the Motor Vehicle Safety Responsibility Act of the District of Columbia, approved May 25, 1954, as amended.

Calendar No. 1178, H.R. 4251, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the limitation and the deduction of exploration expenditures.

Mr. President, I ask that the clerk read the unanimous-consent agreement which already has been entered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the agreement will be read. The Chief Clerk read as follows:

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Ordered, That effective on June 23, 1960, at 9:30 o'clock a.m., when the Senate convenes, the Senator from Montana, Mr. MANSFIELD, be recognized for 1½ hours to address the Senate.

Provided further, That, following the above address, during the further consideration of the nominations of John S. Bragdon, to be a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board; Vice Adm. Ralph E. Wilson, to be a member of the Federal Maritime Board; and Robert E. Lee, to be a member of the Federal Communications Commission, debate shall be limited to 20 minutes on each nomination, to be equally divided and controlled by the majority and minority leaders.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, June 22, 1960, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 762. An act for the relief of Manuel Alves de Carvalho;

S. 2089. An act for the relief of Henry K. Lee (Hyun Kul);

S. 2106. An act for the relief of Emiko Nagamine;

S. 2528. An act for the relief of John Lipset;

S. 2639. An act for the relief of Mo Tong Lul;

S. 2646. An act for the relief of Lloyd C. Kimm;

S. 2681. An act for the relief of Yi Young An; and

S. 2768. An act for the relief of Frederick T. C. Yu and his wife, Alice Siao-Fen Chen Yu.

RECESS UNTIL 9:30 A.M.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate take a recess until 9:30 a.m., tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 10 o'clock and 1 minute p.m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, June 23, 1960, at 9:30 o'clock a.m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 22, 1960:

ROUTINE DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The following-named Foreign Service officers of class 2 and secretaries in the diplomatic service, to be also consuls general of the United States of America:

To be consuls general

Herbert P. Fales, of California.
Frank Snowden Hopkins, of the District of Columbia.

W. Garland Richardson, of Nevada.

B. Winfred Ruffner to be Foreign Service officer of class 2, a consul, and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 5 to class 4: Zachary P. Geaneas, of New York.
Henry Hunt McKee, of the District of Columbia.

Arthur V. Metcalfe, of California.

The following-named persons for appointment as indicated:

To be Foreign Service officers of class 4, consul, and secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America

Lee F. Dinsmore, of Maryland.

John Eaves, Jr., of New York.

John Godlove Kormann, of Florida.

Elias C. Rodriguez, of Texas.

Royal J. Wald, of California.

To be class 5 and to be also consul of the United States of America

Gori P. Bruno, of New York.

Robert G. Cox, of New Mexico.

To be class 5, consul, and secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America

Chester J. Pavlovski, of Washington.

Miss Elsie M. Quick, of North Carolina.

Francis X. Ready, of Massachusetts.

Herman A. Washington, of New York.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 7 to class indicated:

To class 6

John P. Blane, of Alabama.

Michael Calingaert, of the District of Columbia.

Jack M. Carle, of Colorado.

Theodore B. Dobbs, of Virginia.

George B. Lambrakis, of New York.

Gerald Floyd Linderman, of Ohio.

Miss Elaine Diana Smith, of Illinois.

To be Foreign Service officers of class 8, vice consul of career, and secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America

Robert E. Armstrong, of Illinois.

Thomas F. Barthelmy, of Ohio.

Charles F. Brown, of Nevada.

Robert B. Duncan, of New Jersey.

Thomas P. H. Dunlop, of North Carolina.

J. David Gelsanliter, of Ohio.

Robert V. D. Griffin, of California.

Philip E. Heron, Jr., of California.

R. Allen Irvine, of Pennsylvania.

Dee Valentine Jacobs, of Utah.

Jay K. Katzen, of New York.

Moorhead C. Kennedy, Jr., of Maine.

Arturo S. Macias, of Wisconsin.

Howard M. McElroy, of New York.

André J. Navez, of Massachusetts.

Patrick T. O'Connor, of New York.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 8 to class indicated:

To class 7

Frederick H. Lawton, of New Jersey.

Francis Terry McNamara, of New York.

To be Foreign Service officers of class 7, vice consul of career, and secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America

Hypolite F. Breard, Jr., of Louisiana.

Harry M. Carter, Jr., of Virginia.

Robert J. Corcoran, of Florida.

William J. McGovern, Jr., of California.

George J. Stanger, of New York.

Miss E. Ursula Wallace, of Georgia.

Miss Anne Pinkney, of California.

Jose L. Romero, Jr., of Virginia.

To be Foreign Service officers of class 7, vice consul of career, and secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America

Richard C. Scissors, of Missouri.

Nathaniel B. Thayer, of Massachusetts.

Thomas M. Tracy, of Massachusetts.

John A. Warnock, of California.

To be consuls of the United States of America

Robert J. Clarke, of Connecticut.
Lawrence R. Devlin, of California.
Lion Gardiner, Jr., of Ohio.
Wilbur L. Garges, Jr., of Virginia.
Fitzhugh Green, of the District of Columbia.

Carl O. Hawthorne, of California.
William F. Keyes, of New York.
Frank A. Kierman, Jr., of Massachusetts.
Joseph Yoshio Kiyonaga, of Maryland.
James F. Shea, of Maryland.

Foreign Service Reserve officers to be vice consuls of the United States of America

Kenneth C. Cathey, of the District of Columbia.

