jurisdiction and direction of some international organization such as the Organization of American States.

I am a strong supporter of increasing economic aid programs for Latin America, preferably on a line-of-credit loan basis related to specific economic projects that will help bring direct economic benefits to the people of Latin America.

A distinguished Brazilian pointed out a few months ago that the relations between the United States and Latin America are perturbed, on both sides, by the prevalence of psychological behavior complexes. As a consequence, he added, the instrumentality of inter-American cooperation has increasingly become a mechanism for juridical and political coexistence rather than a system for mutual understanding.

Our biggest piece of unfinished business is to repair our mutual understanding. This is what the members of this audience are peculiarly well equipped to do. Whatever your vocation may be, I ask you to make this your avocation. I ask you to take it seriously.

REMARKS OF REPRESENTATIVE MORGAN, OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to meet with representatives of the National Citizens Committee for Columbus Day. My distinguished colleague, PETER RODINO, has kept me informed of the committee's past activities, and I welcome the opportunity to be brought up to date concerning its future program.

It is particularly appropriate for the committee to undertake to broaden the traditional observation of Columbus Day to emphasize the heritage which all of the nations and peoples of the Western Hemisphere share in common as a result of the discoveries of Christopher Columbus.

Columbus Day has in the past been celebrated in part as a reminder of our indebtedness to the older nations of Europe and of the ties which continue to bind us to them. It seems to me to be highly desirable that in addition to looking back across the Atlantic toward the Old World, those of us in the United States as well as those in our sister Republics should look around us within this hemisphere. If we pause and look around us and remember how much the date 1492 means to every one of us, it will bring home to us again the unique relationship which exists between the peoples of our hemisphere.

There is a tendency for nations as well as for individuals to become so preoccupied with their own day-to-day problems that they give too much emphasis to their differences. Anything we can do to reemphasize the things we have in common and our obligations to each other should make things better for us all.

Rather than taking more of your time, I am very happy and fortunate to be able to call on the Honorable ARMISTEAD I. SELDEN, who is chairman of the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs. I am glad to be able to transfer to him responsibility for further discussion of the relations of the American Republics with each other. I am sure that you will find that he understands the problems of our hemisphere and that he is very much interested in the work of your group.

Chairman SELDEN and his subcommittee have recently issued a "Report on U.S. Relations with Latin America" which has been widely read and has received many favorable comments. He is a thoughtful and well-informed observer of the Latin American scene. It gives me the greatest pleasure to present to you the Honorable ARMISTEAD I. SELDEN, of Alabama.

REMARKS OF REPRESENTATIVE SELDEN OF ALABAMA

Mr. Chairman, as has been pointed out, last May the Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs of the Foreign Affairs Committee (of which I am chairman) issued a report on U.S. relations with Latin America. In our examination of inter-American relations prior to the report, we were particularly concerned with the climate of misunderstanding which we found. Bitterness and antagonism were showing up as unwelcome guests even at inter-American conferences.

As long as the atmosphere is charged with grievances and recriminations, we will make little headway in resolving the very real conflicts of interest which are bound to crop up among nations of dissimilar stages of development and of wealth.

In the past, serious problems have confronted us without straining the entire fabric of inter-American relations. The difficulties brought about by the depression of the thirties and by dislocations due to World War II were probably greater than those which confront us today. We asked ourselves why it was then possible to reach friendly understandings, even to disagree on issues, without engendering intense antagonisms; and why today, on the other hand, even minor irritations seem to give rise to downright hostility.

The subcommittee's conclusions and recommendations are set forth in a 10-page report. Dr. MORGAN and I brought along a handful of copies for those of you who might be interested. Other copies are available from the House Foreign Affairs Committee. Also, the committee has authorized the printing in Spanish of a number of copies of the report, and it is hoped these copies will be off the press by the end of the week.

In our report, you will find no discussion of such substantive problems as what might be done about the instability of Latin America's markets, or ways to promote economic development. Rather, the subcommittee concerned itself in this report with underlying misunderstandings which are impairing efforts to work out solutions to such questions.

I have been deeply impressed by the efforts of the National Citizens Committee for Columbus Day and the Columbus Foundation. Their work has been directed toward creating the very atmosphere of inter-American understanding that the subcommittee found to be indispensable to effective Hemisphere cooperation. There is no better road to inter-American respect and understanding than by individuals' getting to know each others problems and aspirations.

The Columbus Foundation's initiative in setting up its sister-city program is exactly the kind of approach the subcommittee had in mind when it recommended, and I quote from our report:

"We believe that nongovernmental contacts between people of all the American Republics are an essential avenue toward better understanding. Such organizations as the Inter-American Bar Association, the Inter-American Press Association, and the Inter-American Regional Organization of the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions have contributed enormously toward the basic component of strong inter-American ties—an appreciation of each others' problems and aspirations. Moreover, personal contacts between private citizens remove any lurking suspicions of ulterior motives which sometimes attach to a Government-instigated program, no matter how altruistic might be the intention.

"We urge more professional and other groups to undertake similar relations with their Latin American counterparts."

One final word from the congressional point of view. It is extremely gratifying to find groups of private citizens making foreign policy their business. Previously we have noticed tendencies which might be described as "leave it to the State Department" or "leave it to Congress." These are mighty poor substitutes for the kind of strong inter-American bonds that can be forged when a growing circle of Americans, north and south of the Rio Grande, join hands to make the New World the land of peace and plenty our Founding Fathers envisioned.

SENATE

THURSDAY, AUGUST 6, 1959

Rev. James R. Adams, Curate, St. John's Episcopal Church, Georgetown Parish, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, who declarest Thy power by calling forth peoples to be nations and by scattering them abroad at Thy pleasure, we beseech Thee, as for the people of the United States in general, so especially for their Senators in Congress assembled, that Thou wouldst be pleased to grant them in all their consultations and deliberations the grace to ask what Thou wouldst have them to do, that the spirit of wisdom may save them from all false choices. Make them ever mindful, we pray Thee, of their calling to serve this people in Thy fear alone, that the Nation may be led in the way of truth and righteousness, justice, and compassion, to the end that when called to account for the stewardship of Thy blessings, we not be found wanting, and in the day of tribulation be spared Thy wrath at the hands of our enemies; through Him who came to be our judge, Jesus Christ, Our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, August 5, 1959, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1455) to authorize the rental of cotton acreage allotments, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 8283) making appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H.R. 7454) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

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

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

RESOLUTIONS OF LEGISLATURE OF MINNESOTA

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that two resolutions adopted by the Minnesota State Legislature during the 1959 extra session be inserted at this point in the RECORD and referred to the appropriate committees.

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

To the Committee on Public Works:

"'RESOLUTION 1

"'Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to take whatever action is necessary to secure the apportionment of Federal aid for highways on the Federal aid primary, secondary, and urban systems for the 1961 fiscal year

"'Whereas the State of Minnesota has obligated all of its Federal aid allotments on the Federal aid primary, secondary, and urban systems; and

"'Whereas Federal aid allotments have not been made for fiscal year 1961; and

"'Whereas there are sufficient funds in the Federal highway trust fund to make the allotments on the Federal aid primary, secondary, and urban systems; and

"'Whereas if the allotments are not made forthwith, it will be necessary for the Minnesota Department of Highways to eliminate from its letting on July 24, 1959, all projects on the primary system; and

"'Whereas the elimination of such projects amounting to approximately $7,200,000 will have serious and adverse effects on the economy of the State: Now, therefore, be it

"'*Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Minnesota,* That the Congress of the United States be requested to take the necessary action to secure the 1961 Federal aid highway allotments for the primary, secondary, and urban systems in such time that the Minnesota Department of Highways will not have to eliminate projects on the primary system from its July 24 letting; be it further

"'*Resolved,* That the secretary of state of the State of Minnesota be instructed to transmit copies of this resolution to each Member of Congress from the State of Minnesota.'

"KARL ROLVAAG,
"President of the Senate.
"E. J. CHILGREN,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives.

"Passed the senate the 30th day of June 1959.

"H. Y. TORREY,
"Secretary of State.

"Passed the house of representatives the 30th day of June 1959.

"EDWARD A. BURDICK,
"Chief Clerk, House of Representatives, pro tempore.

"Approved July 2, 1959.

"ORVILLE L. FREEMAN,
"Governor of the State of Minnesota.

"Filed July 2, 1959.

"JOSEPH L. DONOVAN,
"Secretary of State."

To the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"'RESOLUTION 2

"'Resolution memorializing Congress, the President, and the Secretary of Agriculture to enact legislation enabling producers of agricultural products to benefit from the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Seaway

"'Whereas the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Seaway has opened a vast area of shipping and commerce to the Northern and Western States;

"'Whereas the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Seaway is providing low-cost efficient shipping of agricultural products;

"'Whereas the low shipping cost should inure to the benefit of the producer of agricultural products in the form of higher selling prices for the producer of agricultural products: Now, therefore, be it

"'*Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Minnesota,* That the Congress of the United States, the President, and the Secretary of Agriculture be requested to study and explore and to enact suitable legislation to enable the producers of agricultural products in the northern and western areas of the United States to share in the savings of shipping costs by reason of the use of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Seaway; be it further

"'*Resolved,* That the Secretary of State be instructed to send a copy of this resolution to each Member of Congress from the States of Minnesota, Iowa, North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, Montana, and Wyoming, to the President, and to the Secretary of Agriculture.'

"KARL F. ROLVAAG,
"President of the Senate.
"E. J. CHILGREN,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives.

"Passed the senate the 1st day of July 1959.

"H. Y. TORREY,
"Secretary of the Senate.

"Passed the house of representatives the 1st day of July 1959.

"EDWARD A. BURDICK,
"Chief Clerk, House of Representatives, pro tempore.

"Approved July 2, 1959.

"ORVILLE FREEMAN,
"Governor of the State of Minnesota.

"Filed July 2, 1959.

"JOSEPH L. DONOVAN,
"Secretary of State."

RESOLUTIONS OF MINNESOTA FEDERATION OF POST OFFICE CLERKS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that two resolutions adopted by the Minnesota Federation of Post Office Clerks at its annual convention this past June be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, as follows:

EMPLOYMENT OF RETIRED CLERKS AND CARRIERS AT CHRISTMAS

Whereas the Post Office Department must of necessity employ additional help during the month of December; and

Whereas retired postal clerks and carriers would be a considerable asset to the postal department during the month of December because of their experience in post office operations and knowledge of the schemes: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the MFPOC in convention assembled at Bemidji, Minn., June 25, 26, 27, 1959, go on record favoring the enactment of legislation permitting the Post Office Department to employ retired clerks and carriers during the month of December without forfeiture of retirement benefits; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to all Members of Congress from Minnesota, the national resident officers and the Postmaster General.

LEGISLATION: VOLUNTARY PAYROLL DEDUCTIONS FOR UNION DUES

Whereas legislation has been introduced in past sessions of Congress to provide for voluntary additional payroll deductions on Federal employee paychecks to buy life, health, accident, hospital, and medical insurance; and

Whereas we believe that the voluntary deduction of union dues should be authorized by law and would be of tremendous value in reducing the cost and work involved in the collection of such dues; and

Whereas the aforementioned provision would stimulate and maintain a consistent membership, organizationally in the MFPOC: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the MFPOC in convention assembled in Bemidji, Minn., June 25, 26, 27, 1959, go on record in favor of such legislation authorizing voluntary deduction of union dues; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Minnesota congressional delegation and our national officers urging the introduction and enactment of such legislation into law.

RESOLUTION OF UNITED SPANISH WAR VETERANS, DEPARTMENT OF MINNESOTA

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a resolution which I have received from the United Spanish War Veterans, Department of Minnesota, as adopted at its convention this past June in Duluth, be printed in the RECORD, and referred to the appropriate committee.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, as follows:

UNITED SPANISH WAR VETERANS,
DEPARTMENT OF MINNESOTA,
St. Paul, Minn., June 25, 1959.

Hon. HUBERT HUMPHREY,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: At the 55th annual encampment of the Department of Minnesota, United Spanish War Veterans, held at Duluth, Minn., June 14, 15, and 16, 1959, the following resolution was introduced and passed:

"Whereas the present law pertaining to the admission of veterans to Veterans' Administration hospitals does not apply to veterans of the Spanish-American War, the Philippine Insurrection, and the China Relief Expedition; and

"Whereas veterans of the Spanish-American War can only be admitted if there are vacancies: Therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the United Spanish War Veterans, Department of Minnesota, meeting in convention in Duluth, Minn., June 14, 15, and 16, 1959,* That H.R. 2412 corrects the admission qualification of the present laws and establishes service connection for hospitalization purposes for veterans of the Spanish American War, Philippine Insurrection, and China Relief Expedition on the same basis as veterans of other wars regarding admission to Veterans' Hospitals; and it be further

"*Resolved,* That a copy of this resolution be sent to all the members of the Minnesota delegation to the House and Senate, Washington, D.C."

Respectfully yours,

CHARLES E. HILL,
Department Adjutant and Quartermaster.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. SCOTT, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, without amendment:

H.R. 2398. An act to provide for the establishment of a fish hatchery in the northwestern part of the State of Pennsylvania (Rept. No. 622).

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, without amendment:

S. Res. 152. Resolution to provide additional funds for the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce; referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. COTTON, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, without amendment:

S. Res. 151. Resolution to authorize a study of transportation problems in rural areas.

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

S.J. Res. 25. Joint resolution to change the name of Roosevelt Dam in Arizona to Theodore Roosevelt Dam (Rept. No. 623).

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

S. Con. Res. 41. Concurrent resolution to accept the statue of the late Senator Patrick A. McCarran for placement in Statuary Hall (Rept. No. 624);

S. Con. Res. 42. Concurrent resolution to place temporarily in the rotunda of the Capitol a statue of the late Senator Patrick A. McCarran (Rept. No. 624);

S. Con. Res. 43. Concurrent resolution to print proceedings of the presentation and acceptance of the statue of the late Senator Patrick A. McCarran for placement in Statutary Hall (Rept. No. 624);

S. Con. Res. 55. Concurrent resolution to place temporarily in the rotunda of the Capitol a statue of Esther Morris, of Wyoming, and authorizing ceremonies on such occasion (Rept. No. 625);

S. Con. Res. 56. Concurrent resolution accepting the statue of Esther Morris, of Wyoming, for placement in the Statuary Hall collection (Rept. No. 625);

S. Con. Res. 59. Concurrent resolution amending S. Con. Res. 2, continuing the existence of the Joint Committee on Washington Metropolitan Problems (Rept. No. 626);

S. Res. 143. Resolution to increase the amount of funds for the investigation of matters pertaining to immigration and naturalization (Rept. No. 627);

S. Res. 144. Resolution to increase the amount of funds for the investigation of antitrust and antimonopoly laws and their administration (Rept. No. 628);

S. Res. 147. Resolution authorizing additional expenditures by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs; and

S. Res. 149. Resolution authorizing additional expenditures by the Committee on Foreign Relations.

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

S. Con. Res. 38. Concurrent resolution to print for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary additional parts of certain hearings on administered prices (Rept. No. 629);

S. Con. Res. 39. Concurrent resolution to print for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary additional copies of certain reports submitted by it and the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly (Rept. No. 630); and

S. Res. 154. Resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of part 1 of the second interim report of the Select Committee on Improper Activities in the Labor or Management Field.

S. Con. Res. 57. Concurrent resolution to print as a House document the proceedings incident to the acceptance of the statue of Esther Morris, presented by the State of Wyoming (Rept. No. 625);

By Mr. HENNINGS, from the Committee on Rules and Administration:

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, without amendment:

S. 2130. A bill to authorize a payment to the Government of Japan (Rept. No. 631).

MARY VERNON BEALE, JOSEPHINE F. MILLER, AND ADRIAN C. MILLER

Mr. HENNINGS, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 157) to pay a gratuity to Mary Vernon Beale, Josephine F. Miller, and Adrian C. Miller, 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 Mary Vernon Beale and Josephine F. Miller, sisters of Theodora Miller, and Adrian C. Miller, niece of Theodora Miller, an employee of the Senate at the time of her death, a sum to each equal to two and one-sixth months' compensation at the rate she was receiving by law at the time of her death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

ELLA M. SHEFFEY

Mr. HENNINGS, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 158) to pay a gratuity to Ella M. Sheffey, 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 Ella M. Sheffey, widow of Matthew Sheffey, an employee of the Architect of the Capitol assigned to duty in the Senate Office Building at the time of his death, a sum equal to six months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

AMENDMENTS TO MUTUAL DEFENSE ASSISTANCE CONTROL ACT OF 1951—AMENDED REPORT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], I wish to make the following statement:

In reporting the amendments to the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951—S. 1697, Calendar No. 596—there was inadvertently omitted from the report, which is Senate Report No. 599, the so-called Cordon Rule version of the existing law. This would show the changes in existing law made by the bill which is the subject of the report.

I ask unanimous consent to file an amended report containing the statement required by the Cordon Rule, so that any printing of the report may include that statement.

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

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

S. 2493. A bill to provide for the crediting for retirement purposes of certain service performed by John R. Richardson; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

S. 2494. A bill to validate the homestead entries of Leo F. Reeves; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GORE:

S. 2495. A bill to promote the foreign relations of the United States by providing for the establishment of a National Foreign Service Academy; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. HART:

S. 2496. A bill for the relief of Kraemer Mills, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAVITS:

S. 2497. A bill for the relief of Jose Ramon Pineiro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. CLARK, Mr. DODD, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. NEUBERGER, Mr. PROXMIRE, and Mr. YOUNG of Ohio):

S. 2498. A bill to provide for the registration of contractors of migrant agricultural workers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

By Mr. MCNAMARA:

S. 2499. A bill for the relief of Halina Konik Wojtusiak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. SCHOEPPEL, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. SYMINGTON, and Mr. ALLOTT):

S. 2500. A bill to authorize the President to reappoint Elwood R. Quesada, formerly lieutenant general, U.S. Air Force, retired, to the grade of major general and to retire him in the grade of lieutenant general, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

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

By Mr. YARBOROUGH:

S. 2501. A bill to provide for the reinstatement and validation of U.S. oil and gas lease BLM 028500; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 2502. A bill to provide for the development of a comprehensive family farm program, to bring the production of agricultural commodities into balance with demand therefor, to enable farmers to secure fair prices, to better utilize agricultural abundance in the Nation's interest at home and abroad, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

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

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 2503. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to define the real property exempt from taxation in the District of Columbia," approved December 24, 1942, so as to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to waive certain tax liabilities imposed pursuant to such act; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

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

By Mr. HOLLAND (for himself, Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. BEALL, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, Mr. CARLSON, CASE of New Jersey, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. COOPER, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. KERR, Mr. DODD, Mr. DWORSHAK, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. ENGLE, Mr. FREAR, Mr. GREEN, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. HARTKE, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. KEATING, Mr. LONG, Mr. MARTIN, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. MCGEE, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. NEUBERGER, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. SCHOEPPEL, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. WILEY, Mr. YARBOROUGH, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. MCNAMARA, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, Mr. BUSH, Mr. MORTON, Mr. PROUTY, Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, Mr. LAUSCHE, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. CANNON, Mr. CLARK, Mr. HUMPHREY, and Mr. CAPEHART):

S.J. Res. 126. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, relating to the qualifications of electors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. HILL (for himself, Mr. CLARK, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. SYMINGTON, and Mr. WILEY):

S.J. Res. 127. Joint resolution to help make available to those children in our country who are handicapped by deafness the specially trained teachers of the deaf needed to develop their abilities and to help make available to individuals suffering speech and hearing impairments those specially trained speech pathologists and audiologists needed to help them overcome their handicaps; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

RESOLUTIONS

NATIONAL CONSERVATION SPORTS TOURNAMENT

Mr. MARTIN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 156); which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

Whereas for the past two years the Davenport, Iowa, chapter of the Izaak Walton League of America has sponsored annually a National Conservation Sports Tournament for the benefit of the Boy Scouts and Explorer Scouts of America; and

Whereas the purpose and effect of the holding of such tournaments is to encourage physical fitness and sportsmanship on the part of the participants as well as to develop their competitive abilities and inspire in them an interest in and appreciation of outdoor sports; and

Whereas the holding of such tournaments also has the worthwhile effect of imparting to the participants a basic understanding of the importance of the conservation and wise use of the Nation's soil, woods, water, and wild life resources; and

Whereas, in August of 1959, the Davenport, Iowa, chapter of the Izaak Walton League of America will sponsor its Third National Conservation Sports Tournament in which more than five hundred Explorer Scouts from throughout the country will participate: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That there is hereby extended to the Davenport, Iowa, chapter of the Izaak Walton League of America the recognition and commendation of the Senate for the praiseworthy activities of such chapter in the sponsoring of its National Conservation Tournament.

Mr. HENNINGS, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 157) to pay a gratuity to Mary Vernon Beale, Josephine F. Miller, and Adrian C. Miller, which was placed on the calendar.

Mr. HENNINGS also, from the Committee on Rules and Administration reported an original resolution (S. Res. 158) to pay a gratuity to Ella M. Sheffey, which was placed on the calendar.

(See the above resolutions printed in full where they appear under the heading "Reports of Committee.")

REAPPOINTMENT OF ELWOOD R. QUESADA TO GRADE OF LIEUTENANT GENERAL, REGULAR AIR FORCE, RETIRED LIST

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and Senators BRIDGES, MAGNUSON, SCHOEPPEL, MONRONEY, SYMINGTON, and ALLOTT, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the President to reappoint Elwood R. Quesada to the grade of lieutenant general of the Regular Air Force, on the retired list, effective not before the end of his service as Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency. I ask unanimous consent that the bill and a letter, dated August 3, 1959, from Secretary of the Air Force Douglas transmitting the bill to the Congress and explaining its purpose, be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the bill and letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2500) to authorize the President to reappoint Elwood R. Quesada, formerly lieutenant general, U.S. Air Force, retired, to the grade of major general and to retire him in the grade of lieutenant general, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, is hereby authorized to reappoint Elwood R. Quesada to the grade of major general in the Regular Air Force and thereafter immediately to place him on the retired list of the Regular Air Force in the grade of lieutenant general with all the pay, allowances, emoluments, perquisites, rights, privileges, and benefits provided, at the time of such reappointment and thereafter, for an officer of that grade and with his length of service who was on that retired list on May 31, 1958. Effective upon the date he occupies office under such reappointment as provided in section 2 of this Act, and upon his subsequent retirement, Elwood R. Quesada shall be deemed for all purposes to have continued to occupy or hold the office, status, rank, and grade which he occupied or held as lieutenant general, United States Air Force, retired, on October 30, 1958, as though he had not resigned therefrom on that date: *Provided*, That any period of time during which he holds or has held any Federal civil office shall not be credited to him as military service: *And provided further*, That no back pay or allowances shall become due as a result of the passage of this Act or of his reappointment hereunder for or on account of any period of time between October 31, 1958, and the effective date of his occupancy of office under such reappointment.

SEC. 2. The reappointment and retirement authorized by this Act may be made at any time following the enactment of this Act, and, notwithstanding any other provision of law, shall not affect the status of Elwood R. Quesada as Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency: *Provided*, That he shall not occupy or hold office under such reappointment, or have military status pursuant thereto, earlier than the day following the date upon which he ceases to hold office of Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency: *And provided further*, That in the event he dies while holding the office of Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency, he shall, for the purposes of all laws of the United States, be deemed to have occupied and held office pursuant to such reappointment and retirement from and after the day before his death.

The letter presented by Mr. SALTONSTALL is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE,
Washington, D.C., August 3, 1959.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: There is forwarded herewith a draft of legislation "To authorize the President to reappoint Elwood R. Quesada, formerly lieutenant general, U.S. Air Force, retired, to the grade of major general and retire him in the grade of lieutenant general, and for other purposes." The Bureau of the Budget has advised that it has no objection to the submission of this proposal for the consideration of the Congress. The Department of the Air Force has been designated as representative of the Department of Defense for this legislation. It is recommended that this proposal be enacted by the Congress.

PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

The purpose of this legislation is to authorize the President to reappoint Elwood R. Quesada to the grade of lieutenant general of the Regular Air Force and to place him upon the retired list, such appointment not to affect his status as Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency notwithstanding the provisions of section 301(b) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958.

Section 301(b) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 744) provides in part:

"QUALIFICATIONS OF ADMINISTRATOR

"(b) * * * At the time of his nomination he shall be a civilian and shall have experience in a field directly related to aviation. * * *"

In September 1958 the President gave Mr. Quesada a recess appointment as Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency effective November 1, 1958. On October 30, 1958, Mr. Quesada resigned his commission as a lieutenant general on the retired list of the Regular Air Force in order to qualify under the provisions of section 301(b) of the Federal Aviation Act. Mr. Quesada's resignation represents a sacrifice which, in his case, it is felt the Congress did not intend.

Mr. Quesada has been active in the field of aviation for 35 consecutive years. After 27 years of active service in the Air Force and its predecessors, he was placed on the

retired list of the Regular Air Force in 1951. Thereafter he engaged in civilian activities in private industry, and from June 1957 until he qualified as Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency, he served as Special Assistant to the President for aviation matters. His duties included, among other things, the processing, within the executive branch of the Government, of the legislation which established the Federal Aviation Agency. He has clearly demonstrated his unique knowledge of the complexities and needs of civilian and military aviation in the present age.

The main objective of the legislation is to reinstate Elwood R. Quesada to the military status which he enjoyed at the time of his resignation on October 30, 1958, without causing any advantage or disadvantage to accrue to him by reason of such reinstatement other than the mere restoration of his previous status.

While the purpose and wisdom of the applicable language of section 301(b) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 is appreciated by this Department, it is felt that it was not the intention of the Congress that in Mr. Quesada's case his additional public services should deprive him of the honors and status acquired during his years of service to his country in the Military Establishment.

COST AND BUDGET DATA

Enactment of this legislation would have no budgetary effects.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES H. DOUGLAS,
Secretary of the Air Force.

P.S.—An identical letter has been sent to the President of the Senate.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, in connection with S. 2500, a bill making provision for reinstatement of Mr. Elwood R. Quesada to his former retired rank as lieutenant general in the Regular Air Force, there are several things I would like to say at this time.

First, I personally and firmly believe that Mr. Quesada should not be left with the consequences of his personal sacrifice in resigning his military status. He should not have to go forever without the fruits of a long and distinguished career in the military service of our country in order to perform an urgent public service as Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency.

Second, I point out that the proposed bill has been painstakingly prepared to eliminate even the slightest advantage to Mr. Quesada which could accrue through his reinstatement, beyond mere restoration of the military status he would have continued to enjoy had he not resigned from the military. Moreover, the same extreme care has been taken to deny him any connection with the military, or any military status whatsoever, for the remainder of his time in office as Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency. I believe these points should be crystal clear in the minds of all. The bill represents no real favor to Mr. Quesada, but merely provides for what is fitting and proper for us to do.

Since what appears to be an inadvertently inaccurate news item on this legislation appeared in the Evening Star of August 5, 1959, I request permission at this time to have inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the article from the Star and an analysis of the inaccuracies contained in the article. I think we are all distressed by a mistake of this kind, especially when those who have favored this legislation have bent over backward to stay completely within the bounds of propriety and to seek for Mr. Quesada only what it would not embarrass him to receive.

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

[From the Washington Evening Star, Aug. 5, 1959]

CONGRESS URGED TO VOTE QUESADA PENSION RISE

Proposed legislation to retire Elwood R. Quesada at a higher rank and to give him benefits of a military pay increase voted last year has been forwarded Congress by Air Force Secretary James H. Douglas.

Secretary Douglas said the bill would restore to General Quesada status he voluntarily relinquished to become Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency.

Specifically, the President could reappoint Mr. Quesada as a major general and immediately place him on retired lists in the grade of lieutenant general with all pay due an officer of that rank retired May 31, 1958.

Actually, General Quesada resigned his commission as a lieutenant general and was retired as a major general October 30, 1958.

His present retirement pay as a major general is based on an old $1,021 monthly pay scale, figured percentagewise with his years of service. His new retirement pay would be based on a revised active salary scale of $1,350 a month, related percentagewise with his years of service, plus a 6-percent increase for officers who retired before June 1, 1958.

General Quesada has been active in the aviation field for 35 consecutive years, Secretary Douglas pointed out. He said 27 of those years were in the Air Force. General Quesada served as special assistant to the President for aviation before his appointment as Federal Aviation Administrator.

He resigned to comply with a law demanding that the Administrator, at the time of his nomination, be a civilian.

"His resignation was a sacrifice which, in his case, it is felt Congress did not intend," Secretary Douglas wrote in a letter of transmittal accompanying the legislation proposal.

The suggestion was referred to the Senate Armed Services Committee.

ANALYSIS OF INACCURACIES IN STAR NEWS ITEM ON LEGISLATION TO REINSTATE MR. QUESADA TO HIS FORMER RETIREMENT RANK AS LIEUTENANT GENERAL

STATEMENT	TRUE SITUATION
"Proposed legislation to retire Elwood R. Quesada to a higher rank and to give him benefits of a military pay increase voted last year has been forwarded Congress by Air Force Secretary James H. Douglas."	The legislation would not accord Mr. Quesada higher rank or give him benefit of the military pay increase voted last year. Mr. Quesada has no status whatsoever as a military officer at the present time. The legislation would merely reinstate him to the rank he had at the time he resigned to become Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency, and is carefully worded to eliminate any benefit to him not enjoyed by others in the same retired rank on May 31, 1958, which was the day before the effective date of the military pay increase of last year.
"Secretary Douglas said the bill would restore to General Quesada status he voluntarily relinquished to become administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency.	The legislation would not itself restore Mr. Quesada's military status. It would merely authorize reappointment as a major general by the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate, and retirement as a lieutenant general. Moreover, his military status could not be restored under the bill until he ceases to serve as Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency, or dies in that office.
"Specifically, the President could reappoint Mr. Quesada as a major general and immediately place him on retired lists in the grade of lieutenant general with all pay due an officer of that rank retired May 31, 1958."	When Mr. Quesada resigned on October 30, 1958, to accept appointment as Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency, he was on the retired list as lieutenant general and his resignation totally severed all connection with the Military Establishment. In other words, his last rank in the Military Establishment was lieutenant general; and he no longer holds any office in the armed services whatsoever.
"Actually General Quesada resigned his commission as a lieutenant general and was retired as a major general October 30, 1958."	He receives no retirement pay whatsoever at the present time, since he has no connection with the Military Establishment. Moreover, even if he now had retired status with a service, he would be forbidden by law to accept retirement pay so long as he receives his salary as Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency. In addition, the proposed legislation goes to extreme lengths to eliminate any possibility that Mr. Quesada would receive any payment or other benefit from the Air Force or enjoy any of the privileges of military status until he ceases to be Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency, or dies while in that office. The bill expressly provides that Mr. Quesada shall have no military status for the remainder of his term as Administrator. It is painstaking in this regard, even to the point of making certain that his civilian service as Administrator will not be counted as military service in computing the retirement pay he would begin to receive only after completing his term as Administrator.
"His present retirement pay as a major general is based on an old $1,021 monthly pay scale, figured percentagewise with his years of service. His new retirement pay would be based on a revised active salary scale of $1,350 a month, related percentagewise with his years of service, plus a 6 percent increase for officers who retired before June 1, 1958."	

SPECIALLY TRAINED TEACHERS FOR CERTAIN HANDICAPPED PERSONS

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and Senators CLARK, KEFAUVER, KENNEDY, SALTONSTALL, STENNIS, SYMINGTON, and WILEY, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution designed to help resolve a very serious problem afflicting 30,000 deaf children of school age in the United States and the 8 million Americans who suffer from serious speech and hearing impairments.

The problem which affects our deaf children lies in the critical shortage of teachers specially trained to educate such afflicted children. To meet the educational needs of these children, who, of course, have the same aptitudes and intellectual potentialities as have children with normal hearing, we should be graduating 500 teachers of the deaf annually. Instead of 500, we have less than 150 in training this year. Six of the institutions accredited for the training of teachers of the deaf do not have a single student enrolled for training this year. The situation is critical and it is national in scope.

The problem adversely affecting those 8 million Americans who suffer from speech and hearing impairments of such a nature as to seriously handicap many of them in their efforts to become independent, self-supporting, taxpaying members of their communities, is an identical one. Whereas we need some 20,000 speech pathologists and audiologists to diagnose and correct speech and hearing impairments and to train and rehabilitate the afflicted, there are at present only some 2,000 certified speech pathologists and audiologists and 5,000 noncertified specialists in this field in the United States. We should be graduating at least 1,500 trained specialists a year. We are graduating only 400. Here, too, the problem is critical and nationwide in scope.

The joint resolution would establish parallel programs in the Office of Education and in the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation which, through the grant mechanism, will, we hope, encourage a sufficient number of young people to undertake training to become teachers of the deaf, speech pathologists, or audiologists. The numbers of individuals involved in these programs would be relatively small and the cost, estimated to be less than $3½ million a year, would be far less than the dividends which would be paid to the Government as a result of these programs. These dividends to be gained from the development of the abilities of those afflicted with speech and hearing impairments or deafness would include not only increased strength and productivity for our Nation but dividends in dollars—in the increased tax returns which would be paid by the many thousands of individuals who, as a result of these programs, would become independent rather than dependent, employed rather than unemployable, taxpayers rather than tax consumers.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 127) to help make available to those children in our country who are handicapped by deafness the specially trained teachers of the deaf needed to develop their abilities and to help make available to individuals suffering speech and hearing impairments those specially trained speech pathologists and audiologists needed to help them overcome their handicaps, introduced by Mr. HILL (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

COMMISSION ON DEPARTMENT OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY—AMENDMENTS

Mr. HUMPHREY submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 1851) for the establishment of a Commission on a Department of Science and Technology, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT OF 1958, RELATING TO EMPLOYEES OF DEPARTMENT OF STATE AND U.S. INFORMATION AGENCY—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the names of the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], and the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], may be added as cosponsors of the bill (S. 2304) to amend the National Defense Education Act of 1958 in order to promote an adequate supply of qualified individuals to serve the Federal Government in foreign countries as employees of the Department of State and the U.S. Information Agency, introduced by me, for myself and other Senators, on June 29, 1959.

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

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, and so forth, were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. JAVITS:

Statement made by Hon. Arthur S. Flemming, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, at a news conference on July 28, 1959, relating to the status of the student loan program under the National Defense Education Act.

By Mr. WILEY:

Article entitled "Foreign Ministers' Talks Communique," published in the Washington Post and Times Herald of August 6, 1959.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF CARL A. WEINMAN TO BE U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for 2:30 p.m., Monday, August 17, 1959, in room 2300, New Senate Office Building, on the nomination of Carl A. Weinman, of Ohio, to be U.S. district judge for the southern district of Ohio, vice Lester L. Cecil, elevated.

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

NOTICE CONCERNING CERTAIN NOMINATIONS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the following nominations have been referred to and are now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary:

William B. Jones, of Kentucky, to be U.S. attorney for the western district of Kentucky.

James R. Duncan, of Virginia, to be a member of the Subversive Activities Control Board.

Lewis J. Grout, of Kansas, to be a member of the Board of Parole.

Gerald E. Murch, of Maine, to be a member of the Board of Parole.

On behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, notice is hereby given to all persons interested in these nominations to file with the committee, in writing, on or before Thursday, August 13, 1959, any representations or objections they may wish to present concerning the above nominations, with a further statement whether it is their intention to appear at any hearings which may be scheduled.

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

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

ISSUANCE OF BONDS BY THE TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY—UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I would like to have the attention of the distinguished minority leader.

I ask unanimous consent that it be in order for the Chair to place before the Senate bill 2471, and that after the clerk states the bill by title, it be in order to strike the following language from the bill: Beginning with the comma on line 5, page 1, through "1959" on line 7, page 1; that when that amendment shall have been agreed to, the bill shall be temporarily laid aside.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request?

The Chair hears none, and the agreement is entered.

The clerk will state the bill by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2471) to amend the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933, as amended, and for other purposes.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2471) to amend the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I offer an amendment, which is covered in the unanimous-consent agreement, to strike the language following the comma in line 5, of page 1, all of line 6, and through "1959" in line 7.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. It is my understanding that no amendment or motion is in order and that a point of order will not lie against S. 2471 in view of the unanimous-consent agreement previously entered. We shall have 1 hour's debate on it, but no amendment or motion is in order and no point of order will lie against the bill. I wish to make that clear for the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, I should like to say that neither the executive nor the legislative branch of the Government is interested in transgressing or usurping the authority or privileges of the other. In view of the opinion held by the Executive concerning the provisions referred to in S. 2471, as soon as the original bill, H.R. 3460, is acted upon, it is the intention of the leadership in the Senate, under the unanimous consent previously agreed to, to call up by motion S. 2471, and there will be not to exceed 1 hour's debate on it.

I should like all Senators to be on notice of that.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I may say, for the information of the Members of the Senate, the language of S. 2471 was drawn in anticipation of the action taken by the President on the bill which is presently on his desk. I am informed this is actually a technical change, and nothing more, for the purposes of clarification. So that when this bill is enacted finally, it will be in good form, and will conform procedurally and also with the language that is necessary. I think it was done at the suggestion of the Parliamentarian and others who looked into this question.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to my friend from South Dakota, but first I may say to the Senator from Illinois that he is correct.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That statement confirms my understanding and that of the members of the Public Works Committee. This is purely a technical clarification, and does not affect the substance of the bill.

WELCOME HOME TO THE VICE PRESIDENT

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, may I ask the majority leader if he will yield so I may say two words?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Surely. I have a brief statement to make.

Mr. SCOTT. My two words are, "Welcome home" to the Vice President.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Vice President, we are glad you are home. I was delighted to see that great concourse of people at the airport to welcome you back to your native soil. We think you did a great job.

We followed the press accounts. We gloried in your courage, as you stuck your chin out, put your best foot forward, and spoke the piece for your country, as we expected you to do.

So thrice welcome, Mr. Vice President. We are glad to have you back, and we are delighted indeed about what you said abroad, about the great impact of your remarks, about your decorum and your conduct, and about the effect upon the Soviet people and upon people everywhere in the world, which has been so extremely wholesome. Welcome back, Mr. Vice President.

[Sustained applause, Senators rising.]

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I wish to join in the fine welcoming speech of the minority leader. This morning I was privileged to talk to one of the distinguished citizens of my State, and he said the impression in the farm area, from the way the information was carried over the television and over the radio, was exactly as stated by the distinguished minority leader. David stood up against Goliath. You, Mr. Vice President, were David. He said the impression among the common people was such that he had no doubt about where Wisconsin would stand. I am very pleased to relate the conversation.

As to myself personally, I was privileged on two different occasions, Mr. Vice President, to observe over the television your conduct with Mr. Khrushchev and the wonderful way the common people of Russia received you, and the way you reacted to their reception. It was great, Mr. Vice President, and you were tremendous.

I compliment you also for your remarks yesterday after you landed at the airport. It was one of the finest down-to-earth talks I have listened to. It was one that every American citizen could understand and comprehend. When you spoke, advising America of the fine treatment you received from the citizens of Russia, it was very, very touching. Then you suggested that no matter how we have felt, we in America, in like form, should receive Mr. Khrushchev. So I congratulate you, and I say we are mighty glad that both you and your dear wife are back where you will probably get a little rest.

Mr. NEUBERGER subsequently said: Mr. President, I desire to join in the welcome to the distinguished Vice President upon his safe return to the United States from behind the Iron Curtain. I particularly wish to concur in what was said by the able senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] concerning the remarks of the Vice President last night at the airport.

I think the Vice President was well advised to remind us that Premier Khrushchev will be the guest of the United States next month as our Vice President was the guest of the Soviet Union. The Vice President cautioned us that we must treat our guest with courtesy, with decorum, and with fairness.

I have been disturbed about some of the hostile and inflammatory statements which have been made in Congress about the forthcoming visit of Mr. Khrushchev. I ask the authors of those statements, How would we in the United States have felt if similar speeches had been made in the Supreme Presidium of the Soviet Union just prior to the arrival of the Vice President of the United States in Moscow and other cities of Russia and of Siberia?

It seems to me that the Vice President gave the country some very sound and sage advice when he arrived at the airport last night. I trust it will be taken to heart by some Members of both Houses of Congress and by the general public, as well.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota subsequently said: Mr. President, I wish to join the other Senators who have expressed their appreciation of the splendid representation given by Vice President NIXON to the people of the United States and to our country generally in the course of his recent trip overseas. The other day, I made some comment on his trip.

On yesterday, when I was at the airport, I was again impressed by the great, human qualities of the President of the Senate, the Vice President of the United States, Mr. NIXON. I thought that on yesterday he demonstrated in several ways his great qualities which endeared him to the people he met in the course of that trip. His reference to the status of the Washington baseball club was one indication of those human qualities; and I noted with some satisfaction that last night the Washington baseball club promptly ended its slump, and really went to town, with a nine-to-nothing victory.

But above all that, Mr. President, I wish to state that the Vice President's statement that the people of Poland and the people of Russia have a heartbeat in common with the people of the United States, in their desire for peace, was the outstanding statement in his remarks and demonstrated the outstanding lesson to be learned from his recent trip overseas.

In that connection, Mr. President, I am reminded of the fact that the turning point in World War I was considered by many to be the time when President Wilson demonstrated the difference be-

tween the people of Germany and the government which at that time attempted to speak for the people of Germany. I thought that was a very great landmark in the course of World War I.

Likewise, Mr. President, I believe this people-to-people approach is a landmark in the cold war.

CONGRESSIONAL SPENDING

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, it is a well-established principle of propaganda that if a falsehood is repeated often enough and loud enough it will be believed.

On the basis of this principle, there have been many times in our history when the people have been sold whoppers. And the biggest of them all is the fantastic picture of the executive branch standing like Horatius at the bridge to stem the onrush of the congressional spenders.

I want to address myself briefly to this picture today. I do not intend to dispute the concept of the President as a kindly, frugal man who wishes to pinch the taxpayers' pennies. But I do intend to raise some stubborn facts which cannot be disputed.

To repeat, the President is a kindly, simple man who is frugal with the taxpayers' dollar. It is unfortunate that he has had to preside over the largest peacetime budgets of any President in the history of the United States.

It is fortunate that his frugality is matched by the prudence of a Congress which during the past 5 fiscal years has been able to reduce his budget estimates by $10,600 million.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a table describing these reductions in detail.

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

Total budget cuts by Congress in last 5 fiscal years

Congress, session, fiscal year	Budget estimates	Appropriations	Decreased by Congress
83d, 2d, 1955	$60,770,315,686	$58,160,445,563	$2,609,870,123
84th, 1st, 1956	66,023,089,195	63,947,281,321	2,075,807,874
84th, 2d, 1957	73,298,859,629	73,041,364,417	257,495,212
85th, 1st, 1958	78,108,417,112	73,064,958,328	5,043,458,784
85th, 2d, 1959	81,737,060,999	81,119,818,276	617,242,723
Total budget cuts by Congress in last 5 fiscal years			10,603,874,716

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, of course, there are those who seek to deride the efforts of Congress and the President to be frugal by sly references to back-door financing. They insist that Congress is slipping spending in through the back door and that the President is helpless to stop it.

Mr. President, I have not had too much experience with back doors. I leave such preoccupations to my friends across the aisle who apparently have more experience with such matters, since they talk about it more.

But the question arose so persistently that I went to the man who I thought had the most experience in Government financing. I am referring to the President's Budget Director.

In my own simple understanding of the governmental process it was difficult for me to see how there could be back-door financing which had not been requested or approved by the President when his vetoes had not been overridden.

We have not overridden any vetoes. The President, according to the best-informed columnists, keeps his veto pistol well oiled, halfcocked, and ready to fire at the drop of a bill on his desk.

The Budget Director confirmed my suspicions. He said there had been no back-door financing which had not been requested or approved by the President. He also supplied me with some figures that were very interesting.

For example, so far in this session, the President has requested a total of $6,400 million in back-door financing. The Congress has cut this $6,400 million to $6,076 million. And since the housing bill was vetoed, the actual amount approved is $4,776 million.

Let me restate the situation. The President, head of a party which abhors back-door financing, requested $6,400 million. The Congress cut this to $6,076 million.

The President then vetoed a bill, and the total now is $4,776 million. And I predict that when the Congress adjourns there will be satisfactory adjustments which will leave the total still well below the President's requests.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Budget Director's letter and the figures he furnished me be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D. C.

Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR JOHNSON: At the request of Mr. Max Lehrer of your staff there is attached a tabulation of new authority requested of and initiated by the Congress outside the appropriation process; the material covers bills on which such action was completed during the 85th Congress and the 1st session of the 86th Congress to date. Information on the 83d and 84th Congresses will be sent to you as soon as possible.

The tabulation is limited to instances where new obligational authority was requested or enacted in other than appropriation acts. Generally, this is accomplished by the Congress granting authority to borrow from the Treasury and authority to award contracts (so-called contract authority). The lists do not include authority granted to borrow from the Treasury, where such authority is given in appropriation acts.

It should be noted that these data differ from the tabulations sent to Senator DIRKSEN on February 13, 1959, which covered all appropriation acts, and substantive legislation necessitating future requests from the executive branch to the Congress, as well as new authority specifically provided in legislation.

Sincerely yours,

MAURICE H. STANS,
Director.

Amounts requested of and enacted by the Congress outside the appropriation process—New obligational authority

[In millions]

	Requested	Enacted	Congressional change	Presidential action
86th Cong., 1st sess. (to date):				
Requested by the executive branch:				
Public Law 86-48, amendment to Bretton Woods Agreement Act.	$4,550	$4,550	----------	Approved.
S. 57, Housing Act of 1959:				
College housing	200	300	+$100	Vetoed.
Urban renewal grants:				
1959-61	600	900	+300	
1962-65	850	0	−850	
FNMA cooperative housing	----------	385	+385	
College classrooms	----------	625	+625	
Total, Housing Act of 1959	1,650	1,300	−350	
Public Law 86-72, aid to airports:				
1960	65	63	−2	Approved.
1961	55	63	+8	
1962	45	----------	−45	
1963	35	----------	−35	
Total, aid to airports	200	126	−74	
86th Cong., 1st. sess—Continued				
Initiated by the Congress: Public Law 86-73, veterans housing loan act.	----------	$100	+$100	Approved.
Totals, 86th Cong., 1st sess.:				
1959-61 authorizations	$5,470	6,076	+606	
Future years authorizations	930	----------	−930	
85th Cong., 2d sess.:				
Requested by the executive branch:				
Public Law 85-364, Emergency Housing Act.	90	1,900	+1,810	Do.
Public Law 85-424, Export-Import Bank, 1958 borrowing authority.	2,000	2,000	----------	Do.
Public Law 85-748, farm tenant-mortgage insurance.	5	5	----------	Do.
S. 4035, Housing Act of 1958 (resubmitted as S. 57 above).	----------	----------	----------	
S. 4162, writeoff of losses under Defense Production Act, borrowing authority (resubmitted in 86th Cong. as appropriation request).	----------	----------	----------	

Amounts requested of and enacted by the Congress outside the appropriation process—New obligational authority—Continued

[In millions]

	Requested	Enacted	Congressional change	Presidential action
85th Cong., 2d sess—Continued				
Initiated by the Congress:				
Public Law 85-699, small business investments.		$28	+$28	Approved
Public Law 85-740, Navaho-Hopi rehabilitation.		20	+20	Do.
Public Law 85-381, Highway Act of 1958.		235	+235	Do.
Public Law 85-895, Capitol Power Plant.			+6	Do.
Public Law 85-672, Maritime Academy Act of 1958.		3	+3	Do.
S. 3502, aid to airports		437	+437	Vetoed.
Total, 85th Cong., 2d sess	$2,095	4,634	+2,539	
85th Cong., 1st sess.:				
Requested by the executive branch:				
Public Law 85-10, 1957 borrowing authority for Federal National Mortgage Association.	$450	$450		Approved.
Public Law 85-104, Housing Act of 1957.	875	1,990	+$1,115	Do.
Public Law 85-108, St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation.	35	35		Do.
Initiated by the Congress: Public Laws 85-93 and 95, Old and New Senate Office Buildings.		5	+5	Approved.
Total, 85th Cong., 1st sess	1,360	2,480	+1,120	

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, of course, it is still possible to deride the efforts of the kindly President and the prudent Congress to hold down spending. There are those who will still add authorizations to appropriations and then point with horror.

Mr. President, to add authorizations is like adding apples to oranges and coming out with baloney. We all know that there are billions in authorizations available. But not one red cent can be spent until Congress appropriates the money.

We can spend from debt receipts or we can spend from appropriations. But even the most wild-eyed, radical spender that can be imagined cannot find a way of spending from authorizations alone.

Mr. President, it is now clear that this Congress—like all its predecessors—will also save hundreds of millions of dollars from the President's budget requests. I submit a table to this effect, and ask that it be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

86th Cong., 1st sess., appropriation bills, fiscal year 1960—Comparison of budget estimates and bills as of Aug. 5, 1959

	Budget estimate	Amount in bill sent to White House	Increase (+) or decrease (−), conference bill compared to budget estimate
Bills sent to White House or at substantially final figure:			
Agriculture	$4,081,364,863	$3,971,362,673	−$110,002,190
Atomic Energy Commission	2,718,715,000	2,683,029,000	−35,686,000
Commerce	732,191,000	712,672,900	−19,518,100
Defense	39,248,200,000	39,228,239,000	−19,961,000
District of Columbia (Federal payment)	34,218,000	27,218,000	−7,000,000
General Government matters	13,608,500	13,463,500	−145,000
Independent offices	6,584,188,000	[1] 6,517,152,200	−67,035,800
Interior	491,101,400	481,809,100	−9,292,300
Labor-HEW	3,756,848,581	4,016,101,981	+259,253,400
Legislative	133,648,180	[2] 128,797,380	−4,850,800
State, Justice, and Judiciary	682,387,600	648,941,200	−33,446,400
Treasury-Post Office	4,688,327,000	4,643,363,000	−44,964,000
Subtotal	63,164,798,124	63,072,149,934	−92,648,190
		Amount in bill as passed Senate or House	
Bills pending in Senate and House:			
Public works	1,185,406,259	1,265,565,559	+80,159,300
Supplemental, 1960	1,218,090,555	1,076,186,108	−141,904,447
Military construction	1,563,200,000		
Mutual security	[3] 4,436,277,000	[4] 3,191,782,000	−1,244,495,000
Total	71,567,771,938	68,605,683,601	

[1] One amendment in conference.
[2] In conference on language item.
[3] Includes $500,000,000 for 1961.
[4] House bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, this achievement is the product of the collective judgment of Congress without regard to party affiliations.

For some reason, my friends across the aisle do not wish to claim credit for this achievement. They seem bent on convincing the public that they are Members of a body which is riding high to waste the taxpayers' money.

Mr. President, I intend to defend my friends across the aisle from the charges they are making against themselves. The facts and the figures should extricate them from their own predicament.

Madison Avenue may be determined to brand Congress as a spending body. But the facts—the stubborn, unshakeable facts—make it clear that this is not the case, and I have inserted in the RECORD, and I urge each Member of the Senate to read them carefully, tables to substantiate the statements I have made.

These facts make it clear that it is the executive agencies which spend money and the legislative body which exercises restraint. And I do not believe that all the ballyhoo in the world can obscure that point.

LABOR TRIALS END IN OREGON

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President——

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have an editorial I wish to insert in the RECORD, with a very brief comment on it.

A little over 2 years ago the Oregon delegation was very much disturbed and somewhat put on the defensive in Congress because of the alleged disclosures of hoodlumism, racketeering, corruption, and criminality within organized labor in the State of Oregon. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will show that on the floor of the Senate at that time I said that, whatever basis of fact there may be for such charges, the senior Senator from Oregon wanted them brought to the light of day, thoroughly considered and investigated, and let the chips fall where they may. I also said in that speech, Mr. President, that the final judgment on such charges must rest in the jury box and in the courtroom, in keeping with the judicial processes of the land. I made clear that I did not feel, and I still do not feel, that the issue of innocence or guilt in connection with any charges of crime can be settled properly, fairly, and judiciously in the committee rooms of Congress unless the Congress goes so far as to set up the same committee procedural safeguards as exist in the courtrooms of America when a person is charged with crime. If a Senate committee is going to turn itself into a crime investigation body then those brought before it and charged with crime are entitled to the protection of fair procedures. In that speech I listed the basic procedures that should be made available to any person brought before any Senate committee and charged with crime. The procedures I mentioned are the basic procedural guarantees of Anglo-Saxon jurisprudence. Here they are again: First, the right to be served with a bill of particulars setting forth in specific detail the criminal acts charged; sec-

ond, the right to have the necessary time to prepare one's defense; third, the right to be confronted by those making the accusations; fourth, the right to cross-examine the accusers; fifth, the right to present in orderly fashion without harassment and heckling one's defense; sixth, the right to make an orderly rebuttal; and, seventh, the right to appeal.

We should never forget that congressional committees are not criminal courts. They should not be allowed to function as kangaroo courts either.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial which appeared in a recent issue of the Portland, Oreg., Journal, entitled "Curtain Drops on 'Vicecapades.'" This editorial gives a review of what has happened in the courtrooms of Oregon in respect to some of the charges which were brought out before the McClellan committee.

The editorial points how in case after case, in keeping with the procedural safeguards of our criminal jurisprudence, jury after jury brought forth a verdict of not guilty. I hope that in this we will find a lesson for future action in Congress in respect to needed reform of Senate committee rules. I shall continue to stand back of the McClellan committee in carrying out its duty to investigate racketeering, dishonesty, and corruption within the field of the American labor movement. At the same time I shall continue in the Senate to urge changes in the rules of the Senate in connection with the rules of procedure of Senate investigations in any case where a charge of crime is levied against any American, I care not from what economic walk of life he comes. Fair rules of procedure for determining guilt or innocence should be available at all times before a Senate committee irrespective of whether the accused is a bank president or a teamster. When we bring before a Senate committee an American, whether he be a teamster or the president of a bank, and proceed with an allegation of criminal conduct, then I think immediately all the safeguards of criminal procedure available to him in the courtrooms of America should automatically come to his protection before a congressional committee that for the moment has turned itself into a guilt-finding tribunal.

Mr. President, that is in part the lesson to be found in this editorial which I now ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD.

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

CURTAIN DROPS ON "VICECAPADES"

The "vicecapades" are over. After more than 3 long years, the creaking spectacle has litigated its way to a final curtain.

It was a play without a climax. When the Oregon Supreme Court dismissed the last Crosby indictment this week, it simply cleared the cluttered stage. The house lights went up and a few weary spectators went home.

Admittedly, the play had its moments. It opened with a brassy fanfare that was impressive. A second act, set in the Nation's Capital, produced a few elements of drama. But the third act was tedious, anticlimactic and inconsistent with the plot laid down by the producers. The players set down as villains suddenly became heroes. The good guys created by the script writers refused to be good.

From time to time, those responsible for the flimsy sets, the gossamer trappings and the bad casting tried to doctor their brainchild. But no amount of play doctoring could save this ill-conceived tragicomedy. Once packed houses dwindled until they were virtually empty. The public walked out and left the denouement to the few lawyers, union leaders and newspapermen who still held a modicum of interest in the outcome.

What went wrong? Critics of the theater realize the importance of star-billing and timing in showmanship. The timing, in this instance, was as inopportune as the producers were opportunistic. Instead of letting the Oregon State police complete their complex investigations, they hurriedly splashed their billboards across their front pages. And on the marquees, in lights, they raised the name of their star.

Opening night was scarcely over when firstnighters began wondering about the identity of this unknown, elevated to stardom. Who was this Big Jim Elkins? The exploitation sheets called him a "nightlife bankroller," a patriotic citizen and a reformed gambler. But more discerning playgoers began to see him for what he was—thug, hoodlum, gunman, narcotic addict, liar and criminal psychopath. The pressagentry was good, but not good enough to make the public swallow the myth of a former racketeer emerging from a cocoon of self-righteousness to denounce his fellow bad actors.

And so the bubble burst. Juries began bringing in acquittals. Indictments went down the drain. The "vicecapades" were fatally ill and only the final drop of the curtain remained.

And now that the 1956–59 extravaganza is over, who is there to take the bows? Who will come to the footlights? We hear no shouts of "Author."

With 115 indictments out of 117 in the refuse barrel of legal history there is little likelihood that Attorney General Robert Y. Thornton will ever clip his press notices. Handed what could have been the stellar role, he played it like a repertory walk-on.

In all fairness to Thornton, it should be pointed out that few prosecutors have ever proceeded under more difficult circumstances. From the beginning, the Oregonian attempted to dictate the course of the investigation, badgering Thornton and his aids and seeking to influence grand jury deliberations. Added to this harassment were the activities of Arthur G. Kaplan and Ralph Wyckoff, former assistant attorneys general. These men wrested from Thornton the control of a runaway grand jury, issued indictments on a wholesale basis and finally issued a grand jury report condemning their own boss. Kaplan ended his ignominious reign over the investigation by taking his flair for dramatics elsewhere, leaving the prosecution of his hatful of indictments to others.

By any index, the vice investigation was a virtual failure. It cost the taxpayers an estimated $200,000 and left few tangible results. One can cite the removal of former District Attorney William M. Langley from office as an act in the interests of good government. But what of the guilty who went unindicted? What of the corruption in city and county government that was never explored? And, surely, most shameful of all, what of the persecution of the innocent?

Far greater than the monetary cost of the vice probe was the damage it did to the reputations of honest men and to the name of Portland. This proud, staid city was branded with the undeserved stigma of vast wickedness. Men of good repute were hounded, indicted, pilloried in print and subjected to mental torture as well as to great personal expense.

Happily, the mills of justice, like the mills of the gods, grind both slowly and exceedingly fine. Those wronged in most instances have won acquittal both at court and in the eyes of their fellow citizens. And there is still hope that some of the real wrongdoers will yet go to prison.

Throughout the long course of the vice probe and subsequent legal proceedings, the Journal clung to a consistent editorial policy of let the chips fall where they may and of a demand for a complete, thorough airing of the vice scandals. It takes no satisfaction in the collapse of the investigation and its rather ridiculous conclusion. It merely points out that a ship badly launched is a ship too often built to founder.

Repeatedly, this newspaper pointed out that when the probe was finished Vice Czar Elkins would probably prove the greatest rogue of all the defendants. As of today, this hoodlum and one of his henchmen are the only principals under prison sentence.

As this is written thanks to a vigilant mayor and his police administration, Portland is a cleaner city, almost free of vice and underworld influences. But there are ominous stirrings of a resurgence of such activity just outside the city limits. This newspaper fervently hopes that our elected city and county officials can "keep the lid on." We have no quarrel with proper grand jury investigations. But we believe Portland has seen enough of "vicecapades."

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, would the Senator have any objection to my asking permission to have printed in the RECORD, following the printing of the editorial to which the Senator refers, an article from the August issue of the Farm Journal, which deals with a fight between the Teamsters and the farmers which took place at Tillamook County, Oreg., written by Glenn Lorang, which relates the tactics which have been used against the Creamery Association by the Teamsters.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am sure the Senator from South Dakota knows that the senior Senator from Oregon would never object to his inserting in the RECORD whatever he wants to insert.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield to both Senators for those purposes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I want to say to the Senator from South Dakota that I have already publicly condemned any action upon the part of the Teamsters Union or any other union which seeks to carry on any action in any labor dispute that results in destroying perishable commodities. That has always been my position in labor disputes involving perishable farm products. As I said just last week in the Senate, I think such disputes should be settled by voluntary arbitration.

Mr. President, I have no objection to the request of the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I will yield to the Senator from South Dakota for the purpose of the Senator propounding his request, and I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion thereof I may be granted additional time, so that I may yield to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask for recognition in my own right.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I have no desire to avoid having the Senator recognized. I thought perhaps the Senator might want to ask me a question or two.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, in view of the comments of the distinguished Senator from Oregon, I thought the article published in such a nationwide publication as the Farm Journal, dealing with secondary boycotts and blackmail picketing, in regard to the Teamsters Union actions in the Oregon County of Tillamook, would be very much in order, and I ask unanimous consent that the article may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

The country has just had a chance to see what happens when a group of determined dairy farmers take on the Nation's largest labor union. The setting was this:

The 900 dairymen who make up the Tillamook County (Oreg.) Creamery Association have been getting 25 percent less for butterfat than they got 10 years ago.

The Teamsters Union members who deliver bottled milk got $1.40 an hour in 1949, $2.24 by 1957, and were demanding $2.58.

In addition to wage boosts since 1949, the Tillamook Teamsters had won $1,000 a year or so of fringe benefits from their farmer employers—10 cents an hour for pension, $11.35 a month for health and welfare, 3 weeks' vacation with pay (after 10 years' employment), etc., none of which farmers enjoy.

Tillamook farmers had settled with other union employees, but 17 milk handlers wanted more. The farmers couldn't see it, and the strike was on.

It lasted 69 days and was settled last week when both sides accepted a compromise of $2.45 an hour.

What had happened in the meantime is interesting:

Fifteen minutes after striking workers first failed to show up for work, farmers started driving to the plant, yelling and honking their horns. "Three times they almost ran over me," Carl Schaeffer, Teamster business agent, told Farm Journal. Farmers operated their grade A dairy plant and their cheese plant for 69 days without a letup and claim they never lost a drop of milk. Picket lines meant nothing to them.

Seeing they couldn't cripple the manufacturing, the Teamsters tried another tactic—one that hurt.

They went to owners of grocery stores up and down the Pacific coast, asking them not to sell Tillamook cheese. If the store manager wouldn't agree, the Teamsters put pickets on the sidewalk. By appealing to the customer, rather than threatening the store, the strikers could not be charged with a secondary boycott.

Many stores quietly complied, among them giant Safeway. The Carnation Co. stopped taking 42,000 pounds of grade A milk from Tillamook. Five Portland distributors, one in Seattle and one in Spokane stopped selling Tillamook products. Tillamook lost 10 percent of its cheese sales in May, 20 percent in June—up to $80,000 a month. While it had never sold cheese to the Government, that step now appeared imminent.

At this point the Oregon Farm Bureau jumped into the fracas with a counterboycott idea. It urged its members to buy no groceries from any store that had dropped Tillamook. Workers, said Gerald Detering, State farm bureau president, weren't the only ones who could boycott a store.

The fight ended with both sides claiming victory, but as usual both sides had been hurt.

"HORATIUS AT THE BRIDGE" EISENHOWER

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, at some later time I shall devote myself to the observations of the majority leader. I noticed he referred to the President as Horatius at the Bridge. I have not looked at that little old story of Etruscan days for many years, but it seems to me that standing with Horatius was one Herminius and one Spurius Lartius. So there have been standing with the President a Republican contingent in the Senate and in the House of Representatives, to help him hold the line. And may it be said for Horatius Eisenhower and Herminius and Spurius Lartius that they did not fall back from the line. There has been no Operation Fallback. There has been no Operation Retreat. We did not have to retreat from our position on the airport bill. We did not have to retreat from our position on the housing bill. We did not have to retreat from our position on the distressed areas development bill. And there are other bills on which we did not have to retreat from our position. And because we did not retreat, Mr. President, there has been no Operation Fallback. I am delighted that this came about in the interest of economy and frugality, and in the interest of the taxpayers of the country. But I will save my comments for another time.

HIGH GOVERNMENT SPENDING

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, it is always amusing to me, and somewhat educational, to hear the distinguished majority leader try to get the monkey of high spending off the backs of the Democrats. When he makes such attempts I suggest that he should have a little conference with some of his colleagues in the House of Representatives, particularly the chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations, Mr. CANNON, of Missouri. I think if there were more unanimity on the Democratic side as to how that monkey got on their backs the people of the United States might agree with some of the remarks of the distinguished majority leader.

On June 5 Mr. CANNON made some remarks in the House of Representatives, and if my colleagues have not read the speech I suggest they do. Mr. CANNON said, in parts:

We have continued to spend money we did not have until our credit is bad. No one wants Uncle Sam's paper. Since the public debt started on this last spree.

It used to be that foreign nations wanted our dollars. They were eager for hard currency. But now they are getting a little uneasy. They are beginning to say they will take the gold instead of the paper dollars or the bonds. So the gold at Fort Knox is dropping every day.

Who is responsible for this distressing development? No one but ourselves. I am talking right now to the gentlemen who have brought this situation about. Why are we behind Russia in war armament today? Why are we a second-rate power? Because Congress voted the bills that provided the second-rate armament. We cannot shirk the responsibility. We cannot say, "the administration" or "the Bureau of the Budget" or "the War Department" or "the Pentagon" or "they."

Congress has the last word. Congress can reject any advice or recommendation or proposal and control any expenditure. Congress can approve any policy and provide the money to implement it.

We cannot escape the responsibility for the situation as we find it today. Congress spent the money and increased the national debt and brought on the inflation. The responsibility is right here on this floor. We cannot offer an alibi. We cannot pass the buck. And the reason we can no longer sell bonds at 2 percent is because we have steadily and stubbornly and continuously refused to retrench expenditure and begin systematically and methodically to reduce the national debt and stop inflation. Congress did it and let no one try to make the people back home believe any different.

I read that to my colleagues merely to remind them and my good friend from Texas that there is a lack of unanimity on the part of the opposite side of the aisle. If the distinguished majority leader were to confer with Mr. CANNON, I think they could write a speech which would be more in keeping with the compromising attitude the Democratic Party takes toward all our problems.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. CANNON no doubt was referring to the fact that this administration was responsible for the highest peacetime deficit in our history.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the RECORD vote on each appropriation bill passed during this session of the Congress, in order to show that there was practical unanimity in the passage of each of those appropriation bills. The sum total amounts to hundreds of millions of dollars less in appropriations than the President urged us to appropriate.

That will be even more true when we take up the mutual security bill during the next few weeks. The Executive is asking us to appropriate an increase of more than 25 percent over last year in that fund.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I have no objection to the insertion which the distinguished majority leader requests.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas?

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

APPROPRIATION BILLS

Second supplemental for 1959: Appropriated $2,764,500,380 (conference figure). Final passage, 80 to 1.

AEC for 1960: Appropriated $2,683,029,000 (conference total). Final passage, 79–0.

Agriculture and farm credit for 1960: Appropriated $3,971,362,673 (conference figure). Final passage, 74 to 10.

Commerce Department for 1960: Appropriated $712,672,900 (conference figure). Final passage, 89 to 4.

Defense Department for 1960: Appropriated $39,228,239,000 (conference figure). Final passage, 90 to 0.

District of Columbia: Federal contribution $27,218,000 (conference figure). Final passage, 68 to 0.

General government matters for 1960: Appropriated $13,463,500 (conference figure). Final passage, 79 to 2.

Independent offices for 1960: Appropriated $6,559,348,600. Final passage, 89 to 1.

Interior Department and related agencies for 1960: Appropriated $472,717,100 (conference figure). Final passage, 82 to 0.

Labor-HEW-related agencies for 1960: Appropriated $3,950,938,981 (conference figure). Final passage, 84 to 10.

Legislative for 1960: Appropriated $128,797,380. Final passage, 80 to 1.

Public works for 1960: Appropriated $1,256,836,300. Final passage, 82 to 7.

State-Justice-Judiciary for 1960: Appropriated $643,934,700 (conference figure). Final passage, 90 to 0.

Treasury-Post Office-Tax Court for 1960: Appropriated $4,643,363,000 (conference figure). Final passage, 53 to 3.

Supplemental for 1960: Appropriated $1,076,186,108. Final passage, 79 to 0.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, on my own account, that the yea-and-nay votes on amendments offered to cut expenditures be inserted in the RECORD following the list which the majority leader asked to have inserted.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I am referring to specific appropriation bills. If the Senator desires to insert the yeas and nays on any specific amendments, I have no objection.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am referring to amendments offered by Members on both sides of the aisle to cut appropriations.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Also authorizations, such as the mutual security bill?

Mr. GOLDWATER. Anything.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Will the Senator be specific?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I was just as specific as was the Senator from Texas. I mean all amendments to cut any spending bill that came to the floor, whether it was an appropriation bill or anything else.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I merely wish to understand what the Senator is requesting. I referred specifically to appropriation bills which have passed this body.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I believe the distinguished occupant of the chair knows what the Senator from Arizona is referring to. The information will appear appropriately in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arizona?

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

RECORD VOTES IN SENATE ON REPUBLICAN AMENDMENTS TO SAVE MONEY ON SPENDING BILLS

Vote No. 6, February 4, 1959: Omnibus housing legislation (S. 57). Capehart amendment to substitute the administration bill for the committee bill. Estimated savings: $1.3 billion.

ANALYSIS OF VOTE

	Total	Republicans	Democrats
Yeas	32	25	7
Nays	58	7	51
Not voting	8	2	6

Vote No. 7, February 4, 1959: Omnibus housing legislation (S. 57). Capehart amendment to strike out provision for new public housing units. Estimated savings: $21 million.

ANALYSIS OF VOTE

	Total	Republicans	Democrats
Yeas	37	24	13
Nays	50	7	43
Not voting	11	3	8

Vote No. 8, February 5, 1959: Omnibus housing legislation (S. 57). Capehart amendment to reduce new public housing authorization. Estimated savings: $20 million.

ANALYSIS OF VOTE

	Total	Republicans	Democrats
Yeas	39	24	15
Nays	53	6	47
Not voting	6	4	2

Vote No. 9, February 5, 1959: Omnibus housing legislation (S. 57). Capehart amendment to reduce annual grant authorization for urban renewal. Estimated savings: $600 million.

ANALYSIS OF VOTE

	Total	Republicans	Democrats
Yeas	34	20	14
Nays	56	9	47
Not voting	8	5	3

Vote No. 13, February 6, 1959: Federal Airport Act amendments (S. 1). Schoeppel (and others) substitute amendment to continue for 4 years, beginning with fiscal year 1960, the annual authorization of $63 million provided on a matching fund basis by present law for airport construction. Estimated savings: Would run into the millions.

ANALYSIS OF VOTE

	Total	Republicans	Democrats
Yeas	35	28	7
Nays	53	2	51
Not voting	10	4	6

Vote No. 14, February 6, 1959: Federal Airport Act amendments (S. 1). Cotton (and others) "gate to gate" amendment, to exclude use of Federal funds for airport construction items not directly connected with flight, such as parking lots, and airport terminal buildings, except where space was required to house traffic control, weather, and communications activities; and to strike section 5 (which dealt with the same subject) from the bill. Estimated savings: More than $20 million.

ANALYSIS OF VOTE

	Total	Republicans	Democrats
Yeas	33	28	5
Nays	53	2	51
Not voting	12	4	8

Vote No. 15, February 6, 1959: Federal Airport Act amendments (S. 1). Morton (and others) amendments to reduce from $95 million to $65 million authorized grants for fiscal years 1960 through 1963, to reduce from $5 million to $4.5 million authorized grants for Alaska, and the Territories, and to reduce the discretionary fund from $65 million to $30 million. Estimated savings: More than $30 million.

ANALYSIS OF VOTE

	Total	Republicans	Democrats
Yeas	37	29	8
Nays	48	1	47
Not voting	13	4	9

Vote No. 25, March 23, 1959: Area Redevelopment Act (S. 722). Dirksen amendment to substitute the administration bill for the committee bill. Estimated savings: Upward of $200 million.

ANALYSIS OF VOTE

	Total	Republicans	Democrats
Yeas	43	29	14
Nays	52	5	47
Not voting	3	0	3

Vote No. 26, March 23, 1959: Area Redevelopment Act (S. 722). Scott amendment to substitute S. 268 for the committee bill. Estimated savings: About $100 million.

ANALYSIS OF VOTE

	Total	Republicans	Democrats
Yeas	24	21	3
Nays	70	12	58
Not voting	4	1	3

Vote No. 27, March 23, 1959: Area Redevelopment Act (S. 722). Javits amendment to prohibit loans for machinery and equipment, and Bush amendment to prohibit any loan to assist industries relocating from one area to another; both amendments considered en bloc. Estimated savings: Many millions.

ANALYSIS OF VOTE

	Total	Republicans	Democrats
Yeas	33	31	2
Nays	60	3	57
Not voting	5	0	5

Vote No. 73, June 3, 1959: Agriculture appropriations (H.R. 7175). Mr. Williams' of Delaware amendment reducing the total yearly authorization for soil bank payments from $450 million to $375 million. Estimated savings: $75 million.

ANALYSIS OF VOTE

	Total	Republicans	Democrats
Yeas	37	25	12
Nays	48	7	41
Not voting	13	2	11

Vote No. 78, June 15, 1959: Federal Airport Act amendment (S. 1). Dirksen amendment to Monroney substitute amendment to limit Federal share of cost of airport facilities to air traffic control, weather reporting, communications, or other safety activities. Estimated savings: Millions.

ANALYSIS OF VOTE

	Total	Republicans	Democrats
Yeas	27	26	1
Nays	54	2	52
Not voting	17	6	11

Vote No. 80, June 17, 1959: Department of Commerce appropriations (H.R. 7349). Williams modified amendment to committee amendment to reduce from 2,600 voyages in any 1 calendar year, to 2,265 voyages on which operating-differential subsidy may be paid. Estimated savings: At least $10 million.

ANALYSIS OF VOTE

	Total	Republicans	Democrats
Yeas	23	17	6
Nays	42	5	37
Not voting	33	12	21

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a table showing the estimated cost of selected bills, if they were enacted.

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

Estimated cost if selected bills were enacted by the Democratic-controlled Congress

20 BIG SPENDING BILLS INTRODUCED IN THE HOUSE

Bill	Sponsor	Title	Estimated cost
H.R. 22	Metcalf	Aid to education	$16,100,000,000 (for 5 years).
H.R. 77	Patman	Old-age pension	$63,000,000,000 (for 5 years).
H.R. 424	Roosevelt	Farm bill	$21,000,000,000 (for 5 years).
S. 1186	Byrd (West Virginia), Randolph	Social security	$27,000,000,000 (for 5 years).
H.R. 851	Morgan		
H.R. 6484	Zelenko	Reimbursement to States for road construction	$1,100,000,000 (for 5 years).
H.R. 2357	Rains	Housing	$2,800,000,000 (for 5 yerrs).
H.R. 2150	Burdick	Milk distribution	$2,250,000,000 (for 5 years).
H.R. 778	Mrs. Griffiths	Food stamp plan	$5,000,000,000 (for 5 years).
H.R. 252	Rooney	World War I pension	$9,000,000,000 (for 5 years).
H.R. 837	Machrowicz	Public works	$3,000,000,000 (for 5 years).
H.R. 1249	Gray	Area redevelopment	$600,000,000 (for 5 years).
H.R. 5048	Cohelan	Nursing education	$200,000,000 (for 5 years).
H.R. 5462	Roosevelt	Health insurance	$40,000,000,000 (for 5 years).
H.R. 4516	Miller (California)	Youth Conservation Corps	$1,100,000,000 (for 5 years).
H.R. 1011	Harris	Airport construction	$500,000,000 (for 5 years).
H.R. 3610	Blatnik	Sewage treatment plants	$250,000,000 (for 5 years).
H.R. 3299	George	Direct housing loans	$300,000,000 (for 5 years).
H.R. 4651	Roosevelt	College scholarship provisions	$600,000,000 (for 5 years).
H.R. 430	do	Civil rights	$200,000,000 (for 5 years).
H.R. 5631	Metcalf	Manganese production subsidy	$100,000,000 (for 5 years).
House total			$194,100,000,000. (for 5 years).

20 BIG SPENDING BILLS INTRODUCED IN THE SENATE

S. 1	Monroney	Airport grants	$565,000,000 (for 5 years).
S. 2	Murray	School Support Act	$15,000,000,000–$16,200,000,000 (for 5 years).
S. 722	Douglas	Area redevelopment	$400,000,000.
S. 57	Sparkman	Housing	$2,200,000,000.
S. 791	Kennedy	Unemployment reinsurance grants	$1,000,000,000 to $2,000,000,000 (for 5 years).
S. 881	Morse	Social security health insurance	$6,100,000,000 (for 5 years).
S. 1056	Murray	Health insurance	$40,000,000,000 (for 5 years).
S. 1186	Byrd (West Virginia), Randolph	Social security	$27,000,000,000 (for 5 years).
S. 1087	Humphrey	Student Aid Act	$966,000,000 (for 5 years).
S. 1138	Yarborough	Peacetime ex-servicemen's benefits	2,600,000,000.
S. 1776	Neuberger	Income tax rebate to States	$2,200,000,000 (per year).
S. 812	Humphrey	Youth Conservation Act	$1,200,000,000 (for 3 years).
S. 256	Magnuson	Services for older persons	$16,500,000 (for 4 years).
S. 8	McNamara, Hart	School construction	$2,000,000,000 (for 2 years).
S. 1779	Byrd (West Virginia), Randolph	Community redevelopment	$125,000,000 (for 5 years).
S. 2098	Humphrey, Symington	Food stamp plan	$2,500,000,000 (per year).
S. 1406	Hartke	World War I pensions	$9,000,000,000–$10,000,000,000 (for 5 years).
S. 1090	Humphrey	Juvenile delinquency	$75,000,000 (for 5 years).
S. 1322	Randolph, Byrd (West Virginia)	Food for distressed areas	$200,000,000 (for 2 years).
S. 2170	Neuberger	Medical, dental, and public health facilities	$300,000,000 (for 5 years).
Senate total			$132,200,000,000.
Grand total			$326,300,000,000.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following the two insertions just made in the RECORD, there be printed the list of requested projects, inserted in the RECORD by Mr. CANNON, appearing on pages 10015 to 10025, inclusive.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, does that list include the aircraft carrier which the President recommended, and which Mr. CANNON opposed?

Mr. GOLDWATER. If it was recommended in the House of Representatives, it must be included.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The President submitted a budget request for a carrier. Mr. CANNON opposed it as a waste of money. I point out to the Senator that a good many amendments to reduce various appropriations have been condemned by the administration itself.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am quite sure the carrier is in that list. If it is not, the Senator can have it inserted. The $16 billion school bill is here, too. About $200 billion in bills could be passed, further to upset the budget.

I believe the list includes everything which the Democrats enacted to raise hob with our currency and fiscal situation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. But the Senator does not deny, and cannot deny, that the President's appropriation requests have been reduced by many hundreds of millions of dollars. No authorization for any money has been passed by the Congress and put into effect which the President has not either requested or approved. There has been no backdoor financing by this Congress, except at the request of the President, or with his approval.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arizona?

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

REQUESTED PROJECTS

State and project	Benefit-cost ratio	Total cost	Budget			Requested			Agency capability	Requested by—
			G.I.	Advance planning	Construction	G.I.	Advance planning	Construction		
ALASKA										
Chena River at Fairbanks	1.7	$10,790,000		0			$300,000		$300,000	Hon. Ralph Rivers.
Dillingham Harbor	1.3	412,000			0			$406,000	406,000	Do.
Douglas Harbor	1.2	370,000		0			12,000		12,000	Do.
Harbor and Rivers of Alaska (Navigation)	Not applicable	400,000	$30,000			$79,000			79,000	Do.
Harbors and Rivers of Alaska (flood control)	do	850,000	25,000			51,000			51,000	Do.
Homer small boat basin	1.5	553,000			0			545,000	545,000	Do.
Juneau Harbor	1.05	1,970,000		0			36,000		36,000	Do.
Kodiak	Not applicable	25,000	0			20,000			20,000	Do.
Matanuska River	do	1,000	0			1,000			1,000	Do.
Naknek River	1.7	23,000			0			21,000	21,000	Do.
Ninilchik Harbor	1.3	202,000			0			197,000	197,000	Do.
Petersburg Harbor	Not applicable	18,000	0			18,000			18,000	Do.
Rampart Canyon	do	[1] 130,000	0			100,000			100,000	Do.
Seldovia Harbor	1.5	840,000			0			816,000	816,000	Do.
Seinard	Not applicable	25,000	0			15,000			15,000	Do.
Skagway	0.9	960,000			0			937,000	937,000	Do.
Wrangell Narrows	1.1	735,000			0			733,000	733,000	Do.
ALABAMA										
Holt lock and dam	1.1	33,000,000		0			150,000 (By transfer from Jackson lock and dam)		200,000	Hons. Armistead I. Selden, Jr., George W. Andrews, and Albert Rains; Senator John Sparkman; Hons. Frank Boykin, Carl Elliott, Kenneth A. Roberts, and George Huddleston, Jr.; Senator Lister Hill; Hons. George M. Grant, Robert E. Jones, and Frank W. Boykin.
Millers Ferry lock and dam	1.1	52,300,000		0			200,000		200,000	Hons. George W. Andrews, Albert Rains, and Frank W. Boykin, and entire Alabama delegation.
ARKANSAS										
Arkansas River bank stabilization [3]	1.1 [2]	[3] 102,800,000			[4] 84,000,000			9,500,000	[5] 9,500,000	Hon. W. F. Norrell and Senator Mike Monroney.
Beaver Dam	1.1	50,500,000			0			1,500,000	[5] 1,500,000	Hon. James W. Trimble.
Benton Dam survey		5,000	0			5,000			5,000	Hon. W. F. Norrell.
Clarksville seawall	1.6	273,000			0			259,000	259,000	Hon. James W. Trimble.
DeGray Dam	1.2	32,000,000		0			$150,000		150,000	Hon. Oren Harris.
Gillham Reservoir	1.4	10,100,000					150,000		80,000	Hons. Otto Passman, Carl Albert, and Oren Harris.
Ouachita River, 9-foot channel	1.3 (July 1957)	[6] 21,700,000		0			150,000		[7] 150,000	Hons. Oren Harris and Otto Passman.
Red River	1.3	9,880,000			700,000			1,000,000	700,000	Hons. Oren Harris, Overton Brooks, Harold B. McSween, and Carl Albert.
CALIFORNIA										
Bodega Bay (O. & M.)								481,000	481,000	Hon. Clement W. Miller.
Bolinas Channel		25,000				15,000			15,000	Do.
Black Butte Reservoir	1.4	18,300,000						5,500,000	5,500,000	Hons. John E. Moss and Harold T. Johnson.
(R) Central Valley project, water study of San Felipe division.			50,000			50,000			50,000	Hon. Charles S. Gubser.

See footnotes at end of table.

REQUESTED PROJECTS—Continued

State and project	Benefit-cost ratio	Total cost	Budget			Requested			Agency capability	Requested by—
			G.I.	Advance planning	Construction	G.I.	Advance planning	Construction		
CALIFORNIA—continued										
(R) Chowchilla irrigation loans					0			$2,633,000	$2,633,000	Hon. B. F. Sisk.
Dry Creek resurvey (Russian River)		$150,000				$50,000			50,000	Hon. Clement W. Miller.
(R) Georgetown Divide Public Utilities District	Not available				0			3,878,000	3,867,000	Hon. Harold T. Johnson.
Humboldt Harbor resurvey		25,000				25,000			25,000	Hon. Clement W. Miller.
(R) Jackson Valley irrigation	Not available				0			1,091,000	1,320,000	Hon. Harold T. Johnson.
Los Banos Creek Study		30,000				10,000			10,000	Hon. B. F. Sisk.
Merced Stream group study		80,000				20,000			20,000	Do.
Mill Creek levees	2.1	1,740,000						500,000	500,000	Hon. Harry R. Sheppard.
Mormon Slough survey		40,000				20,000			25,000	Hon. John J. McFall.
New Hogan Dam	1.7	19,300,000						1,500,000	1,500,000	Hons. John J. McFall, Harold T. Johnson and Senator Clair Engle.
New Melones Dam	1.2	80,600,000					$600,000		600,000	Hon. Harold T. Johnson.
Noyo breakwater	1.2	2,250,000					56,000		300,000	Hon. Clement W. Miller.
Red Bank and Fancher Creeks		25,000				10,000			10,000	Hon. B. F. Sisk.
Redwood City Harbor	1.6	1,380,000						1,378,000	1,378,000	Hon. J. Arthur Younger.
Sacramento River deep water channel	1.2	45,600,000			$7,500,000			11,500,000	11,500,000	Hons. Harold T. Johnson and John E. Moss.
Sacramento River, Chico Landing to Red Bluff	1.2	1,760,000					50,000		50,000	Hon. Harold T. Johnson.
Sacramento River and major and minor tributaries	1.2	23,000,000			1,100,000			2,000,000	1,200,000	Do.
San Francisco Bay study		3,760,000	$400,000			750,000			900,000	Hons. John F. Shelley, William S. Mailliard, and Charles S. Gubser.
San Francisco Bay to Stockton		150,000	25,000					46,000	46,000	Hon. John F. Baldwin.
San Lorenzo Creek	1.2	6,240,000			1,200,000		1,700,000		1,700,000	Hon. George P. Miller.
San Luis (Obispo) Harbor		60,000	15,000			30,000				Hon. Charles Teague.
Santa Clara River	3.0	2,930,000			1,300,000			1,500,000	1,500,000	Do.
Santa Cruz Harbor	1.6	1,740,000						500,000	500,000	Hon. Charles S. Gubser.
Santa Maria River	2.2	11,400,000			2,200,000			2,500,000	2,500,000	Hon. Charles Teague.
Sausalito Irrigation District (loan)	Not available				0			4,384,000	4,384,000	Hons. Harlan Hagen and B. F. Sisk.
Soquel Creek		52,000				3,000			10,000	Hon. Charles S. Gubser.
Stewart Can on debris basin	1.4	1,670,000		$62,000			Increase budget somewhat.		62,000	Hon. Charles Teague.
Success Dam	1.3	14,200,000			4,000,000			4,500,000	4,500,000	Hon. Harlan Hagen.
Sweetwater River		75,000				75,000			40,000	Hon. Bob Wilson.
(R) Trinity River Division	2.38	262,000,000			37,128,723			42,128,723	37,128,723	Hon. Wayne N. Aspinall.
(R) Trinity River power facilities	Not available	59,607,000			0			2,500,000	2,415,000	Hon. Clair Engle, Senator Thomas Kuchel, Hon. Harold T. Johnson.
(R) Trinity River power facilities (opposition)										Hon. James B. Utt, Hon. Charles S. Gubser.
Whitewater River		320,000	20,000			40,000			40,000	Hon. D. S. Saund.
Public Law 685, new projects								4,000,000		Hon. John F. Baldwin.
COLORADO										
Purgatoire Dam, Colo. (Trinidad)	1.2	19,200,000		75,000			75,000		75,000	Hon. J. Edgar Chenoweth.
(R) Smith Fork, Colo	1.2	4,420,000			0			740,000	730,000	Hon. Wayne N. Aspinall.
Do								750,000		Hon. Henry Dixon.
Do								750,000		Hon. David S. King.
(R) Curecanti Storage Unit	1.23	72,450,000						2,000,000	1,400,000	Hons. David S. King and Henry Dixon.
CONNECTICUT										
Baltic (project not yet authorized; to be considered in survey report on Thames River).									0	Hon. Chester Bowles.
East Branch dam at Torrington	1 3	2,010,000		0			150,000		250,000	Senator Thomas J. Dodd.

See footnotes at end of table.

REQUESTED PROJECTS—Continued

State and project	Benefit-cost ratio	Total cost	Budget			Requested			Agency capability	Requested by—
			G.I.	Advance planning	Construction	G.I.	Advance planning	Construction		
CONNECTICUT—continued										
Hall Meadow Brook Reservoir	2.4	$2,210,000		$75,000			$150,000		$250,000	Senator Thomas J. Dodd, Hon. Chester Bowles, and Hon. John S. Monagan.
Mad River Reservoir	1.2	5,970,000		75,000			252,000		275,000	Do.
West Thompson Reservoir (project not yet authorized; recommended in survey report).								$409,000	(2)	Hon. Chester Bowles.
Surveys:										
Connecticut River navigation study, vicinity of Essex		7,500	0			$7,500			7,500	Do.
Poquonnock River navigation study		10,000	0			10,000			10,000	Do.
Thames River navigation study		9,500	0			9,500			9,500	Do.
FLORIDA										
Apalachicola Bay, East Point Channel (reimbursement)	Not applicable	39,100			0			39,100	39,100	Hon. Robert L. F. Sikes.
Apalachicola Bay, St. George Island (reimbursement)	do	43,000			0			41,900	43,000	Do.
Cedar Keys harbor and channel survey		15,200	0			15,000			0	Hon. Billy Matthews.
Cross-Florida Barge Canal	1.1	165,100,000		0			160,000		160,000	Hons. Charles E. Bennett, Billy Matthews, and A. S. Herlong, Jr.
Intracoastal Waterway, Caloosahatchee River to Anclote River.	1.3	6,860,000			0			1,400,000	1,400,000	Hons. Paul G. Rogers, William C. Cramer, Carl Elliott, and James A. Haley.
Intracoastal Waterway, Jacksonville to Miami	Not evaluated	19,200,000			$1,130,000			1,230,000 ($100,000 for planning below Fort Pierce.)	1,530,000	Hons. Charles E. Bennett, William C. Cramer, Dante B. Fascell, A. S. Herlong, Jr., Billy Matthews, Paul G. Rogers, Robert L. F. Sikes, and James A. Haley.
Central and southern Florida flood control	3.8	237,500,000			9,000,000			20,371,800	13,000,000	Do.
Ybor Channel and Port Sutton study						27,000			27,000	Hon. William C. Cramer.
Port Everglades	2.2	6,740,000			0			1,250,000	1,250,000	Hon. Paul G. Rogers.
Suwannee River project survey		100,000	0			57,000			40,000	Hon. Billy Matthews.
Port Tampa Channel and turning basin								2,014,000	2,014,000	Hon. William C. Cramer.
Intracoastal Waterway, St. Marks River to Tampa Bay		100.000	0			60,000			60,000	Hon. Robert L. F. Sikes.
GEORGIA										
Altmaha River investigation		76,000	$26,000			100,000			26,000	Hon. Iris Blitch.
Brunswick Harbor	1.5	2,030,000			1,150,000			1,350,000	1,350,000	Do.
Savannah turning basin		4,000	0			4,000			4,000	Hon. Prince H. Preston.
HAWAII										
Kahului Harbor	2.9	963,000						945,000	[10] 945,000	Hon. John A. Burns.
IDAHO										
Bruces Eddy (opposition to)										Hon. William H. Meyer, of Vermont.
(R) Palisades project, preserve appropriation for reregulating reservoir (carryover).					(500,000)			(500,000)		Hon. Hamer H. Budge.
ILLINOIS										
Big Muddy River		260,500	30,000			124,000			124,000	Hon. Kenneth J. Gray.
Calumet Union Drainage District	1.8	716,000			0			716,000	250,000	Hon. Edward J. Derwinski.
Degognia-Fountain Bluff Drainage and Levee District		39,000	0			39,000			39,000	Hon. Kenneth J. Gray.
Drury Drainage and Levee District	3.7	1,520,000			0			540,000	540,000	Hon. Robert B. Chiperfield.
England Pond levee	0.5	660,000		0			10,000		10,000	Hons. Edna Simpson and George E. Shipley.
Fort Chartres-Ivy Landing Drainage and Levee District		30,000	0			30,000			30,000	Hon. Kenneth J. Gray.
Grand Tower Drainage and Levee District		28,000	0			38,000			28,000	Do.

See footnotes at end of table.

REQUESTED PROJECTS—Continued

State and project	Benefit-cost ratio	Total cost	Budget			Requested			Agency capability	Requested by—
			G.I.	Advance planning	Construction	G.I.	Advance planning	Construction		
ILLINOIS—continued										
Henderson River diversion	2.8	$1,750,000			0			$550,000	$550,000	Hon. Robert B. Chiperfield.
Hunt and Lima Lake Drainage Districts	1.8	5,420,000			0			1,000,000	1,000,000	Hon. Edna Simpson.
Indian Grave Drainage District	1.5	5,420,000		0			$100,000		100,000	Do.
Little Calumet River Basin study		48,000	0			$98,000			20,000	Hon. Edward J. Derwinski.
Miller City		63,100	0			35,000			35,000	Hon. Kenneth J. Gray.
Prairie du Rocher Drainage and Levee District		40,000	0			40,000			40,000	Do.
Shelbyville Reservoir	1.6	17,600,000		$50,000			125,000		125,000	Hon. Peter F. Mack.
Stringtown Drainage District		20,000	0			20,000			20,000	Hon. Kenneth J. Gray.
Subdistrict No. 1 of Drainage Union No. 1 and Bay Island Drainage and Levee District No. 1.	2.5	4,180,000		0			100,000		100,000	Hon. Edna Simpson.
Wabash River at and above White River		292,000		25,000			40,000		40,000	Hon. George E. Shipley.
INDIANA										
Brookville Reservoir	1.3	19,300,000		0			25,000		25,000	Hon. Earl Hogan.
Cannelton Lock	4.2	65,900,000		0			150,000		150,000	Hon. Winfield K. Denton.
Clinton levee	Pending restudy	93,000		0			5,000		5,000 (restudy)	Hon. Fred Wampler.
Crooked Creek		35,000	0			25,000			25,000	Hon. Earl Hogan.
Monroe Reservoir	2.3	4,960,000		75,000			100,000		100,000	Do.
Patoka River study		76,200	0						Combined with Wabash River study.	Hon. William G. Bray.
Sugar Creek levee	1.5	370,000		0			15,000		15,000	Hon. Fred Wampler.
Terre Haute L.P.P. (Conover levee)	Pending restudy	240,000		0			2,000		2,000 (restudy)	Do.
Uniontown lock	3.2	52,500,000		0			250,000		250,000	Hon. Winfield K. Denton.
Wabash River Basin above White River		292,000	$25,000			40,000			40,000	Hon. Fred Wampler.
West Terre Haute L.P.P.	1.2	473,000		0			30,000		30,000	Do.
Whitewater Basin study		70,000	0				25,000		25,000	Hon. Earl Hogan.
Huntington Reservoir	1.3	14,200,000		25,000			25,000		25,000	Hons. William T. Murphy (Ill.), Roman C. Pucinski (Ill.), Melvin Price (Ill.), Peter F. Mack (Ill.), and William L. Springer (Ill.).
Mississinewa Reservoir	1.2	22,000,000		150,000			150,000		150,000	Hons. William T. Murphy (Ill.), Roman C. Pucinski (Ill.), Melvin Price (Ill.), Peter F. Mack (Ill.), and William L. Springer (Ill.).
Salamonie Reservoir	1.6	15,500,000		150,000			150,000		150,000	Hons. William T. Murphy (Ill.), Roman C. Pucinski (Ill.), Melvin Price (Ill.), Peter F. Mack (Ill.), and William L. Springer (Ill.).
IOWA										
Floyd River	1.7	9,100,000		100,000					150,000	Hon. Charles B. Hoeven.
Green Bay Levee and Drainage District No. 2	1.7	1,570,000		0			75,000		75,000	Hons. Edna Simpson and Fred Schwengel.
Iowa River-Flint Creek Levee District No. 16	1.4	7,920,000		100,000			100,000		750,000	Hon. Edna Simpson.
Mississippi River at Clinton:										
Repair of damages	Not available	155,000			0			147,000	154,000	Hon. Leonard G. Wolf.
Improvement of Beaver Slough	4.0	267,000			0			241,000	262,000	Do.
(E) Missouri River power and transmission lines for Iowa.	Not available	8,888,000			0			1,000,000	800,000	Hons. Steven V. Carter, Merwin Coad, Neal Smith, Charles B. Hoeven, H. R. Gross, Fred Schwengel, and Leonard G. Wolf.
Rathbun Dam	1.1	21,000,000					130,000		130,000	Hon. Steven V. Carter.
Red Rock Reservoir	1.5	71,400,000		113,000				2,000,000	2,000,000	Hons. Fred Schwengel, Neal Smith, Steven V. Carter, and Merwin Coad.
Saylorville Reservoir	1.2	47,000,000		0			200,000		200,000	Hons. Fred Schwengel, Steven V. Carter, and Merwin Coad.

See footnotes at end of table.

REQUESTED PROJECTS—Continued

State and project	Benefit-cost ratio	Total cost	Budget			Requested			Agency capability	Requested by—
			G.I.	Advance planning	Construction	G.I.	Advance planning	Construction		
KANSAS										
(R) Cedar Bluff	2.02	$18,313,600			0			$700,000	$700,000	Hons. Wint Smith and J. Floyd Breeding.
Cedar Point Reservoir	1.8	6,450,000					$25,000		25,000	Hon. Newell A. George.
Council Grove Reservoir	1.8	12,700,000						300,000	300,000	Do:
Cow Creek, tributary of Arkansas River		35,000				$35,000			25,000	Hon. J. Floyd Breeding.
Elk City Dam	1.3	25,000,000						500,000	400,000	Hon. Denver D. Hargis.
Fort Scott Dam	1.1	16,800,000					25,000		25,000	Hon. Newell A. George.
(R) Glen Elder	1.32	57,222,000		$73,000			225,000		73,000	Hons. Wint Smith and J. Floyd Breeding.
Hays		28,000				25,000			25,000	Hon. Wint Smith.
Hillsdale Dam	1.1	9,400,000					25,000		25,000	Hon. Newell A. George.
Marion Reservoir	1.8	7,540,000					25,000		25,000	Do.
Melvern Dam	1.1	21,000,000					25,000		25,000	Do.
Milford Reservoir	1.5	45,700,000		170,000				1,200,000	1,200,000	Hons. Newell A. George, Edward H. Rees, and Richard Bolling.
Neosho-Cottonwood (Mud Creek at Marion) (not authorized).		40,000				27,000			[11] 27,000	Hon. Denver D. Hargis.
(R) Norton-Almena	1.03	15,420,000			0			1,000,000	1,000,000	Hons. Wint Smith and J. Floyd Breeding.
								1,120,000		Hon. Wayne N. Aspinall.
Perry	1.6	18,500,000		125,000					225,000	Hons. Newell A. George and Richard Bolling.
Tuttle Creek Reservoir—land purchase amendment	1.7	85,900,000						23,600	Language required	Hon. William H. Avery.
Wilson Dam	1.2	18,100,000		161,000				1,000,000	1,000,000	Hons. Newell A. George, Wint Smith, and Richard Bolling.
KENTUCKY										
Barren River Reservoir	2.3	23,500,000			0			500,000	1,000,000	Hon. William H. Natcher.
Big Sandy River		217,600	$10,000			35,000		1,000,000	10,000	Hon. Carl D. Perkins, OVIA, and Hon. W. Pat. Jennings.
Bunches Creek (study not authorized)						35,000			0	Hons. Eugene Siler and William H. Natcher.
Cannelton lock and dam	4.2	65,900,000		0			150,000		150,000	Hons. William H. Natcher and Frank W. Burke.
Fishtrap Reservoir	1.6	39,400,000		200,000			300,000		300,000	Hon. William H. Natcher, OVIA, Hons. Carl D. Perkins and W. Pat Jennings.
Green River No. 2 Reservoir	2.0	8,470,000		0			50,000		50,000	Hon. William H. Natcher.
Haysi Reservoir	Restudy underway	18,400,000		0			250,000		0	Hons. Carl D. Perkins and W. Pat Jennings.
Kinniconick River		33,000	0			10,000			10,000	Hon. William H. Natcher.
Licking River Basin		85,000	0			20,000			20,000	Hon. William H. Natcher, OVIA, and Hons. Carl D. Perkins and W. Pat Jennings.
Locks and dams Nos. 3 and 4 (Green River)	O. & M.							100,000 (O. & M.)	100,000	Hon. William H. Natcher.
Lock and dam No. 3 (Big Sandy)	O. & M.							100,000 (O. & M.)	100,000	Do.
Middlesboro flood control project extension	Restudy underway	1,080,000			0			1,200,000	[12] 0	Hon. Eugene Siler.
No. 2 Green River Reservoir	2.0	8,470,000		0			50,000		50,000	OVIA, Hons. Carl D. Perkins, W. Pat Jennings, and William H. Natcher.
Nolin River Reservoir	1.3	14,400,000			$1,800,000			3,400,000	3,400,000	Do.
Ohio River Basin review		1,710,000	400,000			800,000			800,000	Do.
Panther Creek, Daviess County		47,500	20,000			32,500			32,500	Do.
Pound Reservoir (see also Virginia)	1.2	17,700,000		194,000				2,500,000	2,500,000	Do.
Rockcastle River		50,000	0			40,000			25,000	Do.
Sturgis local protection	1.1	708,000		0			10,000		10,000	Do.

See footnotes at end of table.

REQUESTED PROJECTS—Continued

State and project	Benefit-cost ratio	Total cost	Budget			Requested			Agency capability	Requested by—
			G.I.	Advance planning	Construction	G.I.	Advance planning	Construction		
LOUISIANA										
Intracoastal Waterway from Barataria, La., to gulf	3.5	$2,400,000			0				$1,000,000	Hon. Hale Boggs.
Jefferson Drainage District [13] (Reimbursement)		1,420,000						$1,420,000 (O&M)	1,420,000 (O&M)	Do.
McGee Bend Dam, Tex	1.6	55,400,000			$5,800,000			5,800,000 plus	7,000,000	Hon. Overton Brooks.
Parish Line Canal		15,000	0			$15,000			15,000	Hon. Hale Boggs.
Port Allen Indian Village cutoff (Plaquemine-Morgan City route).	1.7	27,300,000			5,951,000				7,925,000	Hon. James H. Morrison.
Red River levees and bank-stabilization below Denison Dam.	1.3	9,880,000			700,000			1,000,000	700,000	Hons. Overton Brooks and Harold B. McSween.
MAINE										
Monhegan Harbor		11,000	0			2,500			2,500	Hon. Frank Coffin.
MASSACHUSETTS										
Boston Harbor, reserved channel	2.3	829,000			0			720,000 to 800,000	825,000	Hons. John McCormack and J. A. Burke.
East boat basin	1.2	465,000			0			460,000	460,000	Hons. Thomas P. O'Neill and Hastings Keith.
East Brimfield Dam	1.4	6,570,000			1,102,000			1,712,000	1,102,000	Hon. John McCormack.
Hodges Village Dam	2.0	4,810,000			0			50,000	[14] 50,000	Do.
Provincetown breakwater	1.1	2,260,000			0				600,000	Hon. Hastings Keith.
Town River channel dredging, Quincy	5.0	690,000			0				([14])	Hon. James A. Burke.
Town River survey		16,500	0			10,000			9,000	Hon. John McCormack.
Westville Dam	1.1	7,450,000			0			1,800,000	1,800,000	Hons. John McCormack, Philip J. Philbin, and Chester Bowles.
MARYLAND										
Baltimore Harbor, deepen and widen channel	3.1	30,000,000			0			7,000,000	5,000,000	Hons. George H. Fallon and Edward Garmatz.
Chesapeake & Delaware Canal (pt. II)	1.3	94,150,000		$180,000				2,000,000	500,000	Hon. George H. Fallon.
MICHIGAN										
Cedar River Harbor study						10,000			(Not authorized).	Michigan Waterways Commission.
Cross Village-Good Hart	([15])								(Not authorized).	Do.
Frankfort Harbor (O. and M.)					20,000(O&M)			350,000	254,000	
Grand Marais Harbor	([15])	965,000			0			965,000	360,000	Hon. Victor A. Knox and Michigan Waterways Commission ($320,000).
Great Lakes connecting channels	1.8	146,500,000			27,000,000			32,000,000	29,000,000	Michigan Waterways Commission.
Hammond Bay Harbor of Refuge	([15])	1,100,000						400,000	20,000(PL)	Do.
Holland Harbor: Lake Michigan-Lake Macatawa channel		13,500	0			13,500			13,500	Hon. Gerald Ford.
Les Cheneaux Channel		13,000	0			13,000			13,000	Hon. Victor A. Knox.
Little Lake Harbor of Refuge	([15])	815,000						400,000	500,000	Michigan Waterways Commission.
Ludington Harbor (O. and M.)					30,000(O&M)			280,000	308,000	
Manistee Harbor (O. and M.)					25,000(O&M)			700,000	325,000	
New Poe lock	1.6	40,100,000		367,000				750,000	750,000	Do.
Port Sanilac Harbor (O. and M.)								60,000	6,000	
Red Run-Clinton River		60,000				10,000			10,000	Hon. James G. O'Hara.
Traverse City Harbor of Refuge		36,000				14,500			10,000	Michigan Waterways Commission.

See footnotes at end of table.

REQUESTED PROJECTS—Continued

State and project	Benefit-cost ratio	Total cost	Budget			Requested			Agency capability	Requested by—
			G.I.	Advance planning	Construction	G.I.	Advance planning	Construction		
MISSISSIPPI										
Pascagoula Harbor	1.8	$1,248,000			0			$1,189,000	$422,000	Hon. Wm. M. Colmer.
FLOOD CONTROL—MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES										
Mississippi River levees	6.8 [16]	221,000,000			[17] $2,500,000			3,740,000	4,096,000	Hon. Paul C. Jones, Mississippi; Valley Flood Control Association and State delegations.
Bank stabilization	6.8 [16]	468,000,000			22,500,000			25,000,000	29,850,000	
Vicksburg Harbor	3.0	4,520,000			1,500,000			2,000,000	1,600,000	
Greenville Harbor	4.1	2,490,000		0				100,000	60,000	Hon. Frank Smith.
St. Francis Basin	2.4	84,400,000			3,500,000			4,000,000	4,070,000	Hon. E. C. Gathings.
Tensas River Basin	3.5	[18] 21,700,000			[18] 920,000			1,000,000	[18] 1,000,000	
Yazoo Basin:										
Lower auxiliary channel	2.7 [19]	12,100,000			1,075,000			1,275,000	1,225,000	
Tributaries	2.7 [19]	27,600,000			125,000			225,000	225,000	
Yazoo backwater	2.2	30,900,000			0			500,000	500,000	Hon. Frank Smith.
Atchafalaya Basin	6.8 [16]	119,000,000			5,290,000			6,900,000	6,910,000	
Lake Pontchartrain	1.8	6,190,000			500,000			700,000	700,000	
West Tennessee tributaries	2.9	8,400,000			0			300,000	200,000	
Wolf River	1.2	2,025,000			0			300,000	300,000	
General investigation			$110,000					117,500	125,000	
Advance engineering and design, lower White River [20]	3.5	10,810,000			0			110,000 (110,000)	107,000	Hon. E. C. Gathings.
Maintenance					17,000,000			18,500,000	18,300,000	
Baton Rouge improvement program	2.1	2,800,000			0				[21] 0	Hon. James H. Morrison.
MISSOURI										
Chariton River		25,000	0			$50,000			25,000	Hon. Morgan M. Moulder.
Des Moines and Mississippi Levee District No. 1	2.7	1,050,000			0			500,000	500,000	Hon. Edna Simpson.
Kasinger Bluff Reservoir	[22] 1.1	102,000,000		$150,000				300,000	250,000	Hon. Morgan M. Moulder.
Marion County Drainage District	1.04	960,000		0			$73,000		73,000	Hon. Edna Simpson.
Meramec River Reservoirs (Cedar Hill, Meramec Park, and Union) (deferred for restudy)	1.4	62,700,000		0			150,000		150,000	Hons. A. S. J. Carnahan and Thomas B. Curtis.
Pomme de Terre Reservoir	1.6	16,700,000			4,000,000			5,000,000	4,200,000	Hon. Morgan M. Moulder.
Archeological investigations			172,800			249,500			249,500	Hon. Morgan M. Moulder ($10,000 for Missouri).
MONTANA										
(R) East Bench unit	2.07	20,597,000			0			1,000,000 650,000	1,000,000	Hon. Lee Metcalf. Hon. Wayne Aspinall.
Libby Dam	2.0	308,000,000		0			500,000		387,000	Hon. Lee Metcalf.
(R) Yellowtail Dam	1.71	109,300,000			0			6,000,000 5,000,000	6,000,000	Hon. LeRoy Anderson. Hon. Lee Metcalf. Hon. James E. Murray. Hon. Wayne Aspinall.
NEBRASKA										
Gering and Mitchell Valleys	1.8	1,463,000		50,000				350,000	350,000	Hons. Phil Weaver and Donald McGinley.
(R) Red Willow Dam	[23] 1.87	6,597,000		150,000	0			525,000	675,000	Hon. Phil Weaver.
Salt-Wahoo (Salt Creek and tributaries)	1.4	16,890,000		90,000				400,000	400,000	Hons. Phil Weaver and Lawrence Brock.
NEW JERSEY										
New Jersey Meadowlands		500,000	0			25,000			25,000	Hons. Frank Osmers, Dominick V. Daniels, and Cornelius E. Gallagher.
Newark Bay-Passaic River Channel		50,000	0			30,000			15,000	Hons. Cornelius E. Gallagher, Hugh J. Addonizio, Peter W. Rodino, Jr., Albert H. Bosch, Frank Osmers, and Seymour Halpern.
Sandy Hook Inlet (Shrewsbury River, N.J.)		50,000	0			50,000			25,000	Hon. James C. Auchincloss.

See footnotes at end of table.

REQUESTED PROJECTS—Continued

State and project	Benefit-cost ratio	Total cost	Budget			Requested			Agency capability	Requested by—
			G.I.	Advance planning	Construction	G.I.	Advance planning	Construction		
NEW MEXICO										
Abiquiu Dam (wants uncontrolled outlet)	1.2	$18,000,000			$3,300,000		$1,800,000			Hons. Thomas G. Morris and J. T. Rutherford.
(R) Hammond	2.1	3,280,000			0			$500,000	$500,000	Hons. Henry Dixon, David S. King, Joseph M. Montoya, and Thomas G. Morris.
Rio Grande floodway between Cochiti and Rio Puerco	1.2	4,400,000						2,000,000	2,000,000	Hon. Wayne N. Aspinall ($400,000), Hon. Joseph M. Montoya.
								2,000,000		Hon. Thomas G. Morris.
Two Rivers	1.2	6,900,000						250,000	75,000	Hons. Joseph M. Montoya and Thomas G. Morris.
Middle Rio Grande	2.9	31,500,000			1,400,000			3,000,000	1,400,000	Hon. Joseph M. Montoya.
NEW YORK										
Buffalo Harbor (Ohio Street Bridge)								1,000,000	2,000,000	
Buttermilk Channel survey		19,000	0			$10,000			10,000	Hons. Albert H. Bosch and Seymour Halpern.
Buttermilk Channel	Safety	2,910,000			0			1,550,000	1,551,000	Hon. Seymour Halpern.
Great Lakes-Hudson River Waterway:										
Lowering lock sills	3.2	38,950,000			730,000			403,000	730,000	Hons. K. B. Keating, C. A. Buckley, Jacob K. Javits, and Albert H. Bosch.
Replacement of Waterford guard gates	5.5							1,000,000		
Great Lakes-Hudson River Waterway Survey		25,000	0			10,000			10,000	Hon. Albert H. Bosch.
Hudson River, 32-foot channel to Albany	1.9	36,300,000			0			1,550,000	640,000	Hon. Leo W. O'Brien.
Hudson River siltation		550,000	0			114,000			114,000	Hons. K. B. Keating, C. A. Buckley, Jacob K. Javits, Seymour Halpern, and Frank Osmers.
Little Neck Bay		13,000	0			13,000			13,000	Hons. Albert H. Bosch and Seymour Halpern.
New Jersey pierhead channel and anchorage	1.4	5,740,000			0			500,000	1,311,000	Hon. Seymour Halpern.
New York Harbor deep-water anchorage		31,000	0			20,000			10,000	Hons. Albert H. Bosch and Seymour Halpern.
Tonawanda Creek		32,000				25,000			25,000	Hon. Harold C. Ostertag.
NORTH CAROLINA										
Morehead City Harbor	1.9	1,382,000						1,197,000	1,370,000	Hon. Graham A. Barden.
Pantego and Cucklers Creek	1.5	536,000		$40,000				413,000	51,000	Hon. Herbert C. Bonner.
Wilkesboro Reservoir	1.2	8,350,000						1,000,000	1,000,000	Hons. A. Paul Kitchin, Sam J. Ervin, Jr., and B. Everett Jordan.
OHIO										
Belleville L. & D., Ohio and West Virginia	2.7	54,400,000		0			125,000		125,000	Hon. John E. Henderson.
Erie RR. bridge No. 19 (Cleveland Harbor)	4.5	16,900,000		0			200,000		250,000	Hons. Charles A. Vanik, Michael A. Feighan, Frances P. Bolton, and William E. Minshall.
Mad River drainage basin		22,000	0			22,000			22,000	Hon. C. J. Brown.
Muskingum River Reservoirs (Black Fork, Mohican River channel).	Not applicable	523,000			0				523,000	Hon. Robert W. Levering.
Sandusky River Basin		131,000	0			60,000			60,000	Hons. A. D. Baumhart, Jr., and Jackson E. Betts.
Scioto River Basin		110,000	$30,000			55,000			55,000	Hon. Jackson E. Betts.
West Branch Reservoir, Mahoning River	1.3	6,940,000		229,000	0		0	525,000	525,000	Hon. Michael J. Kirwan.

See footnotes at end of table.

REQUESTED PROJECTS—Continued

State and project	Benefit-cost ratio	Total cost	Budget			Requested			Agency capability	Requested by—
			G.I.	Advance planning	Construction	G.I.	Advance planning	Construction		
OKLAHOMA										
(R) Mangum	Not available	Not available	$19,300			$34,300			$19,300	Hon. Toby Morris.
Pine Creek Reservoir		$15,400,000					$200,000		80,000	Senator Mike Monroney.
							150,000		80,000	Senator Robert S. Kerr.
										Hon. Carl Albert.
										Hon. Oren Harris.
Recreation facilities (Denison Dam)	Not available	Not available			$75,000			$250,000		Senators Robert S. Kerr and Mike Monroney.
OREGON										
Blue River	1.9	15,800,000		$105,000			200,000		200,000	Hon. Charles O. Porter.
Green Peter	1.4	60,800,000						2,500,000	2,500,000	Hon. Charles O. Porter and Senator Richard Neuberger.
Hayden Island	1.5	598,000					25,000		25,000	Hon. Edith Green, Senator Wayne Morse, and Hon. Al Ullman.
Hills Creek	1.7	40,000,000			8,300,000			9,800,000	9,800,000	Senator Richard Neuberger and Hon. Charles O. Porter.
Hood River small boat basin	2.3	380,000					18,000		18,000	Hon. Edith Green, Senator Wayne Morse, and Hon. Al Ullman.
John Day lock and dam	1.8	387,000,000			20,000,000			25,000,000	25,000,000	Senator Wayne Morse, Senator Richard Neuberger, and Hon. Edith Green.
Lower Columbia bank protection	1.4	7,690,000						600,000	600,000	Senator Wayne Morse, Hon. Al Ullman, and Hon. Edith Green.
Malheur	2.3	423,000						353,000	353,000	Do.
Rogue River	1.2	1,500,000			1,500,000			2,000,000	2,000,000	Hon. Charles O. Porter.
Sauvies Island	1.7	439,000						150,000	150,000	Senator Wayne Morse, Hon. Al Ullman, and Hon. Edith Green.
Siuslaw Harbor	1.3	1,900,000						21,000	21,000	Hon. Charles Porter.
Upper Snake		400,000			46,500	76,500			76,500	Senator Wayne Morse, Hon. Al Ullman, and Hon. Edith Green.
Willamette River bank protection	1.4	12,100,000			500,000			800,000	800,000	Senator Richard Neuberger.
Willow Creek		28,300				18,400			18,400	Senator Wayne Morse, Hon. Al Ullman, and Hon. Edith Green.
Yaguina Bay and harbor	1.3	22,300,000					100,000		100,000	Hon. Walter Norblad.
PENNSYLVANIA										
Connoquenessing Creek (Project not authorized—Recommended in Survey Report).							500,000		35,000	Hon. Frank Clark.
French Creek		120,000	25,000			25,000			49,900	Hon. Carroll D. Kearns.
Shenango River Reservoir	1.7	28,000,000		150,000				500,000	500,000	Do.
Walnut Bottom Run		33,000	0			33,000			15,000	Hon. Frank Clark.
Allegheny River Reservoir (Kinzua dam)	1.3	113,000,000						5,000,000	2,000,000	Hons. Robert J. Corbett, James G. Fulton, William S. Moorhead, James M. Quigley, Thaddeus J. Dulski, Leon Gavin, and Senator Joseph Clark.
Sandy Lick Creek at Dubois						49,300			20,000	Hon. James E. Van Zandt.
Tyrone	1.2	9,949,000		85,000			90,000		125,000	Do.
PUERTO RICO										
San Juan Harbor	2.3	7,000,000		0			400,000		70,000	Dr. A. Fernós-Isern.
SOUTH DAKOTA										
Missouri River, N. Dak., S. Dak., and Nebr.		15,000	0			15,000			15,000	Hon. George S. McGovern.

See footnotes at end of table.

REQUESTED PROJECTS—Continued

State and project	Benefit-cost ratio	Total cost	Budget			Requested			Agency capability	Requested by—
			G.I.	Advance planning	Construction	G.I.	Advance planning	Construction		
TEXAS										
Arkansas-Red River pollution survey						$75,000			$75,000	Hon. Sam Rayburn.
Big and Little Vince Bayou		$21,000	0			21,000			21,000	Hons. Albert Thomas and Robert Casey.
Buffalo Bayou	1.4	51,531,000			$1,650,000			$2,150,000	2,150,000	Hon. Robert Casey.
Colorado River survey		500,000	$75,000			75,000+			150,000	Hon. O. C. Fisher.
Gulf Intracoastal Waterway: Colorado River Channel	1.5	1,310,000			0			500,000	500,000	Hon. Clark Thompson.
Houston ship channel	2.1	8,420,000			1,150,000			[24] 5,000,000 6,000,000	1,400,000	Hons. Albert Thomas and Robert Casey.
Lavon Reservoir, survey (East Fork—Trinity River)		100,000	37,500			50,000			50,000	Hon. Sam Rayburn
Matagordo ship channel	1.4	11,300,000		0			$150,000		150,000	Hon. Clark Thompson.
Navasota River survey		150,000	60,000			100,000			100,000	Hon. Olin E. Teague.
Neches River survey		285,000				25,000			25,000	Hon. Lindley Beckworth.
Port Aransas-Corpus Christi: Waterway channel to La Quinto. (Reimbursement)	5.4	959,000			0			[25] 954,000	[25] 954,000	Hon. John Young.
Proctor Reservoir	1.4	17,100,000			0			300,000	300,000	Hons. Omar Burleson and Frank Ikard.
Sabine River survey		320,000				25,000			25,000	Hon. Lindley Beckworth.
San Jacinto River survey		15,000	0			15,000			15,000	Hons. Albert Thomas and Robert Casey.
Trinity River survey		675,000	200,000			450,000			414,000	Hons. John Dowdy and Bruce Alger.
Waco Reservoir	1.4	39,750,000			4,000,000			4,600,000	4,600,000	Hon. W. R. Poage.
West Fork-Double Bayou		2,000				2,000			2,000	Hon. Clark Thompson.
VIRGINIA										
Pound Reservoir	1.2	17,700,000		$194,000				2,500,000	2,500,000	Hon. W. Pat Jennings.
Potomac River Study (and D.C.)		1,501,500	500,000						712,000	Opposed by Hon. Howard W. Smith and Senator Robertson. Supported by Hons. Lankford, Foley, Broyhill.
Dismal Swamp (opposes discontinuance of lock O. and M. on Dismal Swamp Canal).										Hon. Watkins M. Abbitt.
WASHINGTON										
Bellingham Harbor	1.8	117,000			0			83,700	109,000	Hon. Jack Westland.
Chief Joseph Dam project, Greater Wenatchee Division	7.0	10,280,000			0			700,000	724,000	Hon. Walt Horan.
Chehalis River Basin	Not available	Not available	66,500			5,000,000			66,500	Do.
Edmonds Harbor	do	35,000	0			35,000			25,000	Hon. Jack Westland.
Hoquiam and Chehalis Rivers		20,000	0			20,000			10,000	Hon. Russell V. Mack.
Oak Harbor		36,000	0			36,000			36,000	Hon. Jack Westland.
Sammamish River Channel	2.0	1,050,000		0			88,000		88,000	Hons. Thomas M. Pelly and Jack Westland.
Swinomish Slough		12,000	0			14,000			14,000	Hon. Jack Westland.
Wynoochee River		99,500	25,000			46,000			46,000	Hon. Russell V. Mack.
WEST VIRGINIA										
Belleville lock and dam	2.7	54,400,000		0			125,000		125,000	Hon. Ken Hechler.
Cheat River		210,000	20,000			80,000			80,000	Hon. Harley O. Staggers.
Deckers Creek		41,000	0			15,000			15,000	Hon. Cleveland M. Bailey and OVIA.
Do		41,000	0			40,000			15,000	Hon. Harley O. Staggers.
East Lynn Reservoir	Pending restudy	10,900,000		0		10,000			0	Hon. Ken Hechler.
East Rainelle	2.0	840,000			0			500,000	500,000	Hon. Cleveland M. Bailey and OVIA.
Opekiska lock and dam	1.8	21,900,000			0			2,000,000	1,000,000	Hon. Harley O. Staggers.
Princeton	1.8	1,085,000			0			500,000	500,000	Hon. Cleveland M. Bailey and OVIA.
Summersville Reservoir	2.6	46,800,000			0			2,000,000	2,000,000	Do.
Twelvepole Creek, W. Va		20,000	0			10,000			10,000	Do.

See footnotes at end of table.

REQUESTED PROJECTS—Continued

State and project	Benefit-cost ratio	Total cost	Budget			Requested			Agency capability	Requested by—
			G.I.	Advance planning	Construction	G.I.	Advance planning	Construction		
WISCONSIN										
Eau Galle River	1.1	$7,250,000					$150,000		$150,000	Hons. Alexander Wiley and Lester Johnson.
Colorado River storage (advance planning)	Not available	Not available		$818,000			1,800,000		818,000	Hons. Joseph M. Montoya and Henry Dixon.
Colorado River storage going work	1.3	615,687,107		[26] 1,538,000 (Total, 77,035,000)	$75,497,000			[27] $87,035,000	77,035,000	Hon. Wayne N. Aspinall.
WYOMING										
(R) Seedskadee	1.5	37,885,000			0			1,500,000	1,554,000	Senators Joseph C. O'Mahoney, Gale W. McGee, Hons. Keith Thomson, Joseph M. Montoya, Henry Dixon, and David S. King.

[1] To initiate study.
[2] Multiple purpose plan.
[3] For emergency bank stabilization and regular stabilization program.
[4] For emergency bank stabilization.
[5] Use of these funds are dependent upon completion of additional studies by the Department of Interior to determine whether power revenues can repay the cost allocated to power.
[6] For authorized plan, based on July 1957 prices. The modified plan, being developed in the review report is expected to cost more.
[7] Could be used on modified plan only, if authorized by Congress.
[8] Study complete.
[9] $100,000 of authorized.
[10] Pending authorization, no work can be accomplished. After authorization, planning and construction of the project could be accomplished in 1 year with an amount of $945,000. Project recommended for authorization by Chief of Engineers in H. Doc. 109, 86th Cong.
[11] Study not authorized.
[12] No capability pending completion of restudy and furnishing of local assurances of cooperation.
[13] Payment to local interest for Plaquemine Parish pumping station. Payment will be from "Operation and maintenance appropriation." No funds included in budget.
[14] Funds for completion are already available.
[15] Not evaluated. Benefits for safety to navigation.
[16] Composite for main stem.
[17] Includes New Madrid, Mo.
[18] Boeuf, Tensas River, etc. only.
[19] For Yazoo Basin.
[20] For White River backwater levee only.
[21] First increment has been completed. Second increment dependent on need for same.
[22] System benefit-cost ratio.
[23] For Frenchman-Cambridge Division including Red Willow Dam.
[24] 40-foot channel.
[25] Repayment to local interest for work accomplished by them.
[26] Includes $720,000 preconstruction work on transmission division.
[27] For general acceleration of going work.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I congratulate the majority leader and the leader of his party in the House for having engaged in "Operation Retreat," or whatever one may wish to call it. I am very happy that public opinion finally got through to the two great leaders from Texas, and that they now recognize that the public did not want to see spending on the scale which the Democrats, at the beginning of the session, determined upon.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I am glad that, like a kitten, the Senator is finally getting his eyes open.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The Senator from Arizona has consistently spoken out against high spending, all over the country.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. So has the Senator from Texas.

On November 18 of last year the Senator from Texas was in the great city of New York, represented in part by the able junior Senator [Mr. KEATING] who is now in this Chamber, and he received a call from the White House. He was informed that the President would like to have him stop in Washington on his way back to Texas, to discuss budget matters with the President.

I did so, in company with the Secretary of the Treasury and other fiscal experts. The President told me that he intended to submit a tight budget, and that he felt we had to be very careful and prudent in our expenditures.

The Senator from Texas observed, on November 18, 1958, in the presence of the President, the Secretary of the Treasury, and others, that in his opinion this Congress would reduce the President's budget requests, just as every other Congress had reduced President Eisenhower's budget requests. The Senator from Texas stated that same thing in January of this year, in February of this year, in March of this year, in April, May, June, and July of this year; and those statements appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

So "Operation Retreat" is another slick Madison Avenue phrase intended to mislead and hoodwink the people. But such slogans do not work any more. The cold, hard facts speak for themselves. We face the highest peacetime budget in the history of the Government. A great crusade was organized to balance the budget; yet we have just experienced a budget deficit of $12½ billion. The Congress has reduced every budget the President has submitted to it, and the Congress ought to be proud of that fact.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The Senator happily forgets housing and airports. I suggest to my good friend that he get together with Mr. CANNON. Somewhere between Mr. CANNON's position, that the Congress is responsible, and my good friend's position, that the administration is responsible, he ought to be able to find some place to dump the monkey off the back of the Democratic Party. As of now, he is riding high, clapping his little hands, and saying, "Spend more; spend more."

I say that the Senator from Texas should spread among his colleagues his zeal for economy, so that we would not have bills introduced calling for such fantastically high spending. I hope the Senator from Texas will spend several years of his life in educating his colleagues to the fact that in order for the country to remain stable fiscally, it must be put on the road to economy.

Mr. SCOTT subsequently said: Mr. President, statements have been made concerning two matters to which continual reference is made in this body. The statements are based upon fallacies which ought to be obvious. The first is the reference to the greatest peacetime deficit in the history of the country. In the first place, it is not a peacetime deficit; it is a cold war deficit. We all know who is responsible for that. In the second place, it is not a peacetime deficit by any fair definition, since the deficit is due, very largely, to the fixed charges which are incurred in paying the cost of past and future wars.

A peacetime deficit, moreover, can be created only by the action of Congress. The action of Congress can be created in at least two ways: first, by appropriation; second, by withholding revenues.

That brings me to the second point. The statement was made just a moment ago on the floor that Congress will cut the budget of the President substantially. This statement simply is not correct, because the withholding of revenue asked for by the President will in itself create a deficit. This Congress, rather than reducing the President's budget, has itself created a deficit, because the President's budget for 1960 proposed a $70 million surplus. To date, the action in the other body has turned this into a deficit of $918 million. The Senate action has created a deficit of $1,010 million, a part of which is due to the spending action of this Congress, which is not in the control of my party, and a part of which is due to the $676 million in much needed revenue proposed by the President in his request that Congress enact motor fuel and aviation gasoline taxes and an increase in the postal rates.

Therefore, when Senators assert on the floor that the Senate and the other body will cut the President's budget, they are not candidly revealing to the people of the country that the deficit arises in the budget either through appropriations or through the denial by the leadership of Congress of favorable action on revenue bills which the President has requested.

Finally, no budget can go to the President, and no deficit or surplus can arise under our constitutional system, save by the action of Congress. Congress generally accords on revenue and appropriation bills to what its majority leaders and majority party wish it to do.

The record of the Congresses in the past shows that in 23 of the last 27 years, Congress has been in the control of the Democratic Party, and that the deficits, when they occur, are cumulative; that surpluses have to be hard fought for and hard won.

The deficit to which the distinguished majority leader has referred is due to the cumulative action of Democratic Congresses in appropriating money which the Executive is directed to spend, and in withholding needed revenues.

If we have a deficit this fiscal 1960 year—and we do have one as of now—of approximately $1 billion—it will be due to the action of the Democratic leadership of both Houses of Congress.

I am a little tired of the business of claiming budget cuts when the budget is not being cut, and when Congress is withholding revenues, which would balance the budget. This is a sort of back-door argument. I am tired of hearing the deficit called a peacetime deficit, when it is a cold war deficit and is based upon the necessity for paying for wars which we got into, and for protection against future wars.

A statement has been made about the monkey being on the back of the party of the distinguished Senator from Texas, and as to how high that monkey has gone. I suggest that it is a space monkey, and that the space monkey is carrying our dollars with him in piles so high that if they have not yet pierced the atmosphere and reached outer space, they certainly will if the policies of the Democratic Party in the Senate and in the other body are continued.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement relative to action on the President's budgets as of June 28, 1959.

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

ACTION ON PRESIDENT'S BUDGETS AS OF JUNE 28, 1959

Since the report of June 14, the House passed a veterans' pension bill calling for $208 million more than the President's budget, and the Senate passed a veterans' housing loan bill of $100 million over the President's figure.

Furthermore, Senate actions on the 1960 budget now create a $1,010 million deficit, $89 million more than 2 weeks ago.

The President's budget for 1960 proposes a $70 million surplus. To date, House action turns this into a $918 million deficit. Senate action to date would create a deficit of $1,010 million.

	Effect on President's budgets (1959 and subsequent years)
House of Representatives:	
The President proposes that Congress enact motor fuel and aviation gas taxes and increase postal rates, all of which would provide $676,000,000. Congress has taken no action and the Democratic leadership indicates none is planned.	Denies $676,000,000 in needed revenues.
The House has passed a voluntary pension plan for self-employed persons which would reduce receipts by $365,000,000..	Reduces Government's revenues by $365,000,000.
On the other hand, the House has taken the following spending action:	
Passed Veterans Housing Loan Act for $100,000,000. (Status: Enrolled bill.)	$100,000,000 more than President's budget.
Passed $126,000,000 aid-to-airports bill. (Status: Law.)	$6,000,000 more than President's budget.