Raymond H. Close, of New Jersey.
Charles O. Coudert, of Connecticut.
Martin C. Hawkins III, of Arkansas.
John H. Kenney, of Massachusetts.
F. Lamar King, of Maryland.
Cornelius A. McCauley, of Virginia.
John J. Reagan, of Virginia.
Arthur G. Wiley, Jr., of Virginia.

Foreign Service Reserve officers to be vice consuls and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America

Frank Ahmed, of Massachusetts.
Timothy J. Burke, of New York.
Duane R. Clarridge, of New Hampshire.
Robert Chin, of the District of Columbia.

Foreign Service Reserve officers to be secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America

Robert N. Dahlgren, of California.
Sidney H. Fine, of California.
John T. Flynn, of Maryland.
Robert M. Fulton, of California.
Philip A. Heller, of New York.
James E. Hoofnagle, of Virginia.
Miss Sara Jane Jamison, of Pennsylvania.
Gordon L. Jorgensen, of the District of Columbia.
Edward Macauley 3d, of Rhode Island.
Robert J. Myers, of Indiana.
Brian T. Moran, of Texas.
Walter R. Roberts, of New York.
Richard D. Tucker, of Virginia.
John R. Wood, of Georgia.
Howard V. Bennett, of West Virginia.

Foreign Service staff officers to be consuls of the United States of America

Blake Cochran, of Maryland.
Joseph I. Krene, of California.
Reinhard W. Lamprecht, of Illinois.
Vinton Chapin, of New Hampshire, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Dominican Republic.

Leland Barrows, of Kansas, now Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Cameroun, to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Togo.

UNITED NATIONS

The following-named representatives of the United States of America to the 15th session of the General Assembly of the United Nations to serve no longer than December 31, 1960:

Henry Cabot Lodge, of Massachusetts.
GEORGE D. AIKEN, U.S. Senator from the State of Vermont.

WAYNE MORSE, U.S. Senator from the State of Oregon.

Francis O. Wilcox, Assistant Secretary, International Organization Affairs, Department of State.

Mrs. Oswald B. Lord, of New York.
Mrs. Zelma Watson George, of Ohio.
Arthur F. Lamey, of Montana.
Frederick Blake Payne, of New York.
Charles Rosenbaum, of Colorado.

Miss Frances E. Willis, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Norway.

GOVERNOR OF GUAM

Joseph Flores, of Guam, to be Governor of Guam for a term of 4 years.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 22, 1960

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.
Rev. William F. (Billy) Graham, D.D., Montreat, N.C., offered the following prayer:

Our Father and our God: We come to Thee recognizing our dependence and our need of Thee at this hour of our history. We bless Thee and praise Thee that Thou hast been with us these many years. Thou wast with our Founding Fathers and Thou hast been with this Nation through difficult days and through days of peace and prosperity; and now we come to Thee humbly confessing our sense of need of Thee more now than any time in many years.

We need Thy wisdom. We pray that Thou wouldst give to this body of men supernatural wisdom in dealing with the problems that they face. We pray that Thou wouldst give to them courage, courage to stand for that which is morally right regardless of consequences. Give to them faith, faith to believe that Thou art in the shadows watching, directing, and leading, that Thou art the Lord of history, and that history is in Thy hands.

Bless this Nation, we pray, and bless these men that lead us; for we ask it in the name of Jesus Christ, our Lord. 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 a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H.J. Res. 765. Joint resolution making a supplemental appropriation for the Department of Labor for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. SPARKMAN, and Mr. HENNING as the members on the part of the Senate of the Joint Committee on Arrangements for the Inauguration of the President and Vice President-elect on January 20 next.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN PROPERTY TO THE VILLAGE OF HIGHLAND FALLS, N.Y.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON].

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the

Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 6479) to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to the village of Highland Falls, N.Y., with a Senate amendment thereto and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, lines 3 and 4, strike out "50 per centum of the".

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT ACT

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 8241) to amend certain provisions of the Civil Service Retirement Act relating to the reemployment of former Members of Congress, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, strike out all after line 2 over to and including line 3 on page 2 and insert: "That (a) subsection (1) of section 1 of the Civil Service Retirement Act is amended by striking out the words 'in the case of an employee separated or transferred to a position not within the purview of this Act before he has completed five years of civilian service or a Member separated before he has completed five years of Member service' and inserting in lieu thereof 'in the case of an employee or Member separated or transferred to a position not within the purview of this Act before he has completed five years of civilian service'."

"(b) Subsection (f) of section 6 of such Act is amended by striking out the words 'Member service' where they first appear in such subsection and inserting in lieu thereof the words 'civilian service'."

"(c) Subsection (b) of section 8 of such Act is amended by striking out the words 'Member service' in the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the words 'civilian service'."

"(d) (1) So much of subsection (b) of section 9 of such Act as precedes the first proviso is amended to read as follows:

"(b) The annuity of a congressional employee retiring under this Act shall be computed as provided in subsection (a) except that with respect to so much of his service as a congressional employee and his military service as does not exceed a total of fifteen years, and with respect to any Member service, the annuity shall be computed by multiplying 2½ per centum of the average salary by the years of such service."

"(2) Clause (1) of the second sentence of such subsection is amended by inserting after the words 'congressional employee' the words 'or Member, or any combination of such service'."

"(e) The first sentence of section 9(c) is amended to read as follows:

"(c) The annuity of a Member, or of a former Member with title to Member annuity, retiring under this Act shall be computed as provided in subsection (a), except that if he has had at least five years' service