	Effect on President's budgets (1959 and subsequent years)
House of Representatives—Continued	
Extended temporary unemployment compensation for remainder of this fiscal year, adding $75,000,000 to 1959 expenditures. (Status: Law.)	$75,000,000 more than President's budget.
Passed Housing Act. (Status: Enrolled bill.)	$590,000,000 more than President's budget.
Passed Federal Water Pollution Control Act. (Status: Senate Public Works Committee.)	$840,000,000 more than President's budget.
Passed veterans' pension bill. (Status: Senate Finance Committee.)	$208,000,000 more than President's budget.
Appropriation actions have reduced new obligational authority by $667,000,000	$667,000,000 less than requested.
Senate:	
Failure to act on President's proposed postal rate increase and certain tax increases	Denies $676,000,000 in needed revenues.
Passed Housing Act. (Status: Enrolled bill.)	$590,000,000 more than President's budget.
Passed aid-to-airports bill. (Status: Law.)	$6,000,000 more than President's budget.
Area Redevelopment Act. (Status: House Banking and Currency Committee.)	$337,000,000 more than President's budget.
Extended temporary unemployment compensation for remainder of this fiscal year, adding $75,000,000 to 1959 expenditures. (Status: Law.)	$75,000,000 more than President's budget.
Passed grants to States for education TV. (Status: House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.)	$50,000,000 more than President's budget.
Passed extension of school milk program for fiscal years 1960 and 1961. (Status: House Agriculture Committee.)	$10,000,000 more than President's budget.
International medical research: $50,000,000 annually. (Status: House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.)	$50,000,000 more than President's budget.
Passed Veterans' Housing Loan Act. (Status: Enrolled bill.)	$100,000,000 more than President's budget.
Appropriation action has increased new obligational authority by $42,000,000	$42,000,000 more than requested.
Summary:	
After 6 months of this session of Congress, the House of Representatives has taken actions that increased the President's requests by $2,193,000,000.	Plus $2,193,000,000.
All Senate action to date has increased the President's requests by $1,936,000,000	Plus $1,936,000,000.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota subsequently said: Mr. President, the debate regarding back-door financing which already today has taken place on the floor suggests to me that at this time it would be well to have printed in the body of the RECORD—and I so request, in connection with these remarks—an excerpt from the hearings on the budget for 1960, as held before the House of Representatives Appropriations Committee. Therefore, I submit an excerpt from pages 84, 85, and 86 of the hearings, which includes a colloquy betweeen Representative GARY, of Virginia, and Representative CANNON, the chairman of the committee, and includes a letter by Representative GARY to the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Anderson, and his reply. That exchange of letters sets forth the real problem in public debt issues which are essentially back-door financing.

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

BYPASSING THE ANNUAL APPROPRIATIONS PROCESS

Mr. GARY. You will recall that last year a resolution was introduced to change the rules to take care of that situation and to require that all money bills be sent to the Appropriations Committee. At that time I had some correspondence with the Secretary on the subject; and if the Secretary has no objection, I would like to ask permission to insert at this point in the record my letter to the Secretary and his reply.

Secretary ANDERSON. I have no objection.

Mr. FORD. I think the record which we have developed here this morning indicates that if all money bills, including direct obligational authority and these others, were channeled through this committee, this condition would not prevail.

Mr. GARY. That is exactly the point. All money bills should be channeled through this committee, but a tendency has grown up to bypass the committee. It would seem now that a clarification of the House rules is necessary. I hope that proper action will be taken this year to correct the situation. In fact, I have intended to introduce a resolution myself on that subject.

Mr. Chairman, I have asked that correspondence between the Secretary and me be inserted in the record at this point.

Mr. CANNON. Without objection, it will be inserted at this point.

(The information referred to follows:)

AUGUST 6, 1958.

Hon. ROBERT B. ANDERSON,
Secretary of the Treasury,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: As you know, Congress has from time to time authorized expenditures from public debt receipts to conduct specified programs of Government. The increasing frequency with which this device is being used, particularly in the present Congress, has been a matter of considerable concern. On more than one occasion it has been the subject of debate on its merits as a means of raising and appropriating public funds as well as on its parliamentary and constitutional characteristics.

It has been suggested that, when under such authority you cause Government securities to be sold, the proceeds of such issues are not "in the Treasury." It has been suggested further that, when such proceeds are used to purchase notes or other evidence of indebtedness from the administrative agency authorized to issue such notes, the subsequent expenditure of such proceeds by the agency does not constitute the use of public funds for the support of the general functions of Government.

It appears to me that both of these suggestions are in error, and I would first refer to the Constitution of the United States, article I, section 9, paragraph 7, which states:

"No money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in consequence of appropriations made by law; and a regular statement and account of the receipts and expenditures of all public money shall be published from time to time."

This language makes no distinction as to the source of the money in the Treasury. It clearly provides that money in the Treasury can lawfully get out in only one way—by appropriation made by law. It must necessarily follow that a legislative enactment permitting money to be drawn from the Treasury is an appropriation, the form, method, or the words used being immaterial.

Next, I would expect that in the ordinary course of events the proceeds of public debt issues are commingled in the general fund balance of the Treasury with other receipts such as tax receipts, customs, and miscellaneous income. I take it to be the fact that, in periods of deficit financing, when current tax collections fail to meet daily expenditure needs, the whole range of Government functions is financed from public debt proceeds, at least in part. In short, the day-to-day operation of Government has been met to some extent by borrowed funds, else we would not have a public debt. This debt represents money borrowed, placed in the Treasury, and subsequently expended for functions of Government pursuant to appropriations made by law—mostly, I might add, pursuant to appropriations carried in the regular appropriation bills over the years. I cannot but conclude that public debt receipts have been used, and are being used, to support all manner of Government activities.

Since you are the one official having authoritative knowledge as to the public moneys, I would appreciate from you a statement of the facts as they pertain to my conclusions just cited. I would like to have your response to the following specific questions:

1. Are the proceeds of public debt issues placed "in the Treasury"?

2. If "in the Treasury," are they commingled in the general fund balance with other receipts such as tax and miscellaneous income?

3. In the Treasury statements of receipts and expenditures, are not the expenditures made under authority of the public debt transaction device reflected as expenditures just as are expenditures under other forms of appropriations? That is, are they not shown as withdrawals from the Treasury in the same sense as are withdrawals pursuant to the more common form of appropriating language?

4. Is it not a fact, particularly in periods of deficit financing, that the general fund balance on any given day is a mixture of funds in the Treasury derived from many sources, including the proceeds of public debt issues, and that such balance is impossible of differentiation or distinction as to its derivation?

I would appreciate your early advice and comment on the matter.

With kindest regards.

Sincerely yours,

J. VAUGHAN GARY,
Member of Congress.

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, August 12, 1958.

Hon. J. VAUGHAN GARY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. GARY: This is in reply to your letter of August 6, 1958, which contains a number of specific questions and observations regarding authorizations made by Congress to expend from public debt receipts to conduct specified programs of the Government.

The answers to your questions, which follow, are presented in the same order as in your letter:

1. The proceeds of public debt issues are placed "in the Treasury." In other words,

receipts from public debt issues are covered into the Treasury the same as all other receipts of the Federal Government.

2. Public debt receipts are commingled in the general fund balance with other receipts such as taxes and miscellaneous income. The Treasury maintains one general cash account to which all receipts of the Federal Government are credited and from which all expenditures of the Federal Government are made.

3. In Treasury statements of receipts and expenditures, the expenditures made under authority of the public debt transaction device are reflected as expenditures just as expenditures under other forms of appropriations. They are shown as withdrawals from the Treasury in the same sense as withdrawals pursuant to the more common form of appropriation language.

4. The general fund balance on any give day is a mixture of funds in the Treasury derived from many sources, including the proceeds of public debt issues. Such balance is impossible of differentiation or distinction as to its derivation. This is true regardless of whether there is a budgetary surplus or a deficit.

In conclusion, I agree with your opinion that a legislative enactment permitting money to be drawn from the Treasury is an appropriation.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT B. ANDERSON,
Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, in that connection, I should like to observe that the $12½ billion deficit to which reference was made by the majority leader was undoubtedly a reference to the spending budget of the Government for the fiscal year which just closed on June 30. There is no $12½ billion deficit prospectively in the budget for the current fiscal year for which appropriations are now being made by the Congress. The $12½ billion deficit in the expenditures of the Government for the fiscal year 1959 was caused in large part by so-called back-door financing. It was not due to the appropriations voted in the appropriation bills by this Congress. It was due to the commitments, to the bills which came due, by reason of authorizations and directives to the Secretary of the Treasury to hand over certain funds to spending agencies in the fiscal year just ended.

So we should not, in our thinking, mistake the difference between an appropriation bill budget and a spending budget; and we certainly should not confuse the expenditures of fiscal 1959, which closed on June 30 last, with the prospective demands on the Treasury occasioned by appropriation bills for the fiscal year 1960.

LABOR REFORM LEGISLATION

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, tonight the President of the United States is speaking to the people on the need for effective labor reform legislation. In order to give my colleagues the opportunity to see what the editors of the country are saying about this need, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a number of editorials on the subject.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I should like to read into the RECORD at this point a statement from Mr. CANNON.

WHO PREPARES THE BUDGET?

Let us concede right here that all fiscal recommendations start with the President. Congress does not make the budget. That is the duty and exclusive prerogative of the President. The law is clear and specific. He is directed by the statute to make such tax, spending, and appropriation recommendations as in his judgment are necessary. The President is in complete command in making the budget. He does not have to recommend bigger appropriations. He does not have to recommend extension of war tax rates. He does not have to urge new taxes—as he does in this budget. He is at complete liberty to recommend a cut of 5, 10, 15, 20 billion or any other amount. So when the administration talks economy and hope of tax reduction but submits record budgets that is the President's action, not that of the Congress. He cannot escape that responsibility because the law places it on him.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arizona?

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

[From the Ames (Iowa) State Daily, July 16, 1959]

EFFECTIVE LABOR BILL NEEDED NOW

We believe that the actions of James Hoffa and his Teamsters Union points out the need for labor legislation which will be effective. We hope that Congress recognizes this need and passes such legislation this session.

Hoffa has made a mockery of the courts and has conveniently been unable to remember several incriminating facts in an alleged bribe attempt when questioned by the Senate Rackets Committee. And he has threatened that, should effective labor legislation be passed, he would have all Teamster contracts expire on one day, violating the intent of the law.

When it was suggested that secret voting be introduced in the Teamsters, Hoffa replied, "In the Teamsters every man stands up to vote, and God help him if he votes the wrong way."

In 1957 a lawyer told the Senate Rackets Committee that Hoffa had given him $1,000 and offered him more if he would get a job on that committee and spy for him. The FBI had evidence that Hoffa gave the lawyer $2,000 in cash in a cab.

During the trial Teamsters' lawyer, Edward Williams, "packed" the jury with eight Negroes. Then an advertisement appeared in a Negro newspaper suggesting that the chief Government witness was anti-Negro.

Later during the trial the Teamsters paid former heavyweight champion Joe Louis' expenses to Washington, where he paid Hoffa a visit in the courtroom during the noon recess to "see what they're doing to my good friend Jimmy." Hoffa was acquitted.

Earlier this week the Senate Rackets Committee heard testimony from a New York lawyer that Hoffa promised to pay $150,000 in back fees to a court-appointed monitor on the condition that the monitor resign and someone friendly to the Teamsters replace him.

A three-man board, appointed by a court, is monitoring the Teamsters as part of a cleanup attempt on the part of the courts. At present two of the board members are fighting Hoffa, with the other backing the Teamsters.

Hoffa, however, told the Senate committee that he could not remember discussing the alleged bribe attempt or any of several conversations trying to pack the monitoring board.

Hoffa has threatened to tie up the country with a strike. He has been unable to remember incriminating evidence. He has not known that Teamsters officials have been paid while in prison. He is opposed to a bill guaranteeing union members freedom from arbitrary dues and assessments and protection of the individual's right to sue to secure union freedoms.

The many abuses of his power which he has committed illustrate the fact that the present union system is inherently susceptible to corruptible, power-seeking men. Neither the overall union organization nor the courts have been able to clean up the Teamsters Union.

The responsibility then falls upon the Congress to pass legislation which will enable courts to oust the Jimmy Hoffas from unions. Congress surely cannot fail to recognize this responsibility. We hope that, having recognized it, Congress rises above the petty pressure groups and the campaign fund pressure and passes a strong labor legislation bill.

[From the Norman (Okla.) Transcript, July 7, 1959]

GIANT UNIONS TAKE OVER CULPRIT ROLE

Big labor, meaning the ruling cliques of the gigantic industrial unions, is today in much the same position with respect to the country as big business was 75 years ago. It comes close to having a stranglehold on the Nation's throat.

The abuses of big business in developing monopolies and engaging in other unfair practices led to such widespread public resentment that an antimonopoly political party was formed in 1884, the Interstate Commerce Act was passed in 1887, the Sherman Antitrust Act in 1890, and the Federal Trade Commisison Act, and several other laws regulating business practices followed in later years.

But throughout those years, the laws and the courts were protecting the rights of workers to organize unions and bargain with their employers. The Clayton Act of 1914 specifically exempted labor unions from the antitrust laws. The Norris-LaGuardia Act of 1932 limited the injunction powers of the courts in labor cases.

Then in 1935 Congress enacted the National Labor Relations Act which barred all interference with employees' freedom to organize and bargain collectively and compelled employers to bargain with the unions.

These comprehensive legal immunities have contributed greatly to growth and power of unions until today they are just about the most powerful groups in the country, politically as well as economically.

The NLRB law has been construed as forbidding industry to obtain relief from union abuses in State courts while giving NLRB itself discretionary power to refuse to take jurisdiction in such cases. In many cases, therefore, a business firm has no remedy anywhere.

One such abuse is organizational picketing. Here the employer is approached by a union organizer and asked to compel his employees to join the union. If he refuses and his workers are not interested, a picket line is established and the business is damaged. If he seeks redress in local courts, he often is told to go to the NLRB, and that body often refuses to accept jurisdiction. That leaves him with little choice but to sign up or go broke.

The Taft-Hartley Act of 1947 was the first law which gave recognition to labor union abuses and attempted to curb them. The unions protested bitterly that it would lead to "slave labor," but that has not happened. In fact it did little to stop abuses because

loopholes were found and union officials have continued their wide range of evil practices as brought out by the McClellan Labor Rackets Committee.

Today the mammoth AFL–CIO unions with more than 13 million members can throw their entire weight against a single industry, or even a single company. They can and do conspire and combine to gain benefits from single companies that later can be expanded to all industry.

The AFL–CIO has turned increasingly to political power to gain its ends. It claims to have been influential in electing more than 200 Congressmen and Senators in the 1958 elections. And its power also is felt in State and local government.

Outside the AFL–CIO is the powerful Teamsters Union which, because of weakness in labor laws, could call a nationwide strike and shut down virtually all industry, stop the delivery of milk and food in most large cities, and cut off supplies of coal and other fuel which is transported by truck. In fact James Hoffa, Teamsters president, was quoted as making a threat of such a strike only a few weeks ago.

And so, as the people once feared monopoly powers by big business they now fear the power of the big industrial labor unions and their control over the Nation's economy.

Exposures by the McClellan committee showed urgent need for stopping such abuses as extortion, organizational picketing, rioting, secondary boycotts, and featherbedding. The latter practice, industrial leaders contend, costs the American people billions of dollars each year in higher prices.

Despite the need for stern action, the Senate passed the weak Kennedy bill, leaving out most of the bill of rights for labor proposed by Senator MCCLELLAN. That bill is now before a House committee.

Because so many House Members owe their election to the AFL–CIO, the House is likely to either pass the Kennedy bill unchanged or kill it and leave things like they are. The only thing that can prevent that is widespread demand from the public for stronger legislation.

[From the Watertown (S. Dak.) Public Opinion, July 10, 1959]

FROM A FRIEND OF LABOR

The St. Louis (Mo.) Post-Dispatch is a famous newspaper which always has been friendly to the cause of organized labor. So something it recently said about pending Federal labor legislation is significant.

"The public interest," observes the Post-Dispatch, "does not demand a union-busting bill, but it does demand a measure which effectively guarantees union democracy, makes union leaders more directly answerable to the rank and file, and corrects the abuses so impressively brought out by the McClellan investigation."

It then deals with certain loopholes and defects in the labor bill which passed the Senate. The bill's language is loose, for one thing, and leaves room for evasions. The provision dealing with "blackmail" picketing is weaker, for instance, than that advocated by Secretary of Labor Mitchell. And the means the law provides for enforcing the bill of rights that it is supposed to guarantee the rank and file of union members leaves a great deal to be desired. Workers who felt their rights were infringed would have to file suit in the courts in an effort to obtain redress—an expensive and time-consuming stratagem that is obviously beyond the resources of most union people.

The Post-Dispatch concludes: "There are, no doubt, other respects in which the Senate bill could be improved without converting it into a union-busting measure. The secondary boycott, picketing and bill-of-rights enforcement clauses seem to us the most important. We hope the House will tackle them courageously despite political pressure from the unions."

This is a moderate view, and, it comes from a longtime friend of labor.

[From the Battle Creek (Mich.) Enquirer-News, July 19, 1959]

LABOR REFORM BILL HAS NO TEETH

Senator MCCLELLAN and his committee have ended 2½ years of investigating charges of labor racketeering against Teamster Union President James Hoffa. Calling Hoffa a "fountainhead of corruption," MCCLELLAN demanded that Congress enact a strong labor reform law.

Almost simultaneously, the House Labor Committee tentatively approved a watered-down version of a Senate labor reform bill devised to protect the rights of union rank and file against corrupt leadership. The bill's provision for a blanket 2-year jail term and a $10,000 fine for violating rank-and-file rights was knocked out by the House committee.

The House committee's action is extremely difficult to understand. Its version of the bill would guarantee a union member's right to participate in union meetings and elections, to vote on union dues and assessments, to have safeguards against unfair disciplinary action, and to sue union officers. However, before a union member could seek court action in his behalf, he would be required to exhaust his union's own remedies for settling grievances.

Without specific penalties for violations, the bill is virtually impotent. A union member's only recourse would be a request for a court injunction against the same offense taking place again. If the injunction were violated, a contempt-of-court charge could be lodged, and, if a jury convicted the accused, penalties would follow.

Under such a law, union attorneys could have a field day threading their clients—and labor bosses—in and out of its loopholes.

We repeat, the House committee's action is puzzling. In the 2½ years of Senate investigation millions of words have appeared in newspapers and magazines on the charges against Hoffa. There is no doubt that corruption and racketeering do exist in some labor groups. Certainly every Member of the House must have read some of these stories and must have pondered their significance to the average workingman.

Why, then, was the Senate bill—designed to correct these malpractices revealed by the hearings—emasculated?

Do those who pulled its teeth fear that labor may become hostile to them at the polls? If this is true, then perhaps they had best work out a bill to prevent labor intimidation of our lawmakers. If our Congressmen are sincere in their efforts to protect the rank-and-file union member from corrupt bosses, they should have no fear of defeat.

A strong labor bill could remove coercion and intimidation from the rank and file, leaving them free to vote for those who have liberated them.

[From the Casper (Wyo.) Tribune-Herald, July 19, 1959]

SHABBY PRETENSE

The Senate-approved labor reform bill went a little, but not much, further than Senator KENNEDY'S original mild proposals. Added were curbs on some hot-cargo contracts and organizational picketing, along with a toothless version of Senator MCCLELLAN'S bill of rights to correct the abuses exposed in his select committee's investigation of racketeering.

Efforts to write a stronger measure were repeatedly blocked, with the explanation, more in the nature of excuse, that the mild bill represented the most that could get through Congress. Better some reform, said the bill's sponsors, than no legislation at all.

The other day the House Labor Committee announced that it had completed its own version of the measure, after 5 weeks of closed-door efforts, and would report it this week. Making the announcement, Chairman GRAHAM A. BARDEN, of North Carolina, let go a blast at "brazen outside influences" which he said have attempted to dictate to the committee.

He refused to name names, but neither was it necessary. It is no secret that labor leaders have exerted every possible pressure to block genuine and effective labor reform legislation, nor are they hesitant to remind Congressmen that there is an election next year in which labor is well organized to take part.

The House committee's version of the Senate bill is not available at this writing. However, information from the committee during its deliberations indicates a maintained pressure to weaken the measure. At one point the committee beat down a move to eliminate all proposed changes in the Taft-Hartley Act, including boycotts and organizational picketing. Whether it entertained a subsequent proposal to impose stiffer curbs remains to be learned when the bill is reported.

Apparently the five-point bill of rights for union members was altered by providing for enforcement through injunctions. The Senate version carried a blanket criminal penalty for union leaders who deny members any of the rights.

However written the bill will precipitate a furious floor fight, and then it will be possible to see how Congress stands up under pressure. For there is no question as to the public interest. It is to curb the abuse of power by labor leaders already given too much power, over their own members as well as over those with whom they bargain. The right to bargain should not include the right to injure an innocent third party in an effort to put pressure on an employer involved in dispute, which the secondary boycott does. Neither should it include the right to picket an employer as a means of getting at his employees for purposes of organization.

Nor is there anything of "union busting" nature in procedures to make union officials accountable to their memberships.

It is time to tear away slogans and look at the content of labor reform legislation. If it doesn't affect reform then it is no more than shabby pretense.

[From the Des Moines (Iowa) Register, July 21, 1959]

LABOR BILL WEAKENED

The House Labor Committee appears to have handed labor leaders a major victory in its rewriting of the Kennedy bill.

The bill as it passed the Senate contained a section defining the rights of union members in the determination of union policies, the conduct of elections and the administration of union affairs. This section was written into the bill for the purpose of encouraging rank-and-file members to break the grip of dictatorial bosses and strong-arm cliques that have gained control of some unions.

The bill-of-rights section was intended to provide a basis for court action if members were unable to secure a voice in union affairs through regular union procedures. The section provided fines and jail penalties for persons convicted of violating or interfering with the rights of union members as they were defined. This penalty section had the effect of bringing the Federal law enforcement machinery to the assistance of union members if they could show reasonable grounds for a complaint being filed.

The bill reported by the House Labor Committee, as it is described in news reports,

strips union members of this additional help. In reality, it removes from the bill the major tool for enabling either union members or the Federal Government to take effective action to oust dictatorial bosses and gangster strong-arm cliques from control.

The provision for civil injunction action in the bill is only slightly better than that now available to any union member. It does define by law the rights of a member on which he may base his petition rather than compelling him to rely solely on those defined by the union's constitution and by-laws.

But before civil action may be instituted in the courts, the House bill requires that a member must first spend 6 months trying to get redress through regular union procedures where the cards may be already stacked against him.

A comparison of the Senate bill and the bill reported out by the House committee illustrates why some union officials and their lobbyists have been so vigorous in their opposition to the bill-of-rights section of the Senate bill.

[From the Houston (Tex.) Chronicle, July 17, 1959]

HOFFA INSOLENCE SHOWS NEED FOR MORE THAN THE KENNEDY BILL

The announcement by the McClellan committee counsel, Robert S. Kennedy, that he plans no further questioning of Teamster boss, James R. Hoffa, probably means the curtain is being drawn on one of the most amazingly successful demonstrations of contempt of Congress in our history. Periodically over the past 2½ years, this associate of racketeers and alleged Reds has appeared before the McClellan rackets probers either to answer pertinent questions with insolence or to have subordinates called who take the fifth amendment. Yet he still rides high.

The final session was typical. Asked for details on a contract the committee holds has secret illegal clauses, Hoffa highhandedly directed the committee to call on Roland McMaster, business agent for the Teamsters. Yet when McMaster went up to testify, Hoffa coached him openly: "Take five," he said, signaling by holding up his open right hand. And McMaster obediently "took five." Three times this procedure was repeated with three different witnesses.

But why is Hoffa permitted to show this disdain for lawfully constituted authority? Others, including the industrialist, Bernard Goldfine, have been penalized for less, yet Hoffa continues not only to defy Congress but to rule the largest independent union in the world. There may be a clue in the observation of Kennedy that the board of monitors appointed by U.S. District Judge F. Dickinson Letts to oversee Hoffa's administration of Teamsters affairs is preparing to move against Hoffa, to request the court to oust him as president.

The board of monitors has a file of 263 charges against Hoffa. Among these is the evidence provided by Pierre Salinger, committee investigator, that, under terms of his own Teamsters constitution, the vote electing Hoffa president was 56.2 percent illegal. The monitors need merely to submit their information to the court upon which Judge Letts would appoint a referee to act.

But even with Hoffa out, there is no guarantee of a cleanup in the Teamsters. Hoffa was the power behind the throne when the bumbling Dave Beck was nominal head. Ousted at this time, he would still rule by indirection as surely as Lucky Luciano rules the Mafia from his banishment in Naples. By the same system through which Hoffa was elected, one of his tainted henchmen would go in. The ctench of this situation is simply one more reason we must have a strong labor reform bill and not the simple palliative of the Kennedy-Ives bill. The American people must understand this and must make their demands on Congress. Otherwise nothing ever will be done.

FROM ROCKS TO ROSES—THE STORY FROM CARACAS TO WARSAW

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I was one of the thousands of people who on yesterday crammed the National Airport, when Vice President NIXON and his charming wife, Pat, returned to this country from their historic tour of Russia and Poland.

Perhaps no one who has ever traveled to a foreign country, to meet the citizens of an alien land who live under a political philosophy directly opposite to ours, has more completely won the hearts of those people with frankness and friendliness, than has our Vice President NIXON.

As Vice President NIXON spoke briefly, on yesterday, to the crowd at the airport, one thought ran through my mind. He spoke most eloquently of the friendly reception he had received in Warsaw. He said that people threw bushels of roses into the pathway of his automobile, and he said that the people all along the streets exuded friendship.

I contrasted that reception with the reception he received when he toured certain South American countries. There, he and his wife were spat upon and were stoned by crowds of hostile, Communist-led people.

The contrast I thought of was this: In Warsaw, where the people live under Communist rule, the Vice President was enthusiastically and warmly greeted as a representative of our free way of life. In Venezuela, where the people do not have communism, but only sit around and talk about what a wonderful system of government communism is, the people were unfriendly.

To me, that contrast indicates most dramatically that theoretical communism, which the people of Venezuela know about, is much more desirable than the actual communism which the people in Warsaw have. Some of our own fellow travelers and Communist sympathizers in this country might well ponder very carefully that comparison, Mr. President, because I believe that if Communist sympathizers in this country were to do so, they might well conclude, with people living under communism elsewhere, that communism is a more attractive theory than it is a working formula. In practice it produces disillusionment.

Mr. President, I believe that several lessons can well be learned from the short interval of history which took the Vice President of the United States on the big jump from rocks in Venezuela to roses in Warsaw, on his good will missions for the people of the United States.

I think the first lesson is clearly this: Communism has its greatest appeal to the people who live farthest from it.

The second lesson is that to people living under communism, but once enjoyed freedom—as is true in the case of the people of Poland—the existence of freedom and its demonstration anywhere in the world, as exemplified by Vice President NIXON's visit to Warsaw and to Russia, is a cause of great rejoicing.

The third lesson is, I believe, that the more one knows about communism, the closer he lives to it, and the more intimate his connections with it become, the more he detests and abominates it both as a philosophy and as a way of life.

Mr. President, I believe that if those lessons will be reflected upon, as they have been demonstrated so vividly by the experiences of one great American, Vice President NIXON, in the course of his visits to South America and to Russia and to Poland, all encompassed within the past year or two, everyone in the world can be a better citizen and can look forward with more hope to a world of freedom and tolerance as a consequence of the lessons to be drawn from Vice President NIXON's experiences.

SENATOR RANDOLPH'S VIEWS ON THE PROSPECTIVE EXCHANGE OF VISITS BETWEEN PRESIDENT EISENHOWER AND PREMIER KHRUSHCHEV

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, on Tuesday, August 4, following President Eisenhower's announcement that he would exchange visits with the Premier of the Soviet Union, I received a telegram from the West Virginia office of the Associated Press, Charleston, W. Va., stating:

> Appreciate your concise views on exchange of visits by American-Russian heads of state for inclusion in West Virginia roundup. Thanks and regards.
>
> ASSOCIATED PRESS.

My reply was:

AUGUST 4, 1959.

ASSOCIATED PRESS,
Charleston, W. Va.

In response to your telegram: The arrangement to exchange visits between the President of the United States and the Premier of the Soviet Union is, in my considered opinion, a further affirmative approach to a better understanding not only between the top level leadership of the two countries but between their peoples. We can work with other nations and other peoples in the constant pursuit of peace. We must beware of possible propaganda entrapments, but the search for mutual understanding must be explored vigorously. Informal discussions oftentimes can accomplish the meetings of minds that formal conferences fail to achieve.

JENNINGS RANDOLPH.

RECESS AT GENEVA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, with the approval of the distinguished Senator from New York, who has been so patient, that I may proceed for 2 minutes in addition to the 3-minute limitation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. BYRD of West Virginia in the chair). Is there objection to the request? The Chair hears none, and the Senator may proceed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the foreign ministers completed their work at Geneva yesterday. I understand that these meetings, which have been in prog-

ress since last May, have gone into recess rather than into actual adjournment.

Whatever the precise form of the termination, it is apparent that the search for reasonable agreement between the Soviet Union and the Western nations is now moving into other channels. It would be easy to pass off the Geneva Conference of Foreign Ministers as a futile, time-consuming exercise leading nowhere. In my opinion that ld be an erroneous interpretation, a ..ous underestimation of its importance. I think it is entirely reasonable to say that we might well be, at the present time, in the midst of another costly Berlin blockade or harassment had this conference not been held. True, we still have to face that possibility for the future. For the moment at least, the Geneva Conference has put off the crisis and paved the way for a further search for agreement.

Without the Geneva Conference, moreover, it is also reasonable to say that there would have not been a trip by the Vice President to Moscow, or certainly not a trip as constructive and useful as his has proved to be. Nor would there have been, in any likelihood, the coming exchange of visits between the President and Mr. Khrushchev.

So, let me repeat, it is, in my opinion, a smug and carping injustice to depreciate the efforts put forth by the Secretary of State at Geneva and, indeed, other ministers at that meeting. Mr. Herter did the spadework, so to speak, which had to be done if there is to be any lasting constructive results from the Vice President's recent mission and the impending Eisenhower-Khrushchev exchanges.

The Secretary of State set forth at Geneva a fresh and cogent expression of U.S. policy with respect to Germany. It was an expression which made clear for the first time that there exists a basis for reasonable agreement in our policy, derived from the realities of the situation with which we must live in 1959. I would hope that Mr. Khrushchev, when he confers with President Eisenhower, will see that such is the case, as his foreign minister at Geneva apparently did not. There may be at least some ground for this expectation because Mr. Khrushchev characterized as "sober and sensible" nine essentials of policy on Germany and a divided Europe, which I listed in a speech on February 12. And the proposals put forth by Mr. Herter at Geneva do not differ, in great degree, from these nine points.

One would hope that geometry in the Soviet Union is the same as in the United States, and that the theorem applies that "things equal to the same thing are equal to each other."

Let me recall in summary form at this point these nine suggested essentials of policy, as they were stated on February 12 and developed in subsequent speeches.

First. Stand fast in Berlin, not as a slogan, not as an end in itself, but as the basis for a Western initiative for peace in Europe.

Second. Call upon the German leaders of the East and West Berlin communities to begin serious negotiations for unifying the public services and municipal government of that city.

Third. Enlist the conciliatory services of the Secretary General of the United Nations in the effort to bring about the interim unification and neutralization, not just of West Berlin but of all Berlin; guarantee by U.N. or other international means the free use of the routes of access to the entire city until such time as it became once again the capital of a unified Germany.

Fourth. If this or a similar approach to interim unification and neutralization of all Berlin is not obtained, then continue the Western presence in West Berlin, whether or not the Russians chose to leave the other sector of the city.

Fifth. If forced to maintain the Western presence in West Berlin in such circumstances, however, consider seriously withdrawing the garrisons of French, British, and American forces from the city and replacing them with West Germans supported by NATO guarantees.

Sixth. Call upon the Germans in authority in West and East Germany to talk, to talk a great deal on the whole range of problems involved in harmonizing the political, economic, and military systems of the two zones as an essential preliminary step to the unification of Germany.

Seventh. Call upon the East German Communists and the Russians to permit the exercise, without the threat of terror, of basic political freedoms in the Eastern zone, as a preliminary to reunification.

Eighth. Seek agreements between the Soviet Union and the Western allies to guarantee for a period of years the kind of unified Germany which might emerge from German discussions, and see to it that a reunited Germany is neither subjected to military pressures by its neighbors nor becomes a source of aggressive military pressure on them.

Ninth. To that end, consider agreements for the control and limitation of armaments in Germany and central Europe along the lines of the Eden plan, the Rapacki plan, and similar plans, predicating them on satisfactory agreements being reached at the Geneva Conferences on the Prevention of Surprise Attacks and the Suspension of Nuclear Testing.

Mr. President, when these proposals were advanced initially, there was a great deal of comment on them both at home and abroad. Some of it was critical and some of the criticism was little short of an expression of shocked disbelief. But since that time, we have, in fact, witnessed an evolution of United States and Western policy with respect to Germany in the direction of these proposals.

This Nation went into the present Geneva Conference with a general approach which represented a sharp modification of the policies to which we had clung for years. The new approach has made it evident that, while we would stand fast in Berlin, we would do so not as an end in itself, but as the basis for moving toward a reasonable settlement of basic Berlin, German, and European problems. Beyond standing fast, we have suggested at Geneva specific plans for bringing about negotiations for the reunification of the public services and municipal government of that city. We have called for a phased reunification of all Germany based upon extensive contact and extensive talk on the part of the German authorities of the East and West prior to free, all-German elections. We have sought the restoration of the right of open political activity for all Germans, free of terror and legal reprisals, in both zones. We have expressed our willingness to seek agreements between the Soviet Union and the Western nations to guarantee a unified Germany and its neighbors against aggression. We have noted our willingness to consider limiting the level of armaments in both parts of Germany and a reduction in foreign forces in that country—a position which seems to me to encompass the basic philosophy of the Eden and Rapacki plans.

In more recent weeks, moreover, there have been indications that the Western nations are prepared to consider bringing the United Nations Secretary General into the situation at Berlin, and we have also given assurances that we are willing to refrain from arming our forces in Berlin with nonconventional weapons and that we are ready to limit our forces in that city if it will help to achieve agreement. In short, Mr. President, on the eight points of the nine essentials—and only eight are applicable at this time—there have been significant changes of direction or expression in U.S. foreign policy in an effort to bring about a thaw, to end the rigidity.

So I repeat, Mr. President, a basis for reasonable agreement has been set forth at Geneva by the Western nations. That had needed doing for a long time. It has now been done, in a highly effective manner by the Secretary of State. From this achievement has flowed the highly successful mission of the Vice President to Russia and Poland. From it, too, is derived such hope as may be reposed in the coming Eisenhower-Khrushchev meetings. The Secretary of State and his staff have performed a distinguished public service at Geneva. I do not think that the Senate should lose sight of it in the dazzling new developments which are now taking place.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL FARM LOAN ACT, RELATING TO TRANSFER OF RESPONSIBILITY FOR MAKING APPRAISALS

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to Senate bill 1512.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, are we still in the morning hour?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is still in the morning hour. The matter referred to by the Senator from Florida is a privileged matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1512) to amend the Federal Farm Loan Act to transfer responsibility for making appraisals from the Farm Credit Administration to the Federal land banks, and for other purposes, which

was to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That this Act may be cited as the "Farm Credit Act of 1959".

TITLE I—FEDERAL LAND BANKS

SEC. 101. Section 3 of the Federal Farm Loan Act, as amended, is amended—

(a) by changing the paragraph thereof relating to the appointment of registrars, appraisers, and examiners (12 U.S.C. 656) to read:

"The Farm Credit Administration shall appoint a farm loan registrar for each farm credit district to receive applications for issues of farm loan bonds and to perform such other services as are prescribed by this Act, and may appoint a deputy registrar who shall during the unavoidable absence or disability of the registrar perform the duties of that office. It shall also appoint as many farm credit appraisers and farm credit examiners as it shall deem necessary. Such farm loan registrars, deputy registrars, farm credit appraisers, and farm credit examiners shall have no connection with or interest in any institution, association, or partnership engaged in banking or in the business of making land mortgage loans or selling land mortgages but they may perform such duties as are authorized by the Farm Credit Administration in connection with the business of the banks and associations it supervises: *Provided,* That this limitation shall not apply to persons employed by the Farm Credit Administration on a temporary basis.";

(b) by deleting the paragraph thereof relating to the compensation of appraisers and inspectors (12 U.S.C. 658);

(c) by deleting the paragraph thereof relating to the employment of certain personnel by the Farm Credit Administration (12 U.S.C. 659); and

(d) by deleting the second sentence of the third paragraph from the end thereof (12 U.S.C. 662).

SEC. 102. (a) The second paragraph of section 9 of the Federal Farm Loan Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 742), is amended to read:

"Any person desiring to secure a loan through a Federal land bank association under the provisions of this Act may, at his option, borrow from the Federal land bank through such association the sum necessary to pay for shares of stock subscribed for by by him in the Federal land bank association. Any such sum for the purchase of stock shall be made a part of the face amount of the loan and such sum shall for all purposes be additional to the 65 per centum of the normal value of the farm as specified in any provision of this Act."

(b) Section 10 of the Federal Farm Loan Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 751–757), is amended to read:

"SEC. 10. (a) Whenever an application for a mortgage loan is made to a Federal land bank association, the loan committee provided for in section 7 of this Act shall cause to be made such investigation as it may deem necessary as to the character and solvency of the applicant and the sufficiency of the security offered. When it appears that a loan may be approved, the loan committee shall obtain a written report on the security by an appraiser designated or appointed by the Federal land bank of the district and such appraiser shall investigate and make a written report upon the security offered. Such appraisal, investigation, and report shall be made in accordance with appraisal standards prescribed by the Farm Credit Administration and may be made by any competent person (including an employee of a Federal land bank association) when designated for that purpose by the Federal land bank of the district. The loan committee shall cause a written report to be made of the results of such investigations of the applicant and the security and shall, if it concurs in such report, approve the same in writing. After the loan committee has reached an agreement as to the amount and terms of the loan which may be offered to the applicant, if such amount is not in excess of 65 per centum of the normal value of the security offered as determined by said appraiser, the association may notify the applicant of the amount and terms of the loan approved by the loan committee: *Provided,* That any such notice shall contain a statement that the amount and terms of the loan offered to the applicant are subject to and conditioned upon subsequent approval or disapproval by the Federal land bank.

"(b) The written report of the loan committee and the report made by an appraiser designated or appointed by the Federal land bank shall be submitted to the Federal land bank with the application for the loan, and the land bank shall examine said reports when it passes on the loan application which they accompany. No loan shall be made unless the report of the loan committee and the report of the appraiser are favorable.

"(c) All appraisal reports shall be made on forms approved by the Farm Credit Administration.

"(d) No farm credit appraiser and no appraiser designated or appointed by a Federal land bank shall make any appraisal in connection with a loan in which he is interested, directly or indirectly. No member of a loan committee or of a board of directors of a Federal land bank association shall participate in the consideration of or action on any loan in which he is interested, directly or indirectly.

"(e) Each Federal land bank shall conduct studies in such manner and to such extent as the Farm Credit Aministration deems necessary in connection with the appraisal standards prescribed for the district.

"(f) Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this section—

"(1) appraisal reports made by appraisers heretofore or hereafter appointed by the Farm Credit Administration pursuant to section 3 of this Act may be used as a basis for Federal land bank loans;

"(2) the Farm Credit Administration may, in its discretion and in such circumstances and for such periods as it deems necessary, direct that any or all appraisals in connection with loans by any Federal land bank, or appraisal standards studies required by subsection (e), shall be made by farm credit appraisers appointed pursuant to section 3 of this Act; and

"(3) for purposes of paragraph (2) of this subsection, the Farm Credit Administration is authorized to employ additional farm credit appraisers, including such appraisers as it may select who have been designated or appointed by a Federal land bank, and to require that the salaries and other expenses of all such additional appraisers be paid by the Federal land bank served by them in such manner as the Farm Credit Administration shall determine.

"(g) Farm credit appraisers appointed pursuant to section 3 of this Act shall make such reviews and investigations as the Farm Credit Administration determines to be necessary to assure compliance with the appraisal standards prescribed by it pursuant to subsection (a) of this section; make such additional reviews and investigations concerning the quality of first mortgages securing farm loan bonds as the Farm Credit Administration shall direct; and perform such other duties as may be prescribed by the Farm Credit Administration. Any first mortgage which is found not to conform to the appraisal and loan standards prescribed by the Farm Credit Administration shall not be credited toward meeting the amount of bond collateral which a Federal land bank is required to maintain with a farm loan registrar except in such amount as the Farm Credit Administration shall approve."

SEC. 103. On the effective date of this title each land bank appraiser shall be transferred from the Farm Credit Administration to the Federal land bank served by him immediately prior to said effective date, without reduction in salary and accumulated leave, unless the Farm Credit Administration, in its discretion, determines that individual appraisers shall be retained as farm credit appraisers. The selection of personnel for transfer, or for retention as farm credit appraisers, shall be without regard to section 12 of the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944, as amended (45 U.S.C. 861). Land bank appraisers shall be subject to the same employment conditions as other bank employees after transfer under this section. At least sixty days prior to the effective date of this title the Farm Credit Administration shall notify each land bank appraiser that he is to be transferred to a Federal land bank or that he is to be retained in the Farm Credit Administration. Any land bank appraiser who notifies the Farm Credit Administration in writing at least thirty days before the effective date of this title that he does not desire to accept employment as stated in the notice from the Farm Credit Administration shall be separated from employment on said effective date and such separation shall be deemed involuntary.

SEC. 104. (a) Section 12 of the Federal Farm Loan Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 771), is amended by (1) changing the last proviso of paragraph "Second" thereof to read: "*And provided further,* That any land bank may make loans on an unamortized or partially amortized basis, under rules and regulations issued by the Farm Credit Administration."; (2) striking out of paragraph "Seventh" thereof "loans to any one borrower shall in no case exceed a maximum of $200,000, but".

(b) Section 20 of the Federal Farm Loan Act, as amended, is amended by deleting the second sentence thereof (12 U.S.C. 861, second sentence) and by inserting the following immediately before the period at the end of the last sentence thereof (12 U.S.C. 864, last sentence): ", except that, with the approval of the Farm Credit Administration, an issue of bonds may be limited to bearer or coupon bonds.

(c) The first and second sentences of section 23 of the Federal Farm Loan Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 901), are amended by substituting "at the end of each fiscal year" for "semiannually" therein.

(d) The first and second sentences of section 24 of the Federal Farm Loan Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 911), are amended by substituting "at the end of each fiscal year" for "semiannually" therein.

(e) The seventh paragraph of section 29 of the Federal Farm Loan Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 967), is amended by changing "land bank appraiser" in the second and third sentences thereof to "farm credit appraiser".

(f) Section 202(c) of the Federal Farm Loan Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1033), is amended by changing the period at the end thereof to a comma and adding the following: "and any Federal intermediate credit bank may in its discretion purchase such loans or discounts with or without such endorsement.".

(g) Section 208(c) of the Federal Farm Loan Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1093), is amended by changing "Land bank appraisers" in the first sentence thereof to "Farm Credit appraisers".

(h) The Federal Farm Loan Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 641 et seq.), and any other Act of Congress in which the words appear, are amended by changing "national farm loan association" and "national farm loan associations" to "Federal land bank association" and "Federal land bank associations", respectively.

(i) The Federal Farm Loan Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 641 et seq.), and any other Act of Congress in which the words appear, are amended by changing "secretary-treasurer" and "secretary-treasurers", when used

to mean the secretary-treasurer of a national farm loan association (herein renamed "Federal land bank association"), to "manager" and "managers", respectively.

(j) The first sentence of section 5(d) of the Farm Credit Act of 1953 (12 U.S.C. 636 (d)) is amended by inserting immediately before the period at the end thereof ": *Provided*, That the salary of not more than three positions of deputy governor shall each be fixed by the Board at a rate not exceeding $17,500 per annum."

(k) This title shall become effective December 31, 1959.

TITLE II—STATUS OF FARM CREDIT BANKS AND EMPLOYEES

SEC. 201. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, and in order to encourage and facilitate increased borrower participation in the management and control of institutions operating under the supervision of the Farm Credit Administration in accordance with the policy declared in section 2 of the Farm Credit Act of 1953 (12 U.S.C., supp. IV, 636a), section 6 of the Farm Credit Act of 1937, as amended (12 U.S.C. 6401), is amended—

(a) by inserting "(a)" immediately following "SEC. 6.", by redesignating subsections "(a)" and "(b)" as paragraphs "(1)" and "(2)", respectively, and by deleting subsection "(c)";

(b) by adding the following at the end of paragraph (1) of subsection (a) thereof (as redesignated herein): "The employment, compensation, leave, retirement (except as provided in subsection (e) hereof), hours of duty, and all other conditions of employment of such joint officers and employees employed by the district farm credit board, and of separate officers and employees of the Federal land bank, Federal intermediate credit bank, and bank for cooperatives of the district employed by the board of directors of such banks, shall be determined by the respective boards without regard to the laws from which exemption is granted in this section, but all such determinations shall be consistent with the laws under which such banks are organized and operate. Appointments, promotions, and separations so made shall be based on merit and efficiency and no political test or qualification shall be permitted or given consideration. The district farm credit board shall, under rules and regulations prescribed by the Farm Credit Administration, provide for veterans' preference and limitations against political activity for such officers and employees substantially similar to the preference and limitations to which such officers and employees were subject upon enactment of this sentence."; and

(c) by adding the following new subsections after subsection (a) thereof (as redesignated herein):

"(b) The provisions of section 1753 of the Revised Statutes (5 U.S.C. 631) and the Act of January 16, 1883, entitled 'An Act to regulate and improve the civil service of the United States', as amended (22 Stat. 403; 5 U.S.C. 632 et seq.), any laws supplementary thereto, including but not limited to the Act of August 24, 1912, as amended (5 U.S.C. 652), section 1 of the Act of November 26, 1940, as amended (5 U.S.C. 631a), and section 1310 of the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1952, as amended (5 U.S.C. 43, note), and any rules, orders, or regulations promulgated for carrying such Acts or laws into effect, shall not apply to a Federal land bank, Federal intermediate credit bank, or bank for cooperatives, or to its directors, officers, or employees.

"(c) The Federal Employees' Compensation Act, as amended (5 U.S.C., ch. 15), shall not be applicable in respect to the injury, disability, or death of any employee of a Federal land bank, Federal intermediate credit bank, or bank for cooperatives unless such injury, disability, or death (or cause thereof) occurred before January 1, 1960.

"(d) Section 9 of the Hatch Act, as amended (5 U.S.C. 118i), and the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944, as amended (5 U.S.C. 851–869), shall not be deemed to apply to a Federal land bank, Federal intermediate credit bank, or bank for cooperatives, or to its directors, officers, or employees.

"(e) Each officer and employee of a Federal land bank, Federal intermediate credit bank, or bank for cooperatives who, on December 31, 1959, is within the purview of the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended (5 U.S.C., supp. IV, ch. 30), shall continue so during his continuance as an officer or employee of any such banks without break in continuity of service. Any other officer or employee of such banks and any other person entering upon employment with any such bank after December 31, 1959, shall not be covered under the civil service retirement system by reason of such employment, except that (1) a person who, on December 31, 1959, is within the purview of the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended, and thereafter becomes an officer or employee of any such banks without break in continuity of service shall continue under the civil service retirement system during his continuance as an officer or employee of any such banks without break in continuity of service and (2) a person who has been within the purview of said Act as an officer or employee of such banks and, after a break in such employment, again becomes an officer or employee of any such banks may elect to continue under the civil service retirement system during his continuance as such officer or employee by so notifying the Civil Service Commission in writing within thirty days after such reemployment.

"(f) Each Federal land bank, Federal intermediate credit bank, and bank for cooperatives shall contribute to the civil service retirement and disability fund, for each fiscal year after June 30, 1960, a sum as provided by section 4(a) of the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2254(a)), except that such sum shall be determined by applying to the total basic salaries (as defined in that Act) paid to the employees of said banks who are covered by that Act, the per centum rate determined annually by the United States Civil Service Commission to be the excess of the total normal cost per centum rate of the civil service retirement system over the employee deduction rate specified in such section 4(a). Each bank shall also pay into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts such portion of the cost of administration of the fund as is determined by the United States Civil Service Commission to be attributable to its employees.

"(g) Any Federal land bank, Federal intermediate credit bank, or bank for cooperatives may, subject to the approval of the Farm Credit Administration, establish a retirement system for its officers and employees either separately or jointly with any other corporation under the supervision of the Farm Credit Administration. In determining eligibility for or the amount of any benefit under any such retirement system, there shall not be taken into account any service which is creditable under the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended, but service which constitutes employment as defined in section 210(a) of the Social Security Act, as amended (42 U.S.C., supp. IV, 410 (a)), may be so taken into account notwithstanding section 115 of the Social Security Amendments of 1954 (42 U.S.C., supp. IV, 410, note) or any other provision of law.

"(h) Subsections (b), (c), (d), (e), (f), and (g) of this section shall apply to the Central Bank for Cooperatives and its personnel and the board of directors of the Central Bank for Cooperatives shall have all the authority and responsibility with respect to personnel of such central bank as is vested in the farm credit board of a district or the board of directors of a district bank for cooperatives with respect to personnel of any such district bank under subsection (a)(1) of this section."

SEC. 202. (a) Section 210(a)(6)(B)(ii) of title II of the Social Security Act, as amended (42 U.S.C. supp. IV, 410(a(6)(B)(ii)), and section 3121(b)(6)(B)(ii) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, as amended (26 U.S.C., supp. IV, 3121(b)(6)(B)(ii)), are each amended by inserting "a Federal land bank, a Federal intermediate credit bank, a bank for cooperatives," immediately before the words "a national farm loan association" therein.

(b) Section 2680 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection: "(n) Any claim arising from the activities of a Federal land bank, a Federal intermediate credit bank, or a bank for cooperatives.".

(c) Section 102(b) of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945, as amended (5 U.S.C. 902(b)), is amended by striking out "and" immediately preceding "(6)" therein and by inserting before the period at the end thereof "; and (7) officers and employees of a Federal land bank, a Federal intermediate credit bank, or a bank for cooperatives".

(d) Section 303 of the Government Employees Incentive Awards Act (5 U.S.C., supp. IV, 2122) is amended by inserting within the parentheses after the words "the Tennessee Valley Authority" the words "or the Central Bank for Cooperatives".

(e) Section 205(e) of the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951, as added by section 4(b) of the Act of July 2, 1953 (5 U.S.C., supp. IV, 2064(e)), and section 1 of the Act of December 21, 1944, as amended by section 4(a) of the Act of July 2, 1953 (5 U.S.C., supp. IV, 61b), are each amended by substituting "(C), (H), or (I)" for "(C), or (H)" therein.

SEC. 203. (a) Nothing in this title shall be deemed to amend, alter, repeal, or restrict the application of (1) section 190 of the Revised Statutes (5 U.S.C. 99), relating to the prosecution of claims against the United States by former employees; (2) the Act of August 26, 1950 (5 U.S.C. 22–1, 22–2, 22–3), relating to the suspension and separation of employees for security reasons; (3) section 710(e) of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended (50 U.S.C., app., supp. IV, 2160 (e)), relating to the authority of the President to provide for an executive reserve training program; or (4) any Act of Congress the violation of which is punishable by a fine or imprisonment, or both.

(b) Any Act of Congress enacted after the effective date of this title and which states that it shall be applicable to agencies or instrumentalities of the United States or to corporations controlled or owned, in whole or in part, by the United States, or to officers and employees of the United States or such agencies or instrumentalities or corporations, shall not be applicable to a Federal land bank, Federal intermediate credit bank, or bank for cooperatives, or to its directors, officers, or employees unless such Act specifically so provides by naming such banks.

(c) This title shall become effective January 1, 1960.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the situation involving the House amendment, in which I am going to ask the Senate to concur, is as follows: Some time ago, the Senate passed S. 1512, relating to the Farm Credit Administration, which was a carefully studied bill reported from the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry unanimously, and representing the reduced request of the Federal Farm Credit Board.

Two or three of their requests, which were minor, the committee felt should

be denied because of some controversy having arisen.

When the bill went to the House, the House proceeded to pass its own bill with one amendment, that amendment being the only part of the House bill which differs in any substantial way at all from the Senate bill.

I have had counsel for the Senate committee carefully check the House bill, and in a written statement from Mr. Harker T. Stanton, counsel for the Senate committee, he states there is no substantial difference other than this one amendment to which I shall refer, the other differences being matters of punctuation and the like.

The one amendment is a substantial amendment, and before we decided what to ask the Senate to do about it, I followed this course: Serving as chairman of the subcommittee which had handled the bill, I conferred with the chairman of the full committee, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], and with the ranking minority member, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], both of whom, after some study, decided, as I had decided, that it would be advisable for us to concur in the House amendment.

I may say that the Board of the Farm Credit Administration asked us in writing to concur in the amendment. I shall ask that their letter be included in the RECORD.

Mr. President, both the Senate bill and the original House bill were addressed to the single objective of trying to bring about more grower-borrower ownership and control of the units of the Farm Credit Administration, and particularly the Federal land banks and their associations. As to the substance of the amendment, both original bills provided that all the civil service laws and regulations and requirements applicable to the employees of these institutions, from 1,500 to 1,600 in number, should be canceled, except the one having to do with their retirement privileges. Since all the employees up to this time have vested interests in the retirement fund, some of them of long duration, the Senate bill provided simply that the retirement privilege should be continued exactly as in the case of its earlier application; that is, by the employees paying 6½ percent of their salaries and the employers out of their own funds paying 6½ percent.

When the bill reached the House, both the Civil Service Commission and the chairman of the Civil Service Committee in the House of Representatives, after study, decided that the Senate provision did not go far enough in its requirements of the employers—that is, the units of the Farm Credit Administration—because of the fact that the program is not entirely self-supporting at present, but is operating with some deficit, so that it does not completely carry itself. So the amendment proposed in the House and adopted in the House provided, in substance, what the House believed the employers should pay.

I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 6353

Page 14, strike out lines 8 to 17, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(f) Each Federal land bank, Federal intermediate credit bank, and bank for cooperatives shall contribute to the civil service retirement and disability fund, for each fiscal year after June 30, 1960, a sum as provided by section 4 (a) of the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended (5 U. S. C. 2254 (a)), except that such sum shall be determined by applying to the total basic salaries (as defined in that act) paid to the employees of said banks who are covered by that Act, the per centum rate determined annually by the United States Civil Service Commission to be the excess of the total normal cost per centum rate of the civil service retirement system over the employee deduction rate specified in such section 4 (a). Each bank shall also pay into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts such portion of the cost of administration of the fund as is determined by the United States Civil Service Commission to be attributable to its employees."

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the amendment provides that instead of paying 6½ percent, the employers shall pay whatever percent is found in each year by the Civil Service Commission to be necessary to carry the normal cost of the program. For this first year it is estimated at 7 percent rather than 6½ percent. It may be more in the future. Indications are that it probably will be. Whatever it is, the banking institutions will have to pay it.

In addition, as provided by both the Senate bill and the House amendment, they must pay their fair share of the cost of the administration of the program as reported by the Civil Service Commission from year to year.

Mr. President, it is with that amendment that we are dealing, and it is that amendment in which I ask the Senate to concur.

I may say that I have conferred, as a matter of course, and as a matter of trying to do the right thing, with the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], and with the distinguished ranking minority member, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], so that they would have full opportunity to apprise themselves of what has been done.

I have also conferred in some detail with my distinguished colleague the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], a member of the Agriculture and Forestry Committee and a member of the subcommittee which had considered this bill.

After full notice and with those Senators present, I am asking the Senate to concur in the House amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Delaware?

Mr. HOLLAND. May I yield first to the distinguished Senator from South Carolina? I have conferred with him at some length. He is the chairman of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee, and I understand he has had contact with the Civil Service Commission, and perhaps with the House committee, although I am not sure of that. So I think it would be appropriate for the Senator from South Carolina to make his statement first, and I yield to him, if I may.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I wish to invite attention to the fact that certain provisions of title II of S. 1512 violate accepted principles of a good staff retirement system. I refer to the provisions which would continue coverage under the Civil Service Retirement Act for present bank employees after they cease to be employees of the United States.

The Civil Service Retirement Act comes within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, of which I have the honor to be chairman. This Retirement Act establishes a staff retirement plan for civilian employees of the United States. All of its benefits, and likewise all its obligations, are based on the existence of an employer-employee relationship between the Government and the individual. In other words, coverage applies, and retirement credit is allowed, only for periods in which the Government is the employer. Worded another way, credit for retirement purposes accrues only when the individual is an employee of Uncle Sam.

By the terms of S. 1512, employees of the Federal land banks, Federal intermediate credit banks, and banks for cooperatives will cease to be Federal employees on December 31, 1959.

This was made quite clear by the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the floor manager of the bill, when he stated as follows on July 16 when the bill was first before the Senate for consideration:

> The personnel of such banks are, therefore, more like private business employees than Government employees. However, they are subject to numerous statutes as Government employees, and it is the purpose of this bill to correct that situation by making such statutes inapplicable to these employees. The specific statutes are set out and described on pages 7, 8, and 9 of the committee report. Employees already covered by the Civil Service Retirement Act would continue subject to that act, while the Social Security Act would be made applicable to new employees. It is intended that such new employees would also be covered by District retirement plans.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] continued:

> Mr. President, it is quite obvious that this is but another step in carrying out the general intent of Congress as made plain back in 1953, that these institutions shall not only become borrower owned and borrower managed, but that their employees may be regarded as employees of private institutions rather than as Government employees.

Mr. President, this statement certainly makes it clear that these employees will in the future be private employees and not Federal employees. Yet notwithstanding this, under the terms of the bill they will continue to receive credit for future service for retirement purposes.

In the future they are employees of the banks, and the banks as their employers should assume responsibility for retirement benefits for service from and after January 1, 1960. The bill, however, continues these present employees under the Civil Service Retirement Act until they eventually retire or are otherwise separated. This action for the first time in history grants retirement credit and gives coverage to individuals who are not Federal employees.

Mr. President, this action should not be considered as a precedent for the future or with respect to any other group.

Mr. President, I do not know why the report on this bill, filed in the Senate on June 5, failed to contain the adverse report of the Civil Service Commission with respect to this particular provision. The report of the Commission is dated April 23, 1959. Certainly, it should have been made a part of the report so that the Senate would have had the full picture. While it does little good to now lock the barn door, I ask unanimous consent that the report of the Commission be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from South Carolina? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I notice in one paragraph the statement is made:

> The Commission endorses the basic purposes of the bill, but objects to the provisions which would permit employees of these organizations to continue under the Civil Service Retirement Act.

Mr. President, my purpose in making these comments at this time is simply to establish for the record that the action taken in respect in this bill will in no wise establish a precedent for the future, when there is a transfer of employees from the Federal Government to private industry or from the Federal Government to State governments.

I think the financial integrity of the civil service retirement system must be protected, and this can be done only if coverage thereunder is limited strictly and without exception to bona fide Federal service.

Mr. President, I am not objecting, but I want to make sure this will not be considered a precedent. We have to be sure of what we do, for the protection of the civil service retirement fund.

EXHIBIT 1

U.S. CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., April 23, 1959.

Senator ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
Chairman, Senate Agriculture and Forestry Committee, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR ELLENDER: At the request of a member of your committee's staff, we are submitting herewith the views of the Civil Service Commission on S. 1513, a bill "to clarify the status of the Federal land banks, the Federal intermediate credit banks, and the banks for cooperatives and their officers and employees with respect to certain laws applicable generally to the United States and its officers and employees, and for other purposes."

The principal purpose of the draft bill is to provide that officers and employees of the lending institutions under the supervision of the Farm Credit Administration shall no longer be considered as Federal employees for all personnel purposes other than retirement. With respect to retirement, the bill provides: (1) those officers or employees subject to the Civil Service Retirement Act on December 31, 1959, would retain such coverage as long as they remained in bank employment without break in service; (2) persons having civil service retirement coverage in other employment on December 31, 1959, and subsequently appointed to bank positions without a break in service would remain under the Retirement Act; (3) persons who were once subject to the Retirement Act as bank employees could, after a break in service and upon later appointment to bank positions, elect to secure retirement coverage; and (4) officers and employees not having retirement coverage on December 31, 1959, and those appointed after that date, would not acquire such coverage.

The Commission endorses the basic purposes of the bill, but objects to the provisions which would permit employees of these organizations to continue under the Civil Service Retirement Act.

Because we concur with the position that employees of these institutions are to be considered as non-Government employees, we cannot agree with the proposal that some of them continue to be covered by the Civil Service Retirement Act. The Civil Service Retirement Act establishes a staff retirement system as part of the personnel program of the United States. The system is designed solely for the retirement of Federal and District of Columbia employees. It is intended to provide benefits as an award for faithful service to the Government. All of its obligations and all of its benefits stem directly from the employer-employee relationship which exists between the United States and the employee. Annuity benefits are given only for periods of service in this employer-employee relationship.

To depart from this concept would necessitate the substitution of some other criterion as to when the United States should be obligated to provide retirement coverage and benefits for periods of non-Federal employment. We do not believe any line could be drawn which would in fairness distinguish between different groups of non-Federal employees.

We do not believe that our position in this matter would be unfair to the employees of these institutions. The Retirement Act vests in an employee with at least 5 years' civilian employment a right to an annuity beginning at age 62, thus fulfilling any reasonable obligation the Government might have to provide retirement benefits to an individual who spends only a part of his working career in the Federal service. Employees with 30 years of service who attain the age of 55 could receive immediate annuities under the act. Furthermore, since separation from the Federal service (resulting from passage of S. 1513) would be involuntary, employees who had served 25 years or who had reached age 50 and completed 20 years of service would be eligible for immediate annuity. These annuities would be payable regardless of whether the individual later becomes entitled to social security benefits and benefits under the bank's retirement system.

If the banks desire to guarantee that a possible loss does not occur, their retirement plans could incorporate a provision whereby the benefit, when combined with social security and civil service retirement benefits, could not be less than what would have been payable to the employee had he remained under the Civil Service Retirement Act.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that although it has no objection to the submission of this report to your committee, the Bureau cleared for transmittal to Congress the Farm Credit Administration's draft bill which has been introduced as S. 1513 and which provides for Retirement Act coverage for these employees after their Federal status is terminated.

By direction of the Commission.

Sincerely yours,

———,
Chairman.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I fully recognize the importance of the matter, and the accuracy of the statement made by the distinguished Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. President, I should like to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks the letter to which I referred to in my earlier remarks, from Earl H. Brockman, Chairman of the Federal Farm Credit Board, requesting acceptance of the House amendment.

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

FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D.C., August 3, 1959.

Hon. SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Agricultural Credit and Rural Electrification, Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR HOLLAND: The House of Representatives today passed, with an amendment, the farm credit bill (S. 1512) which the Senate passed on July 16. The amendment, offered by Congressman MURRAY, chairman of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, would require the farm credit banks to contribute to the civil service retirement and disability fund an additional amount estimated at one-half of 1 percent of payroll for the approximately 1,500 employees who will remain under the civil service retirement system under the terms of the bill. The banks now contribute 6½ percent of payroll to that fund, a percentage which is matched by the employees of the banks. Therefore, in the future, the banks would contribute to the fund a sum equal to some 7 percent of payroll which, together with the 6½ percent paid by the employees, would cover the normal cost of the fund for the future for all of the bank employees affected.

The Federal Farm Credit Board, at its meeting today, voted to recommend Senate approval of the Murray amendment adopted by the House and respectfully requests your assistance in obtaining Senate concurrence in this amendment as soon as possible. There is enclosed a copy of the amendment, together with an explanation thereof, which was sent to us by members of the staff of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

Except as explained above, the bill as passed by the House is identical in substance to the bill passed by the Senate on July 16.

On behalf of the Board, I wish to express to you our sincere appreciation of your efforts in the passage of this legislation and your continued interest in the farm credit system.

Very truly yours,

EARL H. BROCKMAN,
Chairman, Federal Farm Credit Board.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the memorandum from Harker T. Stanton, counsel for the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, reporting on the substance and meaning of the amendment.

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

MEMORANDUM FOR SENATOR HOLLAND

Except for the amendment proposed by Congressman MURRAY and accepted by the House, the House amendment to S. 1512 is identical in substance to the bill as passed by the Senate.

The Murray amendment requires the 37 farm credit banks in the future to pay into the civil service retirement fund with respect to those employees retained under civil service retirement the amount by which the total normal cost for retirement coverage for these employees exceeds the amount contributed by the employees, while the Senate bill requires the banks to pay an amount equal to that paid by the employees (that being the amount required by sec. 4(a) of the Civil Service Retirement Act to be paid out of agency funds). On the basis of present normal costs the banks would, under this amendment, pay an estimated 7 percent of payroll instead of 6½ percent.

Under both the Senate bill and the House amendment the banks, in addition, would pay their fair share of the estimated cost of administration of the fund.

There are a number of minor technical differences between the Senate bill and the House amendment, none of which appear to be significant.

Respectfully,

HARKER T. STANTON,
Counsel, Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

AUGUST 4, 1959.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I earlier asked unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a copy of the amendment. For the situation presented it is not easy to find a completely satisfactory answer. We are considering some 1,500 to 1,600 employees, some of whom are on the verge of retirement and some of whom have been in employment for many years, though some have been employed only a short while. We cut off all that group from later employees, and we provide for their equities in the civil service retirement program to be continued, but it seems to me we do so on the soundest basis from the Government standpoint that would be possible; that is, by specifically requiring, under the House amendment, that whatever is the cost it must be met by increased payments by the employers, payments greater than those which the Government is making, and also that the fair part of the administrative cost shall be paid, in addition.

Except for that kind of handling, Mr. President, a grave injustice could be done one way or another.

First, there is a possible injustice to the employees themselves.

Second, if the employees should elect to leave these concerns and go to other Government agencies, a hardship would be sustained by the employers, who would be deprived of their long time and experienced employees.

Third, I wish to point out that there will probably be no other program exactly like this, because these companies, which are not new at all, are simply being gradually taken away from their former Federal links financially, in that the companies are reducing and retiring their obligations to the Federal Government. The Federal land banks have completely retired their obligations and are completely grower- and user-owned. The other institutions are partly so, and the Federal Government still has a substantial interest in them, and still has, through the Directors of the Farm Credit Administration, very sizable jurisdiction over them. As a matter of fact, the Federal Government has some jurisdiction and always will have some jurisdiction over the Federal land banks and over their associations, so it cannot be really said these groups are completely being divorced from the Government as, for instance, a contractor would be, or a private business would be, or a lawyer going out into practice from former employment in the Government would be, because there will always be this link with the Government. This is recognized by the fact that the President appoints 12 of the 13 Directors, and the Secretary of Agriculture appoints the other one. It is also recognized by the fact that considerable regulatory power is continued under the permanent legislation on the part of the directors of the Farm Credit Administration over all of the unit institutions.

I do not know of any more fair solution of this matter than that which has been worked out by the House of Representatives. I am very frank to say I think it is a more fair solution for the matter than the one which was offered in the Senate bill we originally passed. I am glad the amendment has been adopted, and I am more than happy to support its acceptance by the Senate.

Mr. CARLSON rose.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, if I may, I should now like to yield to the ranking minority member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON].

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I wish to thank the distinguished chairman of the committee handling this proposed legislation. I support the motion to concur in the amendment, but I do so with some reservations.

I think the record ought to be made absolutely clear, and the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service has already done so. While this might be considered to be a precedent, we must not let it become a precedent for future legislation. There is no question about it being a new phase of taking care of our employees.

I think it might be well for the RECORD to give a little history in regard to this particular legislation and in regard to the retirement of these employees.

In 1942 the Retirement Act was amended to cover all employees in the excepted civil service. The farm credit district employees were but a small segment of that large group.

Sometime prior to that, farm credit banks had engaged an actuarial consultant at a cost of $5,000 to develop a private retirement program for their employees. The program developed was an excellent one with benefits substantially equal to those of the Retirement Act at that time. The plan provided that the total cost of prior service of employees would be funded, either immediately or on an installment basis.

The districts were on the verge of installing the program when the 1942 amendment to the Retirement Act was reported in both Houses of Congress.

In other words, the districts had made plans originally to take care of their employees, but then the Retirement Act was passed, and those employees were included under the Retirement Act of 1942.

Since the Civil Service Commission would have authority to administer the amended act, farm credit attorneys questioned the Commission on the effect the amendment would have on district employees if it became law. The Commission replied that the amendment would apply to the wholly Government-owned banks and corporations, but not to the others. The Commission also advised that there was no choice in the matter and that retirement deductions were mandatory. This decision did two things. First, it split the organization in each district as far as retirement benefits were concerned, providing coverage under the act to the employees of the Federal intermediate credit banks and the production credit corporations and denying this coverage to employees of the Federal land banks and the banks for cooperatives. Secondly, it made it impossible to proceed with the proposed private retirement program.

About a year later, the Farm Credit Administration pointed out the administrative difficulties arising from split coverage of district employees. The Civil Service Commission then extended the benefits of the Retirement Act to employees of the Federal land banks and the banks for cooperatives, ruling that deductions for these employees would have to be made retroactively to date of the amendment.

Thus the record clearly shows that present civil service retirement coverage of farm credit bank employees was not at its inception attributable to any voluntary action on the part of the farm credit system, and that in fact the employees were blanketed under the Retirement Act at the very time a private retirement program was to be instituted in their behalf. Under these circumstances, it would be particularly unfair to change their retirement program in any way other than that proposed in the bill.

I wish that statement to be in the RECORD as a part of the history. We are confronted with a difficult situation today. Here was a Government agency which offered to set up its own retirement program. When these employees were blanketed in, the Civil Service Commission extended coverage to two additional agencies which had not been included; so all four of them were included. For that reason. I think it would be most unfair to those employees if we did not concur in the amendment of the House.

The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, placed in the RECORD—and I am glad he did—a letter from the Civil Service Commission, written to the chairman of the House Civil Service Committee, Mr.

MURRAY, opposing this provision. Therefore, I think it is important that the RECORD show that while I approve the House amendment, which I hope will be concurred in, it does not set a precedent for the future transfer of agencies from the Federal Government.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I express my appreciation to the Senator from South Carolina and the Senator from Kansas for their understanding attitude. I believe they would agree that no exactly comparable situation is likely to arise in the future. So we cannot create much of a precedent, because of the continuing relationship between the Federal Government and the entire Farm Credit Administration, and because of the past history, which has been so fully described by both Senators, who are interested in this subject.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware rose.

Mr. HOLLAND. I shall be glad to yield in a few minutes to the Senator from Delaware, who is concerned about this situation.

First, I should have said earlier that it is now estimated that it will cost these 37 institutions $48,000 in the first year, by reason of the excess of the actual going cost over the 6½ percent required of the Government as a contribution under the civil service law, which will mean that this part of the whole system will certainly be solvent. That amount may be increased in later years. That possibility is fully within the knowledge of the 37 companies concerned, and of the Farm Credit Administration itself. They accept that responsibility.

I am sure that it will not do the Senate any harm to realize that the civil service retirement program, which is a very important part of the Government program relating to its many employees, is not as soundly financed as it should be, in its average application. As one Senator, I assure my distinguished friends on the Post Office and Civil Service Committee that I shall be glad to support them and their committee in an effort to make the civil service program sounder in its general application.

I now yield to the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], or I shall be glad to yield the floor, as the Senator may wish.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I desire to be recognized in my own time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware is recognized.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I point out that should we adopt this amendment we shall be establishing an entirely new precedent. I agree with the Senator from Kansas that we may not want to do that, but we cannot escape the fact that when this provision becomes law we shall have established a precedent under which employees of a privately owned company will be allowed to continue to qualify for civil service retirement benefits—a retirement system which was established solely for the benefit of employees of the U.S. Government. I do not think we can escape that fact. I am sure the Senator from Florida will agree that that is exactly what we are doing.

I now yield to the Senator from Florida, to see if there is any disagreement on that point.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I certainly agree that these employees, by other provisions of the bill, are being designated as not under the Civil Service Commission, in that various acts, such as the Hatch Act and numerous others listed in our report, including a blanketing of other acts under general terminology, applying to civil service employees, are made inapplicable to them.

This is a part of the general effort to make these institutions as nearly grower- and user-owned and managed as possible. But we have the problem of doing equity to this limited group of employees now in the firms. All the others will be under the private retirement plan. We have the problem of protecting these firms against employees leaving wholesale in order to keep themselves under civil service, as they would have the right to do, of course, by going to some other governmental agency.

The two Senators who have commented on the subject have brought into the picture another real equity, in that these employees were apparently blanketed into the civil service, which fact was not known to the Senator from Florida until just now, notwithstanding the fact that the institutions, foreseeing what would happen in the future, preferred to set up a retirement program of their own, and were engaged in so doing when their employees were all blanketed into the civil service.

I now yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I thought I had the floor.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I get back to my original statement. We cannot escape the fact that we are establishing a precedent. These companies were formerly agencies of the U.S. Government, owned by the U.S. Government, and operated as such. Therefore, the employees were properly classified as employees of the Government. The agencies, however, have been sold. The arrangements have already been made even though they may not be entirely paid for.

These agencies were sold, just as we sold the rubber plant, and just as we sold the inland waterways years ago. They were formerly owned by the Government. In those instances when we sold the property belonging to the Government, the employees working for the particular agency became employees of the private company which bought the property, just as these employees will be employees of this particular company. If they built up a retirement credit under the civil service retirement fund, they can retain it. That protection is afforded all Government employees who leave Government service. But these employees are no longer working for the U.S. Government. They will no longer be subject to such restrictions as are provided in the Hatch Act, and so forth. They are not employees of the U.S. Government; yet we are conferring upon the private company to which we have sold these establishments the authority to continue some of their employees as though they were Government employees so far as retirement benefits are concerned. This would be the first time in the history of the country that such a thing has been done.

It is a bad precedent and will prove very costly to the Government should it be adopted.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. If it is the first time, it clearly establishes a precedent. However, it occurs to me that in enacting much legislation we have recognized a principle of equity which has come to be described as "grandfather rights." The other day I heard a discussion of the veterans' benefits bill which has been proposed by the administration, I believe. It was pointed out in that connection that while it would change some things in the future, it would not disturb awards which had been made theretofore. Those who had received awards on some particular basis would be entitled to continue to receive the benefits.

We have recognized the so-called grandfather rights in connection with other forms of governmental activity. We do so in connection with the licensing of air lines, and in granting licenses to common carriers. In that respect, we would not be establishing an entirely new principle.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator from South Dakota is in error, because no matter what action we take, the rights of every one of these former employees of the Government are protected; they are in no way reduced. They are already taken care of under the law. For instance, if they have 15 years of credit under the civil-service retirement system, they can maintain full credit. No one is proposing to take any of it away. The Senator from South Dakota and I, as well as other employees of the Government today are building up retirement benefits. When we reach retirement age and have retired, we will be eligible for benefits based upon our period of service and our contribution to the fund. But when we leave the Government for private employment, we cannot continue to build up credit as if we were employed by the Government of the United States.

This bill gives to these private employers the right to make contractual arrangements with the Civil Service Commission to continue retirement benefits for their employees. Why?

For example, suppose one of these employees has already built up 25 years of credit as an employee of the U.S. Government. The retirement benefits are

based on the highest 5-year average salary, and suppose his average salary was $5,000 a year. Now, that employee gets employment for 5 years in this private company, and suppose he gets an increase to a $10,000 salary. If he works 5 years at that salary with this private company, he can double his retirement benefits. The Government cost would be doubled if this bill passes.

This may be an extreme example, but it could happen. The retirement credits earned while an employee of the U.S. Government would be doubled in this case.

What is proposed here today is something which has never been done before. If we are not careful, we will break down the whole principle of the retirement system for employees of the U.S. Government. To my knowledge this is the first time it has ever been proposed that the Government extend the benefits of the civil service retirement system to employees other than those of agencies of the U.S. Government.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I would not in any way wish to challenge the statement made by the Senator from Delaware. I think he has made an accurate statement. But I desire the RECORD to show very definitely that this proposal applies only to employees who are now under the civil service program.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is correct.

Mr. CARLSON. From now on, the Farm Credit Administration must set up its own retirement program. So the proposal affects only employees who have been on the rolls and who were blanketed in in 1942.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is correct. But my position is that the Farm Credit Administration and other properties which have been sold by the Government and are now private organizations should establish their own retirement systems for the benefit of their employees. Then when those employees reach retirement age, they can claim retirement credit for the amount which they built up as employees of the U.S. Government plus any retirement credits they have built up in the private company.

The question we must decide today is, Shall we extend the right to retirement benefits to employees of establishments and businesses which were once owned by the U.S. Government but which have been sold to private companies? I should like to see the Government get out of those businesses.

Should we allow the employees of those companies and agencies to continue to be classified for retirement purposes as employees of the U.S. Government?

The Government during and after the war owned rubber plants. Naturally, those employees were working for agencies or plants owned by the U.S. Government. In the sale of such plants, should we continue to consider their employees as employees of the U.S. Government?

The Government owns the Alaska Railroad. No one advocates the Government ownership of railroads, but the Government must operate it because a buyer cannot be secured. But certainly if the time comes when it is possible for the Government to dispose of the Alaska Railroad should we allow the employees of that railroad to continue to be employees of the U.S. Government for retirement benefit purposes?

The question is not only, What shall we do about this situation? But, How shall we consider the employees of the numerous business establishments which were once owned and later sold by the Government? How shall we treat those employees who are no longer employees of the U.S. Government?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Does the Senator from Delaware regard the transfer of the ownership of the Farm Credit Administration as desirable?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Yes; I questioned at the time the manner in which it was to be transferred. I did not think the Government was properly compensated for it, but that is a matter of opinion. That question has been decided by Congress in legislation previously enacted.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Does the Senator from Delaware think it was a desirable objective to have the Government get out of that business?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Yes, I do, but I want the buyer to accept his responsibilities.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Does the Senator think the provision here proposed to recognize the continuing rights of the older employees facilitated the disposition of the Farm Credit Administration?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I do not think it affected it at all.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I rather think it did. I think the attitude of some of the employees has been more friendly to the liquidation of the business by the Government since they felt that the security which was accorded them in their positions will not be jeopardized.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That thought might have been in the minds of one or two employees, but I do not think it would have influenced the sale of these properties one single iota.

These properties during the course of their operation had built up several million dollars in surplus. I know that one agency had built up a $180 million equity for the U.S. Government. When it was sold the Government gave away its rights to this surplus. I opposed this as a giveaway at the time. Whether the properties were sold too cheap or too high is a matter which has been decided by Congress. It is not in issue here.

The question now before us is, shall we allow an agency or a company which was once Government-owned and which has been sold by an act of Congress to permit its former employees to continue to secure benefits under the Civil Service Retirement Act, while working for this new privately owned company?

As the Senator from Kansas has pointed out, the bill affects only the employees having service prior to the sale. It is proposed to allow them to continue to build up retirement credits under the civil service retirement system, a system which has heretofore been operated exclusively for the benefit of employees of the U.S. Government.

I do not think this is so much a question of the amount of money involved as it is a matter of principle and of what its effect will be on the retirement system tomorrow and in the days to come.

I am one who does not think the Government should socialize our economy. Are we to place the Government in the position where it cannot sell a business to private enterprise unless it continues the employees under the civil service retirement system?

Perhaps it was necessary for us to start the synthetic rubber plants and some of the other businesses in which the Government engaged during and after the war, but later I think it was proper that they be sold to private enterprise. If every time we sell such a business we are going to raise a question as to whether its employees should be continued on the civil service retirement rolls, we had better ask ourselves how far we are going. Shall we extend the principle to all other businesses and plants which the Government may hereafter sell?

I hope this is only the beginning of an effort by the U.S. Government to get out of businesses which should properly be privately operated. A moment ago I specifically mentioned the railroad in Alaska. I look forward to the day when the Government can dispose of that railroad as well as of many other businesses. But when the time comes to dispose of them, shall we say that those employees must be retained under the civil service retirement system and will be recognized as employees of the Government for retirement purposes?

I shall vote against this proposal.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, there are two or three reasons why I agree to this proposal instead of object to it. It will be noted that the number of employees affected is between 1,500 and 1,600. That is all the bill amounts to.

Some of these persons have been in the Government service a long time and are probably within 1 year of their retirement. I doubt whether, from the standpoint of equity, it is right for the Government to change their status and the agreements with them, and to block them out when they are so close to the retirement stage at this time. That is one reason.

Another reason is that the proposal cannot in any way jeopardize or make the retirement fund any more insolvent than it is at present. In a way, the bill says to the Civil Service Commission, "We need to pay more funds, and we will pay more funds." We do not say that to the employees. That is another reason why we should agree to the measure.

This is not a situation which is like some other ones. Sixty percent of the

civil service workers in the United States at present have been blanketed into the civil service, and have been given credit without 1 cent being paid by the Government or by the employee. They are men and women who were in the military service during the war. Such things will, I believe, call for some attention.

But the enactment of this bill will not make the retirement fund insolvent; instead, it will make the fund more solvent than ever.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator from South Carolina, and I thank the Senator from Delaware.

In view of the caution the Senator has expressed I believe it very appropriate to remind him that in various respects the enactment of this bill would not establish a precedent which would operate in the case of the sale of a business and the outright severance of any connection with it.

We shall always have the Farm Credit Board, with 12 members appointed by the President and one member appointed by the Secretary of Agriculture; and up to the time when these institutions are fully paid out, we shall have a very special control. For instance, in the case of the Farm Credit Administration, a certain number of directors of institutions down the line are named by the Farm Credit Administration, as the Senator knows, so long as there is a continuing obligation to the U.S. Government; and other powers and other supervisory privileges and requirements exist in the case of the Federal agencies until the debts to the United States are finally paid off.

I remind my distinguished friend that only in the case of the land banks—but not in the case of either the regional banks for cooperatives or the Central Bank for Cooperatives, or the intermediate credit banks—have the obligations been paid off.

So there will be, for many years—and my present estimate is for 20 years or more, in the case of some of these institutions—special supervisory powers by the Federal Government, resulting from the fact that Federal funds are still invested in these institutions.

Therefore, Mr. President, I do not regard this measure as establishing a precedent in any sense. I am perfectly willing to join the Senator from Delaware in expressing very strongly the belief that we should not permit the enactment of this measure to be regarded as establishing a precedent, because this action is being taken, not at the request of the employees, but in the carrying out of a policy, adopted here in Congress—a policy which those employees could not have affected, either one way or the other—which will provide an opportunity for private enterprise to return again and to take the Government out of too important a place in connection with the management of these agricultural credit institutions.

I hope the Senate will concur. I believe this is the fairest arrangement that could be worked out.

I have already stated that I think the House amendment is preferable to the Senate bill, which was reported in the best of faith by the Senator from Delaware, myself, and the other Members. But I believe we overlooked one point—although not a big one—which has been taken care of by means of the House amendment; and I am always glad to admit error when I find we have committed it. That is why I ask the Senate to concur in the House amendment.

Mr. President, I call for a vote on the question.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JAVITS. 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. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield temporarily to the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], without losing the floor.

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

Mr. GOLDWATER. I thank my distinguished friend.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas will state it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Is the Senate still proceeding in the morning hour?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York will state it.

Mr. JAVITS. Have I been recognized?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York has been recognized.

Mr. JAVITS. I ask unanimous consent that at this time I may yield temporarily to the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], and then to the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], and thereafter to any other Senators who may seek recognition for the submission of morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, at this time I yield to the Senator from Arizona.

WHO WILL REPLY TO PRESIDENT EISENHOWER'S BROADCAST ON THE LABOR BILL?

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, as my colleagues know, this evening the President of the United States will address the American people, on the television and the radio, and will urge them to support the efforts of the Members of the House of Representatives who want a really effective labor reform bill passed and enacted into law this year.

It has been suggested in the House of Representatives, by no less than my distinguished colleague, Representative UDALL, that Representative RAYBURN answer the President.

It has been suggested in this body by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] answer the President.

Mr. President, if someone has to answer the President, I wish to suggest who should answer him. On yesterday I suggested that the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] answer the President because I think the Senator from Arkansas knows more about this matter than does any other Member of the Senate. I stated that if it is decided that someone should answer the President, the Senator from Arkansas should be the one to answer him.

However, at this time I should like to suggest someone whom the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] must agree should be the one to answer the President, if an answer is to be made. I suggest George Meany and his lawyers.

In that connection, I read a portion of a speech which the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] delivered not long ago in Oregon before the State of Oregon AFL–CIO:

> Certainly I share their regret that the reasonable, fair, and responsible bill reported by the Senate Labor Committee, and worked out carefully with President Meany and his lawyers, and supported by the executive council, was altered undesirably and unfortunately altered on the floor of a supposedly friendly Senate.

So, Mr. President, finally we have, from the supposed architect of that supposed great bill, the admission that George Meany and his lawyers and the executive council of the AFL–CIO had a great deal to do with the writing of that bill.

Therefore, I suggest that Mr. Meany and his lawyers be asked to reply to the President, if we think the President should be replied to—although I do not think he should be. However, I have that offer to make.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield to me?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from New York may yield, for the purpose of calling up, by unanimous consent, the conference report on the Atomic Energy Commission appropriation bill for 1960, with the understanding that when action on the conference report is concluded, the Senator from New York will hold the floor.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator from Texas.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, at this time I yield to the Senator from Arizona.

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION APPROPRIATION BILL, 1960—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 8283) making appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

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

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of today, p. 15303, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

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

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

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, at this time I ask the Senator from Alabama to restate the policy of the Senate in regard to the procurement of aluminum from the stockpile inventories.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the Appropriations Committee made its position on this matter very definite and clear in its report on the bill to the Senate.

In the report, the Senate Committee on Appropriations made the following statement:

> While in accord with the purpose of the House committee language, insofar as it reflects a desire on the part of the House to stimulate efforts to liquidate Government-owned holdings of metals and similar materials, the committee cannot concur in the House recommendation.

Then the Appropriations Committee proceeded to set forth its reason why it cannot and could not concur in the House recommendation.

I ask unanimous consent that a portion of the report on that point be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

> PROCUREMENT OF MATERIALS FROM STOCKPILE INVENTORIES
>
> The committee expresses concern over the various plans thus far advanced toward orderly liquidation of the strategic and similar stockpiles of critical materials, including the Defense Production Act inventory. In this regard, the committee notes that the House committee has directed in its report that procedures be established whereby fiscal year 1960 aluminum requirements for the Atomic Energy Commission would be furnished from the Defense Production Act inventory rather than being procured from industry.
>
> While in accord with the purpose of the House committee language, insofar as it reflects a desire on the part of the House to stimulate efforts to liquidate Government-owned holdings of metals and similar materials, the committee cannot concur in the House recommendation.
>
> As an indication of the complexities encountered in this area, the general manager of the Atomic Energy Commission has pointed out that the Defense Production Act inventory of aluminum is in fairly basic form, i.e., pigs, ingots, or their equivalent, while "Atomic Energy Commission requirements for materials in this particular form are relatively minor, the bulk of (our) needs being for finished, fabricated, or semifabricated shapes."
>
> The committee fears that any piecemeal approach toward the liquidation of stockpile and Defense Production Act inventory acquisitions could adversely affect domestic and world metals markets, and perhaps the national defense.
>
> Testimony before congressional committees by officials of the executive branch indicates that substantive legislation concerning the problems of Defense Production Act inventory disposals, along with liquidation of critical and related stockpile holdings, is presently under consideration by the executive branch. Consequently, the committee feels that the Atomic Energy Commission should take no action relative to the utilization of Government-owned aluminum until Congress has had an opportunity to consider this legislation.
>
> The committee expects the executive branch to submit legislation to accomplish these purposes to the Congress as soon as practicable.

Mr. HILL. I may say that the position of the Senate Committee on Appropriations is today exactly as it was at the time it filed the report and made the statement which I have just had included in the RECORD. We cannot and we do not concur in the House recommendation.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator whether the conference report provides for stockpiling of manganese.

Mr. HILL. The question did not arise in connection with this bill.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I may be mistaken as to whether the item is in the bill now before the Senate, but there was a discussion about aluminum and bauxite.

Mr. HILL. We discussed aluminum.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The item could be in another bill.

Mr. HILL. It is in the supplemental bill, and not in this bill.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Very well. I shall interrogate the Senator about it at the appropriate time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have included in the RECORD a brief address on behalf of the chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator may proceed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. This statement is submitted on behalf of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON]:

> As one of the conferees on H.R. 8283, the AEC appropriations bill, I must say that I am disappointed in some of the cuts that have been made in the requested AEC budget for fiscal year 1960. In conference, it was necessary to make some concessions to the House conferees which had passed a lower figure than the Senate, but I believe that more concessions and cuts were made than advisable for our important program to develop new uses for the atom.
>
> For example, the physical research program was cut $5,280,000 below the AEC request, which was already lower than the amount recommended by the AEC's General Advisory Committee and the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. The cut was aimed at the important work done under contract by the AEC with various universities. Also, the $1,300,000 cut in training, education, and information might adversely effect the program to train additional nuclear scientists and engineers. I hope that the Commission will be able to make savings in other portions of its budget in order to transfer funds to the Physical Research and Educational programs. During the hearings, AEC Chairman John McCone described the physical research program as "the very foundation and the hard core of our whole atomic program."
>
> In summary, I was disappointed at certain of the cuts. I do not wish to oppose the conference report, but I hope that the Commission will be able to make savings in other portions of its budget so that the Physical Research and Training and Education programs will not suffer.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I move the adoption of the conference report, which is below the budget estimate by $35,686,000.

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

The report was agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a table comparing estimates with the appropriations made by the bill.

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

H.R. 8283, Atomic Energy Commission appropriation bill, 1960 comparison of estimates with action taken on the bill

Item	Appropriations, 1959	Budget estimate, 1960	House bill	Senate bill	Conference agreement
ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION					
Operating expenses	$2,397,406,000	[1] $2,417,300,000	[1] $2,374,114,000	[1] $2,410,414,000	[1] $2,389,114,000
Plant acquisition and construction	249,929,000	[2] 270,000,000	[2] 255,000,000	[2] 270,000,000	[2] 262,500,000
Total, direct appropriations	2,647,335,000	2,687,300,000	2,629,114,000	2,680,414,000	2,651,614,000
Add: Indefinite appropriations of receipts	28,720,000	31,415,000	31,415,000	31,415,000	31,415,000
Total available	2,676,055,000	2,718,715,000	2,660,529,000	2,711,829,000	2,683,029,000

[1] In addition, reappropriation of $133,100,000 available.

[2] In addition, prior year unobligated balance of $152,216,000 available.

Distribution of amounts for operating expenses

Program	Appropriation, 1959	Budget estimate, 1960	House allowance	Senate bill	Conference agreement
Raw materials	$702,100,000	$738,600,000	$738,000,000	$738,000,000	$738,000,000
Special nuclear materials	545,000,000	568,000,000	563,000,000	565,000,000	563,000,000
Weapons program	480,000,000	495,000,000	495,000,000	495,000,000	495,000,000
Reactor development	342,000,000	407,400,000	397,400,000	407,400,000	402,400,000
Physical research	119,000,000	153,280,000	143,000,000	151,000,000	148,000,000
Biology and medicine	43,242,000	49,000,000	49,000,000	49,000,000	49,000,000
Training, education, and information	13,700,000	14,800,000	13,500,000	13,700,000	13,500,000
Civilian applications of isotopes and nuclear explosives	5,700,000	14,100,000	9,000,000	14,100,000	12,000,000
Community	16,792,000	15,666,000	15,666,000	15,666,000	15,666,000
Program direction and administration	49,803,000	52,000,000	52,000,000	52,000,000	52,000,000
Security investigation	7,506,000	7,390,000	7,390,000	7,390,000	7,390,000
Other costs	6,585,000	5,673,000	5,673,000	5,673,000	5,673,000
Selected resources	36,408,950	60,906,000	50,000,000	59,000,000	50,000,000
Less revenues applied	−28,720,000	−31,415,000	−31,415,000	−31,415,000	−31,415,000
Total obligations	2,339,116,950	2,550,400,000	2,507,214,000	2,541,514,000	2,520,214,000
Adjustment for unobligated balances	+58,289,050	−133,100,000	−133,100,000	−133,100,000	−133,100,000
AEC appropriation required	2,397,406,000	2,417,300,000	2,374,114,000	2,408,414,000	2,387,114,000
Added by Senate for transfer to National Science Foundation				2,000,000	2,000,000
Total amount in Senate bill				2,410,414,000	2,389,114,000

APPROPRIATION FOR NATIONAL FORESTS PROGRAM

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the Senate by approving an appropriation of $22 million in the supplemental appropriation bill to implement the program for the national forests, has taken a far-reaching step toward preserving our Nation's natural resources. I congratulate the chairman and the members of the Appropriations Committee for including these funds in the bill. The committee deserves for its action a vote of thanks from conservationists throughout the country.

The forest resources of our Nation have been neglected too long. The Forest Service has always been prevented, by lack of funds, from carrying out needed projects to improve the resources and the utilization of our national forests. We in Arkansas are acutely aware of the importance of our national forests, since the Ouachita and Ozark National Forests lie almost wholly within the State. We are familiar with the economic benefit derived from forestry research work. We also appreciate the many recreational opportunities afforded in our forests. The program for the national forests, announced earlier this year, was welcomed by all of us who are interested in obtaining maximum benefits from our forestry resources. Regardless of whether any of the money from the recent appropriations will be spent in Arkansas forests, the State will ultimately benefit through the knowledge gained from other areas.

Since I have been in the Congress I have stressed the need for more emphasis on our forestry programs, and forestry research in particular. I have always looked upon expenditures for these purposes as an investment in the Nation's future. Experience has shown that funds expended for forestry research ultimately are repaid to the Government many times over through stimulation of the lumber industry. There has been much discussion in recent years about the increase in the demand for wood products. Many of us have pointed out the urgency of the problem and the need for research to bring about improvements in the Nation's timber inventory. The two forestry research stations in my State, located at Harrison and Crossett, have uncovered many promising leads which could, if developed, greatly improve the outlook for timber production in our region. Many of these leads have not been pursued because of lack of funds. For example, I have been told that each of the stations could have effectively utilized at least $50 thousand this year in addition to the amount allocated under the President's budget request. I am, of course, hopeful that some of the money included in the supplemental bill will be allocated to these stations to expand their activities.

A short time ago, I pointed out to Members of the Senate the need for a brush control research project in the Ozarks region. I mentioned at that time the unusual potential of what is now brushland for conversion to growth of shortleaf pines. There are millions of acres of this waste land in Arkansas, and indeed in many other States, which are adaptable to commercial timber production. Converting such lands to timber would help us meet the future demands for wood products. I am hopeful that the Department will give serious consideration to initiating the proposed research project with a portion of the funds included in the supplemental bill.

The funds voted by the Senate are only a start on implementing the program for the national forests. It is merely the beginning of work which should have been completed years ago. I am confident that the Nation as a whole will benefit from this work. I sincerely hope that even greater steps will be taken next year to bring about proper development of our forestry resources.

THE NATIONAL HIGHWAY PROGRAM

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, before speaking about the main subject on which I wish to address the Senate, I should like to make a few remarks on the national highway program.

Mr. President, grave hardship will be suffered by reason of the fact that it has been necessary for the Superintendent of Public Works of the State of New York to announce the prospective cancellation of letting of highway construction contracts scheduled for today and August 27 because of the unavailability of Federal aid funds to finance proposed construction. Civic organizations, chambers of commerce, and private firms in New York have joined in protesting.

Mr. President, my most detailed information comes, of course, from the State of New York, but I believe that the same situation prevails over the rest of the country. The hardships which will be imposed as the result of the necessary abrupt cancellation of this program, hardships to the local communities, to individual companies, and to their employees which have planned on these highways, can hardly be estimated. Some way to deal with this problem, which is comparatively small when compared with the scope of most of the fiscal problems of the country, can and must be found.

The announcement in New York was based on notice to the State last week by the Federal Bureau of Roads that no Federal payments could be guaranteed for State contracts let after August 1. This notice in turn was based on the fact that the President has been unable to take action to replenish the Highway Trust Fund because the Congress has not acted. I believe that it would be a tragedy for our Nation if this important program which contributes so much to our security and economic well-being should come to a halt. At the time the Senate considered the excise tax extension bill, I supported the proposal to increase the gasoline taxes by 1½ cents a gallon as the President had requested in order to keep the highway program alive. Unfortunately, this amedment was defeated. The House Ways and Means Committee is now considering other proposals to supply funds for the highway program and has announced tentative approval of a bond issue as well as the allocation of part of the automobile excise taxes to the fund.

So many plans have been made and so many commitments have been entered into on the basis of the continuance of this program that we owe a moral obligation to those who are concerned to carry it forward on a reasonable basis. The expectations of the country, and its

needs, must not be frustrated. I shall support an increase in the gasoline tax as requested by the President, as I did before, in order to continue the national highway program, but if this be defeated I will support alternate measures to continue the national highway program.

Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

FREEDOM OF TRANSIT THROUGH THE SUEZ CANAL

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I have taken the floor this afternoon to discuss a situation which has just arisen in the Near East and which may involve a very serious threat to the peace, a situation which has been much too little noticed because of the fact that we are so taken up with the crisis of Berlin, with Mr. Khrushchev's impending visit here, and with the distinguished and great performance given by our Vice President in the Soviet Union and Poland recently.

Mr. President, one of the difficulties with our diplomacy—and we learn only the hard way in that respect—is that it lacks a sense of anticipation. We face the stern reality that no sooner are we heavily engaged in another part of the world, as we are now in Berlin, than a Mideast crisis boils up to tend to distract us from the main issue. Also, our aid program, which is involved, should not be conditioned to the rise and fall of crises in this area, as it is today. For these reasons, in view of the increase in tensions in the Near East, I believe it is essential, first, that the facts be spelled out and that our Government determine them and deal with the present crisis about the transit of shipping through the Suez Canal, and not temporarize with it.

Several months ago President Nasser of the United Arab Republic resumed his blockade of the Suez Canal barring the passage of cargoes bound to and from Israel. During the last 10 days the U.A.R. leader has hurled the most violent threats against Israel in a new and startling demonstration of belligerency. The ostensible reason for President Nasser's outburst is given as some provocative statements by Brigadier General Dayan, former Chief of Staff of the Israeli Army and now a candidate for public office; but his statements obviously do not purport to speak for the Government of Israel. Hence President Nasser's reaction must be written down as the desire to seize a pretext for a declaration of his own, which gives the matter its foreign policy connotation. It must, however, be made clear at the same time that provocations from whatever source only exacerbate and make more difficult maintenance of the peace and pose the danger of a recurrence of the events of 1956 and 1957 which should certainly be avoided.

All these events have occurred at a time when we have been increasing our assistance to Egypt and when we have been bending our every effort to bring about mutual cooperation with President Nasser. Here is a disconcerting paradox in our Mideast diplomacy. On all sides we have been assured President Nasser wants better relations with the West; all agencies of our Government seemingly are moving to improve those relations. Yet, at almost the same time President Nasser openly threatens the peace of the Mideast. I submit that these matters should be of grave concern to those who are charged with the formulation and execution of our policy in the Middle East.

Let us take a brief review of the facts, Mr. President, which brought about this most recent occurrence. I do not like to call it a crisis yet, but it may very well become a crisis.

I would like to go back to the spring of 1957. It will be recalled that at that time there was great pressure on Israel to withdraw its forces from the Sinai Peninsula. Many of us in this Chamber, however, believed that Egypt should at the same time be asked to give guarantees against the resumption of the raids and blockades to which Israel had been subjected at the hands of her Arab neighbors. There was a widespread view—indeed, I believe almost all Members of the Senate concurred—that an international force should guarantee against border raids on the Gaza strip and that Israel's shipping should be permitted to pass unmolested through the international waters of the Straits of Tiran and the Suez Canal.

While there were no explicit commitments, it was made clear to Israel that if she withdrew, she could look for a cessation of the intense and intolerable siege to which she had been exposed for so long. When President Eisenhower urged the Israelis to withdraw from Sinai on February 20, 1957, he declared:

> We should not assume that, if Israel withdraws, Egypt will prevent Israeli shipping from using the Suez Canal or the Gulf of Aqaba. If, unhappily, Egypt does hereafter violate the armistice agreement or other international obligations, then this should be dealt with firmly by the society of nations.

And a few days later, when the Israelis agreed to withdraw, President Eisenhower sent a message to Prime Minister David Ben-Gurion to the effect that:

> Israel will have no cause for regret having thus conformed to the strong sentiment of the world community * * *. It has always been the view of this Government that after the withdrawal there would be a united effort by all the nations to bring about conditions more stable, more tranquil, and more conducive to the general welfare than those which existed heretofore.

Israel's Government withdrew its forces, and for the next 2 years there was a measure of serenity on Israel's frontiers.

Israel's own ships passed through the Straits of Tiran. Incidentally those straits, Mr. President, are between Egyptian territory and Saudi Arabia at the entrance to the Red Sea. Israel's own ships passed through the Straits of Tiran, opening up that country's trade with Asia and Africa, and Israel's cargoes were permitted to transit the Suez Canal—though not Israel's shipping.

But this state of comparative calm came to an end early this year. After permitting some 40 ships to pass through the Suez Canal carrying cargoes to and from Israel, President Nasser suddenly halted two ships in the canal in the spring of this year. In both cases, cargoes were seized. A few weeks later a Greek ship was allowed to pass, but on May 21 Egyptian authorities halted the *Inge Toft*, a Danish freighter, as it attempted to carry an Israel cargo of cement, potash, and other goods to Hong Kong, Manila, and Japan. This ship is still in Port Said. President Nasser will not let it pass.

Mr. President, I point out in this connection that at no time had Israel's ships passed through the Suez Canal, that Israel has not complained about that, though she had a right to do so under international law and under the particular convention which regulates the Suez Canal, accepting, as it were, a practical arrangement by which business could be done. It is this practical arrangement which has now been disrupted by the action of President Nasser which brings about the present difficulty.

In this blockade of Israel's shipping, President Nasser is running counter to the 1888 Constantinople Convention which provided that the Suez Canal "shall always be free and open in time of war as in time of peace to every vessel of commerce or of war, without distinction of flag. The canal shall never be subjected to the exercise of the right of blockade." Despite the plain language of that convention, President Nasser has contended that he may close the Suez Canal to Israel shipping because Egypt has been in a state of war with Israel since 1948. However, on September 1, 1951, the United Nations Security Council refused to accept Egypt's interpretation of the convention and the United Nations Armistice Agreement. That is the armistice agreement made to end the Arab-Israeli War of 1947 and 1948.

The Security Council held that Israel's ships had the right to traverse the canal and called upon Egypt "to terminate the restrictions on the passage of international commercial shipping and goods through the Suez Canal wherever bound and to cease all interference with such shipping beyond that essential to the safety of shipping in the canal itself and to the observance of the international conventions in force."

Our Government took a firm position on this question when it came before the United Nations Security Council. But, unfortunately, after Egypt refused to comply with the Security Council's order, no action was taken to enforce it, and when the issue came before the Security Council once again in 1954 it was no longer possible to do so because the Soviet Union, which had already begun its cynical pursuit of Arab favor, vetoed a resolution to reaffirm the 1951 decision.

In July 1954, when our Government was assisting in negotiations to bring about the British withdrawal from Suez, we might have pressed for an undertaking by Egypt to comply with international law. It will be recalled that that is the time when the British withdrew from their great base on the Suez. At that time a group of us in the Congress appealed to the Department of State for action because we believed that these negotiations presented a historic oppor-

tunity to dispose of that blockade. At that time, Senators SALTONSTALL and DODD—then a Member of the House of Representatives—joined in these recommendations. Again, when President Nasser nationalized the Suez Canal in 1956 and promised to maintain the international character of that waterway, many of us urged it as the time for firm guarantees against illegal blockade.

All of us will recall how our Government came to President Nasser's aid, insisting on withdrawal from Sinai and the Suez Canal area by the United Kingdom, France, and Israel in 1956. On May 17, 1959, the New York Times in an editorial recalled the solicitude with which the West treated President Nasser in that crisis. The Times correspondent wrote:

> One of the unsolved mysteries of the Suez affair of 1956 is the fact that the General Assembly allowed Mr. Hammarskjold to clear the canal, with the United Nations paying the $8,376,000 bill without requiring Colonel Nasser to comply with the Security Council resolution upholding the right of free passage for all nations.

The United States, on its part, advanced $5 million through the United Nations for the purpose of reconstructing the Suez Canal; $1.2 million of this has already been repaid. President Nasser has reciprocated poorly.

Our deep concern with the economic well-being of the Mideast was evidenced in dramatic fashion again when the President, in his address before the U.N. General Assembly on August 13, 1958, proposed the establishment of an Arab development institution on a regional basis to accelerate progress in such fields as industry, agriculture, water supply, health, and education. The Arab Development Bank, as it has become known, would provide loans to the Arab States as well as the technical assistance required in the formulation of development projects, would be managed by the Arab States themselves and would serve also to attract needed private investment funds to the area as well.

While much has been said, and while preliminary plans have been drawn, no great progress has yet been made by the Arab States in the organization of an Arab Development Bank and it has not yet come to fruition. Such a regional economic development organization, based on self-help and mutual cooperation, could advance immeasurably the progress of the region, raise individual living standards, and apply itself to the nettling problems of health, communications, education, and primitive agriculture affecting the Mideast and, very importantly, in providing for the settlement of the Arab refugees.

One of the primary aspects of a positive Mideast policy by the United States would be in respect of a regional economic plan for the area. Indeed, there is every assurance that other allied governments will cooperate in the financing of such a plan; notably the United Kingdom, Italy, and Germany have already indicated their interest, and so has the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

Mr. President, how sad it is, therefore, that with all this help, with all this aid from the United States and from other countries, and with all this promise for the Mideast, the rather extreme statement of President Nasser promises us only more and more crises, exacerbation of tempers, difficulty and tension in that area.

Mr. President, it is noteworthy in this connection that the United States resumed large-scale economic assistance to President Nasser last fall. In December 1958, again in May 1959, and now on July 29, 1959, only a few days ago, our Government has approved the sale of agricultural commodities to the United Arab Republic for a total of $105 million in exchange for local currency. In addition, we have resumed technical and economic assistance in the last fiscal year, and this totals $10,233,000. The Export-Import Bank has made a $5 million loan for a fertilizer plant. And within the last few months the World Bank has been considering a loan to Egypt to deepen and widen the Suez Canal.

On June 24 a group of 25 Senators joined in a telegram addressed to President Eisenhower expressing our concern over the matter I am discussing, shipping in the Suez Canal. Nine days later, on July 3, we received a reply from Assistant Secretary of State William B. Macomber, which was made public, in which we were reassured that our Government clearly and unequivocally adhered to its original position in opposition to any restrictions on the use of the Suez Canal.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter of Assistant Secretary of State Macomber be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, D.C., July 3, 1959.

The Honorable JACOB K. JAVITS,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR JAVITS: In connection with the joint telegram which 25 Senators, including yourself, sent to the President on June 24, 1959, expressing concern over the recent detention by the United Arab Republic of cargoes bound from Israel on Israeli chartered ships, I have been asked to furnish you with details regarding the Department's position with respect to the Suez Canal transit issue.

As your telegram to the President indicates, the U.S. Government's position with respect to the unrestricted use of the canal is clear and unequivocal. The United States joined with France and the United Kingdom to sponsor a resolution before the Security Council in September 1951, which called upon Egypt to terminate restrictions on the passage of international commercial shipping and goods through the canal. This position was reaffirmed by a majority of the Security Council in voting in favor of a draft resolution, subsequently vetoed by the Soviet Union, on March 27, 1954, which called upon Egypt to comply with the 1951 resolution. Further statements by U.S. officials, including one by Ambassador Lodge in the Security Council on April 26, 1957, have maintained the position that there should at all times be free and nondiscriminatory passage through the canal for all countries. The United Arab Republic and all other members of the United Nations are fully conversant with the U.S. position.

The recent seizures of several cargoes bound from Israel aboard non-Israeli ships, and the current detention of a Danish flag vessel chartered on behalf of Israel interests, have again raised the issue of free transit through the canal after a period of apparently satisfactory transit of cargoes originating in Israel. The United Nations and the parties concerned are currently engaged in trying to resolve the problem which had been created by these recent difficulties. The Secretary General of the United Nations is now visiting Cairo where he will be discussing a number of questions, including the Inge Toft case.

It is hoped that the transit problem may be resolved between the parties immediately concerned, and we are encouraging and supporting the continuing efforts on the part of Mr. Hammarskjold. The U.S. Government has already discussed the Suez transit question in various foreign capitals, including Cairo and Tel Aviv. While the efforts at settlement currently being undertaken by the United Nations, supported by the United States and other powers, would appear for the present to constitute the most effective means of seeking a satisfactory solution, you may be assured that we will continue to take every appropriate measure which may contribute to a resolution of this problem.

The U.S. Executive Director of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development is aware of developments in this matter and is also conversant with our long-standing policy in support of the principle of freedom of transit through the canal.

If I can be of any additional assistance to you with regard to this problem, please do not hesitate to communicate further with me.

Sincerely yours,
WILLIAM B. MACOMBER, Jr.,
Assistant Secretary.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, it is gratifying that the administration has not been deflected from our Government's traditional position as a maritime power. We are vigilantly concerned with freedom of the seas. But I would like to invite the attention of the Senate to the fact that the Secretary General of the United Nations, Mr. Dag Hammarskjold, was entrusted with primary responsibility in this matter. Mr. Macomber's letter points out that Mr. Hammarskjold was in Cairo and that we are encouraging and supporting his efforts. It continues:

> The U.S. Government has already discussed the Suez transit question in various foreign capitals, including Cairo and Tel Aviv. While the efforts at settlement currently being undertaken by the United Nations, supported by the United States and other powers, would appear for the present to constitute the most effective means of seeking a satisfactory solution you may be assured that we will continue to take every appropriate measure which may contribute to a resolution of this problem.

Since that letter was written, Mr. Hammarskjold has been to Cario and has visited with President Nasser. There has been no official statement from any of the parties. No one is in a position to say whether Mr. Hammarskjold elicited commitments from President Nasser. It has been reported in the press that the Egyptian President refuses to return to the policy he followed in 1957 and 1958, of allowing Israel's cargoes to pass through the Suez Canal.

On the contrary, he now refuses to permit any ships or cargoes owned by Israel to traverse the canal. However, it is said that he will make one concession—this is the report—canal authorities will not interfere with cargoes if

they are not the property of Israel or Israel firms at the time they pass through the canal. This means that cargoes leaving Haifa would have to become the property of the purchaser at the time they left that port while cargoes going through the canal and bound for Israel would have to remain the property of the seller until they reached Haifa.

Furthermore, it has been reported that canal authorities would seize any ship where there had been publicity. I do not know whether anything will result from this speech, but in this way of running a canal who knows? It might. I do not know whether any of these arrangements are workable.

I do not know whether the Israel Government could accede to any such arrangement, but I do submit that such an arrangement cannot be acceptable to the world community at large, for it permits President Nasser to operate the canal as his own private waterway and it permits him to discriminate between users. In this connection, I would recall two of the six principles about operation of the canal which President Nasser accepted in 1956. They provided: First, there should be free and open transit through the canal without discrimination overt or covert—this covers both political and technical aspects—and, second, the operation of the canal should be insulated from the politics of any country.

All members of the United Nations, whether they be big or small, are entitled to protection from aggression, and all members of the United Nations owe an obligation to that body to help it discharge its responsibilities. We will not carry out our responsibilities to meet and solve the problem of transit through the Suez Canal by an airy reference of the issue to Mr. Hammarskjold or the U.N. I use the word "airy" in that regard as being one of those buck-passing operations.

The United Nations, to be effective, must be backed up as it was in regard to the original Palestine partition issue, because the U.N. is no stronger than its members, and we are one of the strongest. This is not an issue to be decided by asking little Israel to accept some abridgement of its rights, and by pressuring Israel to live under imposition, blockade, and siege. The premise upon which the United Arab Republic predicates its course is untenable. No member nation of the United Nations has the right to assert that it is in a state of war with its neighbors in the face of a United Nations Security Council resolution making a contrary finding. The U.N. Charter requires it to work for peace and to live in peace.

I know there are some who will say that it is regrettable that this dispute between Israel and the United Arab Republic should have flared at a time when President Nasser, disillusioned by his flirtation with Moscow, should be courting the West. It may be argued that nothing should be allowed to embarrass or impede the rapprochement between Cairo and Washington. But this viewpoint serves neither convenience nor conviction.

We cannot accept the substitution of one kind of intolerable conduct for another kind of intolerable conduct. In one breath the flirtation of Egypt with the Communists is intolerable to the free world, yet in another breath the effort to impose discriminatory conditions on the use of the Suez Canal is also intolerable to the free world. These matters of intolerability are questions of degree only. The point is that both kinds of conduct are such that we cannot live with them in the free world.

Mr. President, editorial comment upon this matter has certainly borne out what I say. The Washington Post and Times Herald reflects on these matters in a penetrating editorial in its issue of August 2. I would like to quote from that editorial which emphasizes above all that unless the freedom of transit of the Suez Canal is confirmed soon there will be no alternative but to bring the matter again before the Security Council or the General Assembly. It says:

> The world has learned to judge President Nasser less by what he says than by what he does; and conceivably he believes he needs this issue to bolster his prestige. Ordinarily it would be preferable to settle such questions through quiet negotiation, in the hope that the generally more amicable relations with the United Arab Republic would not be disrupted. But unless the freedom of transit of the Suez Canal is confirmed soon, there will be no honorable alternative but to bring the matter again before the Security Council, or the General Assembly, for public discussion and action—including the imposition of sanctions if necessary. The painful experience of 1956 argues strongly for a check on such abuses before they erupt into major international trouble.

Mr. President, that is the whole purport of my speech today. The experience of 1956 argues strongly for a check on such abuses before any of them erupt into major international trouble.

Mr. President, I would conclude with a reference to the angry statements that have erupted in Cairo in the last few days. On July 22 President Nasser declared:

> Israel * * * is a threat to the Arab people in every Arab country, and its conspiracies against Egypt, Syria, Lebanon, Jordan, and against all the Arab countries are constant. * * * Today we also observe that Israelis infiltrating Africa and then Asia under the guise of financial and technical aid. * * * Its infiltration represents a spearhead of imperialism.

I may interject parenthetically that one of the most constructive jobs being done in the free world is the help Israel is giving to African nations such as Ghana, Nigeria, Guinea, and others, in the ways of modern technology and industrial ideas in the field of sanitation, health, and similar activities. Thus not involving a great power whose motives are always under suspicion in that area of the world which is emerging from colonialism.

Resuming the statements made in Egypt, the following day, General Abdul Hakim Amer, commander of Egypt's armed forces, had this to say:

> I do not think it is any secret that our submarines form the largest fleet in the surrounding seas. * * * Because of the unity of the armed forces, Israel has lost the ability to move swiftly and to strike at each country separately from inside the borders of the usurped area. * * * Israel now faces one armed force which lies in wait for it in the north and in the south. It realizes that if it moves against any front, it will have to prepare to face a full war on both fronts at the same time.

Inside Israel, General Moshe Dayan, former commander of the Israel army, wrote a newspaper article in which he argued Israel should return hostility for hostility.

These bellicose utterances are attributed, it is said, by the Egyptians to this newspaper article. General Dayan said that Egypt should know that "any policy of increased hostilities against us will cause us to reactivate the policy which brought about the Sinai campaign," whereupon President Nasser in Alexandria on July 26 issued an angry threat, "Moshe Dayan threatens to invade Sinai; let him come—we are waiting for him. I announce from here on behalf of the United Arab Republic people that this time we will exterminate Israel." This intemperate and demagogic utterance from the leader of a government brought a sharp rebuke from the New York Times.

I emphasize that I do not condone any provocative utterance from any source, but General Dayan, notwithstanding his high standing, is not the Government of Israel. He is only a candidate for public office. I am sure President Nasser knows this.

I am putting the Times editorial of July 28 into the RECORD.

I call attention to its concluding statement:

> The question keeps arising as to whether a person who talks as irresponsibly as President Nasser is a worthy representative of people, a good subject for international credit, or a guaranty of something representing peace and civilization in the Middle East.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks the editorials from the Washington Post and the New York Times to which I have referred.

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

[From the New York Times, July 28, 1959]

THE TWO NASSERS

President Gamal Abdel Nasser, of the United Arab Republic, showed himself at his best and at his incredible worst in a speech in Cairo on Sunday celebrating the seventh anniversary of the abdication of King Farouk. President Nasser could be proud of his own part in the revolution of 1952. He could also pose as a statesman, at least in words, when he told his people that "the basis of everything is work," and revealed plans to double Egypt's production and income within the next 10 years.

Not so much could be said for his assertion that the U.A.R. would soon be making guns, armored cars, tanks, and airplanes. Down to now the Republic has had to import these things, and one can think of nothing much more foolish than using the resources of a poverty-stricken country to produce them at home.

Finally, President Nasser rose to the height of foolishness when he misrepresented the history of October-November 1956, and distorted a statement made by Brig. Gen. Moshe

Dayan, former Israeli Chief of Staff, as a threat against Egypt. The President told his cheering but not well-informed auditors that Egypt had "defeated Britain, France, and Israel 3 years ago"; he said "all the Arabs want a decisive battle"; and declared that if there were more trouble the U.A.R. would "exterminate Israel."

This is the kind of tosh offered the unhappy people of the UAR on one of their great holidays. They have a right to celebrate the absence of King Farouk, which is in itself a blessing to Egypt. But the question keeps rising as to whether a person who talks as irresponsibly as President Nasser is a worthy representative of his people, a good subject for international credit, or a guarantee of something representing peace and civilization in the Middle East.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald, Aug. 2, 1959]

CANKER ON CONSCIENCE

Why has President Nasser, of the United Arab Republic, chosen this time to renew his muscle-flexing against Israel. Ostensibly his warlike talk was in response to an article by Moshe Dyan, former Israeli chief of staff and now a political candidate, advocating a tougher stand against U.A.R. interference with shipping bound to and from Israel. But General Dyan's article, imprudent or not, was based upon the hostile U.A.R. action last March in seizing the Danish freighter *Inge Toft* with an Israeli cargo. The real issue is freedom of transit in the Suez Canal.

For the world community these ought to be storm warnings. Nations which helped to restore the Suez Canal can scarcely be indifferent to a Cairo decision that some countries are more equal than others in use of the canal. The unresolved state of theoretical war between the Arab States and Israel—an unrealistic condition that has existed for more than 10 years—does not alter the basic situation. The United Nations Security Council has explicitly recognized the right of Israel to use the canal. The present controversy does not even concern ships of Israeli registry. Evidently, however, the Nasser government regards capricious interference as a weapon of economic warfare against Israeli commerce.

The world has learned to judge President Nasser less by what he says than by what he does; and conceivably he believes he needs this issue to bolster his prestige. Ordinarily it would be preferable to settle such questions through quiet negotiation, in the hope that the generally more amicable relations with the United Arab Republic would not be disrupted. But unless the freedom of transit of the Suez Canal is confirmed soon, there will be no honorable alternative but to bring the matter again before the Security Council, or the General Assembly, for public discussion and action—including the imposition of sanctions if necessary. The painful experience of 1956 argues strongly for a check on such abuses before they erupt into major international trouble.

Mr. JAVITS. Yet despite Nasser's menacing threats against his neighbor, the West is pouring the most lavish assistance into Cairo. Just about the time he made this speech, the World Bank's technical mission arrived in Egypt to study the Suez Canal widening, and on July 29, 3 days after President Nasser made his speech, we announced that we had provided him with $57 million in U.S. meat and flour which he can purchase with Egyptian pounds which are then loaned back to finance and develop the United Arab Republic's industry.

I wish to emphasize that I feel deeply that Egypt should be helped and developed. I had hoped very much that all the Arab States would cooperate to that end. I have favored, and will continue to favor, the most generous kind of assistance, financial and otherwise, by the United States in furthering those efforts.

Such efforts do not have to involve Israel, either. The mere fact that that region will be prospering as a region is reason enough for the United States to render such assistance, in the interest of world peace.

I think it is a serious question whether these activities are justified, if we are to have another threat to the peace from that area, especially when the threat is based upon no factual crisis which justifies it. The action of the United States, of course, is its own; and in my opinion it should be heavily influenced by the degree of cooperation on the part of the United Arab Repubic and other countries, in terms of maintenance of the principles of the United Nations Charter.

The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the World Bank, is a specialized agency of the United Nations. It makes its own decisions. It is independent. It decides who shall receive its loans. Everyone understands that if it decides to make a loan to Egypt, notwithstanding the present saber rattling, that will be its decision, and no one will ask the United States to withdraw from the World Bank. But the Bank, like any other responsible lender, owes some obligations to the international community by which it is sponsored.

Does the World Bank propose to lend large sums to one of its stockholders to improve a waterway which is used in violation of a U.N. decision and in illegal action against other stockholders?

I understand the difficulties which are involved. As I stated at the beginning, the difficulty with our foreign policy—and, indeed, with the foreign policy of world institutions by the United Nations—and the policy of great establishments for help, like the World Bank, is that they raise the question as to whether we look far enough ahead in our own interest.

It is very sad to reflect that after 11 years the Arab-Israel conflict is just as far from solution as it ever was. We have not been able to bring the parties closer together. We cannot hope to bring about peace and concord between Israel and Egypt now, but we can hope to pursue a consistent policy, which in this area we have already inaugurated in 1956 and 1957, and insisting on respect for international law. Our policy has been often criticized for failure of consistency in its application; this is a situation in which such consistency is both practical and needed. Hence, on this step-by-step basis we should insist now that illegal restrictions on the use of the Suez Canal must be lifted and the *Inge Toft* case settled; otherwise we cannot give aid or fail to protest aid proposed by international agencies.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will my distinguished colleague yield to me?

Mr. JAVITS. I am happy to yield to my colleague.

Mr. KEATING. I commend my colleague for focusing our attention once more on the very serious problem involving illegality in the actions of a sovereign power. Illegality, wherever it raises its ugly head throughout the world, is something of which our Nation cannot fail to be cognizant.

As the Senator knows, I have been very much interested in this problem. I joined with him in the telegram which was sent to the President on June 24, 1959. I was happy to receive a rather complete reply, dated July 3, 1959, from Assistant Secretary of State William B. Macomber, Jr., which has been placed in the RECORD by my colleague.

The reply called attention to the fact that as far back as April 1957 Ambassador Lodge, in the Security Council, had maintained the position that at all times there should be free and nondiscriminatory passage through the Suez Canal for all countries.

Mr. Macomber's letter went on to indicate, as has been pointed out, that the Secretary General of the United Nations was then visiting Cairo, and that he would be discussing the *Inge Toft* case, among other matters. He has come and gone.

I agree entirely with my colleague that we cannot leave this problem only to Mr. Hammarskjold. It strikes me that the time has come when we should again, in a formal way, bring up this matter in the United Nations. It may be thought by some persons to be a problem affecting only the courageous State of Israel. It is decidedly of more importance than that. There is no color of legality for the procedure under which the President of the United Arab Republic seeks to prevent, in this case, a Danish ship—simply because it is carrying a cargo to the Far East, which has nothing to do with military affairs—from passing through an international waterway.

Israel is a growing nation. It has wrought miracles of progress in the short span of its existence. But it must trade in order to continue its progress. Israel can be completely starved out, and it may be, if it cannot sell its goods on foreign markets.

But the problem goes far beyond the State of Israel and the interests of many citizens of our country who do business in that nation, because it has been the experience in international affairs that illegality in one area feeds upon itself and may involve illegality in another area.

I think it is most timely that the senior Senator from New York has called attention to the matter. I hope that those in the administration, including specifically the President of the United States, will assume the responsibility to see to it that our representative in the United Nations does everything within his power to bring the Suez Canal problem to a head.

I share the view that so long as any country is acting illegally, we should be very loath to give that country aid to further its illegal purposes.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank my colleague. I close by emphasizing that my reason for speaking at this time is that it is so easy to become distracted by other international crises when one such crisis may

be boiling up under our very noses. I do not want it to boil up. Anyone who is in his right mind is not looking for a crisis in this area.

The time to nip it in the bud, in an effort to get the matter straightened out, is when there are such bellicose statements as we have heard emanating from the Near East.

Israel is not asking for the impossible. If she is, she should be stopped, just like anyone else. But Israel apparently is satisfied with the way the cargoes are being handled. It is not insisting on the letter of the law that they be shipped in her own ships. That was the situation for 2 years. We must see to it that President Nasser does not strengthen his position in the Arab world by restricting the use of the canal. We must know the reason for his suddenly rocking the boat now. I appeal to our Government to see to it that the boat is not rocked.

MIGRANT AGRICULTURAL LABOR CONTRACTOR REGISTRATION ACT OF 1959

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG], the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], and the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill for compulsory registration of migrant labor contractors who recruit, transport, supervise, feed and—too often—exploit many of the 800,000 men, women, and children who cultivate and harvest the perishable crops of our Nation. Protection at a Federal level is the only way to correct many of the abuses now faced by these farmhands; the bill being introduced is intended to fill a gap which would, in my opinion, still be left open even if all pending legislation were to be passed within the near future.

The problems of the migrant worker follow him throughout the United States. The majority of the migrants winter in three States; Florida, Texas, and California. But during the spring, summer, and fall months they can be found in any State of the Union. The Florida migrant travels up the east coast to the peach, strawberry, bean, and other crops in Georgia and the Carolinas; then to the bean, potato, and tomato crops on the eastern shore of Virginia, Maryland, and Delaware; from there he moves northward into New Jersey, Pennsylvania, New York, Connecticut, and sometimes even to Maine to cultivate and harvest our fruits and vegetables. The Texas migrant might follow the cotton harvest northward through Oklahoma, Arkansas, and Missouri; or he might seek work in the sugar beet and vegetable fields of the Mountain, Great Plains, or Great Lakes States. Sometimes he heads to the Northwest, to the sugar beet fields of Idaho, and then into Oregon and Washington to harvest the hops, the peas, and the apples. The California migrant moves northward following the cotton, the tomato, the grape, and the peach and pear harvest work in California, and some then push on to Oregon and Washington to engage in the harvest of fruits and hops.

In 1957 the widely separated States of Texas, with 79,000 employed migrants; Michigan, with 62,000; California, 60,000; New York, with 46,000; and Florida, with 24,000 led in the employment of migrant workers. The States of Oregon, Washington, Arizona, Wisconsin, New Jersey, Kansas, and Colorado were next in order. The Department of Labor has published a map of the United States showing 251 important areas where substantial work is available for migratory workers. These areas can be found in all States but Vermont and West Virginia. In short, to a greater or lesser extent, the problems of the migrant worker are nationwide.

These problems will not disappear. The trends in American agriculture have been toward larger holdings, mechanization, and crop specialization. The consequent result is a critical need for large numbers of harvesting workers for relatively brief periods of time. These trends and the consequences of these trends will continue to become accentuated in the foreseeable future. It is time for Congress to give serious thought to this urgent aspect of the American economy. To quote Secretary of Labor Mitchell:

> It is intolerable and indecent for a society to produce by overworking and underpaying human beings. Even if the product may cost more, we, in this country, usually accept the difference in cost because it is the man that counts—not the thing.

As these workers move from State to State, from farm to farm, and back again, few ordinary citizens concern themselves about the fate of these migrants. There is some alarm when an overloaded vehicle crashes and kills many of these workers. We are shocked when we hear reports of unbelievable living conditions in some camps. We read of new methods of exploitation every year, and occasionally we wonder. Usually we are convinced that the worst kind of abuses do not exist in our own home State. But here is a clear area for general concern; and here is an area for Federal action. Until a clear-cut Federal policy and program is developed, we cannot expect the problems—which are described in more detail in a statement which I shall submit—to solve themselves.

Yesterday, the creation of the Special Senate Subcommittee on Migratory Labor was announced. I hope that the subcommittee's study, which will be the first congressional inquiry of its kind since 1951, will help to focus attention on the difficulties now facing these workers. We know that the pay of the migrant workers is often away below all decent minimum wage standards. Many of the youngsters receive no education to speak of. Proposed legislation has already been introduced to deal with some of these conditions. I am certain that the subcommittee hearings, which will begin tomorrow at 10 a.m., will lead to other worthwhile legislation. I am particularly hopeful that we shall find methods to cope with the problem of elementary and high school training for the children. The first witnesses before the subcommittee will be members of the Departments of Labor and Agriculture. They will discuss legislation already introduced this year. The subcommittee will deal with the overall picture. The bill I introduce today, as I have already mentioned, deals with the contractor—the man who so often is the link between the grower and the worker who moves from farm to farm.

My bill, like one already introduced by the Senators from New York [Mr. JAVITS and Mr. KEATING], requires the registration of those who in the East are generally called crew leaders, and in other parts of the country are known as migrant agricultural labor contractors. The two terms are often used interchangeably, but I have chosen to use the term "migrant agricultural labor contractor" because it is more inclusive. I shall outline briefly the functions of a migrant agricultural labor contractor, or crew leader, and shall explain why he exists.

The migrant labor market has many special characteristics which set it apart. The grower needs large numbers of employees, for brief periods of time, at wages which are not competitive with those generally paid in the area. This requires him to recruit workers from long distances, transport them to his farm, and provide shelter, food, and supervision while there employed.

The migrant worker in the East, winters in Florida, where work is available in the citrus fields through June, and in the fruit and vegetable fields through March, April, or May. Then no work is available in Florida until late fall; and in the meantime he must go northward, following the crops. A given migrant, ideally, could find continuous year around employment by working respectively in Florida citrus, in North Carolina strawberries, in Virginia strawberries, in Maryland tomatoes, in New York tomatoes, in Virginia apples, and then back to Florida citrus.

The migrant labor contractor is the bridge between the northern grower and the Florida migrant. Florida workers join a crew, usually between 45 and 75 in number. The crew is led by a man who usually owns a truck or trucks, and has some degree of education. In March or April of each year, representatives of the east coast employment services—who ascertain from the growers within their States the approximate need for labor during the coming season—meet in Florida with crew leaders, and work out with them a series of work commitments for the summer. These commitments cover a considerable proportion of the migratory workers who leave Florida.

With this cursory outline, I shall focus my further discussion on the labor con-

tractor, as dealt with by various sections of my bill.

The bill applies only to labor contractors who recruit, transport, and so forth, 10 or more workers. In Florida, the smallest crew found numbered 13, with the average size between 45 and 75.

An Oregon survey disclosed the presence of 13 crews from Texas, none smaller than 80 in number. One contractor was handling 3,000 workers, through 8 subcontractors and 40 crew leaders.

These labor contractors differ among themselves in the types of operation they perform. Some contractors contract with a grower to do the harvest work at a rate fixed in advance, and further agree to recruit, transport, house, feed, supervise, and pay the workers. The profit of these contractors consists of the difference between the contract price with the operator and the operational costs in connection with the harvest.

Other labor contractors perform only one, two, three, or more of the above functions, and are paid in various ways. Some are paid according to the number of workers they recruit and deliver. Others are paid by being given a concession to manage the housing facilities, or the commissary privileges, or a contract to haul produce from the farm to the packing shed. The bill defines the term "migrant agricultural labor contractor" so as to include those persons who perform any of the major functions now customary. Excluded from my definition are Federal and State employment agencies, foremen or supervisors who are employed on a permanent basis, and nonprofit organizations which engage in some of the functions described above.

The essence of the bill is that is seeks by registration requirements to eliminate the relatively few migrant labor contractors who are dishonest and immoral, and who exploit migrant workers and growers.

Some labor contractors exploit the workers by misleading promises of high paying employment, when they know such employment does not exist. The bill seeks to end this practice, by making such misrepresentation a ground for revocation or refusal of a license, by requiring all representations concerning farm employment to be reduced to writing, and by requiring the migrant labor contractor who seeks registration to disclose the names and addresses of those who were in his crew in former years. The Secretary of Labor is thus afforded easy opportunity to ascertain whether the migrant labor contractor has engaged in exploitation.

Some migrant agricultural labor contractors exploit their crews by promising cheap or free transportation, housing, or commissary services, when, in fact, the crew member, once signed up, is charged high prices for these services. The bill requires that the prices for these services be made known in advance, and in writing. Misrepresentations can then be easily proven, and the license revoked.

Some migrant agricultural labor contractors mislead the members of their crew as to the hours worked, the amount produced, and the wages due them. Disputes generally are won by the migrant labor contractor, because agreements are oral.

Some migrant agricultural labor contractors withhold social security payments from the wages of their crew members, and then pocket them. Some do not pay their crew members when their wages are due; and some leave shortly before the last payday of the season, and leave their crew members broke and stranded. This bill requires labor contractors who make payments to keep accurate accounts and to pay each worker the amount due him. Failure to comply will be ground for revocation or refusal to renew a license.

Some migrant agricultural labor contractors transport their crew in trucks dangerous to the occupants and to others who use the highway. The bill seeks to solve this problem by requiring all labor contractors, prior to licensing, to produce evidence that their vehicles are insured.

Some migrant labor contractors purposely recruit wetbacks; and the latter, being here illegally, can be exploited without danger of protest. Some crew leaders, for a cut of the profits, bring professional prostitutes and gamblers to the camps under their control, and permit the sale of habit-forming drugs. This bill makes all of these activities a reason for revoking or refusing to issue a license.

Some labor contractors exploit the growers by leaving them high and dry when the easy and profitable work is done. For example, a migrant labor contractor may agree to pick all the growers' apples on a piece-rate basis. When the apples at the bottom of the trees are picked, the workers must then use ladders—which reduces the productivity of the laborers and the profits of the labor contractor, since he often is paid according to the amount of work done by those in his crew. The contractor then breaches his contract, and moves on. This makes it difficult for the grower to get the rest of his apples picked, and may result in financial stress. The bill requires revocation of a migrant labor contractor's license when this occurs. Enforcement of this provision is made easy, by requiring the applicant in each annual application to list the names and addresses of the farmers with whom he contracted in the past two seasons.

Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a descriptive statement on other general problems in this area. I believe that only when we consider the overall problem can we judge the need for action on any individual part of the problem.

It will be noted that the statement includes a description of several clear-cut signs of growing interest in the problems of the migrant worker. This is a healthy and, I hope, continuing trend. Americans have proven in the past that they are deeply concerned about our undone business—the social problems we have not yet solved. The families and individual wanderers who would be affected by this bill form no great voting bloc. There is no powerful pressure group to speak for them, although many individual national associations have taken great pains to publicize their plight. This lack of strength is all the more reason why the migratory workers should be considered here, and I am sure that they will be.

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

The bill (S. 2498) to provide for the registration of contractors of migrant agricultural workers, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The statement presented by Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey is as follows:

STATEMENT

The migrant laborer is a living testimonial to the neglect that is possible in a wealthy and aggressive democracy which prides itself on the protection of the individual.

The migrant is poorly paid. This evidence comes from all corners. Mexicans cannot enter this country to work unless they are paid the prevailing wage rate in the community as determined by the Secretary of Labor. And yet the July 9, 1959, issue of the Wall Street Journal reports that Texas farm operators are balking at a Labor Department regulation requiring piece rates at an amount which will guarantee 90 percent of Mexican crews an hourly wage of 50 cents. A recent survey of Puerto Rican migrants on the farms and nurseries in the New Haven, Conn., area discloses that 80 percent of them earned 65 cents an hour or less, some as little as 51 cents an hour. The Sugar Act of 1948 requires sugar producers, as a condition to obtaining certain Government benefits, to pay wages determined by the Secretary of Agriculture to be fair and reasonable. The Secretary determined that the 1959 fair and reasonable wage rate for thinning, hoeing and weeding sugar beets in the Imperial Valley of California was 70 cents an hour unless done by workers between 14 and 16 years of age, in which case the rates could be reduced by one-third. Wage rates and weekly earnings vary depending on the age, skill, sex, and experience of the worker, the State or the particular crop in which he worked, and many other variables. Two things, however, stand out. First, that the migrant neither receives nor contributes his fair share to the blessings of America. Second, some sort of minimum wage protection is necessary.

The migrant is underemployed, as well as poorly paid for the work he does. A Department of Agriculture survey of migrants who winter in the Belle Glade area of Florida discloses that they, although available and willing, went without work on almost 1 out of every 4 days they spent in my own State of New Jersey. A Department of Agriculture survey of migrants who winter in south Texas discloses that male heads of households lost an average of 89 days of worktime when they were available for work. Steps are now underway to improve this situation. Federal and State agencies recently have undertaken what is known as the annual worker plan whereby workers are directed crop by crop, area by area, to continuity of employment for periods ranging up to 7 months.

Closer attention to planning is certainly necessary to reduce the number of lost work days. Some days of work must inevitably be lost, due to such unforeseen factors as failure of crops to mature when expected. The question I raise, however, is whether the migrant must inevitably shoulder the loss

when blight of some form hits a crop and reduces profit for the farmer, and work opportunity for the worker. Long ago we solved the problem for the industrial worker in the form of unemployment compensation laws. Perhaps a similar remedy can be shaped to fit the problems of the farmworker.

The migrant is poorly housed. The Migrant Missionary Fellowship, which operates in the areas of Pompano Beach, Fla., and Traverse City, Mich., reports that most camps are dilapidated shacks with large families living in one room with no windows. The toilet facilities are the outside privy type that are so filthy many use the ground. The President's Commission on Migratory Labor reported in 1951 that good on-job housing for a family of 4, 5, or 6 members (and less than half the camps inspected were good) might consist of an unpainted cabin, 9 by 12 feet, one in a row of such cabins. The cabin could have running water, but this would be unusual. Characteristically, water suitable for drinking would be obtainable from centrally located faucets. Cooking facilities, if existent, would probably be central. Sanitary facilities would be central and in the exceptional case, there would be flush toilets; more often, there would be privies. As noted, this is a description of the good on-the-job housing.

In 1958 an Oregon legislative committee visited many of the major labor camps in that State and saw excellent conditions and also saw vile, filthy places crowded with migrants which were unfit for human habitation. The Oregon State Board of Health inspected housing sanitation facilities in 10 Oregon counties, and reported that the sewage disposal, toilet facilities, and handwashing and bathing facilities were unsatisfactory from the point of public health in almost 50 percent of the camps visited.

A many-pronged attack has been made on the migrant housing problem. The Secretary of Labor now requires the farmer to provide housing meeting minimum requirements before he will permit that operator to hire a laborer from Mexico. The government of Puerto Rico requires that operators utilizing labor from that area must provide adequate and hygenic housing at no cost to the workers. New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, California, and some other States require that migrant labor camps be registered and meet certain minimum standards. Whether these measures will suffice is unknown. The migrant housing is used only for brief periods of each year, and all housing is expensive to build and maintain. Oregon proposed a solution in 1958 by permitting the operator to deduct the cost of new housing from his tax returns to an amount up to 25 percent of his income. The United States might well study this and other proposals in the field of migrant housing.

The migrant is poorly educated. The report of migrants who winter in south Texas states that "one-third of them had no education and only 5 percent have had any education above the grade-school level. The usual situation is for them to have had 3 to 6 years of schooling or, for the older workers, no schooling at all."

The report of migrants who winter in Florida states that "Median years of school completed by those in survey households was 4.8 years."

A survey of children in Oregon migrant camps in 1958 discloses that between 60 to 80 percent of those entering adolescence (13 and 14 years old) were behind their proper grade in school. Twenty-six percent were more than 3 years behind their proper grade.

The reasons for this are clear. Families leave their winter quarters a month or two before school ends and return a month or two after school begins.

Many States are concerned about the child whose lack of education might well bar him from the more desirable types of occupational opportunities. My own State of New Jersey has instituted pilot summer school projects for migrant children, as have the States of Oregon, Washington and some others. The State Universities in Michigan, Illinois and others have instituted studies toward seeking the dimensions and some cure of this area of concern. Church, civic and other public-spirited groups have investigated and attempted small-scale solutions for many years. The results of these efforts should be of interest to us all. As Secretary of Labor Mitchell recently put it: "Look beyond the screen of statistics at a child behind in school, in poor health, housed in a coop, whose father works for 131 days a year for 50 cents an hour. That child hasn't much of a chance to develop his talents, to be fully useful to himself or to his country. This is the ugliest kind of human waste."

The migrant is transported for long distances in cramped and unsafe conditions in vehicles which are often a menace to the safety of all who use the highways. The U.S. Government requires that livestock (cattle, pigs, sheep, etc.) be transported under safe and sanitary conditions. The U.S. Government annually appropriates funds to provide rest areas for wild migratory birds in transit. Foreign Mexican migrant workers are protected, for the standard work contract requires that all growers utilizing Mexican labor provide free transportation in trucks with fixed seats, adequate protection against inclement weather, and with the same safety requirements that are applicable to common carriers.

But the U.S. Government has long withheld benefits afforded animals, birds, and Mexican laborers from the U.S. citizens who form the basis of our migrant-labor farm-operations work force.

Some action is now under way. In 1957 the Interstate Commerce Commission issued safety regulations governing the interstate transportation of migrants, and at least six States have adopted regulations governing intrastate migrant transportation. What further action is required by Congress is a question which requires some investigation and study.

The migrant, although recently brought within the coverage of the Social Security Act, is generally excluded from social legislation such as that relating to minimum wages, child labor, unemployment compensation, disability compensation, and the right to join unions of his own choosing and bargain collectively. Mexican workers within the United States fare somewhat better; they are guaranteed "the right to elect their own representatives who shall be recognized by the employer as spokesmen for the Mexican workers." The grower utilizing their services is required to obtain an insurance policy or give bond guaranteeing medical care and compensation for personal injury and disease contacted on the job. It might also be pointed out that American migrant workers are often denied the benefits of public welfare because of an inability to meet residence requirements.

I would like to conclude by reviewing recent manifestations of interest in this overall problem.

President Eisenhower has established, at Cabinet level, a committee on migratory labor.

The Interstate Commerce Commission has begun to investigate and regulate the interstate transport of migrants.

Secretary of Labor Mitchell recently proposed the establishment of certain labor standards which employers must meet before they can recruit out-of-State workers through the facilities of the U.S. Employment Service.

Since 1954, 14 States have established migratory labor committees; the Council of State Governments has established a committee on migrant farm problems, and the Governors of 12 eastern seaboard States from New York to Florida have created the Committee of Officials on Migratory Farm Labor of the Atlantic Seaboard States to examine the situation and determine what the States can and should do about it.

The AFL–CIO recently announced a program to end 19th century poverty in 20th century rural America. This group has proposed bills which would alleviate and improve certain aspects of the migrant laborer.

Senators McNAMARA and CLARK have introduced S. 1085 which seeks to establish a minimum wage for workers on large corporate farms. Senator McNAMARA and 15 others have introduced S. 2141, of which I am a cosponsor, which seeks to prohibit child labor in agriculture during school hours. And I have already mentioned S. 1778, introduced by Senators JAVITS and KEATING, which relates to regulation of crew leaders.

Each one of these manifestations of interest is certainly welcome. I hope that interest continues to grow as the Senate subcommittee presses its study of this problem. Many individual groups have studied the difficulties facing migratory workers throughout the years. To them and others who are interested in the problem I extend an invitation to participate in and cooperate with the workings of the subcommittee.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article, published today in the Washington Post, in regard to the proposal of the Maryland Commission on Migratory Labor for a housing code for itinerant farmworkers; and also an article, published today in the New York Times, which indicates the concern of New York for meeting some of these problems.

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

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 6, 1959]

MIGRANT LABOR CODE SOUGHT FOR MARYLAND

(By Laurence Stern)

BALTIMORE, August 5.—Maryland's Commission on Migratory Labor today proposed a housing code designed to improve living conditions for the State's 8,000 itinerant farmworkers.

Commission Chairman Paul E. Nystrom unveiled the draft code as the first step in a broad survey of health, welfare, and transportation conditions of migratory workers.

He said the commission will ask that the new housing regulations be adopted before next year's harvesting season. Public hearings will first be conducted on the Eastern Shore and in western Maryland's fruit growing regions.

Migrant camp operators would have to meet the new minimum standards in order to qualify for operating permits. The code would be policed by the State department of health.

At present there are no health or housing standards for Maryland's estimated 135 labor camps. Pennsylvania, Delaware, and New York have enacted housing codes for migrants.

As outlined by Nystrom, the code proposes a minimum space requirement of 100 square feet per person. Other provisions would require sanitary water supply, toilet and sewage disposal facilities.

Last month the Commission, appointed by Gov. J. Millard Tawes, made an on-the-spot survey of migratory camps in Somerset

County. "Things weren't as bad as we anticipated," Nystrom said.

Two years ago the State department of health made an exhaustive inspection of labor camps throughout the State. It reported that "housing is generally unsound and in a dilapidated condition. Very little protecttion is provided against flies and other insects.

"Washing, bathing, and laundry facilities are inadequate to meet the needs of the campers."

Health inspectors also reported that 66 percent of the water supplies and 72 percent of sewage disposal systems were unapproved.

The State department of health can adopt the proposed new code without legislation after public hearings.

Nystrom reported that reaction among the growers was favorable.

He noted that the Federal Department of Labor also is considering migratory camp regulations. "The growers realize that any State's standards would be easier to live with than Federal standards," Nystrom said.

Most of Maryland's migrant workers are Negroes from Florida and the West Indies and Puerto Ricans.

[From the New York Times, Aug. 6, 1959]

CALIFORNIA TO COMBAT ABUSES OF MIGRANT FARM LABOR LAWS

(By Gladwin Hill)

LOS ANGELES, August 5.—California is starting a long-awaited crackdown on abuses in the system of importing migrant Mexican farm labor.

The importation of up to 500,000 men annually has been under incessant criticism of organized labor and other organizations on these major counts:

That it deprives domestic farm labor of employment.

That it has led to exploitation of the Mexicans themselves.

The State has begun two inquiries into the farm labor field, one by the Attorney General's office and the other by the State Department of Employment in the new administration of Gov. Edmund G. Brown.

Representatives of the U.S. Department of Labor have also been studying the abuses.

TWO STATE AIDS OUT

These moves have resulted within the last few days in the dismissal of a high-ranking State employment officer for alleged corrupt practices; the resignation under fire of another; and the revocation of the labor importation permit of a large Coachella Valley rancher for alleged discrimination against domestic farmworkers.

The developments reflect increasing concern by James P. Mitchell, the Secretary of Labor, over enforcement of laws dealing with imported labor.

The use of Mexican labor is an outgrowth of the manpower shortage in World War II.

Southwestern farmers contend that, despite a pool of up to 1 million migrant U.S. farmworkers, they cannot depend on domestic labor entirely to produce their crops.

Under Public Law 78, the United States and Mexico have agreed that Mexican workers may be imported by farmers for 6-month periods if the farmers certify that domestic labor was not available.

The Mexicans are supposed to be paid a prevailing wage in the area where they work. More than 150,000 are used annually in California whose $2,750 million yearly farm production is the State's largest industry.

William N. Cunningham, assistant State farm placement chief in Los Angeles, was dismissed last week, 4 days before his retirement, for allegedly taking gratuities from several large farming concerns and assigning State employees to personal missions.

Don R. Park, State farm placement supervisor in San Diego and Imperial Counties, resigned this week as his activities came under official scrutiny.

Yesterday, the Federal officials revoked the Mexican labor permit of Joseph Munoz, a member of the Coachella Valley Farmers Association on the ground that he had ignored repeated warnings against refusing work to available U.S. citizens.

OREGON A LEADER IN PROTECTING MIGRANT WORKERS

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I am pleased to cosponsor the bill introduced today by the distinguished junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] to provide for the registration and regulation of contractors of migrant agricultural workers.

I think this is needed legislation, and I hope that it will receive serious consideration by the 86th Congress.

Mr. President, my own State of Oregon has been a leader in enacting legislation to protect migratory farmworkers.

During the last session of the Oregon State Legislature, five major bills were passed to aid in insuring that the men, women, and children who come to Oregon annually to help us harvest our crops, live and work under decent conditions.

The five measures established minimum standards for housing and sanitation, safety inspection of motor vehicles, a pilot program for education of children, licensing of farm labor contractors, and an interagency committee of State government agencies to coordinate the programs.

Mr. President, passage of these laws was stimulated by the work of many dedicated public officials and private citizens.

REPORT BASIS FOR LEGISLATION

When the Oregon State Legislature met in January of 1959, it had available, as a basis for action in this field, an exhaustive and detailed report on migratory labor conditions in Oregon, prepared by the Legislative Interim Committee on Agricultural Labor, whose members included Representative Don Willner, of Portland, chairman; Senator Truman A. Chase, of Eugene, vice chairman; Daniel Wessler, Corvallis, Secretary; Senator G. D. Gleason, Portland; Representative George J. Annala, Hood River; Representative Arthur P. Ireland, Forest Grove; Hoyt Franchere, Portland; Lawren King, Ontario; and Dean Holmes, Sheridan, editor of the Sheridan Sun.

The report presented by this group was described by the executive secretary of President Eisenhower's Committee on Migratory Labor as the most extensive and comprehensive study of migrant labor ever undertaken by a State. The report indicated that there were both good and bad conditions in our State. It showed that the bad conditions were not widespread, but that corrective action was required to protect transient labor. Specific legislative recommendations were submitted.

Late in 1958, the Oregon Committee on Migrant Affairs was formed. This group—formed with the assumptions that migrant labor is essential to Oregon, and that the migrant deserves greater understanding and attention—swung its support behind the interim committee recommendations.

CITIZENS' COMMITTEE PROVIDES SUPPORT

Members of the group include Dr. Roy E. Lieuallen, chairman; Roger Buchanan, vice chairman; Mary Kay Rowland, secretary; Robert Richter, treasurer; Earl A. Holmer, executive director; Rev. Earl W. Riddle, Mike Mischke, Sister Jean Marie, W. J. Mishler, and Dr. Louis Feves, district chairmen, and Rt. Rev. Benjamin D. Dagwell, J. W. Forrester, Jr., editor of the Pendleton East-Oregonian; Dr. Dorothy O. Johansen, Tom Lawson McCall, and Hon. Charles A. Sprague, State advisory committee. Mr. Sprague is an ex-Governor of Oregon.

Church, farm, PTA, and other groups interested in the problems of migrant workers also gave their support.

The result of these joint efforts was the enactment of legislation to assist in the elimination of mistreatment of transient laborers and their families.

Charles A. Sprague, former Governor of Oregon, and editor of the Oregon Statesman, pointed out recently that the job is not yet done. "A more comprehensive program of work with migrants is desirable," he declared. He suggested instruction in English, for the many Spanish-speaking migrants; some instruction in health, in sanitation, and in home economics; and some effort to relate the transients to the settled life of the community. He stated in the latter regard:

> Education is needed among the permanent residents, too, for they are apt to wash their hands of any responsibility and be relieved when the migrants pile into their jalopies and go on to the next harvest.
>
> So long as we depend on migratory labor for gathering of our crops, we must plan to give such workers fair treatment and decent conditions for living. Camps for migrants should not become festering social sores.

Mr. President, I am proud of the fact that Oregon has established the most complete and balanced program of any State in the Union with respect to the protection of migratory labor. Those who contributed to this achievement deserve high praise.

I think that we in Congress can well look to the action of my State as an example. I believe we have been negligent in tackling this problem at the Federal level. The bill introduced today in the Senate by the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS], is a step in the right direction. Consideration should also be given by the Federal Government to migrant housing needs. Such a move was made when there was inserted in the modern housing bill, which was vetoed by the President, language directing the H.H.F.A. Administrator to study this problem. Furthermore, proposed legislation which has been introduced in the House of Representatives would aid farmers in the financing of migrant labor housing.

Mr. President, one of the most vigorous supporters of programs to end abuses of migrant laborers has been Oregon's able commissioner of labor,

Norman O. Nilsen. Recently Commissioner Nilsen sent me an extremely cogent letter describing the need for effective legislation to deal with difficulties created by migrant labor housing demands and certain crew leader activities. I ask unanimous consent that his letter be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

STATE OF OREGON,
BUREAU OF LABOR,
Portland, Oreg., June 15, 1959.

DEAR MR. NEUBERGER: In April of 1958, I had occasion to call to the attention of the Oregon congressional delegation a bill introduced by Mr. ROGERS of Florida to authorize Federal low-interest farm housing loans for migrant housing. The bill was apparently late in appearing or met with some opposition and it was not passed. I was greatly appreciative, however, for the interest given to the bill by the Oregon delegation.

At this session, there are four bills affecting migrant labor, and I once again am requesting your help in securing constructive action on the problems which the bills are aimed to correct.

There are two bills which are directed toward the problem of migrant farm housing. H.R. 422, introduced by Mr. ROGERS of Florida, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, creates a program in the Farmers Home Administration to insure farm labor housing loans from private lenders, in addition to the existing program of direct Federal farm housing loans under title V of the Housing Act of 1949.

H.R. 1247, introduced by Mr. FASCELL, of Florida, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, authorizes low-interest farm housing loans (up to 90 percent of cost) to associations of farmers for migrant housing, in addition to the insurance program proposed in H.R. 422 and the existing program under title V of the Housing Act of 1949.

Many individuals and groups throughout the country have been concerned about the inadequacy of housing for migratory farm workers. The International Association of Governmental Labor Officials and the Council of State Governments, among other organizations, have worked for a treatment of the problem comparable to H.R. 422 and H.R. 1247.

While we are greatly concerned with the condition of such housing, we feel that the farmers who provide the housing do so under some handicap. One of the handicaps apparently is the lack of availability of loan funds for this purpose. In most cases the housing is used for a relatively short period of time and, of course, is not directly productive. It also has a tendency to deteriorate more rapidly than other farm buildings. For these and other reasons it is sometimes difficult for the farmer to arrange financing for adequate migrant housing.

In all candor I must admit that when I asked publicly for support for the Rogers bill in 1958, I did not arouse much enthusiasm around the State. Since that time, however, several surveys have tended to support my contentions. The Oregon Board of Health survey, above all, certified the need for improvement in the housing for migrants. The Oregon State Employment Service survey tended to show the problem in the economic context upon which we must direct some attention.

With 1,017 farm operators with migrant housing answering the employment service questions, only 15.5 percent of their family units and 14.6 percent of their barracks units have been built since 1952. There is some doubt that the percentage is this high with respect to number of workers accommodated, although the only available figure was on the barracks type—of the 14.6 percent of barrack units house only 6.3 percent of the total worker capacity of all barracks reported. (Table XVII and XVIII, 1958 State of Oregon Farm Operator Survey, Oregon State Employment Service.)

These statistics are dramatized by the most common estimate of these farm operators that the life expectancy of their migrant housing is between 10 and 14 years (table XX). With 85 percent of the present housing units already over 7 years old, it is obvious that new construction is not keeping pace with the need.

Furthermore, of the 4,273 farm operators reporting (1,017 of whom now have some housing), only 53 are planning any expansion (table XXI).

Right on point in terms of the two bills before Congress, the farm operators were asked if they had in the last 5 years applied for a loan to build migrant housing. Only five reported that they had done so. The interesting thing is that all five answered "yes" to the question of whether they had had any difficulty in securing the loan (table XXI).

What do these statistics mean? Certainly, we can conclude that since hardly any of the farm operators sought loans to build their housing, most migrant housing is entirely paid for out of current operating revenues, i.e., the cash from that year's crop.

How many businesses would progress as fast as everyone wants migrant housing quality to progress, if the owner had to purchase major capital investment items out of 1 year's cash receipts?

After paying off crop loans and ordinary operating expenses, the farmer budgets his remaining cash among the needs of his family, home and farm building improvement or maintenance, machinery which will add to profits in future years and capital outlay for migrant housing from which he receives no direct production profit. Is it surprising that some farmers let their migrant housing go in the face of this unequal contest for his cash dollar?

If this is the problem, the agricultural industry must find ways to pay for migrant housing needs over a period of several years as do businesses of all other descriptions who have capital needs, and as farm operators do for their other capital investment needs.

A pertinent question may relate to the attitude of the farm operators toward the various solutions which might be suggested. Again the employment service survey is a handy reference (table XXIII). Of the 1,381 farm operators who said that they needed housing (or that housing was needed for their workers), the following were their choices on how to provide housing (no distinction being made on the finer points of insurance, loans, or ownership):

TABLE XXIII

Housing should be provided by:	*Percent*
The farmer	28.8
The association	20.1
The Government	12.6
The farmer and Government	5.3
The association and Government	3.3
The farmer and association	3.6
All three	1.3
No method suggested	25.0
Total	100.0

The only thing these figures prove, probably is that a substantial number of the 1,381 farm operators are having difficulty in finding a way to secure satisfactory housing. Some significance might be attached to the fact that 22.2 percent mention a role for Government, this in view of the reluctance of many nonsubsidy farm operators to have anything to do with Government.

It appears to me that H.R. 422 and 1247 have merit. Virtually all surveys, in Oregon and elsewhere, prove conclusively that the agricultural industry is not, and perhaps, without some governmental assistance cannot provide the uniformly satisfactory housing which most would agree is the minimum necessary.

Lastly, I would like to call your attention to two more bills before the current session of Congress—H.R. 5930, introduced by Mr. KEARNS, of Pennsylvania, referred to the Committee on Education and Labor, and S. 1778, introduced by Senators JAVITS and KEATING, of New York, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Both of these bills provide for the registration of crew leaders in interstate agricultural employment and both begin as follows:

"CONGRESSIONAL FINDING AND DECLARATION OF POLICY

"(a) The Congress hereby finds that interstate commerce and the channels and instrumentalities of interstate commerce are being used by certain irresponsible crew leaders to spread and perpetuate the exploitation and abuse of workers for interstate agricultural employment.

"(b) It is declared to be the policy of this Act, through the exercise by the Congress of its power to regulate commerce among the several States, to correct the conditions above referred to by requiring a person to obtain a certificate of registration from the Secretary of Labor before engaging in the activities of a crew leader with respect to interstate agricultural employment."

Every investigation of which I am aware has found incontrovertible evidence that the above finding is true. Crew leaders (called farm-labor contractors in our report) were found to be practicing deplorable abuses of law and ethical standards in Oregon.

I must say that from the information I have received from informed persons in a number of States there is no major difference among the States, except in the degree to which it has been brought to public attention.

There is a very simple explanation for the presence in unwholesome quantity of irresponsible and unethical conduct on the part of crew leaders or farm-labor contractors. The following excerpt is taken from my testimony before the Oregon Legislative Interim Committee on Migratory Labor last summer:

"LABOR CONTRACTOR ABUSES

"Because of the opportunity of abuse of a peculiar position of trust by a farm-labor contractor or a private employment agency, many States have enacted regulatory legislation. Some such statutes, however, apply to employment agencies only, but more and more States are enacting farm-labor contractor registration laws.

"The Bureau of Labor report of July 19, 1958, dealt with some of the abuses of trust that have come to our attention. We regard these abuses as an understandable outcome of the position of power achieved by a farm-labor contractor (often called crew leader) because of the complete dependence of crew members for jobs, transportation, housing arrangements, wages, and even food sometimes. The cultural, lingual, and/or transient status of the migrant who is a member of such a crew further solidifies the control of the contractor.

"INEFFECTIVENESS OF PRESENT LEGISLATION

"Some of the abuses mentioned in the Bureau of Labor report are contrary to present legislation (general). Because of the secluded location of most migrant installations and activities, because of the fear of law enforcement officials on the part of some migrants, because of the dependence on the farm labor contractor, and because of related factors, few prosecutions have resulted

under general legislation. Civil remedies are almost totally unused for the same reasons."

The 1959 Oregon legislative session passed a farm labor contractor licensing act, I am proud to report. We are now one of several States with such legislation.

This is not to say, however, that even those States with such a law can cure this problem which is characterized by rootless, highly mobile interstate movement. We can help, and in the absence of Federal regulation we must try. We cannot, however, regulate at all what the Federal Government could regulate with relative ease, i.e., the total pattern of the individual farm labor contractor movement from the State in which he recruits his crew to the last State on the summer harvest trail in which he works his crew.

Unlike the regulation of the private employment agency, with its stationary office and character, all States must look to the Federal Government for help on this more elusive problem. For the good of the farmers, who often have sad experiences with contractors, and for the good of the migrants and the public welfare, the business of farm labor contracting (or crew leading) must be regulated sufficiently to promote respectable and ethical conduct.

If improvement is not forthcoming the agricultural industry and the migrants will be completely caught in an untenable position—they won't be able to live with the farm labor contracting business and they won't be able to live without it.

On all four of the bills mentioned in this letter, I most urgently request that you consider their merits and actively participate in securing some effective legislation. Copies of the Oregon State Employment Service report from which I quoted at length can be obtained from their Salem office in the Public Service Building. Our reports are available at either our Portland office at 1216 SW. Hall Street or our Salem office in the State Office Building. Please let me know if I can be of assistance, and thank you for your consideration.

Cordially yours,

NORMAN O. NILSEN,
Commissioner of Labor, State of Oregon.

WORLD CONFEDERATION OF TEACHERS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, Washington, D.C., has been host this week to approximately 700 educators representing over 100 national teacher organizations from 70 countries. These education leaders represent collectively over 3 million members of the teaching profession.

The World Confederation of Organizations of the Teaching Profession was formally organized 8 years ago, though there were years of preliminary groundwork, led in part by the National Education Association of the United States.

This is the first time the group has met in the United States. Previous meetings have been held in Copenhagen, Oxford, Oslo, Istanbul, Manila, Frankfurt, and Rome. This year's meeting includes members from countries in Africa, Asia, Australia, Europe, North and South America. Simultaneous translation in four languages—English, French, German, and Spanish is provided for the delegates. General sessions are held in the beautiful new headquarters building of the National Education Association, whose executive secretary, Dr. William Carr, is secretary general of the world confederation.

The people of the United States and especially my colleagues in the Senate should be impressed, as I am, with the dedication of these teachers in their efforts to improve the effectiveness of their work on behalf of their millions of students and the well-being of the world of the future. I know that my colleagues will join in paying tribute to these dedicated educators whose efforts to bring knowledge, understanding, and mutual respect to their fellow teachers—and through these teachers to the future citizens of the world—are of such vital importance to all mankind.

Sir Ronald Gould, of England, president of the World Confederation of Organizations of the Teaching Profession, in his keynote address, July 31, made many statements which I feel will be most heartening to all who believe in education and world peace. In order to share his ideas with Members of Congress, I ask unanimous consent that excerpts of his remarks be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE MUTUAL APPRECIATION OF EASTERN AND WESTERN CULTURAL VALUES

(Address of Sir Ronald Gould, president of the World Confederation of Organizations of the Teaching Profession, July 31, 1959, Washington, D.C. (Excerpts from keynote address.))

EASTERN AND WESTERN CULTURAL VALUES

The theme of this year's conference is the same as that of the UNESCO major project—the mutual appreciation of Eastern and Western cultural values. What a title and what a target for the scoffer and the hypercritical.

Why East-West? it may be asked. What is East and what is West? Is Turkey East or West? Is Africa East or West? Or is it divided, and if so, where? Seach for such precise definitions will prove singularly unrewarding. What really matters is not whether this or that country is in the East or West, but whether each country appreciates the achievements, the ideas, the values, the hopes, and the fears of others.

WHY CULTURE?

But, it may be asked, why the highfalutin language? Why that detestable word "culture"? You will remember that Goering remarked that whenever culture was mentioned he felt for his revolver. I have a sneaking sympathy for him, for what often passes as culture is but social snobbery—"U" as opposed to "non-U," "in" as opposed to "out," pretentious, arty-crafty, and phony. But if culture is what I believe it to be, the sum total of ideas, values, social and political forms of society; if culture is a measure of how far we have sought for and found beauty, truth and moral worth; if it is an indication of how civilized a society has become, culture is not irrelevant, trivial, snobbish, pretentious, arty-crafty, or phony. It determines a society's spiritual, mental, and material well-being.

But, the cynic may reply, why is it necessary to appreciate other people's culture? Why doesn't each country look after its own? And the short answer is that it can't. The world is too small; countries are too interdependent. There is no purely indigenous culture, none that does not owe something to others, none that can remain unaffected by others.

Take, for example, my own country. We owe the introduction of printing and the consequent spread of learning to the Chinese, much of our mathematical knowledge to the Arabs, ideas about democracy to the Greeks, our law to the Romans, and our knowledge of the world of the spirit to the Jews.

Or take, as another example, the United States. Inspired by political and religious ideas from England, Holland, Switzerland, Germany, and elsewhere, a colony became independent. National advantages have been exploited by means devised in many countries, and a high standard of living has been achieved. Yet these advances have been made while maintaining and giving deeper and richer meaning to human rights. Ideas about human rights were derived from many sources and particularly from some of the early settlers, who came here to escape from religious or political persecution, but these ideas have here been enlarged and refined.

Was it not one of America's greatest statesmen, Franklin Roosevelt, who, during the war, urged us to fight not alone for material things but for human dignity, for the four freedoms inseparable from human dignity—freedom of speech, freedom of religion, freedom from want, and freedom from fear?

Thus the culture of the United States is an amalgam of many cultures; but all who aspire to independence, high living standards and a concept of human dignity will look to it for inspiration and guidance.

Or take, as another example, Asia. In those remarkable articles, "Reality in Asia" and "The Destiny of Asia", written by Dr. Welty, our Assistant Secretary General (the most penetrating articles on this topic I have read, and which I advise you to read and reread), he showed how Asia's aspirations, Asia's values, Asia's ideas are being modified by Western ideas. Like Western countries, Asia wants food, clothes and homes. Asia believes poverty is caused by man and can be prevented by man, that man is greater than material forces and he can control them, that if he wishes, he can become master of his fate. Like Western countries, Asia seeks independence and freedom from oppression by its own leaders and by outside forces. Asia is endeavoring to destroy family despotism, raise the status of women, and kill the notion that some races are superior to others. These reforming ideas have come from many sources, and they need further reinforcement.

There is then no pure culture. All culture is affected by that of others, and national cultures can be improved and refined by contact with the best in others. Is this important to ordinary people? It is. Let me take a simple illustration. Many parts of the world know the meaning of real poverty. Asia is poor; with more than half the world's population it consumes less than one-fifth of the food the world produces. Millions are hungry; tens of thousands die of starvation. And what will enable the East to provide more food? Technology, know-how, the use of that knowledge which is power, the harnessing of science to production, the transfer to Asia of Western ideas, or if you like, of scientific culture. And then, if this know-how is introduced from outside, note what will happen. More food will be produced and since international trade is really barter, Asia will get more from other countries and other countries will get more from Asia. Appreciation and understanding of the cultures of others, then, is not mere altruism; it is the way to a better material life for all.

And note this, too. Unless ideas about human dignity and human freedom prevail everywhere, there will continue to be international tensions, international incidents and even war. This, then, is no academic subject. It is vital to human well-being and even to human survival.

But what has all this to do with education? The teachers' task is to transmit to their pupils the best in their national culture. They can play a part in refining that culture by leading their pupils to appreciate

some of the worthwhile in other cultures, and this must be done if the world is to be wiser, more prosperous, and free from the tensions which lead to war. Whatever else education may do for children, it must free them from ignorance, prejudice and parochialism. Anything less is insufficient for today's needs.

BETTER PURPOSES

And how is this to be done? Do we add another subject to the time table or use a few new visual aids? This is but tinkering with the question, when fundamental rethinking is required. What is really needed is an education actuated by better motives, with better content, given in a better way, under better conditions by better people.

Let us look at each in turn. First, education should be devoted to better purposes. An American university (I am told) chose as its motto "Pep without purpose is piffle." Regretfully I must admit that some education is piffle, for it is all pep and no purpose. I have no particular objection to pep, but I insist purpose is important. Said Abraham Lincoln: "If only we knew what we were about perhaps we should get about it better." It is clear to me that some of our educational problems arise from the fact that some teachers are but dimly aware, or even oblivious of what they are really about.

This is dreadful some will say; education needs no purpose; it is an end in itself and it is advocating a biased education, an education committing people to social ends. Unashamedly, I plead guilty. I am advocating a purposeful education, for to me education is a social dynamic. I am advocating a biased education, but biased toward the best. I want teachers committed to the production of good citizens of their country and of the world. I want them to combat ignorance, suspicion, and prejudice whenever it may be found. I want them committed to the pursuit of truth, beauty, and moral excellence.

There is little risk, I think of any of our countries committing themselves to ignoble educational purposes. But there is a real risk we may be muddled in our aims or pursue ends that are too narrow. Some, for example, appear to be concerned about otherworldly ends. They readily become airborne. The sordid business of earning a living, they think, must not be mixed up with education.

What nonsense. I readily concede man has a right to a personal life, even an abundant personal life. But he also has to work, for we all belong to the working classes now. He has to live in a real world, not a dream world, but the world as it is. He has to spend his leisure in this real world and become a citizen of it. And children should be educated for this real world.

I know man does not live on bread alone, but he can't live without it, or, as Mark Twain remarked, "A man does not want Michelangelo for breakfast."

Yet this isn't the biggest risk in education today. When the sputnik was put into orbit, many rushed to the conclusion that education should be revolutionized and devoted to technological ends. And indeed the emphasis today is almost exclusively on education as the means by which individuals and the country generally achieve a higher material standard of living. I am all in favor of higher living standards, but other things need emphasis, too. A. N. Whitehead rightly reminded us that "A man may know all about the laws of light and yet miss the radiance of the sunset and the glory of the morning sky." Education must produce not only better scientists, but men who are aesthetically and spiritually alive.

Again, since half the world is illiterate, it is not surprising that in some countries the main educational purpose is to make people literate. Yet that purpose needs widening, too. We must not forget other things, and particularly what Plato called the science of good and evil, or, if you like, the pursuit of moral worth.

I must admit I cannot define the purposes of education for you. Purposes must vary between country and country and even school and school, because history, traditions and aspirations vary. Each school must define its own purposes. This is all the advice I can give: First, define purposes as best you can and make them worthy purposes; secondly, avoid, like the plague, narrow aims; thirdly, relate to the purposes all that is taught and how it is taught; fourthly, constantly reflect on what you and the pupils are doing and how this relates to your purposes. You will then find that method and content will more and more fulfill the purposes, and the purposes themselves will be clarified.

BETTER CONTENT

In preparing curriculums, then, only that relevant to the purposes should be included; all else should be excluded, and if in your enthusiasm, you are tempted to attempt too much, take note of Gould's law, which runs as follows: "If more is added to a pot which is already full, a mess is created." Don't therefore, add, unless you are prepared to take away.

And don't, I beg you, change everything, and abandon the traditional as being useless and old fashioned. People who do this are just as dangerous as those who want to leave everything alone.

Gustav Holst, an English musician, remarked there were two kinds of musical Philistine—he who believes musical history to have begun at a definite date and he who believes musical history to have finished at an equally definite date. Dean Inge, an English theologian, said there were two kinds of fool—those who say, "This is old and therefore good" and those who say "This is new and therefore better."

In education the Philistine and the fool are out of place. The worthwhile is not necessarily old or new. It could be either or both. So if we are going to improve the curriculum, we should make selections of old or new material, but all must be relevant not only to the capacities of children but to the purposes to be pursued.

BETTER METHODS

And then we must examine our methods to make sure they help to fulfill our purposes. I am no pedagogical expert but I see colleagues falling into the error of regarding methods as of little or of no importance or alternatively all important.

Let me give two examples of the devaluing of methods. Here is No. 1. Moral conduct, it is assumed, is merely a matter of knowledge. Teach the right things and children become moral. This is a fallacy. In moral education content and method are both important. For virtues and powers are developed not just by knowing of them but by practicing them. I submit that in the classroom unselfishness, courtesy, toleration, cooperation and appreciation of others' efforts and achievements need to be practiced just like reading, writing, and arithmetic.

Here is example No. 2. Scientific education, it is said, is too narrow, so humane and liberal studies must be added to make the scientist liberal minded. This, too, is a fallacy. In these days of increasing specialization, I doubt the practicability of adding much in the way of the humanities to science courses. But is it true that the study of science is illiberal and the study of the arts liberal? I know liberal-minded scientists and illiberal arts men. The fact is that science teaching can be liberal if it is constantly related to life, to its effects on men, to its social consequences. Indeed it has freed many men from prejudice and parochialism, and enabled them to work more readily with their fellows.

Of course, literature and history ought to be liberal studies, for they deal with men's hopes and fears, loves and hates. But sometimes these subjects have been taught in an illiberal way with no suggestion that they bear on personal relationships. Even literature and history can become a mere matter of assimilation and regurgitation with no liberalizing effect. Thus there are no liberal or illiberal subjects; there are only liberal and illiberal ways of teaching and learning. Liberal methods are needed in history, literature, science, and all subjects. All that is taught should be related to man, his needs and his aspirations.

But the worst error of all and the most prevalent is to regard content as unimportant and method all important. The teacher's task, it is said, is to create the conditions within which a child can be happy, and happiness is derived from doing what one pleases. Thus content is of no great importance. This, too, is a fallacy. It misunderstands the nature of children and the nature of happiness. At all costs, so some have suggested, the child must avoid strain or he will become anxious and something dreadful will happen to his psyche, his ego, his libido, or whatever is the current word. Education, they infer, demands no effort. It is an experience, like falling in love, joy, or the state of grace. It is not achieved. It is given. This is contrary to my own personal experience, and all I know about children. Real and abiding happiness does not spring from ease and idleness. Happiness comes from strain, tension, struggle, from grappling with difficulty and succeeding. Music, I may remind you, comes from taut strings, not slack ones. No education worthy of the name is possible without effort. Sweat has pedagogical and character-building merit.

You will therefore see I have no sympathy with those schools where the rights of children are cherished and where teachers have none to cherish; where intellectual content has little importance; where projects and methods that ought to be means to further the ends of learning have become ends in themselves, and where teachers are never allowed to raise their voices in anger and the children never lower theirs except from exhaustion.

I have admiration only for those who regard methods as important means of serving great ends, and who realize that every new burden cast on the school, and every widening purpose to be followed, demands a new valuation to ensure that methods serve the determined ends.

BETTER CONDITIONS

At previous conferences we have discussed how education is hampered because teachers, buildings, and money are in short supply. We have agreed that what is chiefly wrong with the schools is their poverty. This must be constantly stressed. Half of the 500 million children of school age in this world (that is under 14) are getting no education at all.

Even in wealthier countries classes are often overcrowded and buildings are inadequate. Institutionalized teaching, mass production, factory techniques, leave little time for anything but assimilation, and the lack of individual attention and the inadequate time given for reflection can easily lead to political and social irresponsibility.

No doubt some countries have the will to provide good education facilities, but lack the means. I am told that if the whole local authority and national revenues in India were devoted to education, they would be insufficient to provide primary education for every child. But some countries have the means yet lack the will.

The fact is, substantial natural backing and substantial national resources are needed for modern education. Without them, even

in countries like the United States of America and Canada, phrases like "equality of opportunity" have a hollow ring. Teachers can determine the purposes of their work, work out curricula, and devise suitable methods, but the help of others is needed. In particular, governments must learn to give priority to the things of the mind and spirit.

BETTER TEACHERS

Now may I add what is generally overlooked? Schools need not only enough teachers, but teachers of the right sort. And what are they? Obviously, they must be academically qualified, though standards must vary from place to place. Yet we need more than this. Teaching is not just a job. It is a vocation, a profession, which involves dedication to ideals and causes greater than ourselves.

Schools need teachers with a real sense of vocation and a true professional spirit for many reasons. Heavy responsibilities like those I have enumerated demand high-quality teachers. And if we are going to wage war on prejudice and suspicion and be successful, we must not rely alone on textbooks describing toleration, unselfishness, and sacrifice, but on toleration, unselfishness, and sacrifice incarnate in teachers. What is taught, why it is taught, and how it is taught may all be important, but what the teacher is, is most important of all.

WHAT ABOUT IT?

Thus, you will see that the appreciation of Eastern and Western cultural values is a real challenge to our thinking, to our educational practices, and to the quality of our renowned lives. It reminds us we are educating children in a tough world, where suspicions and misunderstandings, intolerance and stresses abound. It reminds us we must learn to live together, not alone for altruistic reasons, but because the alternative is too unpleasant to contemplate. And an education suited to such a world must not be soft, slipshod, or spineless. It must make big demands on teacher and child.

You remember what Kipling wrote:

"Oh, East is East, and West is West, and never the twain shall meet,
Till Earth and Sky stand presently at God's great Judgment Seat.
But there is neither East nor West, border nor Breed nor Birth,
When two strong men stand face to face though they come from the ends of the Earth."

Note what he says: Your ideas are impossible of achievement. Eastern and Western minds cannot meet in understanding; ignorance and misunderstanding are inevitable, and may result in conflict.

But the twain have met. In schools, children of different races work together and play together with complete absence of racial tensions. The childlike have no racial, sex or language prejudices. The childlike, of whatever age, are of the kingdom of heaven. In them east and west can and do meet.

And in WCOTP there has been neither east nor west, border, nor breed nor birth. And we have not stood face to face in conflict, but side by side in common purpose. UNESCO's theme now presents us with a fresh challenge. Let us accept what is fundamental to it, that education is the great transforming power, that it can work a material, intellectual, and spiritual revolution. I know schools have their failures and partial failures, for human nature is unreliable. But despite this, if the world is to make moral and spiritual progress we must rely upon education.

Let us then take this message back to the 3 million teachers we represent in our own countries. Let us urge our colleagues to reexamine their theories and their practices. Let us encourage them to dispel ignorance and misunderstanding, to root out fear and suspicion in all of the many millions of children entrusted to their care. For the challenge of a world divided and subdivided by indifference, misunderstanding, fear, selfishness and greed can only be met by making men better. To that supreme task let each of us today dedicate himself afresh.

WHITE FLEET

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the reaction to the proposal made by myself and the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], together with 33 other Senators, that a White Fleet be established for disaster relief and technical assistance, has developed wide public support.

Last week the Committee of American Steamship Lines offered to meet with the sponsors of the Senate and House resolutions and to discuss ways and means of implementing the idea. I am particularly gratified to have this offer of technical assistance from the leaders of our great maritime industry.

A very fine editorial appeared in the Christian Science Monitor of July 27, 1959, entitled, "Great White Fleet."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this 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:

GREAT WHITE FLEET

In 1907 President Theodore Roosevelt sent 16 American battleships on a cruise around the world. The Great Whte Fleet (American warships were then painted white in peacetime) carried its intended message: that the United States was emerging from an era of preoccupation with recovering from its own great civil conflict and with developing a continent under a network of railroads—from an era of taken-for-granted security behind the British Navy—and that it now was a world power.

Today an idea initiated by a young Navy commander, Frank Manson, and now sponsored by Senators HUMPHREY and AIKEN and Representatives BATES and EDMONDSON—a bipartisan group—is being framed into a resolution asking President Eisenhower to recommission from ships now in mothballs a modern Great White Fleet. This would carry aid to disaster-stricken areas throughout the world and technical assistance to nations which welcome it.

There are, of course, practical problems to be solved. Except for emergency rescues, care of the injured, food and shelter, the needs arising from disasters vary greatly. And the fleet could be a long way off from the place it would be needed. But these difficulties are not wholly insuperable. Even tardy, partial aid would not necessarily be futile. And technical assistance (instruction) could be a continuing service.

As a dramatic, impressive, traveling advertisement of Americans' dominant desire to be helpful, not warlike, the idea has enormous possibilities. It certainly should be seriously explored and considered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I am hopeful that in the coming weeks hearings may be scheduled on Senate Concurrent Resolution 66. In the meantime, it has been most gratifying to have the many offers of assistance from individuals and organizations interested in developing the idea for a White Fleet into a concrete, operating organization. On behalf of the sponsors of the resolution, may I say that all of these ideas are being considered, and it is hoped that gradually details can be worked out for a specific organizational structure.

HIGHWAY FINANCING

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point a statement prepared by me regarding highway financing.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HARRY F. BYRD, CHAIRMAN, SENATE FINANCE COMMITTEE, IN RE HIGHWAY FINANCING

I am vigorously and unequivocally opposed to the billion dollar bond issue currently proposed in the House Ways and Means Committee to supply additional funds for the Interstate Highway System.

I was one of those who actively opposed the Clay Committee report which in 1954 proposed borrowing more than $20 billion against future revenue from Federal highway user taxes to build this Interstate System.

I said then that road bonds issued in anticipation of revenue from Federal gas taxes, etc., was totally unrealistic. I repeat that statement now.

Bond issue financing for such a highway system is unrealistic because mileage and construction costs constantly increase, and invariably the time is hard to find when it is convenient to use available funds for redeeming the bonds. The result is that the debt plus interest continues indefinitely.

After prolonged debate, the Clay committee bond issue recommendations for the interstate highway system were rejected in the Senate by a 2-to-1 vote.

In 1956 Congress enacted an interstate highway financing plan, including the Byrd-Bennett pay-as-you-go amendment limiting apportionments to estimated receipts available to the trust fund derived from highway user taxes fixed in the act.

The Byrd-Bennett amendment was suspended last year as a so-called antirecession measure. I protested against the suspension and predicted that the highway trust fund would be bankrupt under the suspension. This happened quickly when 2 years' apportionments were made against 1 year's receipts.

Now the House Ways and Means Committee is proposing bond issue financing again temporarily to supply additional funds for the interstate road system.

Besides the basically unsound nature of such financing, bond issue for this purpose would be backdoor financing of the worst kind. It would authorize expenditure of Federal funds outside of appropriation process control and it would pile up an additional billion dollars of fully guaranteed Federal debt outside of the statutory debt limit.

In view of the constantly increasing costs of the interstate system, it is foolhardy to believe this debt would be repaid at any time in the reasonably near future. Approval of such a bond issue at this time would be an invitation to issue more bonds as time goes on. The debt plus the cost of continuing interest would go on for years.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will my friend, the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING], who has been expecting to take the floor, permit me to

occupy the floor very briefly for two purposes? One is to enable the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] to propose a constitutional amendment and the other is to call up the TVA bill.

Mr. KEATING. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from New York be recognized, and that he may yield to me for those purposes, and then regain the floor at the conclusion of the transaction of that business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from New York is recognized.

Mr. KEATING. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

THE PROPOSED CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT RELATING TO THE QUALIFICATIONS OF ELECTORS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Florida for 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator may proceed.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, in the 81st Congress and in every succeeding Congress I have introduced for several other Senators and myself a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the qualifications of electors participating in the election of elective Federal officials, including electors for President or Vice President, and Senators and Representatives in Congress. Hearings were held by a subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee on this proposal in the 81st, 83d, and 84th Congresses, and the printed record is available on two of the three hearings.

The joint resolution, in substance, has proposed that the Constitution be amended so as to forever end the poll tax problem in Federal elections by prohibiting the imposition of a poll tax or any other tax or any property qualification as a prerequisite for qualifying to vote for electors for President or Vice President, or for Senators or Representatives in Congress. The control of State and local elections is left to the States.

I am glad to announce that in reintroducing this joint resolution today, I am joined by many distinguished Senators as cosponsors.

I ask unanimous consent that the list of cosponsors be included in full at this point in the RECORD.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. BEALL, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. CASE of New Jersey, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. COOPER, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. KERR, Mr. DODD, Mr. DWORSHAK, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. ENGLE, Mr. FREAR, Mr. GREEN, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. HARTKE, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. KEATING, Mr. LONG, Mr. MARTIN, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. MCGEE, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. NEUBERGER, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. SCHOEPPEL, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. WILEY, Mr. YARBOROUGH, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. MCNAMARA, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, Mr. BUSH, Mr. MORTON, Mr. PROUTY, Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, Mr. LAUSCHE, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. CANNON, Mr. CLARK, Mr. HUMPHREY, and Mr. CAPEHART.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, at this point I call clear attention to the fact that our proposed amendment is completely bipartisan in character as well as nonsectional. It is supported by Senators of both political parties, and from every area of the Nation, and it has the sponsorship and support of the majority leader and the majority whip, as well as that of the minority leader and the minority whip.

We sponsors of this joint resolution strongly believe that the proposed constitutional amendment should be speedily submitted by this Congress to the States for ratification, and, if so submitted, we believe it will be quickly ratified by at least the required 38 States. Because we are so sure that the requisite number of States would speedily ratify the proposed amendment, we are quite agreeable to the allowing of any reasonable period of time for its consideration and ratification by the various States. I suggest a limitation of 2 years. The ratification of the 17th amendment, which was in some respects comparable to our proposed amendment, was completed in a little less than 1 year.

The poll tax requirement, now limited to five States, namely Alabama, Arkansas, Mississippi, Texas, and Virginia, has been accorded far greater importance than it deserves. The fact of the matter is that the amount of poll tax required to be paid in the several States is so small as to impose only a slight economic obstacle for any citizen who desires to qualify to cast a ballot. This requirement operates, of course, equally on citizens of all races and colors and is generally subject to important exemptions which limit its application, such as the exemption of veterans, of women, and of citizens beyond a certain age. Nevertheless, the question has remained a vexing one, which ought to be settled.

Many good citizens have indicated their feeling that this subject matter should be dealt with by the passage of a Federal statute rather than through the adoption of a Federal constitutional amendment. The sponsors of this resolution feel very strongly that the Federal Government is without any authority whatsoever to deal with this subject matter except by the submission for ratification of a Federal constitutional amendment. Our position is concurred in by many able constitutional lawyers from every section of the Nation, who believe and contend that the only legal way to deal with this question, other than through action by the States themselves, is by Federal constitutional amendment, and that action through Federal statute would clearly violate the provisions of section 2 of article I and also the provisions of the 17th amendment of the Federal Constitution, by both of which provisions the qualifications of electors, as prescribed under the laws of each State for the election of members of the most numerous branch of the State legislature are adopted as the qualifications of electors to vote upon Federal officials.

The introducers of the proposed amendment are exceedingly anxious that it be acted upon speedily and favorably by the Congress so that this subject matter, which has been the source of such long controversy and fruitless debate, may be quickly submitted to the States, where we believe that it will be promptly ratified. We feel that such a conclusion of this long-standing controversy is decidedly in the interest of sound democratic government and stronger unity among all of the people of our Nation.

For myself and on behalf of the other Senators who are cosponsors, I now introduce a joint resolution proposing the constitutional amendment, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 126) proposing an amendment to the Constition of the United States, relating to the qualifications of electors, introduced by Mr. HOLLAND (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is hereby proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. The right of citizens of the United States to vote in any primary or other election for electors for President or Vice President, or for Senator or Representative in Congress, shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or any State by reason of failure to pay any poll tax or other tax or to meet any property qualification.

"SEC. 2. Nothing in this article shall be construed to invalidate any provision of law denying the right to vote to paupers or persons supported at public expense or by charitable institutions.

"SEC. 3. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation."

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, this amendment is in accord with a philosophy which I have followed all my life. It is that government is at its finest peak not when it just helps peo-

ple, but when it helps people to help themselves.

I am delighted to join with the distinguished senior Senator from Florida, the minority leader, and forty-odd other Members of this body in cosponsoring this joint resolution.

In a democratic society, the best way to help people to help themselves is to place the fewest possible burdens on their right to vote.

From a practical standpoint, the only experience I have had with poll taxes is in my native State of Texas. As a young Congressman, many years ago, I urged my fellow Texans to repeal the tax.

I do not believe the poll tax in Texas is any great barrier to voting. But it is still a burden on voting, and I have remained consistent in stating that it should not be in force.

The right to vote is the most precious heritage we have. Any man who has a vote has a potent instrument for helping himself. The vote should not be conditioned upon a poll tax or any other kind of a tax.

I am aware of the fact that there is a dispute over whether Congress can repeal the poll tax by a simple law or whether a constitutional amendment is required.

I have my own feelings on this subject. But I do not believe we have any reason to linger over the argument.

We have every reason to believe that, if Congress acts in this field, the State legislatures will follow quickly. Any delay would be negligible.

As the Senator from Florida has already reminded the Senate, the poll tax as a prerequisite for voting is effective in only five States.

Consequently, I do not see any reason for risking court suits by seeking to pass a simple law.

A simple law would be resented by the people of the States. It would certainly be tested, and there are strong reasons to believe that the results could be adverse.

But if we act by the constitutional amendment route, the results are virtually certain, as certain as anything can be in this uncertain world. We will have a foolproof achievement which will have behind it a double force.

It will have been approved by the Congress. It will have the sanction of the States themselves.

Mr. President, there are today five States which have the poll tax, including my own State of Texas. The trend over the years has been against placing such a burden on the right to vote.

But trends can be reversed. By acting now, we can settle this issue through the most stable aspect of our Government, the Constitution itself.

Mr. President, I supported the Civil Rights Act of 1957, because its enforcement provisions were directed to the basic right of voting. This would be yet another step in helping to safeguard that right.

I do not believe that any reasonable man or woman in this day and age will argue with the right to vote. All of our citizens who are not felons or incapacitated for mental reasons should have that right.

And whatever limitation is placed upon the right, such as an age limitation, should apply equally to all. Any financial limitation obviously cannot be made to apply equally.

We offer this amendment in the belief that it is time to act. And we hope that action will be swift and in accordance with the American tradition.

Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KEATING. I thought I had the floor.

Mr. ENGLE. The Senator from Texas yielded to me.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I had asked the Senator from New York to permit other Senators to be recognized for the purpose of introducing a joint resolution proposing a constitutional amendment and to act on the TVA bill, and then the Senator from New York would be recognized.

Mr. KEATING. I wanted to be sure.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. ENGLE. I thank the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. President, I am happy to join with my distinguished friend and colleague, the Senator from Florida, as a coauthor of this joint resolution. I hope that it will be enacted into law.

I agree with the majority leader that the course taken in this instance is the proper course to take and one which will result in the most expeditious elimination of the poll tax as a bar to voting. I am pleased to have the opportunity to join as a coauthor of this resolution.

This subject should be dealt with by the adoption of an amendment to the Federal Constitution rather than by the enactment of a Federal statute.

Article I, section 2 of the Federal Constitution provides that the electors of Representatives, in each State, shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature. The 17th amendment contains the same provision with regard to the qualifications of electors of Senators from each State.

Article II, section 1, provides that, as regards the election of President and Vice President, each State shall appoint, in such manner as the legislature thereof may direct, a number of electors, who shall meet in their respective States and vote by ballot for President and Vice President.

It is evident from these provisions that the Federal Constitution has committed to the several States the power to determine the qualifications of voters in Federal elections, by adopting as qualifications to vote in Federal elections the qualifications prescribed under the laws of the several States for voting for the members of the most numerous branch of the State legislatures.

The poll tax is now a prerequisite for voting in five States—Alabama, Arkansas, Mississippi, Texas, and Virginia—each of which considers the payment of this tax as a qualification for voting. Should we enact a Federal statute prohibiting the poll tax from being considered a qualification for voting, we will be met with the charge that such a statute is unconstitutional as being in conflict with the above-mentioned sections of the Federal Constitution.

While it is true that, among other amendments, the 15th amendment to the Constitution limits this power of the several States to establish qualifications for voting, in that this amendment prohibits the denial of the right to vote because of race, color, or previous condition of servitude, it cannot be charged that the poll tax is a discriminatory measure. It operates equally on citizens of all races and colors, and was held to be constitutional. *Breedlove* v. *Suttles* (1937), 302 U.S. 277, the Court pointing out that "the payment of poll taxes as a prerequisite to voting is a familiar and reasonable regulation long enforced in many States."

The discussion on any proposed Federal statute will veer off on a tangent and the real issue of the poll tax will be drowned by the question of Federal and State relations. It is therefore apparent that the constitutional amendment method is the only proper one through which this subject should be approached.

ARGUMENTS AGAINST THE POLL TAX

While the citizens of the United States, generally, do not have to pay any sum of money in order to be able to vote for Federal officers, the citizens of the United States who reside in these five States do have to make a payment for the privilege of voting. These five States which continue to require a poll-tax payment for voting have softened that requirement through the years by exempting older people reaching a certain age, by exempting persons in military service, and by exempting persons with certain physical handicaps. But the fact remains that hundreds of thousands of American citizens, both white and colored, still must pay for the privilege of voting in Federal elections. There is proof in the record of voting in the Southern States which have abolished the poll-tax requirement that both Negroes and whites have voted in much greater numbers and in a much greater percentage of the mature adult population after the repeal of the poll-tax requirement.

This amendment would extend the franchise to these disfranchised persons to vote for Federal officers, without interfering with State and local matters. At this point, other phases of the amendment should be emphasized. It will apply to primary elections and special elections as well as to general elections. It will apply to election of Federal officers only and will not affect State or local elections. It would apply to Federal legislation as well as State legislation, so that at some future time Congress could not impose a tax for the privilege of voting. It would apply to any tax for the privilege of voting, whether called a poll-tax or by some other name. Several States both in the North and in the South have had such taxes under different names, but have since repealed them. Neither the United States nor any of the several States would ever be able to set up a property qualification as a prerequisite for voting in a Federal election.

The amendment would not affect the disqualification of paupers and persons supported at public expense or in charitable institutions. Twelve States have laws disqualifying such persons from voting. These States are Delaware, Louisiana, Maine, Massachusetts, Missouri, New Hampshire, Oklahoma, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Texas, Virginia, and West Virginia. These laws would not be affected.

The five States which still have a poll-tax requirement would probably ratify this amendment for in 1951 when a similar amendment was proposed—Senate Joint Resolution 12, 82d Congress—the four Senators of two of these States joined eight other Southern Senators in sponsoring it. They were Senators BYRD and ROBERTSON, of Virginia, and MCCLELLAN and FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas. This gesture of solving the question by an amendment to the Constitution would be an admission by Congress that qualification of voters is now within the province of State not Federal legislation, and would allow the several States the possibility of ratifying the amendment with the assurance that it was not a challenge to their remaining rights to regulate the qualifications of voters.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution submitted earlier today by the distinguished senior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] on behalf of himself, the minority leader, myself, and other Senators, remain at the desk for the remainder of the day in order that any Senators who desire to join the senior Senator from Florida and the other cosponsors of the resolution to submit a constitutional amendment to repeal the poll taxes in Federal elections may have the opportunity to join as cosponsors.

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

ISSUANCE OF BONDS BY THE TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 2471.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey in the chair). The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2471) to amend the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933, as amended, and for other purposes.

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, there are two technical amendments that should be made to S. 2471.

I should like to inform the Senate that the President has now signed H.R. 3460. Therefore I ask unanimous consent that line 3, page 1, of S. 2471 be amended by striking out the words "H.R. 3460, an," and inserting in lieu thereof the word "the".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I also ask that on line 5, page 1, the words "passed by the House of Representatives on May 7, 1959, and the United States Senate on July 9, 1959" be deleted, and to insert in lieu thereof the words "approved on August 6, 1959."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, the bill which was H.R. 3460 and which has now been signed into law by the President, is a bill to provide the financing for the expansion of the TVA in its area of operation, to set up a more realistic method of reimbursement to the Federal Government for appropriations advanced to TVA, to provide for the payment of interest on appropriated investment in TVA by the Corporation, and to prescribe definite limits and restrictions with reference to territorial expansion by the TVA.

In working that bill out in the committee, certain provisions were included for the transmission of construction programs by the corporation through the Office of the President to Congress, with a directive that the President shall transmit the construction programs with his budget messages to Congress. It was felt by the President that that particular phase of the legislation restricted the Executive as to his constitutional authorities and prerogatives. That certainly was not the intention of the authors to the bill or of the committee or of Congress. To remove the objectionable feature from the bill, S. 2471 was introduced and reported to the Senate by the committee. It is corrective in reality, Mr. President, and in no way impairs the general functions and purposes of the bill, H.R. 3460, which is now a law, but is calculated to guarantee the maintenance of the constitutional position of the power both of Congress and of the President, and therefore the passage of S. 2471 is urged.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I am prepared to yield back part of my time. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I am very happy that after a 4-year struggle, events are transpiring today which will enable the Tennessee Valley Authority to finance its power needs, by the issuance of bonds.

The President has signed today H.R. 3460, the TVA bill which was passed by the Senate on July 9. And now with the enactment of this amendment, the legislative process will be completed.

In 1954, I recommended that TVA financing be accomplished by the issuance of bonds, rather than by appropriations. In 1957, I introduced a bill to permit the financing of the facilities of the Tennessee Valley Authority. H.R. 3460 which has been developed will avert a power deficit in the TVA service area that would have occurred in the winter of 1960–61, and it will permit the orderly financing of the growth needs of the Tennessee Valley Authority service area.

The Tennessee Valley Authority serves a part of the State of Kentucky. It has been the primary source of power for some cities of Kentucky, and H.R. 3460 makes Paducah, Glasgow, Fulton, Hickman, Princeton, and Monticello eligible for TVA power. TVA supplies primary power to our rural electric cooperatives. It provides exchange power and stand-by power for the Eastern Kentucky Rural Electric Cooperatives, which supply 16 local cooperatives and 84 counties in my State. Because of the large interest of the people of Kentucky I have been very much concerned in this legislation. I add also that TVA supplies exchange power to the private utilities in Kentucky.

I congratulate the able chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Public Works, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], who had charge of this legislation. It is due chiefly to his leadership that we have been able to get a TVA bill this year.

I also thank the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], who, although not a resident of the area, is aware of its problems and has given his best efforts to work out agreements which have led to this successful conclusion. The amendment we vote on today is another of his contributions.

To all of those, to our minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN], the majority leader [Mr. JOHNSON], to my colleagues from the TVA States, and all others who have worked to bring this bill to a successful culmination I know I speak the gratitude of my State. And I particularly thank the President of the United States for his consideration and interest in this problem.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I wish to join the Senator from Oklahoma, the Senator from Kentucky, the majority leader, and other Senators in expressing gratification that, after a long effort and a long time of anxiety, there is now to be a satisfactory provision for the self-financing program of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

It has been 7 years since money has been appropriated for the construction of a hydroelectric facility or steam plant. The Tennessee Valley Authority and the area it serves are faced with a power shortage of 2 years which may be relieved, however, by the early issuance of bonds and the building of facilities, which can be done now under the provisions of this bill.

I am glad the President has signed the bill which was before him, and that this amendment will remove the objection he had to it.

I am sorry it has been necessary to have territorial limitations which do take away to some extent the freedom of the TVA to make its own decisions and to operate its own business in the public interest. I am advised that the Directors of the TVA feel they can live with this action and can carry out the great program of the TVA under the provisions of the bill which has been signed, with the amendment upon which we are to act. That being the case, I go along with others in support of the proposal.

The TVA has made a great record. It will continue to do so. It is one of the great showplaces of our developments in the United States.

As a Senator from Tennessee, I wish to say we are proud of the fact that there is interest in the TVA and that it has support from all sections of our country. I especially wish to express our thanks and gratitude to the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the chairman of the subcommittee, for the interest, leadership, and thought he has given to the problems affecting the Tennessee Valley Authority. I also wish to thank the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], the majority leader, and other Senators.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield such time as he may desire to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I wish only to say that a rare amount of patience, restraint, and effort has gone into this matter, in order, first of all, to procure the President's signature and at the same time to perfect the deficiency in the bill to which the President so emphatically objected.

I only express my delight that this has ended as it has, and that the bill has been signed, with the point made by the executive branch with respect to a diminution of executive power, which will be cured by our action today.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I am prepared to yield back my time, with the understanding that the minority leader do the same.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I should like to say a few words.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. If ever there was a bill which illustrated the old truth that legislation is the art of the possible, the TVA bill does. Many, many points of view had to be accommodated. Probably the bill is not identical with the way any one person might have written it. I refer to the basic bill, which the President signed today. This modification is an accommodation of viewpoints.

As I said at the time the major bill was originally before the Senate, it provides better legislation and a better TVA law than we now have. The balance is in favor of the bill. I am glad the President signed it.

I express my appreciation to all who cooperated in getting this result. The bill never would have been passed and would not be law today, I will say to all friends of TVA, if it had not been for the leadership of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR]. He had more patience than I had. Many times I was reay to quit, but we had a practical situation to meet. We were not legislating in a vacuum. The TVA is a going concern.

The bill which will become law today will improve the basic Tennessee Valley Authority law and will permit the TVA to do the job for which it was created.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield myself 30 seconds.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas is recognized for 30 seconds.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I think the action we are about to take will be a great tribute to the dedicated and devoted efforts of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] and the cooperation which he has received from the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] and the other members of the Committee on Public Works. I applaud them and congratulate them for the fine achievement which has been accomplished. I trust this body will speedily and unanimously approve the bill.

Mr. President, I am prepared to yield back the remainder of my time.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, the Committee on Public Works has been considering legislation to permit self-financing for TVA by the use of proceeds from revenue bonds for the past 5 years. Extensive hearings were held during the 84th and 85th Congresses, and again during the present session. A bill to accomplish this purpose was passed by the Senate during the 85th Congress but did not pass the House.

On May 7 of this year, the House passed H.R. 3460. The Senate passed the bill on July 9 of this year with amendments. The House accepted the Senate amendments and the bill did not go to conference.

The Senate amendments were adopted after consideration of the testimony of many witnesses. Many conferences were held, every amendment proposed was carefully studied, the executive branch was consulted, and at one point after the bill was first reported to the Senate by the Committee on Public Works, it was recommitted to the committee for further study and consideration of other desirable amendments.

As passed by the Senate, H.R. 3460 would permit TVA to issue revenue bonds in an aggregate amount of $750 million outstanding at any one time to assist the Corporation in expanding its electric power facilities. Thus TVA would be self-supporting and not rely on appropriations by Congress each year for their construction needs. For the first time, distribution of TVA power would be limited to a prescribed geographic area. This limitation was provided to allay the fears of many that TVA would expand their service area and distribute electric power to cities or areas now served wholly by private companies.

The bill also contains provisions for interim financing if the time of issuance of revenue bonds was not believed desirable. It would also remove certain restrictions and limitations on TVA which the committee felt would not permit efficient and economical operation.

It was believed that the Board of Directors of the Corporation should be free to conduct its activities on a business-like basis, with sufficient flexibility to meet the needs of the area, yet protect the interests of the Federal Government, as the owner of the assets of the Corporation.

The bill was sought to be in the public interest, as under its provision the Corporation would return to the Federal Treasury over $2.2 billion in 53 years whereas under present law there would only be returned $1.2 billion, the present appropriation investment, in 40 years.

H.R. 3460 included provisions that with the budget estimates submitted to Congress, the President would transmit the power construction program of the Corporation, as presented to him, with any recommendations he deemed advisable. In the absence of modifying legislation by concurrent resolution within 90 calendar days of a single session of Congress, the projects would be considered as having congressional approval.

H.R. 3460 was presented to the President for approval. We noted in the press and by conferences with representatives of the executive branch, that the President has voiced his reluctance to approve the act as presented.

His objection was in the manner of approval or disapproval of the power construction program by the Congress by concurrent resolution, over which he has no veto power. He considered that procedure an abrogation of power by the legislative branch, a disruption of the time-honored separation of powers between the three branches of Government established by the Constitution, and as weakening the Office of the President.

S. 2471, the bill now under consideration, would delete from H.R. 3460 the language found objectionable by the President.

It would remove some of the restrictions placed on TVA by the language that would be deleted, and would eliminate the scrutiny of the power construction program of the corporation by the President and the Congress, and approval of the power construction program of TVA by congressional action over which the President would have no control.

Deletion of the language from H.R. 3460 would have no effect on the other provisions of the act, nor on the use of revenue bond proceeds, and such deletion would not place TVA under the Bureau of the Budget any more than H.R. 3460 now places that corporation.

I am glad that H.R. 3460 will become law. It is financially advantageous to the Federal Government and essential to the future operations of the TVA.

Enactment of S. 2471 will preserve the separation of powers between the executive and legislative branches, and I recommend its approval by the Senate.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I must not let this opportunity pass, after the nice things which have been said about me by distinguished Members of this body, without publicly acknowledging the deep personal gratitude I feel to the meny Senators who participated in the development of the legislation for the Tennessee Valley Authority. I must place high on that last the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE],

who was a sponsor with me of the original bill, and who is the original author, with whom I am a cosponsor, of S. 2471.

The Senator from South Dakota very kindly said that without my efforts the bill would not have come to fruition. Mr. President, without the efforts of the Senator from South Dakota the bill never would have survived the many rugged experiences of the legislative hammering and compromise to which it was subjected.

The friends of the TVA in the valley were tremendously cooperative. The members of the committee on both sides, Democrats and Republicans alike, could be named individually. I would name one or two, but I must not do so because there are so many who worked hard and time does not permit the naming of all of them. All gave of their time, effort, and sincere devotion to the development of the legislation which has now been signed by the President, the last main objection to which will be removed when the House passes S. 2471.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time, with the understanding that the minority leader will do likewise.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield back the time remaining to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has been yielded back.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 2471) 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 section 15d(a) of the Act to amend the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933, as amended, and for other purposes, approved on August 6, 1959, is hereby amended by deleting therefrom the following:

"*Provided,* That, with the budget estimates transmitted by the President to the Congress, the President shall transmit the power construction program of the Corporation as presented to him and recommended by the Corporation, together with any recommendation he may deem appropriate.

"Neither bond proceeds nor power revenues received by the Corporation shall be used to initiate the construction of new power producing projects (except for replacement purposes and except the first such project begun after the effective date of this section) until the construction program of the Corporation shall have been before Congress in session for ninety calendar days. In the absence of any modifying action by a concurrent resolution of the Congress within the ninety days, such projects will be deemed to have congressional approval."

Mr. HILL subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD immediately following the debate on Senate bill 2471, amending the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933, as amended, excerpts from the report of the Senate Committee on Public Works. I call particular attention to the following language in the report of the committee:

It is the understanding of the committee that the proposed deletion of the language from H.R. 3460 will have no effect on the procedure of operation by the TVA; that revenue bond proceeds will be used under the same procedures as current revenues are now used; that such deletion does not alter the relationship between the TVA and the Bureau of the Budget as otherwise established by H.R. 3460; and will have no effect or deterrence on the issuance of bonds or on the remaining provisions of H.R. 3460.

I ask unanimous consent that extracts from the report may appear in the body of the RECORD.

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

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of S. 2471 is to delete certain language from H.R. 3460, an act to authorize the Tennessee Valley Authority to issue and sell revenue bonds to assist in financing needed additions to its power system; to provide for payments to the Treasury; to establish a geographic limitation on the area within which TVA power can be distributed; and including necessary administrative provisions in connection with the proposed bond issues. The language that would be deleted from the act is the proviso relating to the transmission of the power construction program of the Corporation to the Congress by the President with the budget estimates and with any recommendation he deems appropriate; the withholding of initiation of construction of new power-producing projects until the construction program of the Corporation has been before Congress in session for 90 calendar days; and the considered congressional approval of such projects in the absence of modifying action by concurrent resolution of Congress within the 90 days.

GENERAL STATEMENT

The provisions of H.R. 3460, as amended by the Committee on Public Works, are fully set forth in Senate Report 470, 86th Congress, 1st session, with a discussion of such provisions. The matter of revenue bond financing by the TVA has been under consideration by the committee for the past 5 years. The committee made an earnest endeavor to provide the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority with a means to assist them in financing additions to power facilities required to meet the anticipated needs of the area, to make the Corporation self-supporting and self-financing, and, at the same time, preserving sufficient flexibility to permit them to conduct the power operations of the Corporation on a businesslike basis, unhampered by restrictions that would affect the marketability of the revenue bonds, or cause undue delay in their issuance or the prompt construction of power-producing projects. The act also included provisions for review of the power construction program of the Corporation by the President, transmission of the program to the Congress with his recommendations, consideration of the program by the Congress, and provision for modification by concurrent resolution if deemed advisable.

The President has indicated his reluctance to approve H.R. 3460 in its present form, objecting to language included in the act by the Senate which permits modification of the TVA power program by concurrent resolution. He considers this method of legislation as usurping the powers of the executive branch, since such legislation would not be subject to his approval.

S. 2471 would meet the objections of the President by deleting from H.R. 3460 the following:

"*Provided,* That, with the budget estimates transmitted by the President to the Congress, the President shall transmit the power construction program of the Corporation as presented to him and recommended by the Corporation, together with any recommendation he may deem appropriate.

"Neither bond proceeds nor power revenues received by the Corporation shall be used to initiate the construction of new power-producing projects (except for replacement purposes and except the first such project begun after the effective date of this section) until the construction program of the Corporation shall have been before Congress in session for ninety calendar days. In the absence of any modifying action by a concurrent resolution of the Congress within the ninety days, such projects will be deemed to have congressional approval."

RECOMMENDATIONS

The committee believes that this bill removes certain restrictions from H.R. 3460, and also removes from that act provisions for congressional scrutiny and approval of the power construction program of TVA which the President himself did not have, thus maintaining the constitutional concept of power among the branches of the Government. It is the understanding of the committee that the proposed deletion of the language from H.R. 3460 will have no effect on the procedure of operation by the TVA; that revenue bond proceeds will be used under the same procedures as current revenues are now used; that such deletion does not alter the relationship between the TVA and the Bureau of the Budget as otherwise established by H.R. 3460; and will have no effect or deterrence on the issuance of bonds or on the remaining provisions of H.R. 3460. The committee further believes that H.R. 3460 is financially advantageous to the Federal Government; that it is essential to the future operations of the TVA; that deletion of the proposed language from the act preserves the separation of powers between the executive and legislative branches; and recommends enactment of S. 2471.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL FARM LOAN ACT, RELATING TO TRANSFER OF RESPONSIBILITY FOR MAKING APPRAISALS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion of Mr. HOLLAND that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House in the nature of a substitute for S. 1512.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask that the Senate take action upon my motion with regard to the House amendment to S. 1512, which is pending at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Florida that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House in the nature of a substitute for S. 1512. [Putting the question.]

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The "ayes" have it, and the motion is agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator from Illinois was on his feet requesting recognition when the vote was taken.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I wanted to observe that action on the House

amendment to the conference report was held up for a time at my request. I had in mind checking with the Bureau of the Budget and also with the Civil Service Commission. I find in one case the bill was supported, and in the other case it was opposed because of the retirement provision.

I still believe that the kind of retirement provision provided for is faulty and bad. If we can apply this procedure to 1,500 or 1,600 persons who are on a private payroll—if they can be insinuated into or kept in the retirement system of the Federal Government—we can do it with regard to 100,000 persons. I am afraid the proposed action would establish a bad precedent. However, I am not insensible to the difficulties which confronted the committee in this matter, because it is very desirable to dispose of these institutions and to put them into private hands.

The question is how to do it without too much injustice to the personnel involved. It is one of those questions which requires the wisdom of a Solomon; but I have an idea that the case will rise up to haunt us.

Under the circumstances, the Budget Bureau having in the first instance approved, and the Civil Service Commission having opposed, I am left rather betwixt and between. Someday we shall have to come to grips with the residual question which will not have been solved by concurrence in the House amendment.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I appreciate the statement of the Senator from Illinois. The delay in the proceedings was due to his request—which I was glad to grant—for time to confer with the Civil Service Commission. I want him to know that every Senator advocating the acceptance of the House amendment, and every Senator supporting the bill, has made it quite clear that this case is not considered as a precedent, for many reasons, but particularly because the Federal Government will have a continuing interest in and connection with each of these institutions. The fact of owing money to the Federal Government in the case of most of them will exist after the retirement date of the present employees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] that the Senate concur in the House amendment in the nature of a substitute for Senate bill 1512.

The motion was agreed to.

THE PROPOSED CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT TO REPEAL POLL TAX

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] a question.

As I understand, the Judiciary Committee has held hearings twice on the so-called constitutional amendment repealing the poll tax, and the hearings have been printed.

Mr. HOLLAND. The subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee headed by the late Senator Miller, of Idaho, later by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], and still later by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], conducted hearings. Two of the hearings have been printed, and are available in the form of documents at this time.

The distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] is present in the Chamber. He is one of the cosponsors of the resolution. I am sure he will recall having conducted hearings on this proposal.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, the Senator is correct. There was a substantial hearing upon an identical resolution providing for a constitutional amendment.

Mr. HOLLAND. The resolution is identical.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Hearings were held in the last Congress, and perhaps in the Congress before that.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. As I understand, the hearings during the last session were printed.

Mr. KEFAUVER. My impression is that they were.

Mr. HOLLAND. They have been printed twice.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, at the present time I am chairman of the Constitutional Amendments Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary. If action is desired upon the resolution in this Congress, we can expedite further hearings and will do so if the chief sponsor of the amendment wishes that to be done.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I think that would be a matter for consideration and decision by the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, and not the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. We are not asking for a decision of any kind. We are asking for information. The Senator from Florida stated to me in private conversation that hearings were held in the last Congress.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I think it would be a matter for the chairman of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Certainly, the resolution would be referred to the Judiciary Committee; and I hope the committee will give it consideration at an early date.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I have no desire to interfere with the prerogatives of the chairman of the committee. I stated that, as chairman of the subcommittee, so far as I am concerned, I will do everything possible to expedite hearings on the resolution, if the members of the committee and the chief sponsor of the resolution wish that that be done.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, it is not my purpose at all to try to deprive the Committee on the Judiciary or its chairman, or any of its members, of any of their powers or prerogatives. I am too proud and happy over the assiduous attention which the committee has given to certain legislation ever to try to do so.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I have only one thing to add to the discussion of the proposal for the constitutional repeal of the poll tax provision as it applies to the election of Federal officers.

On three occasions I was a Member of the House when we undertook, by legislation, to effectuate this result, but the action was never consummated.

I recall many discussions with the late distinguished Senator Taft, of Ohio. It was always his contention that it had to be done by a constitutional amendment. I am confident that this resolution will receive appropriate and expeditious attention.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I should like to add to what the distinguished majority leader has said that it is my personal opinion as a lawyer that the Federal Government could accomplish the desired result by a law, rather than by constitutional amendment. But certainly we should get on with the task.

I have been very happy to cosponsor the joint resolution, and I shall do everything in my power to urge that early hearings be held, and that the proposed constitutional amendment be reported from the committee at this session of the Congress.

RENTAL OF COTTON ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1455) to authorize the rental of cotton acreage allotments, which were, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That section 377 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 377. In any case in which, during any year beginning with 1956, the acreage planted to a commodity on any farm is less than the acreage allotment for such farm, the entire acreage allotment for such farm (excluding any allotment released from the farm or reapportioned to the farm and any allotment provided for the farm pursuant to subsection (f)(7)(A) of section 344) shall, except as provided herein, be considered for the purpose of establishing future State, county and farm acreage allotments to have been planted to such commodity in such year on such farm, but the 1956 acreage allotment of any commodity shall be regarded as planted under this section only if the owner or operator on such farm notified the county committee prior to the sixtieth day preceding the beginning of the marketing year for such commodity of his desire to preserve such allotment: *Provided*, That beginning with the 1960 crop, except for federally owned land, the current farm acreage allotment established for a commodity shall not be preserved as history acreage pursuant to the provisions of this section unless for the current year or either of the two preceding years an acreage equal to 75 per centum or more of the farm acreage allotment for such year was actually planted or devoted to the commodity on the farm (or was regarded as planted under provisions of the Soil Bank Act or the Great Plains program): *Provided further*, That this section shall not be applicable in any case, within the period 1956 to 1959, in which the amount of the commodity required to be stored to postpone or avoid payment of penalty has been reduced because the allotment was not fully planted. Acreage history credits for released or reapportioned acreage shall be governed

by the applicable provisions of this title pertaining to the release and reapportionment of acreage allotments."

SEC. 2. Section 344 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended as follows:

(1) Subsection (f) is amended by changing paragraph (8) thereof to read as follows:

"(8) Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of paragraphs (2) and (6) of this subsection, the Secretary shall, if allotments were in effect the preceding year, provide for the county acreage allotment for the 1959 and succeeding crops of cotton, less the acreage reserved under paragraph (3) of this subsection, to be apportioned to farms on which cotton has been planted in any one of the three years immediately preceding the year for which such allotment is determined, on the basis of the farm acreage allotment for the year immediately preceding the year for which such apportionment is made, adjusted as may be necessary (i) for any change in the acreage of cropland available for the production of cotton, or (ii) to meet the requirements of any provision (other than those contained in paragraphs (2) and (6)) with respect to the counting of acreage for history purposes: *Provided,* That, beginning with allotments established for the 1961 crop of cotton, if the acreage actually planted (or regarded as planted under the Soil Bank Act, the Great Plains program, and the release and reapportionment provisions of subsection (m)(2) of this section) to cotton on the farm in the preceding year was less than 75 per centum of the farm allotment for such year, in lieu of using such allotment as the farm base as provided in this paragraph, the base shall be the average of (1) the cotton acreage for the farm for the preceding year as determined for purposes of this proviso and (2) the allotment established for the farm pursuant to the provisions of this subsection (f) for such preceding year; and the 1958 allotment used for establishing the minimum farm allotment under paragraph (1) of this subsection (f) shall be adjusted to the average acreage so determined. The base for a farm shall not be adjusted as provided in this paragraph if the county committee determines that failure to plant at least 75 per centum of the farm allotment was due to conditions beyond the control of producers on the farm. The Secretary shall establish limitations to prevent allocations of allotment to farms not affected by the foregoing proviso, which would be excessive on the basis of the cropland, past cotton acreage, allotments for other commodities, and good soil conservation practices on such farms."

(2) Paragraph (3) of subsection (g) is hereby repealed.

(3) Subsection (i) is amended by adding the following at the end thereof: "Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, beginning with the 1960 crop the planting of cotton on a farm in any of the immediately preceding three years that allotments were in effect but no allotment was established for such farm for any year of such three-year period shall not make the farm eligible for an allotment as an old farm under subsection (f) of this section: *Provided, however,* That by reason of such planting the farm need not be considered as ineligible for a new farm allotment under subsection (f)(3) of this section."

(4) Paragraph (2) of subsection (m) is changed to read as follows:

"(2) Any part of any farm cotton acreage allotment on which cotton will not be planted and which is voluntarily surrendered to the county committee shall be deducted from the allotment to such farm and may be reapportioned by the county committee to other farms in the same county receiving allotments in amounts determined by the county committee to be fair and reasonable on the basis of past acreage of cotton, land, labor, equipment available for the production of cotton, crop rotation practices, and soil and other physical facilities affecting the production of cotton. If all of the allotted acreage voluntarily surrendered is not needed in the county, the county committee may surrender the excess acreage to the State committee to be used for the same purposes as the State acreage reserve under subsection (e) of this section. Any allotment released under this provision shall be regarded for the purposes of establishing future allotments as having been planted on the farm and in the county where the release was made rather than on the farm and in the county to which the allotment was transferred, except that this shall not operate to make the farm from which the allotment was transferred eligible for an allotment as having cotton planted thereon during the three-year base period: *Provided,* That notwithstanding any other provisions of law, any part of any farm acreage allotment may be permanently released in writing to the county committee by the owner and operator of the farm, and reapportioned as provided herein. Acreage released under this paragraph shall be credited to the State in determining future allotments. The provisions of this paragraph shall apply also to extra long staple cotton covered by section 347 of this Act (7 U.S.C. 1344(m))."; and to amend the title so as to read: "An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, with respect to the preservation of acreage history and the reallocation of unused cotton acreage allotments."

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. President, S. 1455 deals with the acreage history and allotments for crops in the operation of production adjustment programs.

All corps subject to acreage allotments are affected by the first section of the bill which provides that, beginning with the 1960 crop, the entire current farm allotment shall be regarded as planted if during the current year, or either 1 of the 2 preceding years, the acreage actually planted or devoted to the commodity on the farm—or regarded as planted because of participation in the soil bank—was 75 percent or more of the farm allotment. Acreage history credited to the farm under this provision also would be credited to the State and county.

The automatic preservation of history for allotment purposes expires with the 1959 crops. Unless S. 1455 or some other legislation is enacted, producers of allotted crops beginning with the 1960 crops must plant each year in order to maintain the acreage history for their farms, county, and State. Thus, if no action is taken, the result would be an increased production of crops already in surplus.

Other sections of the bill relate specifically to the orderly transfer of unused cotton acreage allotments.

The purpose is to require that a farmer holding a cotton acreage allotment plant it, voluntarily release it to retain the acreage history on his farm, or gradually forfeit it to other farmers who want to use it.

The unused cotton allotments would be transferred to other farms, first, within each county, and then within the State. Allotted acreage not used within the State would become available for distribution in other States.

The original version of S. 1455 provided for the transfer of county acreage allotments within county lines through leasing agreements reached between individual farmers.

As a result of strong objections by the Department of Agriculture, a new approach was written into the present version of S. 1455.

Extensive hearings have been held by both the House Committee on Agriculture and the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry on the problem of transferring unused acreage allotments.

The bill before us today meets with the approval of the Department of Agriculture and with a vast majority of the cotton producers of the United States. These amendments are recommended by the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I handled the bill.

I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments to S. 1455.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, S. 1455, as amended by the House, provides a sound approach for protecting acreage history for all allotted crops. This legislation is critically needed to protect allotted acreage at the State, county, and farm levels. It is one of the most important farm bills that has come before the Congress during this session and offers a permanent solution to our acreage history problem.

This bill is, in effect, a modified version of S. 62, which I introduced in January of this year, and carries out the primary objectives which I emphasized in a Senate speech on July 15.

Under the provisions of this bill, every farmer with an allotment is given a chance to fully protect his acreage history by planting 75 percent of his allotment, or by planting a measurable amount of his allotment in any 1 of 3 years and releasing the balance to the county committee for reapportionment to other farms.

The county allotment is fully protected when 75 percent of the farm allotment is planted every third year. This bill provides desirable flexibility of acreage allotments between farms and at the same time establishes necessary safeguards for those who want to protect their acreage history permanently. In past years many inequities have resulted in acreage shifts at the farm and county level, and as a result many farmers have hesitated to release their allotments to the county committee for fear of losing their acreage history credit.

For the past several years the allowable planted acreage for basic crops has been reduced to an uneconomical level. In the case of cotton, I see no real hope in the next few years for increasing the national allotment materially above the minimum 16 million acres. This will have a serious impact on local farm economy and we must get every available acre into the hands of farmers who will plant the full amount. Only in this way can the acreage allocated to the county be protected.

It is essential that we retain a formula to encourage the planting of maxi-

mum county acreage while we provide safeguards for individual farm allotments.

Since 1957 we have been operating under a temporary formula which automatically protects allotted acreage regardless of whether acreage is planted. This provision will expire at the end of 1959; and if this bill, S. 1455, is not adopted, procedures for preserving history will revert back to a formula which will be detrimental to county acreage history. Under the old formula each individual farm allotment can be fairly well protected, but at the expense of county acreage. Even by fulfilling complicated requirements, valuable acreage will be lost at the county and State levels. Farmers must be encouraged to release unplanted allotments to the county committee. This is especially true when acreage is critically needed on other farms for efficient production, thereby making a greater contribution to the local economy.

In 1958 almost one-half of all cotton farmers in the United States did not plant cotton. More than 95 percent of these farmers were small farmers with allotments of 15 acres or less. It is here that S. 1455 will make its greatest contribution in protecting acreage history in such a way as to benefit the individual county's rights to retain their historical share of allotted cotton acreage.

While I strongly feel that my bill, S. 62, would fully protect history in future years, I fully support the amendment adopted by the House and hope that this bill will receive the full support of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN].

The motion was agreed to.

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.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports were submitted:

By Mr. ANDERSON, from the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy:

John H. Williams, of Minnesota, to be a member of the Atomic Energy Commission.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with reservations and declarations:

Executive G, 86th Congress, 1st session, Telegraph Regulations (Geneva Revision, 1959) with final protocol to those regulations, signed for the United States at Geneva on November 29, 1958; Executive Report No. 9.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

U.S. ATTORNEYS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of U.S. attorneys.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask that the nomination of U.S. attorneys be considered and confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

U.S. MARSHAL

The legislative clerk read the nomination of M. Frank Reid to be a U.S. marshal for the western district of South Carolina.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

ADVISORY BOARD OF THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Frank A. Augsbury, Jr., to be a member of the Advisory Board of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

CALIFORNIA DEBRIS COMMISSION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Col. Howard A. Morris, Corps of Engineers, to be a member and secretary of the California Debris Commission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE—NOMINATION PASSED OVER

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask that the nomination in the Department of Commerce be passed over temporarily.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The nomination will be passed over.

U.S. COAST GUARD

The legislative clerk read sundry nominations in the U.S. Coast Guard.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask that the nominations in the U.S. Coast Guard be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations in the Coast Guard are confirmed en bloc.

SECRETARY OF COMMERCE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I had asked that the nomination of Frederick Henry Mueller, to be Secretary of Commerce, be passed over until the distinguished senior Senator from Washington could come to the floor. I now yield to the Senator from Washington.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The nomination in the Department of Commerce will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Frederick Henry Mueller, of Michigan, to be Secretary of Commerce.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, Mr. Mueller appeared before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on Wednesday and testified at some length. Immediately after his testimony and the many questions asked by members of the committee with respect to the policies of the Department of Commerce, the committee unanimously approved Mr. Mueller's nomination.

Normally, the nomination would lie over one legislative day, but there is some doubt in the Department of Commerce whether certain papers which must be signed this weekend can be signed by Mr. Mueller in his capacity as Secretary without the confirmation of his nomination following his appointment by the President. So this doubt has necesitated our acting on the nomination now.

Mr. Mueller was before the committee approximately 5 weeks ago when the committee was considering his nomination to be Under Secretary of Commerce. At that time, also, the committee questioned him at great length on many matters involving the policy of the Department of Commerce and the relations of the Department with Congress. At that time, Mr. Mueller's nomination to be Under Secretary of Commerce was unanimously confirmed. The committee felt that there was not much difference with respect to the ability of Mr. Mueller to handle either the position of Under Secretary of Commerce or Secretary of Commerce. He made a very favorable impression upon the committee on both occasions.

Mr. Mueller has been connected with the Department of Commerce for some time. He served with distinction in various capacities as an Assistant Secretary. He knows well the work of the Department, and he has cooperated to the fullest with Congress. He has worked hard for many projects in which Congress has thought the Department of Commerce should participate.

Mr. Mueller has a wide background of business experience. In fact, he is one of the few so-called small businessmen who have been able to take time out to serve in a top governmental capacity. I think that as Secretary of Commerce he will render outstanding service, as he has done in the other branches of the Department. I hope the Senate will unanimously confirm his nomination, as did the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in voting to report it.

Both Senators from Michigan sent letters to the committee in commendation of Mr. Mueller. The distinguished senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], who is now on the floor, said that he had no objection to the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Mueller.

Mr. Mueller has been a distiguished citizen of Michigan for many years. He has served in various civic capacities, and in important posts in the business world, as well. Also, he has been honored by national organizations in his own field of business, which is furniture manufacturing, in Grand Rapids. I am certain that he will be an excellent Secretary of Commerce.

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

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. As a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I heard Mr. Mueller when he appeared before the committee yesterday morning. I was pleasantly surprised by his extensive knowledge of the various activities of the Department of Commerce. I am quite certain that he made a most favorable impression upon all who heard him present his cause yesterday.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, this occasion should not go by so quietly as it is going. Today's action on the pending nomination marks the end of a chapter. The Senate had quite a battle over the nomination of Lewis L. Strauss to be Secretary of Commerce. There were some violent disagreements. The action we are about to take will mark the confirmation of the nomination of his successor.

I do not believe it would be fair to a man who served our Government creditably for 42 years, as did Lewis Strauss, simply to let this occasion roll by and forget about his record. The achievements of Mr. Strauss should be reiterated. In my opinion the Senate made a mistake in rejecting his nomination. But whatever may have been the reasons for turning down the nomination of Lewis Strauss, the record would not be complete unless it was emphasized that Mr. Mueller is succeeding a man who served our Government well and honorably for 42 years. The circumstances under which the confirmation of his nomination was denied were not such as to involve any discredit on him or in any way to invalidate his more than four decades in the service of the Government of the United States.

I wish Mr. Mueller all the luck in the world. I am certain that his nomination is deserving of confirmation.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I associate myself with the statement of the Senator from New York. I am happy that the nomination of Mr. Mueller to be Secretary of Commerce is about to be confirmed.

Like the Senator from New York, I, too, say that, in my judgment, it was very unfortunate that the Senate did not confirm the nomination of Mr. Strauss, because he had an excellent record of service to the country and is a man of character and integrity. I still am very sorry that his nomination to be Secretary of Commerce was not confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is: Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Frederick Henry Mueller, of Michigan, to be Secretary of Commerce?

The nomination was confirmed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask that the President be immediately notified of all nominations this day confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The President will be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nominations.

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.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask the majority leader to inform the Senate as to the possible program for tomorrow.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I anticipate that we will finally get around to calling the calendar this afternoon. When the call of the calendar has been completed, there may be some brief statements to be made by Senators.

Because of the death of the gracious and charming Mrs. Langer, the wife of the beloved senior Senator from North Dakota, I have agreed to have the Senate adjourn early tomorrow. We expect no yea-and-nay votes tomorrow. It is planned to have the Senate convene at 12 o'clock and to remain in session for a few minutes, and then to adjourn, so that Senators who desire to attend the funeral of Mrs. Langer may be in a position to do so.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thank the Senator from Texas.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL NOON TOMORROW

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today, it stand adjourned until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I give notice that it is not expected that there will be any yea-and-nay votes tomorrow. So far as the leadership is concerned, we will do our best to protect all Senators in the matter of votes.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF CALL OF THE CALENDAR

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield further to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey in the chair). Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the staffs of the calendar committees have been waiting all day for the call of the calendar, which will take less than 5 or 10 minutes.

I wish to announce, for the information of all Senators, that we hope it will be possible to call the calendar today, at the conclusion of the very brief address to be made by the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING], who has been so patient and so understanding with us.

So I should like to have the attachés of the Senate request the two calendar committees to be available shortly for the call of the calendar.

PROSPECTIVE EXCHANGE OF VISITS BETWEEN PRESIDENT EISENHOWER AND PREMIER KHRUSHCHEV

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield briefly to me?

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, without a doubt, one of the most important developments in Washington and in the world today is the decision of President Eisenhower to exchange visits with Nikita Khrushchev, the Premier of Soviet Russia.

When this was announced, it precipitated a flood of speculation and opinion which have ranged from full approval of the idea all the way to outright indignation and opposition.

Some feel that this country is letting down the people of the free nations who have sided with us against the threat of world communism.

Some argue that the people in captive nations behind the Iron Curtain will be discouraged, and even feel that they have been "sold down the river" by this agreement to invite Mr. Khrushchev to visit the United States.

There is also concern that some incident which might occur while Mr. Khrushchev is in our country would make matters worse in the tense relationship which now exists between the free world and the world of Soviet Russia. All of us are fully aware of all these viewpoints and anxieties; but I have faith in the sound common sense of our people and our leaders.

I do not think Mr. Khrushchev's visit to this country will pull the wool over anybody's eyes. I do think that this chance to show Mr. Khrushchev the strength and prosperity of America is a golden opportunity to give the leader of Soviet Russia a sober second thought if he is laboring under any delusions about our material strength and our spiritual stamina.

I think the peoples of all the nations of the world are acutely concerned with the nuclear threat that hangs over their heads.

Our Nation will spend more than $40 billion this year for missiles and military defenses.

The cold war requires Russia, too, to divert tremendous outlays from its economic development into support of gigantic military commitments.

The vision of destruction and death that a nuclear attack and counterattack would mean is a sober and terrifying one.

The cold, hard fact that there is no alternative to peace becomes more inescapable every day. Any avenue that can turn Nikita Khrushchev and the world away from the deadly march toward war is an avenue we must explore. His visit to the United States and President Eisenhower's visit to the Soviet Union constitute one of those avenues.

It will be noted that our President intends to visit first the Western European nations. I think that is good. I think it will ease any anxieties by our allies that any major policy decisions or commitments will be made without consulting them.

After all, this is a new course for the United States, and it should be explained to our allies and the friends we seek in the uncommitted nations.

No great settlement will come from the visits of Mr. Khrushchev and President Eisenhower. Such cannot result without the participation of our allies.

But if nothing more results than a relaxation of the tensions that have been generated over the latest Berlin crisis, certainly we will be able to say that progress has been made.

As long as we are talking, we are not fighting or dying.

So I welcome the opportunity our people now have to show Mr. Khrushchev our wonderful country.

I have urged President Eisenhower to include in Mr. Khrushchev's list of American highlights the Tennessee Valley Authority's dams and lakes and powerplants. These are outstanding, living examples of democracy in action, and they are a unique demonstration of what can be done to enrich the economy and lives of the people of an entire region.

I have also agreed to help arrange for a visit to our State capital at Nashville, to the rich farmlands of our State, and for a performance of the Grand Old Opry, which is typical of our American music and folklore.

When Mr. Khrushchev tours our countryside, let us remember that we are proud of what we have. But let us labor under no delusions that he is a great, friendly Santa Claus of some sort. He is a shrewd and tough opponent. We must be very alert when the talking takes place.

But we, as Americans, should never fear a free and open display of our institutions and strengths.

I have no fear that we shall ever give away our freedom for peace; but I am certain that we should never "slam the door" on any avenue that might lead to the peace all of us desire.

THE CRIME RATE AND CIVIL RIGHTS LEGISLATION

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, in the absence of other Members who desire that I yield to them, I wish to address myself briefly to some remarks which were made last Tuesday by the distinguished senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], who for the second time spoke on the crime rate in New York.

I am glad to note the continued keen interest of our colleague in New York's problems. It serves to demonstrate that law enforcement is truly a matter of national, and not just sectional, concern. I have been of this view for many years, and have long advocated—both in the other body and here in the Senate—Federal legislation to help us meet the constantly increasing national crime menace.

Until I heard the Senator from South Carolina expound his theories on the cause of the crime problem, I had thought, and I still hope, that I could count on him to support some of the measures I have proposed to improve our fight against the criminal elements of our society. But now I learn from the Senator's speech that his view is that all we have to do to meet the serious crime problem in this country is to cease our efforts to—in his words—"ram civil rights legislation through the Congress." I had always believed that a more constructive way of meeting the crime problem would be by the passage of laws which would make it easier to get the criminals off our streets and behind bars. I must admit that I have considerable difficulty in following the subtle logic of the Senator's theory; but, be that as it may, I hope that I shall have him as an ally in my proposals for direct action against the rapists, the murderers, the Communists, and the other felons who constantly threaten the peace and security of our people.

Mr. President, I want to make clear my position on this issue. I believe that our fight to secure for all our citizens their constitutional rights to equal protection under the law will help to make Americans more, not less, law abiding. We cannot condone violations of any citizen's civil rights, without creating a climate in which the violation of all personal and property rights will be more likely to flourish. Respect for law and order go hand in hand with respect for the dignity of each man, woman, and child in this country, regardless of race, color, or creed. I do not doubt the sincerity of the convictions of the Senator from South Carolina. I realize that he speaks out of a depth of experience in his own State. But I speak with equal sincerity, Mr. President, when I say that I believe that no one of us can rest secure if liberty and equal justice are denied to our fellow citizens, because of the color of their skin.

I want to ask the Senator from South Carolina which of the civil rights bills he thinks will promote crime in this country. For example, does he think that the bill, which has been introduced, to provide for the education of children of members of the Armed Forces in communities in which the public schools are closed, is likely to make these children into criminals? Or does he think that provision for the retention and preservation of Federal election records is going to lead to an increase in the number of rapes and murders in this country? Or does he perhaps feel that further study of the many problems in this area by the Civil Rights Commission will encourage a fresh outbreak of homicides and bank robberies?

Just one more point, Mr. President, before I conclude. As I have tried to indicate, I believe that it is utterly fallacious to relate the effort to obtain effective civil rights legislation with any increase in the crime rate. It may be of interest to the Senator from South Carolina, however—since he apparently does not join in my analysis of the situation—to study some actual comparisons between the rate of crime in New York and his own home State. If he is interested in such comparisons, he will find, according to the official reports of the Department of Justice for 1957—the last year for which official reports are available—that South Carolina crime rates top New York State in all types of serious crime except robbery. South Carolina has 3 times as many murders per 100,000 of population, twice as high a burglary rate, and twice as high larceny rate. One hundred and four assaults occur in South Carolina for every 100,000 in population, whereas the comparable figure for New York is 96 assaults for every 100,000 in population.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that a table showing the comparative serious crime rates for New York and South Carolina be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

Comparative crime rates, New York and South Carolina, 1957, per 100,000 population

	New York	South Carolina	U.S. average
Murder	3.2	9.1	5.1
Robbery	45.9	32.8	64.3
Assault	96.1	104.6	90.2
Burglary	381.4	613.5	502.9
Larceny	874.7	1,612.4	1,317.8
Auto theft	167.1	195.9	254.7

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, crime in any part of the country is a distressing thing. We live in a wonderful land. It is pitiful to realize that law-abiding citizens in any part of the country—for instance, indeed, as we know, sometimes in the city of Washington—may be afraid to stroll in a park at night, because of the fear that some depraved hoodlum will cut short their enjoyment of nature's wonders. There is no greater denial of human rights than the denial exacted by a criminal from his victim. This is a concern which all of us must share. This is a matter upon which we should act in unison. Let us not be distracted by fallacious explanations and misconceived remedies for dealing with the threat of crime. To confuse this problem with the challenge of securing the enjoyment of civil rights for all our citizens can only serve to divide the forces against the evil of

crime and make more difficult any ultimate solutions of this awful problem.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, since the Senator from New York has brought this matter up, I notice he said in his statement:

I must admit that I have considerable difficulty in following the subtle logic of the Senator's theory—

Referring to me—

but, be that as it may, I hope that I will have him as an ally in my proposals for direct action against the rapists—

Rapists have no business in the Federal courts, and there has been no Federal law passed concerning them. It is a State matter entirely.

the murderers—

That is a matter for the States to deal with—

the Communists—

The question of Communists is one for the Federal Government, and no one has fought the Communists more than OLIN D. JOHNSTON has.

Quotations have been made from reports of arrests by the FBI and of people going into prison.

I hold in my hand National Prisoner Statistics for 1958, closing in December. In chart No. 2 in this report by the Bureau of Prisons, it is seen that South Carolina had, per 100,000 population, 94 prisoners. In New York, there were 109 per 100,000 population.

I am quoting the figures from the Bureau of Prisons report for last year.

Then I ask my colleagues to consider what has been happening. I have statistics on the rate of crime and the indication of crime in New York versus crime in South Carolina, crime in other States, crime in the South, and crime in the North.

I am speaking of convictions. I am not speaking of records of arrests and making that a part of crime statistics.

These statistics show that the Negro rate of prison admissions for felonies is over 6½ times greater in Northern States than in Southern States.

Taking the Southern States as a whole, the rate of prison admissions for felonies is only 2½ times greater than that for the white rate.

It may surprise some to know that the rate of Negro admissions to prisons on felony charges is much higher in Northern States of large Negro population than it is in Southern States. For example, in Michigan the Negro rate is 7 times the white rate, while in Mississippi, for example, only 2½ times as many Negroes as whites were sent to prison in proportion to the population.

In New York the Negro rate exceeds the white rate by almost 9 times, while in my own State of South Carolina the white rate actually exceeds the Negro rate by 1½ times.

This certainly proves there is no persecution of Negroes in my State, and in the South generally. South Carolina is the only State having a sizable Negro population where white admissions to prisons on felony charges exceeds Negro admissions.

To me, this all indicates that the crime rate among Negroes is vastly greater in the large northern cities where integration is being forced upon people than it is in the southern areas of the Nation where we practice segregation.

If this matter is stirred up and talked about too much, certain persons will find they will have trouble.

Mr. President, I wish to have included in my remarks, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point, a table which I now send to the desk showing various States with the felony rates based on population and racial proportions between the white and colored.

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

CHART 2.—*Sentenced prisoners confined in State institutions per 100,000 of the civilian population: Dec. 31, 1958*

	Prisoners confined as of Dec. 31, 1958	Prisoners per 100,000 population			
		Up to 50	51 to 100	101 to 150	151 to 200
New Hampshire	144	25	-----	-----	----
Rhode Island	272	32	-----	-----	----
Massachusetts	1,906	40	-----	-----	----
North Dakota	293	45	-----	-----	----
Delaware	226	-----	51	-----	----
Minnesota	2,128	-----	63	-----	----
Utah	570	-----	66	-----	----
Wisconsin	2,617	-----	67	-----	----
South Dakota	467	-----	68	-----	----
Connecticut	1,565	-----	68	-----	----
Maine	647	-----	69	-----	----
New Jersey	3,996	-----	70	-----	----
Pennsylvania	7,945	-----	72	-----	----
Iowa	2,167	-----	77	-----	----
Tennessee	2,712	-----	79	-----	----
Vermont	295	-----	80	-----	----
Nebraska	1,210	-----	84	-----	----
Oregon	1,524	-----	86	-----	----
Missouri	3,673	-----	87	-----	----
Illinois	8,606	-----	88	-----	----
Idaho	587	-----	89	-----	----
South Carolina	2,200	-----	94	-----	----
Montana	645	-----	95	-----	----
Mississippi	2,066	-----	95	-----	----
Kansas	2,001	-----	96	-----	----
Washington	2,623	-----	97	-----	----
Arkansas	1,849	-----	-----	106	----
United States	184,094	-----	-----	107	----
New York	17,552	-----	-----	109	----
Texas	10,531	-----	-----	114	----
Kentucky	3,531	-----	-----	116	----
Indiana	5,296	-----	-----	116	----
Colorado	1,972	-----	-----	118	----
Louisiana	3,636	-----	-----	119	----
Wyoming	384	-----	-----	122	----
Ohio	11,365	-----	-----	122	----
West Virginia	2,406	-----	-----	122	----
Oklahoma	2,754	-----	-----	122	----
Arizona	1,392	-----	-----	125	----
New Mexico	1,060	-----	-----	130	----
North Carolina	5,804	-----	-----	130	----
Michigan	10,334	-----	-----	132	----
California	19,202	-----	-----	137	----
Nevada	380	-----	-----	147	----
Florida	6,374	-----	-----	147	----
Virginia	5,719	-----	-----	-----	151
Maryland	5,037	-----	-----	-----	174
Alabama	5,543	-----	-----	-----	174
Georgia	6,824	-----	-----	-----	182
District of Columbia	2,064	-----	-----	-----	257

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed a table showing the rate of prison admissions in various States by population and race.

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

State	Rate of white felony prisoners per 100,000, 1950	Percent of population, Negro, 1950	Percent of felony prisoners, Negro 1950	Negro rate over white rate
California	25	4.0	19.0	516
District of Columbia	26	35.0	80.0	608
Illinois	15	7.0	32.0	660
Indiana	25	4.0	17.0	432
Kentucky	39	7.0	21.0	338
Maryland	51	16.0	60.0	757
Michigan (1952)	31	7.0	37.0	761
Missouri	31	8.0	27.0	448
New Jersey	19	7.0	35.0	789
New York	*13*	*6.0*	*37.0*	*877*
Ohio	23	6.0	35.0	778
Oklahoma	44	7.0	19.0	325
Pennsylvania	9	6.0	35.0	855
West Virginia	32	6.0	13.0	253
Total	22	6.8	33.3	659
Alabama	35	32.0	52.0	229
Arkansas	27	22.0	41.0	244
Florida	41	22.0	41.0	249
Georgia (1952)	33	30.0	55.0	297
Louisiana	29	33.0	55.0	248
Mississippi	19	45.0	70.0	279
North Carolina	21	26.0	50.0	281
South Carolina	32	39.0	30.0	[1] 145
Tennessee	25	16.0	32.0	252
Texas	32	13.0	30.0	275
Virginia	35	22.0	54.0	366
Total	30	25.0	45.0	250

[1] White over Negro.

State	Negro population, 1950 census	Negroes admitted to prison on felony charges, 1950	Rate of Negro felony prisoners per 100,000, 1950	White population, 1950 census	Whites admitted to prison on felony charges, 1950
California	462,172	596	129	9,915,173	2,472
District of Columbia	280,803	444	158	517,865	136
Illinois	645,980	639	99	8,046,058	1,225
Indiana	174,168	189	108	3,758,512	944
Kentucky	201,921	277	132	2,742,090	1,088
Maryland	385,972	1,484	386	1,954,975	993
Michigan (1952)	442,296	1,058	236	5,917,825	1,834
Missouri	297,088	413	139	3,655,593	1,133
New Jersey	318,565	478	150	4,511,585	888
New York	918,191	1,051	114	13,872,095	1,818
Ohio	513,072	922	179	7,428,222	1,729
Oklahoma	145,503	208	143	2,032,526	892
Pennsylvania	638,485	493	77	9,853,848	933
West Virginia	114,867	93	81	1,890,282	609
Total	5,539,083	8,345	145	76,096,649	16,694

State	Negro population, 1950 census	Negroes admitted to prison on felony charges, 1950	Rate of Negro felony prisoners per 100,000, 1950	White population, 1950 census	Whites admitted to prison on felony charges, 1950
Alabama	979,617	790	80	2,079,591	719
Arkansas	426,639	282	66	1,481,507	403
Florida	603,101	620	102	2,166,051	895
Georgia (1952)	1,062,762	979	92	2,380,577	799
Louisiana	882,428	642	72	1,796,683	515
Mississippi	986,494	530	53	1,188,632	222
North Carolina	1,047,353	622	59	2,983,121	633
South Carolina	822,077	183	22	1,293,405	420
Tennessee	530,603	334	63	2,760,257	691
Texas	977,458	867	88	6,726,534	2,125
Virginia	734,211	941	128	2,581,555	800
Total	9,052,743	6,790	75	27,437,879	8,222

Mr. JAVITS and Mr. KEATING addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield to the senior Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I should like to make a comment, if I may, with the Senator's indulgence, upon this whole matter. There are many aspects of this problem which relate to different States and their crime rates. I am very grateful to my colleague [Mr. KEATING] for taking the matter from the point where the Senator from South Carolina first made the statement, and now pursuing it.

I think the criminologists and others who study crimes could give us reasons for convictions or imprisonments or crime rates. On this point we have to ascertain first what we in our country are willing to pay as the price of order. It is possible to have very low crime rates in a community if a person feels if he steps out of line he may be lynched. I would say that is the implication——

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I object to that statement. I invite the Senator to point out when there has been a lynching in South Carolina. We have not had a lynching in 20 years.

Mr. JAVITS. I posed that as strictly a hypothetical situation as an influence which might affect a crime rate.

Certainly, the crime rate in South Carolina is infinitely better than it is in many Southern States. If we are going to compare crime rates without any of the side issues which go into these matters, we are not going to get anywhere in fixing attention on the main point, which I think is this: While we respect fully the sincerity of persons like the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] and the social situation in Southern States, we can neither condone it as being consistent with the Constitution of the United States nor can we allow red herrings to be drawn across the trail. In short, it is no answer to a deprivation of civil rights to say the crime rate is higher where such rights are granted than where they are not, though in South Carolina the record is better than it is in many Southern States. It is not what it ought to be, but it is better than most. But we cannot get our gaze distracted from the main issue, because if the Constitution is to be observed in this country, as the junior Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] has pointed out, then it will have to be preserved also in a historically great and important section of the country. If the Constitution is flouted in an important section of the country, then it has an effect on the whole moral condition of the entire country.

We do not doubt the sincerity of the Senator in referring to the crime statistics. The important thing is that the public mind should not be distracted in this hassle from the main point. The fact is that the Constitution requires us to give equality of opportunity in every area, to wit, civil rights to every citizen, regardless of race, creed, or color. We should not permit ourselves to be distracted either by the fact that the distinguished Senator can say that the crime rate is greater in New York than it is in South Carolina, because we cannot start locking people behind a compound, as they do in South Africa, in order to deal with crime in our country. We must deal with crime in a constitutional way.

I thank my colleague for yielding. He is much beloved. He is one of the most accommodating and friendly Senators. We happen to have this fundamental difference. In fairness, my colleague has taken up the cudgels, quite properly. What we are seeking to avoid is having a red herring drawn across the trail. That is the reason why I thought this matter should be nailed down.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I am not drawing a red herring across any trail at this time. If I had wanted to do so, I would have brought up the question of Communists, which were mentioned in the speech of the Senator from New York. If the Senator will go to South Carolina, he will find probably 1,000 percent fewer Communists there. We could go to some other sections and probably point out a different situation. But I am not going into the question. The Senator mentioned Communists, and asked me a question about Communists, so he can can go into that question if he wants to. I welcome anybody to stack the record in his State against that in South Carolina so far as Communists are concerned.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. I hope there was nothing in my remarks which indicated that my reference to Communists, whom the Senator from South Carolina abhors as much as I do, had any particular reference to South Carolina or to any other State in the Union. The reference to crimes which I made in my original address was an appeal to the Senator from South Carolina, which I feel quite certain will fall on willing ears. Knowing the distinguished Senator as well as I do, I know his militancy against communism and against crime.

My appeal was for him to join with me in a program of legislation which I have introduced which will make a direct attack upon the crime question by making use of interstate facilities in a conspiracy to commit State crimes a Federal offense. It is a program directed at all kinds of interstate conspiracies which perpetrate felonies. That is the program to which I referred.

I feel sure that the Senator from South Carolina would not feel that I would charge any area with breeding more Communists than any other area, nor that I would make any attack upon his fine State or any other State in the Union. I was simply seeking to set straight in the RECORD the intimations in his prior address that there was greater crime in New York and that the reason for that was that New York had integration whereas his State had segregation.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I think such an inference could be put on this sentence in the Senator's speech:

> I must admit that I have considerable difficulty in following the subtle logic of the Senator's theory, but, be that as it may, I hope that I will have him as an ally in my proposals for direct action against rapists, murderers, and Communists, and other felons who constantly threaten the peace and security of our people.

I am glad to have the Senator from New York explain what he meant, but I want it plainly understood that so far as I am concerned, my record as Governor will show that I have been against murderers. I have been for trying them in the State courts. I have been for trying rapists in the State courts and not in the Federal courts.

When it comes to Communists, I think we have a right to look into those cases. In many instances Communists are crossing State lines, and therefore they come within interstate commerce and apparently they fall into the category of Federal legislation.

Mr. KEATING. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. KEATING. Not only in his record as Governor but in his record as a member of the Committee on the Judiciary, on which I have the honor to serve, I know of the strong views of the Senator from South Carolina against all kinds of crime, against communism, and against all of the things which I deprecate in my

address. I think I said that in presenting this matter. I not only hoped that I would have his support, but I was confident I would have his support in any move which he considered sound to deal directly with crime or with the Communist problem in our great country.

ERRONEOUS ESTIMATES OF COST OF CERTAIN PROPOSED LEGISLATION

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I rise reluctantly but vigorously to disagree with the distinguished senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS]. Incidentally, I informed him today, and I have telephoned his office twice to say that I was going to comment on the speech he delivered last Monday; and I also called other Senators who were involved in this situation, as well as Representatives, to advise them that I was going to speak on bills they have introduced.

Mr. President, I wish to make it clear that I have the greatest regard for the distinguished senior Senator from Delaware. He has performed a great service for the country as well as for this body by constantly calling attention to excessive spending and by setting an outstanding example of being fiscally responsible himself.

At the same time, I feel I simply cannot let the speech he made on last Monday, including the material which he put in the RECORD, pass without comment, because I think it is necessary to make corrections in it.

Mr. President, I agree that there are statements in this excellent speech by the Senator from Delaware with which I agree emphatically.

He said:

> If today, in a period of the highest prosperity that our country has ever known, we cannot live within our income and make payments toward the reduction of this debt, it may well be asked, "When will we do it?"

I think that is correct.

He went on to say:

> We all recognize that our tax rates are too high, and we should work toward the position where we can reduce these rates; but it is time that we tell the American people that this debt has got to be paid and that the sooner we start making payment the better. Tax reductions should follow, not precede, the beginning of an orderly reduction of our debt.

I think this is a responsible, sensible position to take. However, Mr. President, I feel very strongly on this issue, because when I was running for reelection to the U.S. Senate in Wisconsin during the last campaign, charges were made against me that I had introduced proposed legislation in this body which would have cost the American taxpayer a fantastic amount of money.

On the basis of the most responsible and authoritative and honest estimates I can obtain, this was simply untrue, and I think it is necessary, when this kind of charge is made in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, which will go all over the country and is certain to enter into the campaigning of candidates for reelection to the House or reelection to the Senate, that the record should be straight, just as straight as it possibly can be.

In my last campaign the issue arose on a farm bill I had introduced. This was a bill which was introduced with the greatest care. I consulted the former Secretary of Agriculture, who is a distinguished Member of this body, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], who assured me that my bill would save money, and would cost far less than the present farm program.

I consulted the Library of Congress. Their farm expert came up with exactly the same assurance, and did so in writing.

But during the course of the campaign the Secretary of Agriculture came to my State and said that the bill would cost several billion dollars and that it would be enormously extravagant and expensive.

Mr. President, I think it is very important when this kind of charge is made that we insist on chapter and verse. I have done everything I possibly can to elicit from the Secretary of Agriculture support for his statement.

As compared with a careful section-by-section, clause-by-clause, word-by-word analysis of my proposed program by the Library of Congress, the Department of Agriculture has not given me a word of justification for their estimate. As a matter of fact, when the Secretary of Agriculture came before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry this year, I again asked him, and he told me that he would come forward with an analysis of my bill, showing me how he arrived at the charge that it would cost so much money. Actually, I am convinced it would save money. I feel it would do so.

Mr. President, I rise today because there are under consideration a series of bills which, as I say, are important to the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], who is present on the floor; the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], with whom I talked recently; the distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY]; and a number of other Senators, including the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH]. These bills have been discussed by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] on a basis which I think I can show is not accurate.

First, Mr. President, I should like to consider the bill introduced by the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], S. 881. The charge made by the Senator from Delaware in the speech he made last Monday was that S. 881, the bill introduced by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], would cost the Treasury, over a period of 5 years, $6.1 billion. In the course of his remarks the Senator from Delaware said:

> What proposals have been made by the sponsors of these bills to pay for these additional expenditures? Have there been any suggestions for increased taxes? None whatever.

I invite to the attention of the Senate the fact that this is simply not true, for S. 881, the bill introduced by the Senator from Oregon, is a self-financing bill. The Senator from Oregon was very careful to provide, to the very best of his ability, that his bill would be self-financing.

In order to double check the matter, I consulted with the Chief Actuary of the Social Security Administration, to find out whether the Morse bill would be self-financing. I was informed that he had told the Senator from Oregon last year that it would be, that it would pay for itself, that it would not unbalance the budget, that it would not cost the Treasury a nickel. However, this year, apparently after a further study, the Chief Actuary of the Social Security Administration had to make another estimate, and on the basis of the new estimate he states that there might be a cost to the Federal Treasury, as a result of passage of the Morse bill, of some $530 million. Mr. President, this is a possibility, but I should like to invite the attention of the Senate to the fact that $530 million is far different from the $6.1 billion which the Senator from Delaware has asserted S. 881 would cost, if passed.

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

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I want the Senator from Wisconsin to know I appreciate very much the statement he has just made in regard to S. 881, which is my bill in the Senate. It is a companion bill to the Forand bill in the House of Representatives, which seeks to provide medical care for aged persons, after they reach the age of 65, based upon social security payments which these persons make during the period of their working years.

Mr. President, as the Senator from Wisconsin has pointed out, the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] includes my bill in a list of bills which he inserted in a table in the RECORD of the Senate on August 3, 1959, to be found on pages 14984–14985. In the Senator's discussion of the table, he is reported in the RECORD as having said:

> What proposals have been made by the sponsors of these bills to pay for these additional expenditures? Have there been any suggestions for increased taxes? None whatever.

I can understand how a mistake can be made by any of us, Mr. President, but this mistake certainly was not based upon any reading of my bill. My bill makes perfectly clear that the payments in social security taxes by both employers and employees shall be raised to the amount necessary to cover the cost of passage of the bill.

Before I introduced the bill, I checked with the Social Security Administration and I asked for the social security tax figure necessary to cover the cost of my bill. That is the figure which was used in drafting the bill.

Now, a year later, I understand there has been a further study made, and, as reported by the Senator from Wisconsin, the actuary is not sure whether the percentage increase which I provided in my bill will cover every cent of the cost, although it is pointed out in the memorandum to which the Senator from Wis-

consin has referred that under the operation of the bill, on the basis of the tax increase for which my bill provides, there will be years when there will be collected more than the anticipated cost of the bill.

I want to say for the RECORD, Mr. President, I am going to leave the figures in my bill for this session of Congress as they are at present, because we know that there will undoubtedly not be any action taken on the bill until sometime in the next session of Congress. When the time comes that the bill is taken up by the Senate committee, the Senator from Oregon will recheck into the matter, and if a greater percentage increase in the social security taxes is needed in order to cover the cost of the bill, I will modify the bill accordingly.

I want the RECORD to show that the bill was offered on the basis of the report which I received from the Social Security Administration, that the percentage figure for the increase in social security taxes contained in the bill would be sufficient to make it a pay-as-you-go bill. This is my intention, Mr. President, because we all know it is not the policy to have social security paid for in any way by the Federal Government itself.

Even if there is a slight deficiency resulting from my bill in its present form, based upon the increase in social security taxes which I provided in the bill, as reported to me by the Social Security Administration about a year ago, the deficit would be far different from the figure used by the Senator from Delaware which, as I interpret the figures, would be $6.1 billion.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MORSE. $6.1 billion, Mr. President. There is no basis in fact for that figure whatever, because it is based apparently on the calculation as to what the bill would cost if no social security taxes were assessed against either the employer or the employee.

The bill very specifically states, Mr. President, that the taxes for social security shall be raised to the figure which is necessary in order to have the beneficiaries and the employers pay for the cost of the medical care.

I did not know this discussion was going to be held today, Mr. President, or I would not have said on the floor of the Senate what I said yesterday about the matter of medical care for the aged. I would have incorporated that speech in my remarks today.

I say to the Senate, I did discuss this great issue briefly yesterday on the floor of the Senate, and I will summarize my remarks today.

First, I would have the American Medical Association keep this information in mind, because the American Medical Association is the chief lobbyist against my bill with its false propaganda, that the carrying out of our moral obligation to the aged of this country by providing for a social security tax which will make it possible for them to be supplied with the medical care which they will need in their declining years is going to lead to socialism in American medicine. That is "poppycock," and every doctor knows it.

Let me say to the doctors of America, I am not worried about any danger of socialism in American medicine, but I will tell the doctors of America what I am worried about. I am worried about undue commercialization in American medicine.

I care not what the political effects may be on the senior Senator from Oregon as a result of these remarks. If the doctors think they can defeat me, I ask them to come to Oregon and try. They are going to discover that the people are with me.

Increasing millions of people in America are going to be with those of us who recognize the great moral obligation to the aged of this country as the years go by. We must take away from the doctors of America the right to tax, which they now exercise. They exercise it under the guise that they think they should be allowed the right to impose certain fees upon those who they think are better able to pay higher medical fees, in order to take care of the medical cost to patients the doctors serve who cannot pay such fees.

That principle being followed by the medical profession in America has no place in America. I deny that the Government should tolerate the kind of medical fee tax policy practiced by the American medical profession. The American medical profession should charge reasonable fees—and I want them to have reasonable fees. They will find that no Member of this body can be counted upon more certainly to protect the right to the private practice of medicine than the Senator from Oregon. There is not a syllable in my bill that infringes upon the right of doctors to engage in the private practice of medicine free of any threat of socialized medicine. What my bill proposes is to see to it that the aged people have the wherewithal to pay the private doctor of their own selection to treat them in their declining years. That is not socialism. That happens to be putting to work the great religious principles that we profess, but, too frequently, I am afraid, do not practice.

There is house-top after house-top, by the thousands in our country today, covering the heads of millions of old people over 65, who are living under the gnawing fear that a serious illness will wipe out such little earnings as they have been able to save, and impose a tremendous financial burden upon their children or other relatives to take care of them in years of illness.

I happen to believe that the time has come to face up to this issue in America, and proceed to recognize that there is a responsibility on the part of the people of the Nation as a whole to provide legislation which is necessary, such as the bill I propose, to pay for the expenses of such illness through social security. There is needed legislation which will make it clear to the medical profession that we will protect them in the right to the private practice of medicine and at the same time protect the American people from undue commercialism in medical costs.

I think we should draft a bill along the lines of the bill I am now offering, which leaves no room for doubt that we are protecting the private practice of medicine, but also makes it perfectly clear that we have the responsibility to enact legislation which will assure the aged in this country that they do not have to look forward to the declining years of their life under a gnawing fear that they will not be able to get the medical attention they need.

Although reactionary doctors will not approve, nevertheless I take the position—and let us take the issue to the crossroads of America—that the medical profession does not have the moral right to charge whatever fees it chooses to charge. On the contrary, the Government has the duty to impose restrictions upon the medical profession similar to the restrictions we have imposed upon other economic groups whenever an economic group takes advantage of the people.

In my judgment we must face up to the question of medical costs. I have been at work for months in preparation for the hearings to be conducted by my subcommittee of the Committee on the District of Columbia, in regard to medical costs in the District of Columbia. I had hoped, and I still hope, that we may be ready for those hearings before Congress adjourns this month. But if we are not, we will proceed with them this fall, or at the beginning of the next session of Congress.

I believe that the doctors themselves are drawing this issue. I am for meeting the issue, and for placing in effect Government regulations necessary to give to the people of the country the protection which I have come to believe they are entitled to, from excessive medical costs and hospital costs.

So I am glad that the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin raised this question this afternoon and gave me an opportunity to explain the purposes of my bill, and to serve notice that I will modify my bill come next January by increasing the social security tax by whatever fraction of 1 percent may be necessary in order to remove any doubt as to whether or not my bill will raise enough from social security taxes to pay for its costs.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Oregon. If I accomplish nothing else this afternoon, I am happy to have provoked the Senator from Oregon into one of his brilliant speeches. I am delighted to be present to hear it.

What can any Senator do except what the Senator from Oregon has done? He has gone to the administration and asked, "How much would this bill cost?" He has written into his bill what the administration says it would cost.

The distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] said that there has been no suggestion whatever for increased taxes. The Senator from Oregon, in introducing Senate bill 881, did everything he could to make his bill self-financing, and to provide for the taxes to pay for it.

I turn now to Senate bill 1056, which the Senator from Delaware says would cost $40 billion, on the same basis. I

agree that Senate bill 1056 is in a different situation. It is true that there are no self-financing provisions in the bill. On the other hand, at the time the bill was introduced the author of the bill, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], was very careful to say that he intended to make it self-financing. Let me read what he said:

> Financing the insurance system would be similar to that under the old age and survivors insurance program. Employers and employees would share the cost of the program on an equal basis. Each would pay 1½ percent of earnings up to $6,000 per year. The amount of contribution would vary, but could in no case be more than $90 per year for complete health care for both the employee and members of the family. The self-employed, recipients of old age, survivors, disability, and civil service retirement benefits would be included in the program.

I can well understand why the senior Senator from Montana did not attempt to incorporate in his bill a self-financing provision when he introduced it. Obviously it is a long-range bill. Conditions change, as the senior Senator from Oregon has remarked; and it is wise to do as the Senator from Oregon says he intends to do. That is, to wait until a bill is likely to come to the floor of the Senate for action, and then to provide the most accurate kind of self-financing provisions.

But the intention of the author is clear. He wants it to be fiscally responsible. I do not know what the author can do except to say that before the bill comes to a vote, he will see to it that it is made self-financing.

The next bill, H.R. 1301, was introduced by Representative GEORGE MCGOVERN, an outstanding Member of Congress from South Dakota. I spoke to him on the telephone not more than an hour ago.

The Senator from Delaware says that this bill would cost $36.5 billion. I asked Representative MCGOVERN on what basis the bill could cost $36.5 billion. It reminded me of my own unfortunate experience with the Secretary of Agriculture.

Representative MCGOVERN told me that he designed the bill for 2 reasons: First, to improve farm income, but, also to reduce the enormous cost of the farm program. He had been assured by farm experts, with whom he had consulted in the drafting of the bill, that it would be the least expensive kind of farm program, too. In order to support that position, he pointed out what the bill provides is a quota system under which the farmer who receives benefits does not receive them until he has reduced his production, and reduced it to within the limits of the quota system. Furthermore, the bill provides that no farmer can receive more than $3,500 in benefits.

He said that in his judgment, because of the quota provisions in the bill, the cost would be approximately nothing, or very little, because the whole purpose of the bill and the whole method of quotas would be to require the farmer to reduce his production, so that the production and the demand would be in balance. Thus there would not be necessity for a surplus disposal program, and there would not be the colossal waste and the high interest costs which are involved in the present farm program.

I am convinced that the bill in the way in which it is drafted may be criticized on the basis of its being too restrictive. I would not do so. It may be that farmers will have to limit their production, although I think that is necessary. But I do not think the bill can be denounced on the basis of fiscal irresponsibility, when the Secretary of Agriculture in this administration has administered the present farm program in such a way that it is costing the taxpayers $6 or $7 billion, far more than any farm program in history. The program proposed in the bill, it seems to me, under any kind of fair, wise, and prudent administration, would cost far less than this.

Therefore, the $36.5 billion additional cost is certainly subject to question. It is fantastitc. It is wrong. There would, in fact, almost certainly be a saving.

I come next to Senate bill 791. Incidentally, this is the one bill in which I have a personal interest, because I am a cosponsor of it. It was introduced by the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY]. According to the Senator from Delaware, the bill will cost a billion dollars over 5 years. At the time it was introduced, the Senator from Massachusetts assured the Senate it would cost nothing. He made that statement with complete sincerity and on the basis of his own thoughtful, careful, able analysis. It is conceivable that there are circumstances under which S. 791 might cost money, but those circumstances would be unusual. The fact is that the bill provides that there will be no appropriation and no authorization. It also provides that under certain unusual circumstances, when the unemployment compensation rate in a State goes above 2.2 percent, then it will be possible for the State to procure, from the three-tenths percentage it pays to the Federal Government, to replace its depleted fund.

At the depth of the recession, State unemployment compensation funds amounted to $7 billion. Today they are $8 billion. There is very little likelihood that a situation will arise in which many States will rely in any wholesale way on this provision. Occasionally a State might. Rhode Island and Oregon, perhaps, might qualify at present. But I have been assured that under present circumstances, and under the situation which has prevailed in this country over the past 5 years, the bill would cost the Federal Treasury virtually nothing.

I turn now to Senate bill 863, authored primarily by the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS]. My office was in touch with the office of the Senator from New York and was advised that while the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] is correct in saying that the bill would cost the Treasury some funds, the amount, in their judgment, is overstated. The tabulation in the bill says that S. 863 would cost $3.6 billion over a period of 5 years. The author of the bill says that he and his staff have gone over the bill very carefully and scrutinized every title, clause, and word in it. Their best judgment is that the bill would not cost $3.6 billion, but $3.1 billion at the outside. They are careful to point out the various authorizations and the various possible costs in the bill. The best they can say is that it will cost $3.1 billion. Therefore, the amount in this bill is overstated by half a billion dollars.

The next bill is S. 1087, a student aid bill, introduced by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]. The bill provides for a series of authorizations: In the first year, $46 million; in the second year, $92 million; in the third year $138 million; and in the fourth and fifth years, $184 million. This adds up to $644 million.

The office of the Senator from Minnesota has checked the bill very, very carefully and have concluded that they do not see how the bill could possibly cost the $966 million which the Senator from Delaware says it would cost. Therefore, the amount in this bill seems to be overstated by $276 million.

I come next to Senate bill 2162, which is the Johnston-Neuberger bill. I have checked with the persons who were responsible for the work done on this bill. They have told me their best estimates are that the bill would not cost $1,200 million, but, on the basis of present Federal employment would cost $725 million. They say it is true that if we sustain a substantial increase in the number of Federal employees, as has happened in the past—and perhaps the Senator from Delaware was thinking of this—then it is possible the cost may increase. It is conceivable that in 5 years the cost may reach $1.2 billion. But if we assume that we will have the same number of employees, the cost will not be $1.2 billion, but $725 million. So the amount in this bill is overstated by $475 million.

Finally, I come to the bill introduced by the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], S. 570. The bill authorizes reimbursement to the States for certain free and toll roads on the Interstate Highway System. On this bill, I consulted with Colonel Sneed, of the Committee on Public Works. He said he cannot see how the bill could cost more than $225 million annually. It calls for an annual authorization of $225 million. So the amount in this bill is overstated by $1,075 million.

These amounts add up to an overstatement of more than $85 billion. I have made no mention at all of duplications. It is perfectly obvious that if the Murray bill passes—this is the bill supported by the National Education Association and is the most generous of the school support bills—then it is very conceivable and very likely that the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] would not press his bill, which is a bill for the construction of classrooms and would tend to accomplish the same purpose.

It is also clear that if the Murray health insurance bill should pass, then the Morse bill would not be necessary, because those bills seek to do the same thing. As a matter of fact, there are four duplicating bills, which are aimed at health insurance, all tallied by the Senator from Delaware: H.R. 77, S. 881, H.R. 208, and S. 1056. All those bills

attempt to do what the senior Senator from Oregon set forth so eloquently when he spoke to the Senate this afternoon, and pointed out the tremendous, desperate need of our older people for adequate health insurance.

It is clear that if one of these major bills passes, then the other bills, because they would duplicate it, would not be pressed, and therefore would not constitute a drain on the taxpayers.

I asked the Senator from Delaware in the course of our colloquy whether these were grant programs or loan programs, because if they were loan programs, they would result in repayments to the Federal Treasury. He said that they were grant programs, or were very largely grant programs. In that, he is correct.

But I should like to point out that at least one of the bills—the one to provide facilities for a public works program—will involve a loan program; and it would not result in a loss to the Federal Treasury. Instead, the taxpayers would be repaid.

I conclude by saying, as I did when I commenced my remarks, that I do not think any Member of the Senate has contributed more to the awareness of the country of the importance of economy in Government than has the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS]. He has set a wonderful example to this body, and he has also lived up to that example. No Member has been more responsible fiscally than he; and I have been delighted to follow his example as often as I could—which has been quite often, in this session.

But because I have seen the consequences of misinformation in elections—we had that experience in Wisconsin, in the last election—I believe that when a misstatement is made in the RECORD, I have both the right and, indeed, the duty to correct it.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware obtained the floor.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, can the Senator from Delaware inform us how long he will speak? A number of us have waited since noon for the call of the calendar.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I shall speak for only 4 or 5 minutes.

Mr. BARTLETT. Very well.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I cannot allow to go unanswered the challenge which has been made to the figures which I placed in the RECORD of last Monday. Those figures were furnished by the Budget Bureau, and while they may be embarrassing to some, they were correct.

As I listened to the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE], I was reminded of the comment made by the player queen in Shakespeare's play, "The Tragedy of Hamlet, Prince of Denmark." The player queen had been vowing that if her husband died, she would never, never remarry. When Hamlet asked, "Madam, how like you this play?" the Queen replied, "The lady doth protest too much, methinks."

As I listened to all the supporters of the many bills to which I referred, and as I heard them defend them as bills which would not cost the taxpayers anything, I wondered how they arrived at the conclusion that someone can be given something without any cost.

I heard several of the bills described as being self-financing and it was said that they would not cost anyone anything.

Just what miracle in financing has been discovered I do not know; but, at least as far as I am concerned, the only means of financing will be by making charges to the American taxpayers. Thus, the enactment of such bills will result in cost to the American taxpayers.

Who else? I am sure the sponsors do not propose to pay for them.

In the course of my statement last Monday, I said that I had selected 15 bills. The figures I submitted in regard to the cost of those bills were not prepared by me. Neither did I pick out those particular 15 bills on the basis of any opposition by me to them. I may favor some of them, and I may be against some of them. Similarly, some of them may be favored by the administration, and some of them may be opposed by the administration. But that point is immaterial.

When I spoke, I made clear that I was not commenting in any way or manner on either the merits or the demerits of any of those bills. Instead, I simply submitted a list of the bills to the Bureau of the Budget, the official agency of the Government for the compilation of fiscal figures, and asked them for the projected or estimated cost of the bills, if enacted, for a period of 5 years.

I have before me the reply from the Bureau of the Budget. It is dated April 2; and I shall have the reply incorporated in the RECORD along with their report showing the cost. Every figure included by me in the RECORD last Monday was submitted to me by the Bureau of the Budget.

I have respect for both the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from Wisconsin, but if they think they are able to compute more accurately than can the Director of the Bureau of the Budget the cost of running the Government, I am sure the Director of the Bureau of the Budget would appreciate having their help.

It has been said here today that some of the bills would not cost anything. Mr. President, how can someone be given something without having any cost involved? Either the bill will be a complete farce and will not accomplish its objective, or it will have a price tag attached.

The Director of the Bureau of the Budget made no comment as to whether the Bureau of the Budget either favored or opposed the bills. I specifically asked him to avoid any references to the merits of the bills or any comments as to whether the bills should or should not be passed. My question was solely what the bills, if enacted, would cost the American taxpayers.

The figures I placed in the RECORD were the exact figures the Bureau of the Budget submitted.

But when there is such talk about self-financing programs and when there is discussion as to whether taxes will be raised before or after such bills are passed, I point out that the time of raising the taxes has nothing to do with the question of whether the bills will involve cost to the American taxpayers. The point is that in any event there will be a cost to the taxpayers, and the taxpayers will have to pay that cost now or later.

The three bills which I said would reduce revenue are likewise pending before this Congress. Two of them are now before the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives, awaiting action by it; and one of the bills which would reduce taxes has been passed by the House of Representatives and is awaiting action by the Senate Finance Committee.

Again, without commenting on either the merits or the demerits of those bills, I said that if those three bills were enacted they would reduce the revenue of the U.S. Government during the next 5 years by an average of $10 billion a year. The figures in that connection were not originated by me. Instead, those figures were obtained from the Treasury Department.

Again I say, with all due respect to the loud wailing and weeping which goes on here out of sympathy for the American taxpayers, that when it comes to considering the cost of the bills I still keep my confidence in the accuracy and the validity of the figures and the estimates of the Bureau of the Budget and the Treasury Department. I have confidence in their ability to provide us with reasonable figures in regard to the cost of any bill, and I will continue to regard the figures they submit as just as accurate as the figures submitted by the advocates of the bills.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield to me?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Does the Senator from Delaware still stand by the statement he made on Monday, that "What proposals have been made by the sponsors of these bills to pay for these additional expenditures? Have there been any suggestions for increased taxes? None whatever."

Is that an accurate statement, in view of the speech I made a moment ago?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Yes, if you will read the rest of my statement.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Is it accurate in regard to the Morse bill?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I ask the Senator from Wisconsin to read my full statement. I am speaking of the tax bills which have been advocated here by the leadership; and in that connection there are no bills to raise taxes. Certainly the enactment of those 15 bills which I said would cost $187 billion in the next 5 years would increase the cost of running the Government and would, if enacted, raise taxes. That is the point, only it has not been emphasized enough.

I also commented on the need to close loopholes in the tax laws. But at the same time I said that even if those bills to close tax loopholes were passed—and I, myself, sponsored some of those bills

to close tax loopholes—they still would not make up for, or offset, the cost of the other bills to which I referred—the 15 bills. Certainly new spending programs of $187 billion in the next 5 years would require more taxes. At this time I am not discussing either the merits or the demerits of those bills; that is not the issue. We are discussing the cost, and I do say that if the 18 bills—the 15 spending bills and the 3 tax-reducing bills—which I selected and referred to last Monday were passed by the Congress, they would, over the next 5 years, increase the cost of running the Government by $187 billion and would reduce our revenue at the same time by $10 billion annually. My statement was based on cost figures submitted by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget; and I certainly think that even the Senator from Wisconsin, with all his confidence in his own ability, would admit that the Director of the Bureau of the Budget is just as well qualified as he to arrive at the cost figures.

I repeat, the figures submitted by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget show that those 15 spending bills would cost the American people $187 billion during the next 5 years, and that an additional $40 billion would have to be raised by means of taxes.

If the three bills calling for tax reductions, to which I referred, were enacted they would reduce the revenue—and again these figures are on the basis of estimates made by the Treasury Department and are concurred in by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget—during the next 5 years by $50 billion, or by $10 billion a year.

Although each of those bills may have merit, yet, as I have stated many times, *no proposal* can be considered by itself, entirely apart from other measures or apart from our ability to pay. Remember that for 24 of the past 30 years we have lived beyond our income.

We have reached the point where most of the American people realize we are living beyond our income. We have piled up a debt today which will have to be paid by future generations. That is why I made a statement and put in the RECORD the cost of some of these many spending porgrams. I think it is time all of us in the Congress and all the people back home realize that we cannot continue to drain the Federal Treasury of money which we do not have and which we are even having difficulty in borrowing.

This deficit financing is the key to inflation. There may be some here who feel that there is no danger in an unbalanced budget. I happen to be one who feels it is essential that our Government live within its income, particularly at a time when we have the highest level of prosperity we have ever had in this country. If we are not going to live within our income at a time when we have the highest level of prosperity, I ask, When we are going to be able to do so?

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am not going to discuss the merits of the measures referred to. There are bills included that I would not support, that should not pass. What I want to say is that the speech of the Senator was largely based on the unwillingness of Senators to call for taxes to pay for the spending programs they are proposing. I would say some of the measures the Senator listed are fiscally responsible, and I have proven they are. They may be right or they may be wrong on their merits, but I do not think anyone should be accused of being irresponsible, fiscally or otherwise, or of not being willing to call for taxes to pay for the services they offer. Obviously the entire context of the Senator's remarks was to charge exactly this.

I think any reading of the speech of the Senator from Delaware last Monday will indicate that the whole burden of it was that all these measures cost the U.S. Treasury money, and will contribute to an unbalanced budget and are inflationary. I agree that some may do so; some may be inflationary; but I think there are also some measures, and I am in favor of some of them, which are self-financing, provide for revenues as well as services, and simply do not fit into that group which the Senator characterizes as inflationary. That is my whole point. Incidentally of all of these 15 bills I was the principle author of none of them. I cosponsored only one. That was the Kennedy unemployment compensation bill which the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] assured the Senate would cost nothing under most circumstances. I have gone to considerable pains to explain exactly why this bill and other bills would not be costly. I challenge the Senator from Delaware to show that the Kennedy bill—the only one of these bills of which I am cosponsor—would under any reasonable likely circumstances cost $1 billion in 5 years. Let us see the evidence.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I cannot guide the conscience of the Senator from Wisconsin and I cannot stop him from feeling as he does—guilty—when he reads the cost estimates of some of his spending proposals. However, at no point in my speech will anyone find the word "dishonest" or the words "fiscal irresponsibility" as charges made against sponsors of bills. The Senator from Wisconsin is the only one using such reference to the authors of the bills. I do not think the Senator will find I have brought any charges against the authors of bills. I was merely speaking of the fact that we, as a Government, cannot continuously go along the road of deficit spending.

Whether it is the conscience of the Senator or his imagination as to what he thinks may be between the lines I do not know.

Mr. President, I placed the figures in the RECORD the other day as representing the cost of 15 bills over a 5-year period. Since they have been questioned as to accuracy I shall place that same report in the RECORD here again today, followed by the letter from the Director of the Budget dated April 2, 1959, in which these figures are confirmed.

At this point I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the RECORD as a part of my remarks this report on the 15 bills followed by the letter of April 2, 1959, received from the Director of the Budget, in which every figure I used the other day in my remarks of last Monday is confirmed.

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

Bill and description	Present status	Estimated cost over 5-year period as furnished by the Bureau of the Budget	Bill and description	Present status	Estimated cost over 5-year period as furnished by the Bureau of the Budget
		Millions			*Millions*
S. 2; H.R. 22: School Support Act	Reported in House June 8, Union Calendar.	$15,000	S. 722: Area Redevelopment Act	Passed Senate Mar. 23, reported in House May 14, Union Calendar.	$400
S. 1087: Student Aid Act	No action	966,000			
H.R. 1031: Emergency program of grants for public works.	do	2,500	H.R. 1301: Farm income	No action	36,500
H.R. 1030: Community facilities and public works.	do	2,500	S. 570: Authorize reimbursement to States for certain free and toll roads on the Interstate Highway System.	do	2,200
H.R. 77: Old-age pensions of $75 per month for all over 65.	do	66,000	S. 805: Amend Federal Water Pollution Act; H.R. 3610.	Passed House June 9	500
S. 791: Unemployment insurance grants	do	1,000	S. 1056: To provide a program of national health insurance.	No action	40,000
H.R. 102: Pensions for World War I veterans.	do	9,000	S. 863: Construction of classrooms to provide increased amounts for teachers salaries.	Hearings on general subject have been held; pending before subcommittee.	3,600
H.R. 208: Federal employees health insurance.	House holding hearings.	1,200			
S. 2162: Same	Passed Senate July 16				
S. 881: Social Security Health Insurance	No action	6,100			
H.R. 4700	House holding hearings.		Total		187,466

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D. C. April 2, 1959.

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: This is in response to your letter of March 17, 1959, requesting an estimate of the 5-year cost of the following bills:

S. 722, Area Redevelopment Act: $400 million.

H.R. 2357, Housing Act: $1.623 billion over 4¼ years (as reported by the House).

S. 2 and H.R. 22, School Support Act: $15 to $16.2 billion.

S. 1087, Student Aid Act: $966 million.

H.R. 1031, emergency program of grants for public works: $2.5 billion appropriation authorization.

H.R. 1030, community facilities and public works: $2.5 billion public debt authorization.

H.R. 77, old-age pensions for all over 65: $66 billion.

S. 791, unemployment reinsurance grants: $1 to $2 billion.

H.R. 102, pensions for World War I veterans: $9 to $10 billion.

H.R. 208, Fedral employees health insurance: $1.2 billion.

S. 881, social security health insurance: $6.1 billion.

S. 1, airports grants (as passed by the House): $297 million.

H.R. 1301, farm income: $36.5 billion.

S. 1094, amend Bretton Woods Agreements Act: $1.4 billion for 1959.

(NOTE.—S. 1094 provides new obligational authority totaling $4.6 billion. One and four-tenths billion dollars for the International Monetary Fund will be paid out soon after passage of the bill. Three and two-tenths billion dollars involves a commitment to purchase additional shares of stock of the International Bank for reconstruction and development. This commitment is needed only as a guarantee for loans made by the Bank, and there is no reason to believe an expenditure of funds will be required, either in the next 5 years or beyond.)

S. 423, amend Highway Act to provide additional construction: $90 million (1-year program).

S. 931, to amend TVA Act to provide for construction of power facilities by sale of revenue bonds.

(NOTE.—Method of financing other than through appropriation; therefore, would reduce cost by amount of private financing obtained.)

S. 570, authorize reimbursement to States for certain free and toll roads on the Interstate Highway Syster..: $2.2 billion.

(NOTE.—$440 million available each year up to the total cost of the bill, $4.4 billion. Not specifically authorized; subject to change; States may not request.)

S. 805, amend Federal Water Pollution Control Act (this bill is substituted for S. 605, listed in your letter on the assumption that the latter number is a typographical error): $500 million.

S. 57, housing bill (as passed by Senate): $939.97 million for 4¼ years.

S. 879, provide financial assistance for construction of public community colleges: $250 million.

S. 877, 4-year program of Federal assistance for school construction: $2.2 billion.

S. 863, construction of classrooms to provide increased amounts for teachers' salaries: $3.6 billion.

S. 1017, assist institutions of higher education to accelerate constructon of academic and residential facilities: $70 million.

S. 1056, provide a program of national health insurance: $40 billion.

S. 14, Central Valley project; S. 44, Snake River Valley; S. 72, San Juan-Chama: See attached table.

The estimates cover a 5-year period, except in those instances where, as indicated, the life of the proposed legislation is for a lesser period of time. Forecasts 5 years in the future are, of course, somewhat speculative, particularly so in circumstances where legislation has not been more fully considered than have some of these bills.

Sincerely yours,

ELMER B. STAATS,
Acting Director.

[In thousands of dollars]

Bill	Project	Estimated total cost	1st year	2d year	3d year	4th year	5th year
S. 14	Auburn unit, American River division, Central Valley project, California	138,705	2,000	4,275	12,981	21,305	25,000
S. 44	San Luis unit, Central Valley project, California	290,443	2,649	9,735	25,328	32,826	40,000
S. 72	Navajo irrigation project, New Mexico	126,800	2,000	8,500	10,400	11,400	15,000
S. 72	San Juan-Chama project, Colorado-New Mexico	85,955	1,000	10,000	20,000	20,000	15,000
S. 281	Burns Creek (Palisades reregulating reservoir), Upper Snake River Valley, Idaho	46,616	[1] 100	[1] 400	4,217	13,824	17,922

[1] $500,000 appropriated by 85th Cong. Initiation of construction subject to authorization of project.

NOTE.—Above information from Interior public works programs (6-year program—Schedule B: Unauthorized Projects).

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President again I state that I stand by those figures. There is no $85 billion error as suggested by the Senator from Wisconsin. There is not even an $85 error in my figures. It may have been in the back of the minds of some of the sponsors of these bills to raise $85 billion in new taxes to pay for some of the services; but if so, does not that still represent cost to the taxpayers? All that has been said is that of the $187 billion projected cost they would later plan to raise taxes to pay for $85 billion of the cost.

The only comment made by the Director of the Budget on any of these bills was the cost. I did not ask for a comment on the merits or demerits of the measure. I did not ask him whether the Bureau was for or against them. Some may have the endorsement of the administration. I may vote for some of them or against some of them. That is not the point. I merely put a price tag on them so that the American people may know what they cost when the merits of the bills are considered.

I say again, the price tag I put on these bills the other day was accurate according to figures furnished by the Director of the Budget.

Mr. PROXMIRE subsequently said: The argument between the Senator from Delaware and myself is very simple. Both of us believe in economy in Government. Both of us recognize that an unbalanced budget in periods of peace and prosperity is inflationary and therefore wrong. My argument is that any fair-minded reading of the original speech of the Senator from Delaware last Monday, August 3, will show that the burden of his address was that bills totalling $187 billion have been introduced and in the words of the Senator from Delaware authors of the bills had provided "none whatsoever" taxes to pay for them. My speech today shows the Senator from Delaware was wrong; and at least some of the estimates fantastically extravagant. The Senator from Delaware has provided not a scintilla of evidence to support his position except the unexplained bald figures of a partisan Budget Bureau. What is more a number of the bills duplicated each other completely. For instance, there were four health insurance bills to add the total cost of each of these bills and imply that all might be enacted simply does not tell the truth. They will not be. There is no possibility they will be.

I have spoken out on this exactly because I feel so strongly on the importance of fiscal responsibility and a balanced budget. I honestly want to work as closely with the Senator from Delaware on this as I can. But I am determined to work for this purpose with all the honesty I can summon.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1 and 2 to the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 354) for the relief of certain aliens, each with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

EXTENSION OF SPECIAL MILK PROGRAM FOR CHILDREN

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to Senate bill 1289.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1289) to increase and extend the special milk program for children, which was, on page 1, line 6, strike out all after "for" down through and including "$80,000,000," in line 7, and insert "the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1959, not to exceed $81,000,000, and for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1960, not to exceed $84,000,000,".

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, 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 Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE—ORDER FOR CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN MEASURES ON THE CALENDAR

Mr. BARTLETT and Mr. ALLOTT addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I rise to a point of order. I believe I am next on the list of Senators I see present on the floor, with the exception of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The regular order governs. The Senator from Alaska has been recognized.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I appeal from the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask for the regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an inquiry?

Mr. BARTLETT. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. Will both Senators yield to me to make an inquiry?

Mr. ALLOTT. I do not have the floor.

Mr. BARTLETT. I will gladly yield.

Mr. KEATING. My inquiry is this: I was requested by the distinguished majority leader to note the absence of a quorum at the conclusion of my remarks, and it slipped my mind before the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] was recognized. I want to carry out my obligations to the majority leader. I do not want to interfere with what is being said here, but I feel I am committed to note the absence of a quorum. May I do so?

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so I may make a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. KEATING. I am making the inquiry on behalf of the majority leader.

Mr. BARTLETT. I am glad the Senator is.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. BARTLETT. I should like to put this unanimous-consent request: That the Senate proceed to consider bills on the calendar to which there is no objection, beginning with Order No. 581, Senate bill 2026, to establish an Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, to conclude with Order No. 604, House bill 4120, for the relief of Dr. Raymond A. Vonderlehr and certain other officers of the Public Health Service, but that the Senator from Colorado may have the floor before the call of the calendar begins.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, reserving the right to object——

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I object.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. What is the pending business before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is Senate bill 747, the Des Plaines public hunting and refuge area bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It is my understanding that bill was laid aside on yesterday. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. After the privileged matter was acted upon, that bill came before the Senate.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It automatically became the pending business after adjournment last night. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. So presently Senate bill 747, the bill dealing with the Des Plaines area, is the pending business before the Senate. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, it becomes necessary to lay that bill aside by unanimous consent, in order to consider the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Or a motion may be made to take up another bill.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, pursuant to my obligations to the distinguished majority leader, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Has the Senator from Alaska yielded to the Senator from New York for that purpose?

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I move that the pending business be laid aside and that the calendar be called for the consideration of unobjected-to measures, commencing with Order No. 581 and ending with Order No. 604.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The two requests cannot be embodied in the same motion.

What is the first request?

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I ask that the pending business be laid aside.

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

Mr. BARTLETT. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to consider measures on the calendar to which there is no objection, beginning with Order No. 581 and ending with Order No. 604.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection——

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, do I understand that the unanimous-consent proposal is to proceed with the call of the calendar?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. ALLOTT. Then, reserving the right to object, I should like to make an inquiry. The senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] is on the list of speakers at the desk, and I know he is entitled to recognition before the Senator from Colorado. I should like to inquire how it occurred that the Senator from Alaska was recognized when both the Senator from Minnesota and the Senator from Colorado were seeking recognition.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The list which is at the desk is certainly unofficial, and the Chair recognized the Senator from Alaska who was on his feet prior to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. ALLOTT. Reserving the right to object, I call the attention of the Chair to the fact that the Senator from Colorado was on his feet before the Senator from Delaware was recognized, that he was seeking recognition, that he had addressed the Chair prior to the time the Senator from Delaware was recognized.

I do not wish to come ahead of the Senator from Minnesota, but these lists are either going to be recognized in the Senate or they are going to be thrown out the door. We have agreed many times that we were going to proceed according to these lists.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Prior to the appearance of the name of the Senator from Colorado on the list, the majority leader had indicated that the calendar call would be made following the remarks of the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING].

Mr. ALLOTT. The rules provide that the Chair shall recognize the first Senator who addresses the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. I think that is a proper statement of the rules.

Mr. ALLOTT. This has been modified for the convenience of the Senate by the placing of a list before the Presiding Officer. I placed my name on that list after waiting for some 2 hours before I did so. I do not wish to prolong the discussion if the Senator from Minnesota wishes to have the calendar called; since he precedes me on the list, I shall not object.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It would be my desire that the calendar call should be undertaken, since it will expedite our business.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair has recognized the Senator from Alaska. Does the Senator from Alaska yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. BARTLETT. I yield.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I did not ask the Senator to yield. I sought recognition.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska has the floor, and has yielded to the Senator from Tennessee.

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, earlier today the President signed into law a bill providing authority for the Tennessee Valley Authority to sell bonds to provide for the building of additional generating capacity for the TVA. This represents a great accomplishment. It is the result of a very long effort. It was a necessary action in order that the 5 million people who must depend upon the Tennessee Valley Authority, and who do depend upon the Tennessee Valley Authority as the source of their electrical energy, may grow in their economy as the people of other regions are growing.

I am grateful for the action of the Congress. I am grateful for the leadership and for the bipartisan support which has brought the bill to enactment.

I wish particularly to mention the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], the majority leader, the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], the minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], and

other Senators who have contributed time, interest, effort and understanding to the problems of the people of the Valley.

It is remarkable that in the final analysis the understandings and the agreements which culminated in the signature of the President to this bill enacting it into law, on the part of the Senator from Oklahoma, a Democrat, the Senator from South Dakota, a Republican, the majority leader, a Democratic Senator from the State of Texas, the minority leader, a Republican Senator from the State of Illinois and the Speaker of the House, Mr. RAYBURN, now from Texas but a native of Tennessee, played most prominent parts. This is what makes America great. This is what has brought about development of our natural resources in one important instance after another.

Unless Members of the Senate show a concern and an interest in the people of regions other than those of their own direct constituencies, then we cannot be a great Nation.

The fact that this bill has been written into law is a compliment to the bipartisan consideration it has received, a compliment to the cooperation between Democrats and Republicans on the Public Works Committee and also the cooperation between the majority and minority leaders.

I appreciate, too, the approval of the bill by President Eisenhower.

THE CALENDAR—BILL PASSED OVER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senate will proceed with the call of the calendar, beginning with Order No. 581, Senate bill 2026.

The bill (S. 2026) to establish an Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, was announced as first in order.

Mr. BARTLETT. Over, by request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

FRANCISZEK ROSZKOWSKI

The bill (S. 1702) for the relief of Franciszek Roszkowski 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, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Franciszek Roszkowski shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

PACIFICO A. TENORIO

The bill (S. 1731) for the relief of Pacifico Tenorio 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, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Pacifico A. Tenorio shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

PETER SERGEEVICH DERYABIN, ALSO KNOWN AS THEODORE STANLEY OREL

The bill (H.R. 4243) for the relief of Peter Sergeevich Deryabin, also known as Theodore Stanley Orel, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

NETTIE KORN AND MANFRED KORN

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1071) for the relief of Nettie Korn and Manfred Korn which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Nettie Korn and Manfred Korn shall be deemed to have been born in Austria.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ALLEN HOWARD PILGRIM AND OTHERS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1557) for the relief of Allen Howard Pilgrim, Cheryl Ann Pilgrim, Robb Alexander Pilgrim, and Jocelyn Marie Pilgrim, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, on page 1, line 8, after the word "fees", to insert a colon and *"Provided,* That the natural parents of Allen Howard Pilgrim, Cheryl Ann Pilgrim, Robb Alexander Pilgrim, and Jocelyn Marie Pilgrim shall not, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Allen Howard Pilgrim, Cheryl Ann Pilgrim, Robb Alexander Pilgrim, and Jocelyn Marie Pilgrim shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act upon payment of the required visa fees: *Provided,* That the natural parents of Allen Howard Pilgrim, Cheryl Ann Pilgrim, Robb Alexander Pilgrim, and Jocelyn Marie Pilgrim shall not, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

KENZO HACHTMANN, A MINOR

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2238) for the relief of Kenzo Hachtmann, a minor, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, in line 7, after the word "States", to insert a colon and *"Provided,* That the natural mother of Kenzo Hachtmann shall not, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Kenzo Hachtmann, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Charles W. Hachtmann, a citizen of the United States: *Provided,* That the natural mother of Kenzo Hachtmann shall not, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

IRENE MILIOS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2021) for the relief of Irene Milios, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments, in line 6, after the word "of", to insert "Mr. and Mrs."; in the same line, after the name "Milios", to strike out "a citizen" and insert "citizens", and in line 7, after the word "States", to insert a colon and *"Provided,* That the natural parents of Irene Milios shall not, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act."; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Irene Milios, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Nicholas Milios, citizens of the United States: *Provided,* That the natural parents of Irene Milios shall not, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 11) to invite friendly and democratic nations to consult with India, was announced as next in order.

Mr. KEATING. Over by request, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be passed over.

SELECTION OF LEASED LANDS BY ALASKA

The bill (S. 1412) to amend the act of July 7, 1958, providing for the admission of Alaska into the Union, relating to selection by the State of Alaska of certain lands made subject to lease, permit, license, or contract, was announced as next in order.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 613, H.R. 5849.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 5849) to amend the act of July 7, 1958, providing for the admission of the State of Alaska into the Union relating to selection by the State of Alaska of certain lands made subject to lease, permit, license, or contract.

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

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, is this an identical bill?

Mr. BARTLETT. The Senator is correct.

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

There being no objection, the bill (H.R. 5849), was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, S. 1412 is indefinitely postponed.

LEASING OF COAL LANDS IN ALASKA

The bill (S. 1723) to amend the act providing for the leasing of coal lands in Alaska in order to increase the acreage limitation in such act, was announced as next in order.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 612, H.R. 6939, that all after the enactment clause be stricken out, and that the text of S. 1723 as reported be substituted for the text of the House bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 6939) to repeal the act of October 20, 1914 (38 Stat. 741), as amended (48 U.S.C., secs. 432–452), and for other purposes.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Alaska.

The amendment was agreed.

The bill (H.R. 6939) was 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 the Act entitled "An Act to provide for the leasing of coal lands in the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes", approved October 20, 1914 (38 Stat. 741), is repealed.

SEC. 2. The first sentence of section 2 of the Act of February 25, 1920 (41 Stat. 437, 438), as amended (30 U.S.C. 201), is further amended by the deletion of the words "outside of the Territory of Alaska".

SEC. 3. The first six sentences of section 27 of said Act of February 25, 1920, as amended (30 U.S.C. 184), are amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 27. No person, association, or corporation, except as herein provided, shall take or hold coal leases or permits during the life of such lease in any one State, except Alaska, exceeding an aggregate of ten thousand two hundred and forty acres and, with respect to Alaska, twenty thousand four hundred and eighty acres: *Provided,* That a person, association, or corporation may apply for coal leases or permits for acreage in addition to said acreage, which application or applications shall be in multiples of forty acres, not exceeding a total of five thousand one hundred twenty additional acres in such State or ten thousand two hundred and forty acres in the State of Alaska and shall contain a statement that the granting of a lease for such additional lands is necessary for the person, association, or corporation to carry on business economically and is in the public interest. On the filing of said application, the coal deposits in such lands covered thereby shall be temporarily set aside and withdrawn from all forms of disposal under this Act. The Secretary of the Interior shall, after posting notice of the pending application in the local land office, conduct public hearings on said application or applications for additional acreage. After such public hearings, to such extent as he finds to be in the public interest and necessary for the applicant in order to carry on business economically, the Secretary of the Interior may, under such regulations as he may prescribe, permit such person, association, or corporation to take or hold coal leases or permits for an additional aggregate acreage of not more than five thousand one hundred and twenty acres in such State or ten thousand two hundred and forty acres in the State of Alaska, as the case may be. The Secretary may, in his own discretion or whenever sufficient public interest is manifested, reevaluate the lessee's or permittee's need for all or any part of the additional acreage. The Secretary may cancel the lease or leases and permit or permits covering all or any part of the additional acreage, if he finds that such cancellation is in the public interest or that the coal deposits in the additional acreage are no longer necessary for the lessee or permittee to carry on business economically or if the lessee or permittee has divested himself of all or any part of the original ten thousand two hundred and forty acres, or, with respect to the State of Alaska, twenty thousand four hundred and eighty acres or no longer has facilities which in the Secretary's opinion enable him to exploit the deposits under lease or permit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, S. 1723 is indefinitely postponed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1697) to amend the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951, was announced as next in order.

Mr. KEATING. Over, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

ALICJA ZOFJA BATUKIEWICZ

The bill (S. 1152) for the relief of Alicja Zofja Batukiewicz 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, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Alicja Zofja Batukiewicz shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

MAGDALENO V. DEL ROSARIO

The bill (S. 1429) for the relief of Magdaleno V. del Rosario 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, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Magdaleno V. del Rosario shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

ARSHALOUIS SIMEONIAN

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1081) for the relief of Arshalouis Simeonian, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after the word "be", to insert "issued a visa and be", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (6) of section 212(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Arshalouis Simeonian may, if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such Act, be issued a visa and be admitted to the United States for permanent residence, under such conditions and controls as the Attorney General, after consultation with the Surgeon General of the United States, deems necessary to impose: *Provided,* That a suitable or proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, shall be given by or on behalf of the said Arshalouis Simeonian in the same manner and subject to the same conditions as bonds or undertakings given under section 213 of such Act: *Provided further,* That this Act shall apply only to grounds for exclusion under paragraph (6) of section 212(a) of such Act known to the Secretary of State or the Attorney General prior to the date of the enactment of this Act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 4242) for the relief of certain aliens, which had been reported

from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, on page 1, at the beginning of line 5, to strike out "Marie, Rowena (daughter of Marie) and Plarim D-Mar Shimum, and Elishwa, Sulty, Paul, Sophia, Surma, Eshaya, Virginia, George, Mersina, D-Mar Shimum, and Mrs." and insert "Marie, Plarim, Elishwa, Sulty, Paul, Sophia, Surma (daughter of Paul and Sophia), Eshaya, Virginia, George and Mersina D-Mar Shimum and Mrs."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 405) for the relief of certain aliens, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments, on page 1, line 4, after the word "Act", to strike out "Maria Lagomarsino Rosasco,"; in the same line, after the name "Andrew Rosasco", to strike out "Sister Eucharia (Miss Philomena Iannucci), Sister Marie Bernard (Miss Nicolina Ossa), Sister Alphonsus Marie (Miss Mary Grace Padovano), Sister Mary Dulcis (Miss Mary Teresa Di Ioia),"; in line 8, after the name "Ordonio", to strike out "Priscilla Sook Chur Chiang,"; on page 2, line 14, after the name "Godlewska", to strike out "Jose Guadalupe Magdaleno Acosta,"; in line 16, after the name "Machargo", to strike out "Maria Angelidou,"; on page 3, at the beginning of line 3, to strike out "commended" and insert "commenced", and on page 4, line 2, after the word "That", to insert "in the case of Rosa Angarica".

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the joint resolution to be read a third time.

The joint resolution was read the third time and passed.

INCLUSION OF CERTAIN RECEIPTS IN POSTAL REVENUES

The bill (H.R. 4644) to credit to postal revenues certain amounts in connection with postal activities, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DR. RAYMOND A. VONDERLEHR AND OTHERS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 4120) for the relief of Dr. Raymond A. Vonderlehr and certain other officers of the Public Health Service, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the following-named retired officers of the United States Public Health Service are hereby relieved of all liability for payment to the United States of the following stated sums, such sums representing overpayments of retired pay as a result of unauthorized recomputations of their retired pay under the provisions of the Career Commission Act of 1949: Doctor Charles V. Akin, $9,705.12; Doctor Richard H. Creel, $10,928.94; Doctor Marshall C. Guthrie, $10,928.94; Doctor John W. Kerr, $10,928.94; Doctor Allan J. McLaughlin, $10,928.94; Doctor John McMullen, $10,928.94; Doctor Roy P. Sandidge, $10,039.74; Doctor Frederick C. Smith, $10,928.94; Doctor Walter J. Treadway, $10,928.94; Doctor Clifford E. Waller, $8,701.22, and Doctor Mark J. White, $10,928.94.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act for the relief of certain officers of the Public Health Service."

CONSTRUCTION OF BULLY CREEK DAM, OREG.

The bill (H.R. 968) to provide for the construction by the Secretary of the Interior of the Bully Creek Dam and other facilities, Vale Federal reclamation project, Oregon, was announced as next in order.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, in my unanimous-consent request I asked that the call of the calendar be terminated with Calendar No. 604, House bill 4120.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The call of the calendar is terminated.

COMMENDATION OF SENATORS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I wish to express my appreciation to the distinguished and able Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the distinguished and able Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING], and the distinguished and able Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] for their patience, understanding, and cooperation today. I regret that it was necessary for them to wait until late in the evening to take care of what could have been done in 10 minutes.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the distinguished majority leader yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. I express my thanks to the distinguished majority leader for expressing his thanks. It is very pleasant to have such recognition of actions taken, and I am very grateful.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I find that my colleagues in the Senate always try to go more than half way to meet me, and I am grateful for all that has been done. We have very few bills left on the calendar. I do not expect any yea and nay votes tomorrow. The Senate will go over from tomorrow until Monday or Tuesday of next week.

Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HARTKE in the chair). The Senator from Texas.

USE OF GREAT LAKES VESSELS ON THE OCEANS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 378, S. 990.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 990) to authorize the use of Great Lakes vessels on the oceans.

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 Interstate and Foreign Commerce with an amendment.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

PEACE THROUGH THE REDUCTION OF ARMAMENTS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 48, Calendar No. 573. I understood there is no opposition to the concurrent resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 48) to promote peace through the reduction of armaments.

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

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement relating to the purposes of Senate Concurrent Resolution 48, and reaffirming the position of the Senate, be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

PURPOSE

Senate Concurrent Resolution 48 resolves that the Congress reaffirm that upon the achievement of an agreement on the reduction of armaments, the United States is prepared to join with other signatories of the agreement to devote a substantial portion of any resultant savings to expand its works of peace throughout the world.

The resolution also reaffirms the belief of the Congress that the participating governments should continue and expand the works of peace, such as economic and technical assistance to less developed countries; development of natural resources; international cooperation to combat hunger and disease; scientific, cultural, and educational exchange programs; development of atomic energy for peaceful purposes; and the construction of new schools, universities, hospitals, and other essential facilities.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be

proposed, the question is on agreeing to the concurrent resolution.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 48) was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress of the United States reaffirm that upon the achievement of an agreement on the reduction of armaments, which it fervently desires, the United States is prepared to join with other signatories of the agreement to devote a substantial portion of any resultant savings to expand its works of peace throughout the world; and

That the participating governments should continue and expand the works of peace, such as economic and technical assistance to less developed countries; development of natural resources; international cooperation to combat hunger and disease; scientific, cultural, and educational exchange programs; development of atomic energy for peaceful purposes; and the construction of new schools, universities, hospitals, and other essential facilities; and

That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States and the Secretary of State, and that the President make known the sense of this resolution to the heads of all member governments of the United Nations.

The preamble was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the concurrent resolution was passed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEVELOPMENT OF WATER RESOURCES, RED RIVER, TEX.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Calendar No. 609, House bill 4405.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 4405) to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct studies on the feasibility of developing the water resources of the Salt Fork and the Prairie Dog Town Fork of the Red River in the State of Texas.

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

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks an excerpt from the report of the committee.

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

EXCERPT FROM COMMITTEE REPORT ON H.R. 4405

The objective of H.R. 4405 is to reemphasize the existing authority of the Secretary of the Interior to prosecute the investigations authorized. The estimated cost would not exceed $165,000.

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL

Prairie Dog Town Fork rises in the northern part of the State of Texas, southwest of the town of Amarillo, and flows almost due east from there into Oklahoma where it joins the Salt Fork and the North Fork and becomes what is known as the Red River. The Salt Fork lies to the north and parallel to the Prairie Dog Town Fork and is a tributary of that stream.

Water resources in this part of Texas are very limited. At the same time there is an urgent need for additional suitable water supplies for municipal and industrial purposes, as well as for irrigation. The two streams involved in this study offer the only opportunity for impounding surface water for beneficial consumptive-use purposes.

Limited information on the area is available as a result of limited studies by local agencies and by the Federal Government in connection with the Arkansas-White-Red River Basin investigations and the Mangum project investigations. Before the feasibility of development on these two streams can be determined, more detailed study and investigations are required.

Information is needed on the quantity, occurrence, and quality of the surface and ground water supplies; the potential requirements of water by municipalities, industries, and irrigation projects; the location, capacity, and other characteristics of the dam or dams which would be required; and the cost, benefits, and repayment which might be expected. H.R. 4405 provides for developing this needed information and, on the basis thereof, for determining the feasibility of developing the water resources.

The studies and report would be valuable in connection with negotiations presently under way among representatives of the States of Texas, Oklahoma, Arkansas, and Louisiana with respect to a Red River Basin compact. This would assist in completing the basic data necessary to an equitable allotment of water among the States and would provide Texas with a plan for using the Red River Basin water allotted to it.

Cooperation with the Corps of Engineers, the Geological Survey, the Fish and Wildlife Service, the State, and the local agencies that have already initiated studies in the area will be carried out.

DEPARTMENT REPORT

The report of the Department of the Interior favoring the enactment of this legislation follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., February 27, 1959.

Hon. WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ASPINALL: This responds to your request for the views of this Department on H.R. 4405, a bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct studies and render a report on the feasibility of developing the water resources of the Salt Fork of the Red River in the State of Texas.

We favor the enactment of the bill.

H.R. 4405 would direct this Department to undertake an investigation and report to the Congress on the feasibility of developing the waters of the Salt Fork and Prairie Dog Town Fork of the Red River within the State of Texas for municipal, industrial, and other uses. We have some limited information with respect to the area covered by the bill which was acquired in connection with the Arkansas-White-Red River Basins studies and other matters. This information indicates that there is a need for the development of additional, suitable water supplies for municipal and industrial uses as well as for irrigation. We understand that, at least in partial response to such need, two local agencies—the Greenbelt Water Control and Improvement District and the Collingsworth County Water Control and Improvement District—have employed private engineering firms to investigate the possibility of developing water supplies at two prospective reservoir sites.

If the bill should be enacted, we would propose to undertake, first, a general reconnaissance survey of the Salt Fork Basin and Prairie Dog Town Fork Basin areas lying in the State of Texas, to gather and coordinate all available information with regard to the water potential of the area, including both ground and surface waters, and possibilities of developing usable water supplies for irrigation and for municipal and industrial uses, taking into account the investigations being made for the districts mentioned above and their results. On the basis of the reconnaissance survey, we could then determine which possible developments would warrant the feasibility studies called for in the bill to be undertaken thereafter.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there would be no objection to the submission of this report to your committee.

Sincerely yours,

FRED G. AANDAHL,
Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

USE OF GREAT LAKES VESSELS ON THE OCEANS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume the consideration of Calendar No. 378, Senate bill 990.

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 990) to authorize the use of Great Lakes vessels on the oceans.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the committee will be stated.

The amendment of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce was in line 9, after the word "be", to strike out "operated" and insert "permitted to operate", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the provisions of the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946, as amended (60 Stat. 41; 50 U.S.C. 1735, as amended by Public Law 856, Eighty-first Congress), and contracts executed thereunder, vessels purchased from the United States for exclusive use on the Great Lakes, including the Saint Lawrence River and Gulf, and their connecting waterways, may be permitted to operate in any trades and in any manner permitted to other vessels documented under the laws of the United States.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I offer an amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the appropriate place it is proposed to insert:

TITLE II

No common carrier by water subject to the Shipping Act of 1916, as amended; the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended; or any other Act; shall directly or indirectly issue any ticket or pass for the free or reduced-rate transportation to any official or employee of the United States Government

(military or civilian) or to any member of their immediate families, traveling as a passenger on any ship sailing under the American flag in foreign commerce or in commerce between the United States and its Territories and possessions; except that this restriction shall not apply to persons injured in accidents at sea and physicians and nurses attending such persons, and persons rescued at sea, and except that this restriction shall not apply to persons referred to in section 405(b) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (46 U.S.C. 1145(B)), relating to steamship companies carrying mails of the United States: *Provided further*, That nothing in this Act shall prevent the United States Government from entering into contractual arrangements with said companies for reduced transportation rates involving the traveling expenses of those Government employees (military or civilian) when such transportation costs are paid for by the United States Government.

SEC. 2. Any person or corporation who knowingly violates this Act shall upon conviction thereof be fined not less than $500 nor more than $10,000 at the discretion of the Court for each such violation.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I ask that this amendment be voted down.

There is before the Senate a measure on which hearings were held by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. No one appeared in opposition to the bill, and there was no opposition otherwise. The bill before the Senate is properly a calendar measure. It involves one ship, a landlocked ship from the Great Lakes. It involves a very minor consideration.

The amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware involves thousands of ships. He proposes a mountainous amendment to a molehill bill. I hope the Senate will reject the amendment. The amendment is thousands of times greater than the bill to which it is sought to be attached. I hope the Senator from Delaware will give consideration to this aspect.

The bill before the Senate has been considered by various agencies, including the Maritime Administration, the Treasury Department, the Department of Commerce, the Departmet of Defense, the Department of the Navy, and the Comptroller General. No one has any opposition to it. It is properly calendar business, and I hope the Senator from Delaware will be reasonable and not try to add this tremendous amendment to a comparatively minor piece of legislation.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, first I thank the Senator from Michigan for endorsing my amendment and recognizing the fact that it is many times more important for the Senate to adopt the amendment than to pass the bill itself.

I had intended to offer some explanation of the amendment, but frankly the statement of the Senator from Michigan is the best endorsement possible. I was surprised, however, that he wound up his endorsement with the statement that he intended to vote against it.

All the amendment provides is that operators of any passenger ships flying the American flag may not give free transportation or reduced rates to any Government employee. That includes Government employees in general, as well as Members of Congress.

Similar legislation has been enacted with regard to railroads. Many years ago the situation in that regard became disgraceful. American railroads were giving free transportation to top Government officials and later were voted large Government subsidies.

Under the Civil Aeronautics Act, the airlines are barred from giving reduced rate transportation to any Government official.

With respect to the merchant marine, there is no law against it. The merchant marine can, and often does, give reduced rate transportation, free transportation, or various other concessions, to public officials. At the same time, we in Congress are voting hundreds of millions of dollars annually in subsidies to this segment of the American economy, and such subsidies are being recommended by the administration downtown.

When the ships are built in American shipyards the operators get about one-half the cost of the ships in the form of a subsidy paid by the American taxpayers. The subsidy is based upon the differential between what it costs to build the ship here and what it would cost to build the ship in a foreign shipyard. After the ships have been built, they sail the high seas with subsidies paid by American taxpayers.

Public officials, whether they be in Congress or in the executive branch, who are to determine the amount of such subsidies should not accept gratuities from the operating companies.

Much was said a few years ago—properly so, I believe—in criticism of the fact that a member of the executive branch has been accepting from an outside taxpayer subsidized hotel facilities. A great furore was raised in Congress. Yet, sometimes some of us may be beneficiaries of the same sort of subsidies if this bill is not passed. It is my understanding that the bill has the endorsement of every agency of Government involved. The Federal Trade Commission states that it has no objection to the bill. The Department of the Interior has no objection to the bill. The Department of Agriculture has no objection to the bill. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has no objection to the bill. The Civil Aeronautics Board has no objection to the bill. I have here copies of letters from the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, the Justice Department, the Treasury Department, the Department of State, the Comptroller General, and others to the effect that there is no objection to the bill from their departments. I notice that even my good friend from Michigan, the author of the bill before us, says there is no objection to the bill. Everyone is for it. If everyone is for it, why do we not adopt the amendment and pass the bill?

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. McNAMARA. There may be some confusion in the RECORD, because we are dealing with an amendment to a bill, but the Senator from Delaware keeps repeating that there is no objection to the bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The amendment is about what I am speaking. This amendment was previously introduced as a bill. I understood the Senator from Michigan to say that he was in favor of the principle of the amendment. Did I misquote him?

Mr. McNAMARA. The Senator from Delaware did not correctly understand. The reason he does not understand is that the bill before us, in my estimation, is properly a calendar measure. I understand that the amendment the Senator from Delaware has offered to the bill is the same as the text of a bill introduced by him, which has been before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce for some time. The committee has held hearings on it. It finds little merit in the proposal. It has not even reported the bill of the Senator from Delaware.

Those are the facts. Therefore, I am not in a position to say that I would be for the Senator's bill, and I am not in a position to say that I would not be for it. The committee has not reported the bill. We have a report on Calendar No. 378, Senate bill 990. We have no report on the Senator's amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Is the Senator a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce?

Mr. McNAMARA. I am not.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Every agency of the Government which is involved has endorsed the bill which is now being offered as an amendment to the pending bill.

All my amendment does is to state that companies which are being subsidized by the American taxpayers may not offer the Senator from Michigan, or me, or any other Government official a free trip to Europe, perhaps with the hope that they may receive a little bigger subsidy. The Senator is either for it or against it.

Mr. McNAMARA. Only one ship is involved. It makes no trips to Europe. There is no principle involved at all. The Senator is talking about an extraneous subject; it has nothing to do with the pending bill at all. I think the Senator from Delaware ought to be a little fairer in his statement. The pending bill concerns one ship and involves no trips to Europe.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. This amendment prohibits subsidized transportation for Government officials even on the Great Lakes.

Let us understand about what ship it is we are talking. From where did the ship come? The ship which the bill affects was built by the Bethlehem Shipyards in Baltimore at a cost of around $7 million. When it was about 4 years old and had hardly been used at all it was sold for $102,000. If that is not a subsidy, what are we talking about? The ship was sold to a company for operation on the Great Lakes. Now it is proposed to have this ship, which has been converted to passenger service, sail on the high seas during the winter months. I do not object to that. But certainly this is a subsidized ship. It once cost the taxpayers $7 million and was soon sold for $102,000. At the time

that was done, I denounced the transaction as a giveaway. Therefore, I want to make certain that anyone who endorsed that proposal will not be able to get a free trip on the Atlantic Ocean or while it is in the Great Lakes.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. In effect, does not the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Delaware simply put maritime travel on the same basis as air travel, railroad travel, or bus travel today? The bus lines, railroads, and airlines are not able to offer special deals to those who might be passing on their problems. Am I not correct?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator is correct.

Mr. KEATING. Does not the Senators amendment extend that principle to the maritime field?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is all it does.

Mr. KEATING. To me, that is something eminently fair; it is something to which none of us ought to object. I see no reason why it is not perfectly appropriate to adopt such an amendment as a part of the bill. It seems to me the Senator from Delaware has performed a constructive service by raising this question and that his amendment deserves support.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I thank the Senator from New York. I do not for one minute question the sincerity of the Senator from Michigan. I do not want my remarks to be construed as casting any reflection on the Senator from Michigan. He was not a Member of the Senate at the time the construction of this ship was authorized. Nor when it was sold at this price. Certainly I am not directing any of my criticism at him, but I am asking for his support of a good amendment.

At the time these ships were sold I protested. I felt that the sales price was too low.

But right or wrong, the ship has been sold. It is now being operated on the Great Lakes. Now it is proposed to move the ship and to allow it to be sailed during the winter months along the Atlantic coast. I have no objection to that. I simply say that the operator of any ship flying the American flag—and that is as far as we can legislate—should never be allowed to offer a subsidized trip to any public official. Remember these companies are heavily subsidized by the taxpayers.

Mr. McNAMARA. I think the Senator from Delaware has made a very good case. If he will let his amendment apply only to this bill, I will be happy to accept it. If the amendment applies only to the ship to which this bill relates, I will be glad to accept it. As I understand, the amendment provides that no government official shall ride on this one ship. But if the Senator intends to include numerous other ships which operate in the foreign trade, then I will not agree to the amendment. Will the Senator change his amendment so that it will apply only to this one ship?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Oh, certainly not. We do not legislate that only one airplane or one train may carry public officials.

Mr. McNAMARA. But the bill concerns only one ship.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. My position is that this condition must be corrected in the same way as it has been corrected in the aviation industry and the railroad industry. I think the amendment is sound legislation and should be adopted.

Mr. President, I urge the adoption of the amendment and ask for a division.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask for a division.

On a division, the amendment 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 and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 990) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, the House has passed H.R. 4002, a similar bill. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 536, H.R. 4002, and that the text of Senate bill 990, which was just passed, be substituted for the language of the House bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The House bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 4002) to authorize the use of Great Lakes vessels on the oceans.

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

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

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I move that all after the enacting clause of H.R. 4002 be stricken, and that the language of S. 990, as amended, be substituted.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California will state it.

Mr. KUCHEL. Do I correctly understand, according to the request just made by the senior Senator from Michigan, that an identical House bill will be substituted for the Senate bill, plus the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware to the Senate bill, and adopted by the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan proposes to substitute the text of the Senate bill for the House bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Including my amendment adopted to the Senate bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Michigan.

The amendment 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 amendment and third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H.R. 4002) was read the third time and passed.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which H.R. 4002 was passed.

Mr. KUCHEL. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, Senate bill 990 is indefinitely postponed.

REMOVING LIMITATION ON RECLAMATION INVESTIGATION APPROPRIATIONS IN ALASKA

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar 610, S. 1514.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1514) to amend the act of August 9, 1955 (69 Stat. 618).

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

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

THE FAMILY FARM PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT ACT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for the development of a comprehensive family farm program, to bring the production of agricultural commodities into balance with demand therefor, to aid underdeveloped countries of the world by making available to them agricultural commodities produced in the United States, and for other purposes.

I ask unanimous consent that the complete text of the bill be printed at this point in the RECORD, in connection with 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. 2502) to provide for the development of a comprehensive family farm program, to bring the production of agricultural commodities into balance with demand therefor, to enable farmers to secure fair prices, to better uti-

lize agricultural abundance in the Nation's interest at home and abroad, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the Family Farm Program Development Act.

TITLE I—POLICY OBJECTIVE

SEC. 101. The objective of this Act is to provide for the orderly development of a comprehensive family farm income and supply stabilization program that will (1) assure consumers in the United States an adequate, varied, and nutritious supply of food, fiber, and timber in the immediate future and in years to come, (2) bring the supply of farm products into balance with requirements for domestic use and export, (3) enable farmers who are willing to participate in and cooperate with orderly marketing and production adjustment programs for agricultural commodities to secure fair prices that will enable them to secure returns on their labor and invested capital comparable to earnings in comparable nonfarm occupations, and (4) better utilize the Nation's abundance of food and fiber products in support of United States international policies by assisting people in underdeveloped countries of the world to develop their economies, to modernize and expand their training and educational systems, and to avoid famine and malnutrition.

TITLE II—DOMESTIC FOOD AND NUTRITION PROGRAM

SEC. 201. (a) The Secretary of Agriculture (hereinafter 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 programs 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 effected 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 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 60 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 V—LONG TERM AGRICULTURAL PROGRAM

SEC. 501. (a) In order to facilitate the adjustment of the supply of agricultural commodities to the demand therefor and to effect a healthy and balanced growth in agriculture, the Secretary is authorized and directed to formulate and submit to the Congress within six months after the enactment of this Act, a comprehensive program dealing with long term adjustments in agriculture in the United States, together with a long term budget setting out the estimated costs of carrying out such program.

(b) Any program submitted by the Secretary pursuant to subsection (a) shall include, but not be limited to—

(1) plans for an expanded agricultural resources conservation program, including incentives to encourage land-use adjustment and temporary retirement of land not needed for production;

(2) plans for a review and appraisal of the total research effort, public and private, in the field of agriculture with a view to determining the need for increased research in the production patterns, marketing, and uses of agricultural production.

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 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, I offer this bill as the answer of the Congress to Secretary of Agriculture Benson's complaint that Congress has never given him the kind of a farm program he could properly administer. For 6 years, administration forces have marched up Capitol Hill and have offered proposals based on one overriding purpose—namely, to drastically weaken and, in my opinion, ultimately destroy the Federal farm programs that were designed to provide equality of opportunity for America's farm families. For 6 years the administration forces, by adroit use of the veto weapon, have been successful in getting legislative changes that weakened, distorted, and made mockery of the historic purpose of farm programs.

Mr. President, I call the attention of the Senate to a news story which appeared in the Christian Science Monitor on June 13, 1959. The story was written by a staff correspondent of the Christian Science Monitor, Helen Henley. The headline of the article reads as follows:

Law Limits Secretary's Discretion. Benson Outlines Ideal for U.S. Farm Program.

The article lays down the fallacious proposition that current law has limited the authority and the power of the Secretary of Agriculture properly to manage and direct a sensible farm program. Of course I reject that thesis; there is ample authority and ample power, as I shall point out. But today it is my purpose to make even that law and even that authority more precise, more obvious, and more direct.

FARM PROGRAM OBJECTIVES

All of the legislative history confirms that the objective and purpose of Congress in developing the farm programs has been to assure the American people a continued abundance of food and fiber, to offer America's farmers an opportunity to achieve economic equality with other segments of our economy, and to preserve and protect America's traditional pattern of family-owned, family-operated farms as the type of agriculture best adapted to our democratic way of life.

In more recent years, a new objective has been added in the interest of the entire Nation; namely, the purpose of using our abundance as a useful and effective humanitarian arm of better international relations.

EXECUTIVE BRANCH FAILS TO COOPERATE

These objectives have been kept firmly in mind, as year after year new legislation has been proposed. The senior Senator from Minnesota has been joined by many of his colleagues in introducing and pushing for the passage of legislation in all areas of farm programs. A listing of some of these proposed changes in this session shows clearly that any claim that Congress has been lax or remiss in discharging its duty is simply not based on fact. It is the duty of Congress to legislate, with the advice and cooperation of the Executive. We have attempted to fulfill that duty, but the vacuum of administration leadership and cooperation has blocked us. Executive resistance, plus the threat and the exercise of veto, has prevented constructive action.

To all constructive proposals, the Secretary has given the historic thumbs-down signal which, from the days of the Roman circus, has meant death. The committee calendars list hundreds of bills that carry the succinct statement, "Adverse report submitted by Department of Agriculture," or, even more disheartening, an empty space after the statement, "Referred to the Department of Agriculture for report," which indicates that the Department of Agriculture did not even give Congress the courtesy of a reply.

Let me briefly indicate some of the measures which have been brought before this Congress, with the aim of improving farm programs.

The senior Senator from Minnesota has not stood alone in sponsoring these proposals. He has joined with, and been joined by, many of his colleagues in these attempts to get constructive action. Some of these measures were aimed at improved administration of existing programs.

TO STRENGTHEN FARMER COMMITTEES

We introduced Senate bill 662, to insure that democratic election procedures would be used in electing the farmer committees that administer farm price-support programs on the local level, and to strengthen true grassroots farmer representation at all stages of administration. The Department of Agriculture made an adverse report on the bill.

However, I am happy to state that on yesterday the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry ordered Senate bill 662 reported. Last year, the Senate passed a similar bill; but at that time the bill failed of passage by the other body. But, Mr. President, what report do we have from the Department of Agriculture on that bill, this year? We have an adverse report, instead of help by the Department of Agriculture in connection with my efforts to have the Senate pass the bill.

TO STRENGTHEN REA

Senate bill 144 would have returned to the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration the full loan-making authority that has been turned over to a political appointee in the Office of the Secretary of Agriculture. But on that bill we received from the Department of Agriculture an adverse report and active—very active—opposition. As all of us know, this Congress-approved bill was vetoed by the President. We here in the Senate overrode that veto; but the other House was not so successful, for it failed by four votes to override the veto.

TO EXPAND FARM CREDIT

Farmers caught in the vise of low farm prices and high production costs turned to Congress with pleas for more readily available credit. The legislative proposal that would solve many of the problems of our hard-pressed farmers is in Senate bill 1211, the family farm yardstick credit bill. This bill would transform the Farmers Home Administration from the existing minimum operation into a truly constructive credit program. But the Department of Agriculture made an adverse report on the bill.

TO STUDY CHANGING RURAL SCENE

We have expressed our concern with the failure to appraise in any thorough, comprehensive manner the impact of technological changes on rural life, by the introduction of Senate bill 2031, to establish a bipartisan Commission on Country Life. This Commission could and would inaugurate studies of the changing rural scene, and could and would pin-point the most pressing problems of rural life, and would come up with suggested solutions. There was a neutral report from the Department of Agriculture on that bill; the Department was neither in favor of nor opposed to the bill.

TO EXPAND RESEARCH IN INDUSTRIAL USES

In the same spirit of attempting to meet the changing needs of agriculture, we have proposed, and the Senate has passed, Senate bill 690, to expand research in industrial uses of agricultural products. I was a cosponsor of the bill, along with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON]; and it was my privilege to report the bill from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

What was the attitude of the Department of Agriculture toward that worthy bill, which twice was passed by the Senate? The Department made an adverse report on the bill.

TO EXPAND SCHOOL MILK PROGRAM

More children in more schools would benefit from additional supplies of good, wholesome milk. Therefore, I introduced Senate bill 1289, to extend and expand the special school milk program. That bill has been passed by both Houses of Congress; and today the Senate concurred in the amendments of the House to the bill, thus taking final congressional action on the bill. But what was the attitude of the Department of Agriculture in regard to the bill? It did not submit any report on it.

TO FEED THE NEEDY

There have been many proposals that would provide for the distribution of more nutritious foods to the needy in this country. In June the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry held extensive hearings that proved conclusively the great need that exists. It is clearly shameful that there should be around 5 million undernourished and even hungry people in this country at a time when we hear so much about agricultural surpluses. Whether or not we shall get any action on legislation in this area is still uncertain.

I am happy to say, however, that a bill has been reported from the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and is presently on the calendar of the Senate. This particular bill was acted upon favorably by the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry as of yesterday, and will soon be before the Senate for action. It is the result of extensive hearings, but, again, the Department of Agriculture had an adverse report. No uncertainty in the Department of Agri-

culture or the administration about all these bills—just thoroughgoing opposition.

TO BALANCE FEED GRAIN PRICE SUPPORTS

Congress has not turned its back on the producers of individual commodities as price difficulties have engulfed them. Our efforts have been unsuccessful because of the lack of cooperation and, of course, the strong opposition of the Executive. Early in the session we introduced a bill, S. 1343, which would have brought balance into the feed grain picture by letting the price supports on oats, rye, barley, and grain sorghums bear the same ratio to the price support on corn as the feed value of each grain bears to the feed value of corn.

The position of the Department of Agriculture on this important and worthy piece of legislation was, as one might expect, adverse. I say "as one might expect" because of the repeated opposition to these demonstrated constructive and helpful programs.

TO AID MILK PRODUCERS

The senior Senator from Minnesota was joined by other Senators in sponsorship of the Dairy Marketing Act, S. 1821. This bill proposed a self-financing program which would improve the income of milk producers at much less cost to the Government than the existing program. This proposal was met by silence from the Department of Agriculture.

WHEAT LEGISLATION VETOED

The legislative action on wheat is fresh in our memories—kept green, I might say, through the daily insistence of the minority leader in his attempts to point the finger of blame at the majority Members of this body. Congress passed a bill that would have cut back drastically on the acreage of wheat to be seeded this next year—just as the President requested. Congress passed a bill that would have prevented the further buildup of wheat in the inventory of Commodity Credit Corporation, and thus reduced Government costs—as the President requested. Congress passed a bill that would have given income protection to the wheat farmers in return for the drastic production cutback. This is not a principle upon which administration requests are based. The Secretary of Agriculture opposed the bill. The President vetoed the bill. The record is clear. Congress fulfilled its responsibilities. If there were any spirit of cooperation evidenced by the Department of Agriculture or by the President, there would be no question of where the blame should be placed, for there would be no blame. The failure of the wheat program to reduce production follows the pattern of failure set for 7 years by the Secretary of Agriculture and this administration.

The Department's farm program management failure is most dramatically shown by the mountainous supplies of feed grains in the hands of the Commodity Credit Corporation and the predicted 4.2 billion bushel corn crop anticipated this fall.

I add that at the time the most recently proposed corn legislation was acted upon in the Senate I vigorously opposed it. I voted against it. I led the fight against it because I felt it would contribute to greater surpluses and to a depressed market condition. There is no doubt it has contributed to greater acreage, greater production, and greater surpluses. There may be one saving factor—the drought in many parts of America. In Minnesota this year we have had the worst crop of oats in 67 years, and the same is true of grain sorghums. So possibly, by an act of nature, or by an accident of nature, some of the tremendous overproduction of corn may be utilized as a substitute feed for other feed grains which in certain parts of our country have been affected by drought conditions.

TO FIRM HOG PRICES

The Congress knows that this supply of feed grain leads inevitably to price trouble for the hog producers. The June 15, 1959, average price received for hogs was $15 per hundredweight. The July 15, 1959, price was $13.30 per hundredweight. What will the price be 2 months from now? Under the weight of increased marketings, where will it be a year from now? I predict it will be substantially below $12 a hundredweight; and when prices go below $14 a hundredweight, farmers take a licking in the economic marketplace.

Last week the Senators from Minnesota, Mr. McCARTHY and myself, introduced a proposal that attempts to look into the future so that we here in Congress may, by timely legislative action, forestall the hog price collapse. This bill, S. 2453, asks that a plan immediately be put into effect which will reduce the total amount of pork going to market, and thus bolster the market price.

This plan, which has been recommended by the National Planning Association after long study, calls for payments to be made to producers as an incentive to market hogs at lighter weights—at from 180 to 200 pounds instead of the usual higher weights. Not only would this strengthen the market, but consumers would be able to secure the leaner cuts of pork which they prefer.

The Department of Agriculture has not yet had time to report on this proposal. It is my hope that the Secretary will in this instance have enough foresight to cooperate with Congress in the interests of the hog producers and the public.

TO BRING STABILITY TO POULTRY

Next week the senior Senator from Minnesota plans to introduce a bill which will give to the producers of eggs, poultry, and turkeys the right to establish a program that will bring order into the production and marketing of these commodities. These producers have been going through a series of price ups and downs, with the downs becoming more accentuated. These producers have asked again and again for Government assistance to enable them to gain some price stability. For this reason, I shall introduce a bill that presents a positive program, and expect to be joined by colleagues who feel a similar responsibility. That bill is prepared for introduction next week.

FOOD FOR PEACE

I have reviewed these proposals as a refutation of charges that Congress has not borne its proper responsibility toward farmers.

There is another area of responsibility where Congress has forged ahead of the administration in the face of opposition and adverse reports from the Secretary of Agriculture. This is in the use of our agricultural abundance as a positive arm of international relations. The senior Senator from Minnesota was joined by 15 Senate colleagues in introducing S. 1711, the Food for Peace Act, which would expand existing operations under Public Law 480 into a constructive, long-term program to use American surpluses to build peace. I expect action that will bring this proposal before the Senate.

I am happy to state tonight that the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, to which the bill was referred, has acted favorably upon the food for peace bill and will report it to the Senate favorably.

Mr. MORSE. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I am glad the Senator from Minnesota has mentioned that bill of which he is the author with regard to which the Senator from Minnesota has done such wonderful work for a good many years past.

I should like to say for the Record tonight, Mr. President, that this great humanitarian bill would not be coming to the floor of the Senate were it not for the foresight and the leadership and the statesmanship of the Senator from Minnesota. It was my privilege to work on the committee with him and it has been an inspiration to follow his leadership in reporting and in bringing this bill to the floor of the Senate.

Stop to think, Mr. President, what political effects a food for peace program could have. Suppose we placed food in storage in India, Pakistan, Burma, Thailand, Laos, Vietnam, in fact, in any place in the world where people are living in underdeveloped countries, living under the fear that they may be confronted with a famine. Suppose we could place in those countries a few million bushels of American surplus food in storage under terms and conditions that they could be used to meet famine needs. What would be the effect on the political life of such countries? What would be the effect of such a storehouse of food for peace on lessening the dangers of communism? It defies imagination.

This is the kind of foresight the Senator from Minnesota possesses.

I was pleased and privileged to join him. I am not saying that this is the main feature of this particular bill, but it is within the framework of its goal. Much better that the food be in storage, for example, in India than in the United States where such a large percentage of it will be unfit for human consumption by the time it is ready to come out of the bins.

I hope, Mr. President, before Congress adjourns this bill known as the food for peace bill will pass both Houses of Congress and become a law.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I thank the senior Senator from Oregon for his comments. I wish to state publicly that his assistance in reporting this bill and in support of it was of great value and of great help.

It is a good piece of legislation. It was reworked by the members of the committee so that it is a much more constructive piece of legislation than it might well have been in its original form, and I hope the Senate will act favorably upon it.

SECRETARY BENSON PRESENTS NO FARM PROGRAM

Mr. President, many more constructive legislative proposals have been made that could have been tailored to meet head-on the farm problems that exist. I have not reviewed all of them, nor have I attempted to do so. I am confident that a strong, foresighted Secretary of Agriculture could have used these proposals as building blocks to erect a strong edifice of agricultural prosperity.

Furthermore, these proposals are proof that the Congress has not wavered in its determination to develop sound farm programs. But Congress has operated, I regret to say, without the coeperation of the executive branch. We have been handicapped by the shadow of the unstated, secret policy that has motivated all of the actions, demands, and recommendations of the adherents to the Benson way.

Repeatedly, the committees charged with the responsibility of formulating legislation in the interests of the Nation's farmers have requested, insisted, begged, that the Secretary of Agriculture submit an overall legislative plan, a complete farm program that would meet the changing forces in agriculture. We have pleaded for a full honest statement of intention.

Mr. President, there has never been an honest reply to these requests. As late as this spring, another sincere attempt was made in the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry to get from the Secretary of Agriculture a clear statement of his overall policy and intentions. We all know our colleague from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] has informed us again in these past few days of the devious manner in which the Secretary of Agriculture evaded this last request, just as he has evaded the intent of Congress in the administration of farm programs.

Mr. President, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] has been extremely diligent in his work as a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. Time after time he has urged upon the Secretary of Agriculture, as have others of us on the committee—I joined with him on several occasions—that he submit to us an overall, comprehensive farm program rather than to have a piecemeal approach. The Senator from Missouri has stated on the floor the result of his requests; namely, no reply.

The time is at hand to put an end to subterfuge, evasion, and misdirection in this matter of farm policy. It is time to put an end to this blind stumbling in the dark, goaded by the administration's panic cry of "haste."

THE FARM PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT ACT

The bill I have introduced surely should not arouse the administration to charges of "wasteful," "regimentation," "outmoded," and all the other trick words they overwork.

This bill will give to Secretary Benson a whole agricultural policy toolkit, laboratory, and factory—everything he needs to do the job he ought to be doing in behalf of America's farm families.

He is always asking for more authority. This bill gives him all of the authority anyone could want to put the house of agriculture in order. Its basic request is that the Secretary work with and consult with the farm producers on program development and action.

The proposal directs the Secretary of Agriculture to employ the abundant resources at his command—the technicians, economists, and other agricultural production, marketing, conservation, and research specialists—to make a complete, detailed exhaustive review of the many interrelated forces in both domestic and foreign agriculture. Based upon the findings of this study, he shall bring before Congress immediate and long-term practical plans that will assure the consumers of this Nation a continued full, adequate supply of food and fiber while assuring family farmers the opportunity to employ their capital and labor in earning their livelihood without the waste of priceless soil, water, and human resources.

DOMESTIC FOOD AND NUTRITION PROGRAM

The Secretary of Agriculture is directed to submit to Congress a plan for an overall food and nutrition program for the United States, a program that will expand and liberalize the national school lunch program; a program that will more adequately meet the nutritional needs of low-income persons, the unemployed, the aged, and the handicapped; a program that will set up a national security reserve of food and fiber products designed to protect the people of the United States from want in case of war or national emergency.

This is not to be a minimum, halfhearted, "all is well" type of plan. We want the facts and we want the figures. We want to know whether Americans are nutritionally prepared to contribute to a productive, expanding economy. If our fellow citizens are ill-fed and ill-clothed, we want to know who they are, and where they are, and what can be done to correct the situation.

We want to face up to the hard facts of what we should do to prepare for a national emergency—not necessarily and only war, for there are other perils and natural disasters that often cripple broad areas of our country. We want to know that our abundant supplies are safely held as a cushion, a protection against unexpected need. Our previous stores of food and fiber served us well in the last great national emergency. Let us not, in the name of false economy and false economics, destroy this potential treasure. Instead, let us have a plan. How many bushels of wheat do we need to have in ready supply? How many bales of cotton? How many tons of feedstuff? What commodities should be placed in a safety reserve? Where should they be kept to be of maximum value? We have ships in a kind of safety reserve. We even have a mothball fleet of Pullman cars. Let us now plan for a food and fiber safety reserve. Let us face up to the problems and have some complete, honest answers. In previous Congresses, I have repeatedly asked for such a program and information. Always the answer has been "no."

STUDY OF WORLDWIDE NEEDS

The Secretary of Agriculture is directed in this bill to submit to Congress by February 1, 1960, and annually thereafter, a report on worldwide needs for food and fiber. The study to be made should go to the heart of the matter by determining the nutritional deficiencies existing in the world as well as those areas of such need that the people live out their brief lives in a starving condition.

In addition to a determination of the amount and the location of the world's need for food and fiber, the Secretary shall present a positive program that details the fair and feasible share the United States should have in filling this need. A plan for cooperating with other countries which are also in a position to aid in meeting the world's food and fiber deficiency should be part of this program.

This is not to be a short-term dumping type program. This is to be a long-term program, based upon the most effective use of the food and fiber in the recipient countries and based also upon proper production adjustments in this country. Safeguards shall be taken to insure that the program is consistent with the international objectives of the United States and that there is no interference with the commercial trading activities of friendly exporting countries.

ADJUSTING SUPPLY AND DEMAND

This bill provides the Secretary with all of the means and authority necessary to halt the buildup of surplus commodities in Government warehouses, and to adjust the supplies of any commodity to the demand.

When the true needs of this country are determined, taking into account the programs for schoolchildren and our own needy; the supplies of food and fiber needed in the safety reserve; the fair share of the United States in filling the fiber, food, and nutritional deficiency in the friendly nations of the world—then the Secretary may exercise the authority given in this act to adjust supplies with this total demand.

This bill gives the Secretary the right to ask producers of any commodity that is in surplus supply if they favor a national marketing quota. If two-thirds or more of the producers vote "yes" in a referendum for a national marketing quota program, then the Secretary shall develop such a plan and submit it to the Congress. The Secretary is given very broad authority in administering the program. He is to determine the control and adjustment procedures and the necessary penalties. Guidelines are provided in my bill for the use of alternative methods of assuring the farmer of a fair price in return for his compliance.

The Secretary may use the method best adapted to achieve this end. This might be by means of income equalization payments to producers, marketing orders, and agreements, orderly marketing loans and direct purchases, compensatory, or incentive payments, diversion programs, marketing premium payments, or special marketing programs. I have no fear of the Secretary failing to find people who can work out details of the programs chosen. The Department of Agriculture is overflowing with fine, dedicated, intelligent, able career public servants, people who would be more than able and happy to make a decent farm program work.

Yet just in case the Secretary needs any help, the bill provides for farmers themselves having a voice in telling him their needs and in assisting in program formulation.

The bill directs the Secretary, whenever he determines an agricultural commodity is being produced in abundance beyond effective demand in the free markets, to establish producer-chosen commodity committees for any such commodity, to consult with and to help guide the Secretary in developing a national production adjustment and marketing program.

Whenever any national production adjustment and marketing program for a given commodity has been approved by the producers and submitted by the Secretary to the Congress, it shall go into effect automatically unless disapproved by congressional resolution within 60 days—similar to the reorganizational authority already given the executive branch under Hoover Commission recommendations.

By this method maximum authority, maximum discretion, maximum trust is given the Secretary to work with producers in developing more effective programs, yet the right of the Congress to protect the public interest is retained.

What we have done in the bill, Mr. President, after weeks and weeks of consultation with people all over the Nation, is to design a proposal, working in consultation and in cooperation with farm producers, whereby the producers of any commodity which is in surplus will be able to enter into a program for production adjustment and orderly marketing. That program, if it is approved by two-thirds of the producers of said commodity, will be presented to the Congress. If the Congress does not act in opposition within 60 days, or does not reject the program, the program will become law.

Mr. President, the senior Senator from Minnesota feels that we have prepared something which is new, which approaches this problem on a scientific and objective basis, which involves both farm producers and the experts and technicians in the Department of Agriculture, to utilize all the economic and production information we can obtain in order to protect the interests of the taxpayers, the interests of the consumers, and the interests of the Nation. If two-thirds of the producers accept the program, it will become a working program, unless the Congress overrules it.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey in the chair). Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. HARTKE. I should like to say, in regard to the proposal made by the Senator from Minnesota, as usual it is of the highest caliber and looking to the future. One of the things we younger Members of the Senate feel about the leadership of the Senator from Minnesota in the farm program is that he does not walk in the shadow of the farmers, nor do the farmers walk in his shadow. The Senator from Minnesota and the farmers walk side by side, looking to welfare of the farmers and to the future of America as well, considering the overall thinking of experts in the field, for I know the Senator has consulted the experts.

I thank the Senator from Minnesota for the great help he has been to us new Members, by leading the way toward better and sounder practices in agriculture.

I should like to invite the attention of the Senator to the fact that the Secretary of Agriculture, on the 4th of August, suggested to the farmers that they should sell hogs at weights averaging 6 pounds less than the present 240-pound average. I come from an area in which the farmers raise hogs. I have seen many hogs. Most farmers I know have a little bit of difficulty judging a weight within 20 or 30 pounds, let alone trying to guess when the hog is going to be exactly 234 pounds at the marketplace.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator's comments, as usual, are most relevant and pertinent. I thank the Senator for his generous remarks relating to the senior Senator from Minnesota. It has been a privilege and a pleasure, as I said earlier today, to work with the Senator from Indiana, who, when he came to this body, came with a determination to do all that he possibly could in behalf of our farm producers and our family farmers—to do what is just and to do what is fair.

That is the purpose of our proposals. I thank the Senator.

FAIR PRICE STANDARD

For the guidance of the Secretary and individual commodity groups that may be established, the bill establishes a new fair price standard geared to current economic conditions, not frozen to periods of the past. A fair price is defined as that price which will yield returns on capital and labor, on representative family farms, comparable to nonfarm earnings, as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture on the basis of costs and returns collected and published annually by the U.S. Department of Agriculture for typical family operated commercial farms.

Mr. President, the Department of Agriculture has all this information. What is a fair price for an agricultural commodity? What is a fair return for a farmer? This is to be based not on guesswork, not on some yardstick of yesterday or of years gone by, but instead on the current economic trends. In other words, it is to be based on returns on capital and labor, on representative family farms, comparable to nonfarm earnings, based upon the economic materials and facts in the possession of the Department of Agriculture.

In the guidelines established by Congress under this bill, direct payments to an individual farm operator would be limited to $5,000 a year maximum, and crop loans would be limited to $25,000 as an aggregate total for any and all crop loans. We have placed definite limitations as to the amount of assistance to be granted. This is a family farm program. The program envisioned under the bill I have introduced is not designed to directly benefit corporate agriculture. It is designed to be of assistance to that great bulk of the farm producers known as the family farm operators of the Nation. It has restraints and limitations. It has definite cutoffs in terms of benefits.

This is a protection, Mr. President, for the taxpayers. This is a protection for the consumers. Let us hear no idle talk from the administration about the extravagant costs involved. The costs of this program are to be determined, Mr. President, by the rulings and the policies laid down by the Secretary, except that we are not going to permit large payments to any one producer. We shall not permit large crop loans to any one producer.

The measure proposes seeking cooperation of producers themselves in achieving the fair price standard by adjusting supply to overall demand, yet safeguards participating farmers with the assurances of alternate available devices for income stabilization in order to encourage compliance. Government assistance for income stabilization is conditioned on the acceptance of production adjustments and orderly marketing.

LONG-TERM LAND USE

The Secretary is also directed to formulate and submit to the Congress a program dealing with long-term adjustments in agriculture in the United States, after first giving Congress his findings on the domestic and international food and fiber use potential and needs so we will have something factual upon which to make decisions about production adjustments that may be needed.

As guidelines, the bill asks the Secretary to include plans for an expanded agricultural resources conservation program, including incentives to encourage land-use adjustment and temporary retirement of land not needed for production, as well as plans for a thorough review and appraisal of the total research effort, public and private, in the field of agriculture, with a view to determining the need for increased research in production patterns, marketing, and new uses of agricultural commodities.

LOW PRODUCTION FARMS

The measure recognizes the unique and separate problems of our low production, low income farms, and directs the Secretary not only report to the Congress on progress toward solving these problems, but also submit recommendations for dealing more effectively and

more rapidly with them, offering our own guidelines for his consideration.

NEW WAYS TO MEET NEW CHALLENGES

Mr. President, this measure is no panacea, nor does it profess or pretend to offer all the answers. Rather, it is a practical, sensible, well-thought-out approach toward seeking new and better answers to new challenges.

All of these are things the Secretary of Agriculture could and should have already accomplished. Instead of waging his ceaseless battle against the established farm programs, he should have been finding new ways to meet new challenges.

I suggest most respectfully that had the Secretary spent more time in Washington supervising the operations of his Department, counseling and consulting with Members of Congress, and listening to the advice of farm groups and farm representatives, rather than addressing chambers of commerce, Rotary clubs, or whatever fine groups he may appear before, as to the evils of an agricultural policy with which his own administration had so much to do, the farm producers of America would be much better off today. I say, without fear of contradiction, that the Department of Agriculture has spent more time in its political attacks upon the current agricultural program than it has spent in trying to design a better one.

I am but one U.S. Senator, with a limited staff and limited resources. The bill which I introduce can be only my own handiwork, and surely it will have its limitations. I do not have 80,000 people to draw upon for information. Today the Department of Agriculture has 17,500 more employees than it had in 1952, even though there are fewer farmers and very many fewer farms than in 1952.

It is exceedingly difficult to obtain cooperation from the Department, even on a technical subject. But I have felt it my duty and responsibility, as one who has served on the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry for almost 6 years, to present a program which offers at least some constructive suggestions and proposals for the consideration of my colleagues in the Congress.

I repeat, my program may very well have weaknesses and limitations which careful study will reveal, but it has as its one purpose to provide the Department of Agriculture, and whoever may be the Secretary of Agriculture, with the entire agricultural policy toolkit to do the job for American agricultural equality of opportunity.

My bill contains limitations which will protect the taxpayer. It contains guidelines which will assure the consumer of adequate supplies of food at all times. It lays down guidelines and standards which will permit the United States to do a constructive job in the field of international relations. It calls upon farmers to participate with Department experts. It gives Congress the final authority to protect the public welfare.

The Secretary of Agriculture claims that his hands are tied, that he cannot move without a directive from Congress. This is a weak and unjustified alibi for inaction and mismanagement. But if he needs a more comprehensive grant of authority—and apparently he says so—then here it is.

In the bill which the senior Senator from Minnesota has introduced today is the directive, the authority to do the constructive job of agricultural policy formulation and administration that the current situation requires.

Here is the blueprint for immediate and long-term constructive action.

Here is the reaffirmation of the intent of Congress to bring agriculture into a harmonious and equitable relationship with the rest of our economy.

Mr. President, here is a program which all of us who really care about the well-being of family farmers can wholeheartedly support.

We hope that the present Secretary of Agriculture will see that here is a golden opportunity. We hope that we will receive that rare object, a "favorable report from the Department of Agriculture" on this bill.

If the present Secretary of Agriculture does not see fit to accept this challenge, perhaps a future Secretary of Agriculture will.

Mr. PROXMIRE subsequently said: Mr. President, earlier today the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] introduced his omnibus farm bill. I think that makes August 6, 1959, a very significant day, because I think this farm bill, introduced by the senior Senator from Minnesota, eventually—it might take a year or it might take 3 or 4 years—will become the farm law in this country.

Mr. President, there is simply no question at all that the No. 1 victim of economic injustice in this country is the American farmer. I expect to discuss the bill in more detail at a later date. I realize the hour is late.

I wish to say, in conclusion tonight, that the bill is a good bill because it hits at the No. 1 farm problem, low farm income, in a practical, sensible way, that will reduce the astronomical cost of the present farm program by effectively reducing farm production so it will come down to demand, and these enormously expensive surpluses will be eliminated.

LABOR AND AGRICULTURE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, there has been for many years a concerted attempt to drive a wedge between wage earners and farmers and to play one against the other. Farmers are told that the high cost of living is due to the excessive wages of working people, and workers are told that their rising food bills are due to the excessive prices obtained by the farmers.

As I have pointed out so often the objective of this campaign is not to benefit the farmers or the wage earner. It is rather to divide and conquer and thereby to prevent enactment of legislation designed to raise the living standards of all our people.

It is heartening to note, however, that this campaign has in large measure failed. Workers and farmers are more and more coming to realize that they have mutual interests.

Only this week two labor journals came across my desk which contained articles emphasizing the common bond between workers and farmers. The first is an editorial from the Minnesota Union Advocate of July 30 entitled "Farmers and Workers"; the second is from the Machinist of August 6 also entitled "Farmers and Workers."

I commend both of these fine union papers for their keen awarenes of the common bond between those who till the soil and those who work for wages in plants, mines, stores, and in construction and service trades.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these two articles to which I have referred be inserted in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

[From the Minnesota Union Advocate, July 30, 1959]

FARMERS AND WORKERS

The average worker may not be able to follow all the intricacies of the Nation's farm problems—especially in view of the fact that they have been further complicated by the Eisenhower-Republican administration and the Department of Agriculture under the fumbling of Ezra Taft Benson—but this we can all understand:

America's farmers are under attack just as the labor movement is, and while the specific goals of the worker and the farmer are not the same, our opponents are the same. The politicians and the groups who blast labor unions also oppose the aspirations of those who own and work a family-size farm.

Recently, by an overwhelming majority, particularly in the spring wheat States, farmers voted "yes" in a wheat referendum in an effort to improve farm-price supports.

This action should strengthen the hand of farm-State Congressmen who are seeking to pass legislation for better farm-price supports.

Space does not permit going into an explanation of the wheat referendum, but the overwhelming "yes" vote shows that the Nation's farmers know what the score is.

Among other things, they know that in our modern legislated economy there can be no sensible farm program without some control of production and price.

Similarly, most informed union members know that there is practically no connection at all between the price a farmer gets for his products and the prices a worker pays for the food and fiber he uses.

In commenting on the victory for farmers in the wheat referendum, a group of officials including M. W. Thatcher, general manager of Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association, and officials of various farm organizations, included this significant statement:

"No farmer will voluntarily cut his own income any more than any salaried person will vote to cut his own pay."

That's a sentiment that every wage earner can understand—and approve.

Farmers buy many of the products that wage earners make, so they must prosper if they are to continue to be customers, and thus assure full employment for nonfarm people.

And, by the same token, wage earners and their families consume by far the greatest amount of the things that farmers produce, and farmers know that wage earners must make enough money to pay for all the things they and their families need.

In Minnesota and elsewhere, farmers and union workers have cooperated in the past. We must continue to do so to even a greater

extent in the future, because we need each other like bacon needs eggs and bread needs butter.

[From the Machinist, Aug. 6, 1959]

FARMERS AND WORKERS

(Union members have a twofold interest in America's farm problem. We want to pay the lowest possible prices for the food we buy. But we also want to help all those who work on farms maintain a high standard of living. This article, based on a new AFL–CIO pamphlet, explains organized labor's long-standing interest in both of these goals.)

American trade unionists have a vital stake in higher living standards for all who work on the Nation's farms whether as owners, tenants, or hired hands.

When farm people enjoy good times, their increased spending means more and better jobs for city people. When city families are well off, they spend more for the food and fiber our farms produce so abundantly.

But since the end of World War II most of the people who work in agriculture have failed to share in our rising national income.

PRODUCTION UP, INCOME DOWN

Real income from farming actually has been going down at the same time that agricultural output has been going up. In 1958 total farm production was 29 percent higher than in 1947, but the net income of farmers—including government payments—was down 25 percent.

More than a million farms were vacated between 1947 and 1958. A falloff in farm income, rising output per manhour on the farm that even exceeds the rise in industry, and the hope of many families for better times and security elsewhere led to this development.

With a million less farmers to do the work, agricultural output still rose almost one-third between 1947 and 1958. But net income per farm dropped 7 percent in current dollars and 25 percent when figured in terms of real purchasing power.

Even these figures understate the extent of the farm crisis. Despite a temporary rise in some agricultural prices in 1958 which helped push total farm income up, prices are now heading down again.

The emergency in agriculture is not of the farmer's making unless it is charged that he works too hard and too well.

For 25 years it has been a recognized Government responsibility to shape broad economic policies that will help encourage the use of our abundant food and fiber by the millions at home and abroad who need it, and to help secure a better return for the farmers who produce it.

The present national administration has not provided this kind of leadership. Policies to adequately support farm family income have been lacking. The biggest Government subsidies continue to go to the owners of large commercial farms who don't need aid. In the same spirit tax benefits are granted the wealthiest corporations and individuals. The administration's tight money policy with its high interest rates cripples farmers, small businessmen, and consumers while greatly benefiting the moneylenders.

Workers on the land and in industry share many common problems. City wage earners face high living costs and job insecurity due to automation and idle economic resources. Farmers and small businessmen are caught on a treadmill of high costs, mounting output, and lower selling prices. Furthermore, the threat of being driven into corporation dominated farm-factory assembly lines looms ahead for many farmers.

Propaganda is circulated among city people that farmers are responsible for high food prices and farmers are told that union workers seeking to protect the living standards of their families are the cause of the cost-price squeeze on the farmer. Neither charge is true.

The future of those who work in agriculture and in industry depends alike on national policies that insure a rapidly expanding economy. We need expanding job opportunities for those displaced by mechanization on the farm and automation in commerce and industry. And we must have expanding markets so that all who work can obtain a fair return for their contribution to abundance.

American trade unionists are proud of their long effort to lend a helping hand to farmers. Many AFL–CIO members were raised on farms and have relatives and friends who still are farming. For many years the American labor movement has supported legislation to aid farm cooperatives, extend rural electrification, expand farm credit facilities, and to build an adequate system of farm price supports.

Labor has given wholehearted backing to soil conservation efforts, the development of crop insurance, the inclusion of farm operators and hired workers under social security, and to every other measure to improve the housing, health, and educational facilities available to all who live and work on farms.

AID FAMILY FARMS

By recent convention action labor resolved that—

"The American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations will continue to vigorously support corrective measures to restore and to raise the income of all who work in agriculture.

"We seek an American standard of living for the farm proprietors who by their skill, labor, and investment produce our food and fiber.

"In particular, we wish to aid the family operated farm through measures to increase its efficiency and its income so that the independent farmer may efficiently compete with corporation farming and may remain the dominant producer in American agriculture.

"Furthermore, we must raise the living standards of those who work in industrialized agriculture for sweated wages under inhuman conditions, today the most exploited segment of the American labor force.

"Surely this great Nation can and must assure to all who toil on its farms a full partnership in the unlimited promise of the United States."

INTERACTION OF GOVERNMENT AND THE PRESS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the interaction of the Government and the press is a matter of serious concern to me.

As it has always been the job of Congress to formulate and enact the laws of the land, so has it also been the job of the press to communicate intelligibly the laws to the land.

While the interests and works of the Government have expanded over the decades, the methods of the press have equaled this expansion in speed, scope, and efficiency. However, what has come to be a matter of concern to me recently is a fourth dimension of challenge in this era of expansion. This challenge lies in the search, in the insistence, on accuracy—and no less than accuracy. Accuracy of news reporting stems from a self-recognition by the press that it is in a responsible position as an opinion shaper.

The story of the family farm shows the lack of effort on the part of the press to meet this challenge of accuracy. This is visible on too many pages—in the banner headline, "Farm Program Fails," with its followup, "Surplus Mounts"—the ads testify to the rising costs of food, the editorials to the tax dollars spent in controlling surplus.

The sobering reflection is this: Seldom is there a spokesman for the farmer. Seldom are we shown the other side of the coin in the unbiased picture of statistical facts.

I do not say this does not happen sometimes. Occasionally the facts sift through. And I want to commend those responsible for this occasional break for the farmer. Last week I received a newsletter which spotlighted a newspaper poll taken in South Dakota, which asked approximately the same questions as did an overly publicized farm magazine poll recently. The results were quite different when operating farmers answered the questions.

I ask unanimous consent to have this newsletter printed in the RECORD, not only for the tabulation of the South Dakota poll, but for the comments on that poll made by a knowledgeable firm.

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

COMMODITY LETTER

In our letter of March 26, 1959, we called attention to a poll of farmer opinion about agricultural price supports that was completely loaded to get agreement with the editorial opinion of the publication conducting the poll. This was the poll that purported to show that 78 percent of farmers favored the immediate or gradual elimination of all farm price and income support.

We branded the poll as nonsense. Now we have proof to back up our position. A poll was conducted by three newspapers in South Dakota without any accompanying editorializing. The vote for different kinds of plans was as follows:

	Percent
The present program of flexible supports	5.7
A system of direct payments to compensate farmers for the difference between the market price and a fair price. This plan would be accompanied by production controls	22.6
Price supports fixed at 90 percent of parity with strict bushel and pound quotas instead of the present acreage approach	24.5
90 percent of parity with no specific crop restrictions but a reduction of 15 percent of each farmer's historical acreage base	18.9
No Federal crop controls of any kind and no price supports of any kind	28.3

From this tabulation it is perfectly clear that 71.7 percent of farmers want a workable system of supports and controls; 66 percent favored higher price supports and stricter controls than the present programs provide.

The difference in results between the recent poll and the previously cited poll is not a matter of geography. The earlier poll showed only 36 percent favoring high supports and production payments in South Dakota. The results are very different when the bias is taken out.

In our letter of March 26, we said that if farmers were given an opportunity to do so they would overwhelmingly say "I think the Government has a responsibility to see that farmers get a fair share of the national income; that the best way to get a fair income is to adjust production to the market size

just as industry does." The South Dakota poll proves that we were exactly right.

In the South Dakota poll, farmers were specifically asked whether they favored stricter controls and higher supports or less control and lower supports. A majority favored stricter controls and high supports. Farmers know that the price of higher supports is production control and are willing to pay the price.

Farmers voted overwhelmingly to get the Government out of the grain business. Twenty-one percent favored a deeper involvement of Government in the storage, merchandising, and handling of grain and 79 percent favored withdrawal from this type of operation. Farmers are clearly aware of the damage that the badly run programs of the USDA are doing to their prices and want this merchandising competition stopped.

Farmers were asked "Do you believe that farmland retirement, either under the soil bank or some similar program, should be employed as a means of controlling production of farm commodities"? Thirty-six percent voted yes and 64 percent voted no. The soil bank was recognized as a failure and farmers do not approve of failure. Farmers clearly recognize that programs have to have some teeth in them.

Farmers were asked to rate Ezra Benson as Secretary of Agriculture. The results were as follows:

	Percent
Excellent	11
Good	8
Fair	32
Poor	49

This result was obtained in traditionally Republican South Dakota.

Three main conclusions must be reached from this poll:

1. Current price-support programs are unsatisfactory.

2. The present Secretary of Agriculture is disapproved of by the people that he is supposed to represent.

3. Farmers believe that they are entitled to fair prices and incomes and are willing to accept the governmental restriction necessary to get them.

This mandate to the Congress should be perfectly clear. Present programs are not satisfactory when judged by farm prices and income and by the surplus problem. Farmers understand and want a sound, workable program. The Congress is doing nothing about getting one for them. We are watching the spectacle of another session of Congress roll by without any agricultural accomplishment.

In exasperation and frustration we again ask, Why? Why? Why?

DANIEL F. RICE & Co.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a copy of a letter which I have received from Roy Hickman, of Morton, Tex., which he wrote to the editor of the Fort Worth, Tex., Star-Telegram, together with a copy of my reply; also a letter from Mrs. Burton Miller, of Maple Park, Ill., enclosing a letter which she had written to the editor of Newsweek magazine, relating to the agricultural policies as discussed by certain writers in Newsweek magazine.

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

MORTON, TEX., *July 3, 1959.*

EDITOR, STAR TELEGRAM,
Fort Worth, Tex.

GENTLEMEN: I do not know to whom I should address these remarks, but insist that Mr. Carter read them and call them to the attention of the individual who wrote the editorial I am hereafter referring to "Farm Aid Nostrums Alienate the Consumer," which was published in the morning publication of the Star Telegram, dated May 13, 1959.

This is the second time I have written you about your editors being so poorly advised on the farm problems, and this isn't unusual for Associated Press writers. They should make some thorough study of this subject before attempting to write about it; after all, many of your readers are farmers—who know better, but many of the city and urban readers do not. It isn't fair to the farmers and ranchmen.

Why not try and answer some of the following questions in some of your editorials:

(a) Why has food to the consumer gone up continually since the prices to the farmers have gone down since 1948?

(b) Why don't you say something about the millions of CCC farm commodity dollars which have been paid Fort Worth firms for storing farm products much of which could be marketed at prices above the loans and stop the CCC storage costs? A summary of this (just for your city) would be very interesting to the city and urban readers, and they would know who were getting the bigger portion of the farm subsides, and why consumer costs are high.

(c) How about watching the price of bacon and ham at your markets and compare them with the 9-cent drop in hog prices during the last 12 months?

(d) Explain why the retail prices of bread have jumped 5.4 cents per pound loaf or 39 percent since 1948, while the price of wheat was dropping.

(e) How about the farmers receiving from $25 to $41 for cottonseed in 1958 and the mills getting about $80 per ton for cottonseed meal or cake, and then be out except for small amounts when the farmers and ranchmen wanted to buy; a good article could be prepared on how the processed products were channeled through the commercial feed interests in preparation of mixed feeds for the farmers and ranchmen, thereby hooking them going and coming.

(f) Farmers out here advertised in local papers for people to come to their farms on certain days and get all the onions and potatoes they wanted free—and the farmers plowing them up for them. Is that "higher farm prices created by high supports"?

(g) Practically everything the farmer buys is produced on a supported market, and could you expect him to not enjoy some of the supports? When have we had higher labor supports? His interest rates have increased.

(h) Mr. SYMINGTON is very correct in his analysis of the price and production situation for agriculture. Do you remember the early thirties? Low prices, high production, and low farm income.

(i) Why do you suggest no farm supports, no Government aid to farmers, while you admit we are having one of our highest periods of inflation and Government control, and subsidies for labor and industry?

I am not saying the present farm program is in any way an answer to our problems; it isn't. The program which Mr. Benson has been tearing apart since 1952 was not perfect either, but it was a much better program than the one he has made of it, for the producers and consumers and the taxpayers. Wish you would check to see how much the CCC lost in the 20 years it operated before Mr. Benson took office and the amount it cost the taxpayers since 1952. He has lost more in 1 year than the program costs in 20 years.

The CCC program now operates for the warehousemen, exporters, and mills, and not for the producers, operating for the same favored group Mr. Benson's farm program operates for. We farmers do not prefer that the Government monkey with our business, but if we are going to have to operate in a Government-controlled and Government-subsidized economy we feel that we are entitled to a fair share and a like protection with industry, labor, and transportation.

The American consumers and taxpayers are entitled to true and unbiased information on the farm program and the amount of money charged to farm programs and farm subsidies the farmers actually receive.

I believe that your editors would see the farm picture differently if they would make a broad study of the farm programs and use their efforts to improve them instead of misrepresenting them to your readers. I suggest that they have a conference with Representative W. R. POAGE; this would give them an opportunity of catching up quickly and efficiently.

Your readers would be interested in seeing in print the amount of postal subsidy the Star Telegram receives each year.

Yours very truly,

ROY HICKMAN.

JULY 20, 1959.

Mr. ROY HICKMAN,
Morton, Tex.

DEAR MR. HICKMAN: I want to thank you on two counts; first, for writing the fine letter you did to the Star-Telegram of Fort Worth, and second, for sending me a copy of the letter.

If more farmers wrote such letters to the many magazines and newspapers which are currently presenting such an inaccurate picture of American agriculture, some of the true facts might be presented to the general public. Because of the amount of faulty publicity concerning the farm situation recently, I hope to find occasion to mention this to my colleagues in the Senate quite soon. In doing so, I would like to refer to your letter and others I have received regarding this matter. If I do, I shall of course, send you an excerpt from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, of my floor remarks.

With all best wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

MAPLE PARK, ILL., *July 8, 1959.*

The Honorable HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I have been pleased to listen and view various newscasts of your recent committee meetings. From a farmer's viewpoint you seem to be the only one in Washington who evinces an interest and a knowledge of the problems confronting the American farmer today.

I have been struck by the utter lack of knowledge shown by most writers and commentators, particularly those who should be informed.

Recently, I wrote the attached copy of letter to Newsweek which sets forth my disgust with such writers and publications which distort the true facts involved.

Only recently I heard you say that the farmers of your State were being paid 12 cents a dozen for eggs retailing in stores for four or five times that amount. Consequently, it is evident that you know the score.

It is my belief that the vast majority of farmers are in agreement on this matter but for some reason they are not articulate and are unable to get the true facts to the entire public, for we are all in this together, for the failure of one large segment of the population to prosper will react on all.

I want to congratulate you on the stand you have taken and I am sure the rightness of your position will become increasingly clear to many citizens.

Sincerely yours,

MRS. BURTON MILLER.

MAPLE PARK, ILL., *June 26, 1959.*

EDITOR, NEWSWEEK MAGAZINE,
New York, N.Y.

Re Messrs. Hazlitt and Moley and "Perspective."

DEAR SIR: As you undoubtedly have heard "the pen is more deadly than the sword," actually "mightier than the sword." This I believe.

I have never seen the time when newspaper and magazine writers seemed to take such gleeful delight in promoting antagonism between the farmer and the city dweller. The city man is always referred to by the press as "the consumer" and "the taxpayer."

Now my husband and son operate two very fine farms of 415 acres and we, too, are taxpayers (believe me) and we are also consumers. We do not pick loaves of bread, butter, etc., off the trees. Neither do we bake bread nor churn butter "as of yore"—no more than your wife has a kitchen without water or electricity.

These so-called experts may have studied economic trends and patterns but I doubt very much if they understand farm situations and conditions. Therefore, why write about a subject on which they are so obviously uninformed?

As a farmer's wife, I feel I may be competent to expound on a few of the highlights of our department.

In regards to Mr. Moley's article, "Defiance to Omnipotence," it may amaze this gentleman to know that no farmer of my acquaintance cares about subsidies or soil bank. We have never received one dime. Mr. Moley's "Perspective," and I quote, "Those scattered farmers who because he had put the price so high had planted as never before * * *" not only shows an utter lack of perspective and knowledge of the subject bordering on stupidity.

This, Mr. Editor, is the situation. They are not planting as never before on account of greed. They are doing it in order to keep their income up to the place where we can maintain our standards of living at current costs and prices we sell for. Do you think a farmer can buy a $4,000 tractor with $16 to $17 hogs? And very few bring the price. They are not lean enough or finished enough or the good Lord knows what else. Eggs sell here for 18 to 20 cents a dozen. What do you pay? Who gets the big deal between? As a responsible editor, you should start a crusade against bigtime operators and monopolies who buy and sell in such large quantities that they make millions, not for the sake of being a crusader, but to tell the American people the truth.

Does our pious Mr. Benson or the press bring to the attention of the consumer and taxpayer that magazines, railroads, power companies, etc. are subsidized? You fellows aren't very consistent. Let's get with it.

All we ask is the rightful heritage from the soil we till. Equality for all, malice toward none.

We need production controls, not in acres, but limitations to market over and above certain quotas. Incidentally, my husband feeds cattle. If we need extra feed, with all the surplus corn, etc. in bins, do you think he can buy it? No. It's harder to buy than it is to find a needle in a haystack. The Government wants surplus—so do bin operators. Why does Mr. Benson pay subsidies to the wool growers—they're out in Utah, incidentally.

We are not racketeers. Farming is a way of life, a business. "Do away with inefficiency" is a big deal now. Isn't that a laugh?

Most farmers must be darned efficient, or why the tremendous surplus?

I was amused by Mr. Hazlitt's statement that some farmers deliberately produced inferior wheat to get Government generosity. Why would they? It costs no more to plant and harvest good wheat than bad wheat. Surely the good wheat would yield more, make the "old glutton" more dole money out of the trough.

We do not plant 200 acres of corn, get 90 bushels to the acre, making $18,000. We pay for seed, hundreds of dollars for gasoline, dollars and dollars for labor. The crop must be planted, tilled, etc. The equipment required for this is costly. We must buy fertilizer.

If we feed this corn to livestock, we buy the feeder stock. The markets fluctuate. we sell for 26 cents, a good-to-choice beef—you pay $1.15 for steak. We do not fatten livestock on corn alone—it takes protein at hundreds of dollars. And hogs require many vaccinations and veterinarian attention.

Why does not an editor of a national magazine, alive to the facts of life, find someone just once to write something in defense of the farmer, instead of picturing him as an ogre living off public funds? This, I can assure you, would be of more interest to many people than the fulminations of "on again—off again" writers like Moley and Hazlitt.

For farmers to subscribe to Newsweek and be exposed to such drivel and lack of understanding is not only a travesty but a waste of money. Conversely, assuming these two "name" writers receive compensation, Newsweek is very careless with its money if you are interested in building circulation in the rural areas of this Nation.

Very sincerely yours,

MRS. BURTON MILLER.

THE GREAT WHITE FLEET—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL] be added as a cosponsor to Senate Concurrent Resolution 66, calling for establishment of a White Fleet of aid and mercy, which I submitted on July 21, 1959, on behalf of myself and 33 other Senators.

The name of Senator CARROLL was inadvertently left off the original list of cosponsors of the concurrent resolution.

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

RED LAKE WORK PROJECTS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I note with keen interest and attention the efforts towards self-help being undertaken by the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians, with headquarters at Red Lake, Minn., through their attempt to secure additional industry and work projects in their northern Minnesota tribal area.

Recently a report was prepared by the industrial specialist of the Bureau of Indian Affairs in the Minneapolis, Minn., area office, and with this survey as a basis, active steps are being taken to solicit new industry to establish itself in the area.

I wish to commend the Red Lake Band for its initiative in its efforts to provide additional employment for members of the band who wish to remain on or near their tribal lands.

INCREASE IN MAXIMUM OIL AND GAS ACREAGE LIMITATION, STATE OF ALASKA

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, on August 4 the Senate passed H.R. 6940, a bill providing for the increase of acreage limitations upon oil and gas leases in Alaska. Ordinarily, it is not the disposition of the senior Senator from Colorado to rake over old coals. But because of certain facts which have developed since the bill was passed, and because of certain publications which have been made, I feel it absolutely necessary to make this statement. For that reason, I have remained on the floor for 5 hours continuously in order that I may make the record perfectly clear.

It must be understood, first of all, that the present oil lease limitation in Alaska is 100,000 acres. In addition, any individual may secure options for an additional 200,000 acres, making a total of 300,000 acres.

The bill passed by the Senate 2 days ago, H.R. 6940, raises the 300,000-acre limitation to 600,000 acres and does away with the differences between leases and options, so far as the individual who holds them is concerned. In other words, there is now no limitation, whether a person holds leases or options, or whether a company holds leases or options, or whether they hold all of one or all of the other.

I spoke at some length on the floor of the Senate in opposition to the bill. I point out for the record, so that it will be perfectly clear, that when the bill came up in the subcommittee of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, I spoke in opposition to the bill, as did a member of the other party. To make the record further clear, at the time the bill came up for consideration before the full committee, I spoke in opposition to it, as did a member of the other party, and I reserved specifically for myself the right to take any action I thought fair or just or equitable when the bill came before the Senate, and to speak upon it, although I said that I would vote for the bill in committee merely that it would be before the Senate. That is what I did, with a complete reservation as to the action I would take. I thought the bill was bad then; and the more I look at it, the worse it appears to be.

There are in Alaska 46 million acres at present under lease, or as to which leases have been applied for. This is approximately 72,000 square miles. It is more area than is comprised by all the surface of Rhode Island, Delaware, Connecticut, New Jersey, New Hampshire, Vermont, Maryland, and West Virginia.

In other words, there is under lease in Alaska today more acreage than the total acreage in all those States.

It is contemplated that the raising of the acreage limitation from 300,000 to 600,000 will at least double the acreage under the 10-year reserve of the various oil companies. This doubling is more than the land surface of Montana, which was until recently the third largest State. It is more than the combined areas of Rhode Island, Delaware, Connecticut, New Jersey, New Hampshire, Vermont, Maryland, West Virginia, South Carolina, Maine, and Indiana. One is prompted to ask: Just how much do these people want?

I have had a very careful analysis made of the summary of lease rentals,

which are statutory minimums set by section 17 of the 1920 act, as codified in 30 U.S.C. 226.

One of the chief arguments I used with the proponents of the bill the other day was that they were making a grave error in increasing the acreage limitation from 300,000 to 600,000, for the reason that the present rentals of public oil lands, lands rented from the U.S. Government, are grossly inadequate. The Department of the Interior has suggested certain minimums, and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] has introduced a bill providing for the raising of the minimums. At present, the lease rental is 50 cents for the first year and nothing for the second or third years. The situation is that the statutory waiver for the second and third years is a matter of law. The Secretary of the Interior can do nothing about it. If the proposed changes are made lawful, he can then adjust the rentals for those years, as he might adjust them for the others.

So we end up with a lease for the fourth and fifth years of 25 cents an acre each year, or a total gross rental for the first 5 years of $1 an acre. I say without fear of contradiction that it is impossible today to rent any land from any private individual in the United States for less than a dollar an acre a year—not to speak of 5 years.

The result of the present law is that a man can pay 50 cents an acre the first year, nothing for the second and third years, and then relinquish his lease, after having paid a total of 16⅔ cents an acre a year for the 3 years.

If he goes into the next 5 years, he pays 50 cents an acre, so the total average amount paid per acre is a 10-year gross of $3.50 an acre.

The minimum rentals suggested by the Department of the Interior, which compare favorably with those contained in the bill to be proposed by the Senator from New Mexico, provide that a person will start by paying $1 an acre, and then a straight 50 cents an acre after that time, and that in the second 5-year period he will pay $1 an acre a year.

What is the reason for this? The purpose of the Mineral Leasing Act, according to its title, is for the development of mineral lands. Ninety percent of the money which the Federal Government receives from the leasing of the rental lands in Alaska goes to the State of Alaska. A part of that money is committed to schools and a part to roads, according to the disposition of the Alaska Legislature. The rest may be used for any other purpose to which the legislature sees fit to devote it. So it is to the interest of Alaska to get the maximum amount of rental from this acreage, consistent with development.

If we consider the present rentals as against the suggested rentals—and I contemplate that Congress may well act upon this proposal at this session—we find that the gross rental for an acre for 10 years is $3.50. Based upon the suggested minimum rental per acre per annum, the gross rental would be $8. The gross difference, then, in a 10-year period, between what the 600,000 acres are being rented and leased for today, and what will be received if the amount is raised to a decent level, is $4.50 an acre over a 10-year period.

On the basis that Alaska will receive 90 percent of this amount, the figure is $4.05 an acre over a 10-year period. So the very coffers of the State of Alaska itself would have been increased if the Senate had not taken the action it took the other day, but had deferred action until such time as the rental provisions were considered.

We are now in the position of having raised the rental provisions to 600,000 acres per individual a year. That is being done upon the old scale, when a new scale is recognized as imminent and coming.

The Department of the Interior has repeatedly pointed out that with 46 million acres of land under lease or applied for lease in Alaska, the only discovery drilling activity which has occurred in the past 2 years or is now indicated has occurred—with perhaps two exceptions—under the unit plan or under cooperative agreement or under development contract.

In view of the 300,000 acres allowed under the previous law and the 600,000 acres allowed under the new measure—and either amount seems to me to be a great deal of land—I have compared the acreage in Alaska with the acreage in various other States—not for the purpose of belittling any of the other States, but in order that we may have a better grasp of what is involved. The peculiar thing is that under the 300,000-acre limitation, one who has that much land under either option or lease can place part or all of the land in a unit agreement or in a cooperative agreement or in a development contract; and when he does any one of those three, the acreage which is used in that way no longer applies against his minimum—previously 300,000 acres, and now 600,000 acres. I shall give one example of how that works out: The other day, one company, which prior to the passage of the new measure had a total limitation of 300,000 acres, already controlled far in excess of 800,000 acres of land in Alaska, although it had drilled only two wells in order to hold that land.

The new law would permit any company to hold 600,000 acres for 5 years, at an average rental of 20 cents an acre.

Inasmuch as witnesses who testified before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs stated that it costs as much as $180,000 to $200,000 just to get a crew on the ground in Alaska, it is only proper to allow a greater incentive for development there, as compared to development in the rest of the States.

Three hundred thousand dollars in rentals for 600,000 acres during the first 3 years, for example, for contingency or reserve, and not for development purposes, would not be very great. Mr. President, I think we may safely assume that the acreage would double in the near future, and probably would increase to 96 million.

I wish to address myself to the impact which this will have on the economy of Alaska and what I believe was the very shortsighted policy of Congress in passing the bill. Assuming the doubling of the acreage, which the bill contemplates, and relaxation of the acreage limitation, as the bill provides, the State of Alaska would be deprived of at least $81,800,000 in the next 5 years. It follows that during the same period the revenue lost to the United States would be $9,200,000.

The present gross rentals for 10 years aggregate $3.50 an acre. Under the proposed increases, they would be $8. Under these circumstances, the revenue loss to the State of Alaska, because of increased leasing activity as a result of relaxed acreage limitations, and without attendant adjustments—so the Department of the Interior has argued, and I believe it is correct—would amount to at least $186,300,000 over the 10-year period.

So the total threatened revenue loss to Alaska—based upon a doubling of the amount of land leased and based upon any reasonable increase in the rentals—over a 10-year period following the enactment of this measure will be $289,800,000; and during the same period the revenue loss to the people of the United States will be approximately, but not quite, $30 million.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, in connection with my remarks, a tabulation of the present rentals, the suggested minimum rentals, the gross difference per acre, and the potential Alaska loss per acre resulting from the enactment of House bill 6940.

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

Summary: Lease rentals

[Statutory minimums set by sec. 17 of 1920 act, codified: 30 U.S.C. 226]

	Present annual minimum rental per acre per year	Suggested minimum rental per acre per year	Gross difference per acre	Potential Alaska loss per acre (90-percent total)
Lease year 1	$0.50	$1.00	$0.50	$0.450
Lease year 2	(1)	.50	.50	.450
Lease year 3	(1)	.50	.50	.450
Lease year 4	.25	.50	.25	.225
Lease year 5	.25	.50	.25	.225
Total, gross, 1st 5 years	1.00	3.00	2.00	1.800
Average per year, 1st 5 years	.20	.60	.40	.360
Lease year 6	.50	1.00	.50	.450
Lease year 7	.50	1.00	.50	.450
Lease year 8	.50	1.00	.50	.450
Lease year 9	.50	1.00	.50	.450
Lease year 10	.50	1.00	.50	.450
Total, gross, 2d 5 years	2.50	5.00	2.50	2.250
Average per year, 2d 5 years	.35	.80	.45	.450
10-year gross	3.50	8.00	4.50	4.050
10-year average	.35	.80	.45	.405

[1] Statutory waiver.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, in conclusion, I wish to state that in my opinion a very grave error has been made. The purpose of the Alaska Leasing Act is to secure development. But I have shown that only one company has gotten in excess of 800,000 acres, by means of the drilling of two wells.

Certainly it is time for Congress to take a good look at this situation. The

Senate cannot do so now, because the Senate has passed the House bill. But I hope appropriate action will be taken to save for the people of Alaska and the people of the United States this money which justly belongs to them.

Mr. President, the Senator from Kentucky desired to be on the floor at the time when I concluded; and he had asked that I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall be glad to do so; but in the meantime I shall speak for not more than 5 minutes.

Mr. ALLOTT. Will the Senator from Oregon suggest the absence of a quorum, at the conclusion of his remarks?

Mr. MORSE. Yes, I shall be glad to do so.

Mr. ALLOTT. I thank the Senator from Oregon.

SUCCESSFUL COMPLETION OF UNIVERSITY OF OREGON EDUCATIONAL CONTRACT IN NEPAL

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I hold in my hand an article entitled "Oregon Group Sets Up University in Asia Nation." The article was published in the Coos Bay (Oreg.) World on the 23d of July, and points out that a group of Oregon educators connected with the University of Oregon has been conducting a very worthwhile experiment in higher education in Nepal during the past several years.

One of the great educational statesmen of Oregon is the former chancellor of the Oregon system of higher education, Dr. Charles D. Byrne. I have known him for a great many years. He has made outstanding contributions to higher education in the State of Oregon. Following his retirement as chancellor of our State system of higher education, he continued his interest in the field of education, and was at the head of the American group of educators who set up in Nepal a system of education. He was assisted by a group of very distinguished Oregon educators, including Dr. Hugh B. Wood, professor of education, who also has made a very remarkable record in Oregon education; Dr. Francis E. Dart, associate professor of physics; Dr. Paul B. Jacobson, dean of the Oregon College of Education; Dr. Clarence Hines, professor of education; Thomas O. Ballinger, associate professor of art education; and other members of the faculty of the University of Oregon.

Mr. President, it is a very dramatic record that these educators from my State have made in Nepal. It is a great monument to their educational statesmanship; and, as a Senator from the State of Oregon, I consider it a great honor to be privileged this afternoon to ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD this newspaper story, which tells about the fine work they have done and makes the announcement of a successful completion of the University of Oregon's educational contract in Nepal which was realized this month with the establishment, on July 8, of a national university.

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

[From the Coos Bay World, July 23, 1959]

OREGON GROUP SETS UP UNIVERSITY IN ASIA NATION

UNIVERSITY OF OREGON.—Successful completion of the University of Oregon's educational contract in Nepal has been realized this month with the establishment, on July 8, of a national university.

Tribhuvan University is the name of the new institution, which is located in Kathmandu, and which will administer all higher education in Nepal.

Establishment of the new university concludes the work of the Oregon University in Nepal and the remaining members of the contract party, which has been working in Nepal since 1954, will return to Eugene in September.

Oregon, under the direction of Dean Paul B. Jacobson, of the school of education, has administered $640,000 in Nepal in setting up teacher training, bringing educators to this campus for further education, and paving the groundwork for the new university. The contract under which the university worked was between the U.S. State Department's Foreign Operations Administration and the Government of Nepal.

SIMILAR TO OURS

The new university in Nepal is described by Dr. Charles D. Byrne, former chancellor of the Oregon State system of higher education and now a member of the university's education school, as being parallel in some ways to Oregon's state system.

Dr. Byrne, who spent 2 years in the Asiastic country advising on the organization of the university and developing its charter, points out that all the existing colleges of Nepal will be brought together under the single administration of Tribhuvan University. As soon as buildings can be built, the colleges in the Kathmandu Valley will be moved to the university site.

The three branch colleges outside the valley will be affiliated with the university and accredited with it. These colleges are at Dharan, Biergunz, and Biratnagar.

FIRST PARLIAMENT

The new Kathmandu site as a college center had been planned and the ground was broken for it on July 8, just a little more than a week after the first Parliament convened in Kathmandu, on June 30, and the first American Embassy was opened on the same date.

The university is named in memory of the late King Tribhuvan, who in 1950–51 led the revolution that overthrew the century-old tyrannical rule of the Rana family and is now known as the father of his country.

The University of Oregon is probably the only American university, according to Dr. Byrne, that has actually started a new university in a foreign country.

PROFESSORS HELP

University personnel assisting in the establishment of Tribhuvan, in addition to Dr. Byrne and Dr. Jacobson, have been Dr. Hugh B. Wood, professor of education, who was adviser to the first national commission that drafted the general framework and determined the need for the university and has been adviser to the university commission since 1958; Dr. Francis E. Dart, associate professor of physics, now en route home from Nepal, who served 2 years as higher educational adviser and assisted in bringing about improvements in the existing college; Thomas O. Ballinger, associate professor of art education; and Dr. Clarence Hines, professor of education, who with Ballinger assisted in the establishment of a national college of education and 10 mobile normal schools for training teachers.

The new Tribhuvan University has colleges of liberal arts, science, commerce, education, law and Sanscrit. Planned for future development are colleges of agriculture, home science, and engineering, and eventually, a college of medicine and hospital.

TEACHERS TO UO

Nepal will continue to send teachers to the Oregon campus for advanced training. Seven new teachers will come this fall, and four of those who have been here for the past year will remain. Of these 11, 5 will be studying for doctorates.

Completion of the education here of this year's 11 teachers will bring to 44 the number of college professors trained on the Oregon campus. These will form about one-third of the complete staffs of the Nepal University setup, Dr. Byrne estimates.

The University of Oregon's educational work in Nepal is one of the most successful efforts made by the United States in Nepal, according to Guilford Jameson of the International Coooperation Administration.

REAL PROPERTY EXEMPTION FROM TAXATION IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I send to the desk and ask for the appropriate reference of a bill designed to provide the Commissioners of the District of Columbia with discretionary authority to waive the penalty upon the failure to file a report in accordance with the provisions of section 3 of the act entitled "An act to define the real property exempt from taxation in the District of Columbia," approved December 24, 1942, when the Commissioners find that failure to file the report required under existing law was not willful.

The need for this legislation, Mr. President, was brought to my attention by an unfortunate situation in which a local church group found itself liable for the payment of real estate taxes although under the statute it was tax exempt, because of the fact that the responsible officer of the congregation was ill and therefore unable to file the report by the deadline contained in law. There is no question that it completely slipped his mind, as one appreciates can easily happen when a man is sick in the hospital.

I have been assured by the District government that the terms of the statute preclude the exercise of discretion in such cases. I, therefore, have had this remedial legislation drafted and it is my hope that early committee action may be taken upon my proposal.

Believe it or not, the Congress passed a law which very rightly exempts churches and similar groups from District taxes; but there is in that law no language which requires that the tax form must be filed by the church, and that failure to file it as of a certain deadline date means the church will have to pay the taxes.

Mr. President, I am willing to take judicial notice that there was no such intention on the part of the Congress; that what the Congress had in mind was that the church would have to pay taxes if it did not cooperate by filing the form; but, certainly, if there was good cause why the form was not filed, and if there was no willful intent to refuse to file the form, it was not the intention of Congress that the church would have to pay

the taxes. However, that is certainly what the District tax officials feel they are bound by under the language of the act.

Therefore, I am introducing proposed remedial legislation in the hope that there will be early committee action on it and that it will pass the Congress.

I have, as the last part of the proposed act, put in the bill language which makes it clear that the authority of waiver on the part of the District of Columbia tax officials shall be retroactive, covering the taxable year of 1958, so that the particular case which is now pending can have the benefit of the waiver which I provide for in the bill.

Mr. President, I think what I seek is only simple justice. We certainly should not hold the congregation of the church liable for the 1958 taxes which are due this year simply because their finance officer was sick in a hospital and it completely slipped his mind that the tax form filing was due.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed at the conclusion of 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. 2503) to amend the act entitled "An act to define the real property exempt from taxation in the District of Columbia," approved December 24, 1942, so as to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to waive certain tax liabilities imposed pursuant to such act, introduced by Mr. MORSE, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 3 of the Act entitled "An Act to define the real property exempt from taxation in the District of Columbia," approved December 24, 1942 (56 Stat. 1089), is amended by adding immediately after the period at the end thereof the following: "Any tax liability imposed on any such institution, organization, corporation, or association for failure to file a report in accordance with the provisions of this section may be waived by the Commissioners if, in their opinion, such failure was not willful and said authority of waiver shall be applicable to any tax liability beginning with the taxable year 1958."

THE SAVING TO TAXPAYERS BY USE OF COAL IN FEDERAL INSTALLATIONS IN WASHINGTON

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, during this session of the 86th Congress much public attention has been focused on the cost of Government operations here in Washington. In particular, there has been a great deal of comment on construction and operational costs of Government buildings, an example being the New Senate Office Building.

Today I should like to point out the other side of the economy coin by calling attention to a Government operation which is saving the taxpayers nearly half a million dollars annually. I refer to the economical and efficient system used to heat Federal Government buildings in the District of Columbia area.

Since the Capital City first converted from wood, the primary fuel used to heat our Federal installations has been bituminous coal. Current yearly purchases amount to some 315,000 tons at an approximate rate of $3,027,360.

The equivalent amount of energy, in terms of No. 6 fuel oil, the lowest priced industrial oil on the market, would cost $3,440,630 a year. This means that the approximate savings per year through the use of coal instead of oil amount to $413,270. This, I might add, is a conservative estimate since the 6-cents-per-gallon price used for comparison represents a currently existing "soft" oil market.

Now, as for the possible use of gas to heat local Government facilities: It should be noted that gas is not available for Government heating needs here, so that any cost comparison is theoretical. Nevertheless, Government engineers have frequently priced the cost of gas to get a complete operation picture. The comparison of gas and coal costs, though theoretical, is rather startling.

Priced at industrial rates during the heating season, gas would cost approximately $7,347,360 to heat the area's Federal installations. The cost would be $4⅓ million more than is currently being spent.

These cost comparisons must certainly be of interest to everyone concerned with economy in Government. They should come as a revelation to those under the mistaken impression that bituminous coal is an old-fashioned fuel, unable to meet the demands of the mid-20th century energy market.

Bituminous coal heats the White House, the Nation's number one residence. The Capitol is coal heated. The Supreme Court Building, the Library of Congress, and the offices of our Senators and Representatives are coal heated. The Pentagon, said to be the world's largest office structure, is coal heated.

These important structures, as well as all other major Government buildings in the District area, are furnished heat through underground pipelines emanating from four main heating plants. The central plant, largest boiler plant in the country, and possibly in the world, supplying steam for space heating, serves Federal buildings in the downtown Washington area. The Capitol plant heats this building and others in the Capitol Hill area. West central plant supplies the western section of the city, and Federal facilities across the Potomac are served by the Pentagon plant.

The Capitol plant is under the supervision of the Capitol Architect and his engineering staff, while the other three plants are operated by the General Services Administration.

The entire operation is, as I have said, efficient and economical. As Mr. Robert R. Galloway, area manager of the public building branch of GSA, explains, operational cost sheets are regularly reexamined to keep efficiency high and costs low. The results show not only that coal is more economical than competing fuels, but, through modern coal engineering know-how, additional savings are always possible. As an example, let me cite the experience of the Pentagon plant last winter.

A study was made of the coal-burning specifications used by the plant. Mr. Galloway, working with Mr. James B. Coleman, Chief of GSA's Fuel Branch, and engineering experts of the National Coal Association, found a way to effect a change in the specifications that would save from $50,000 to $75,000 annually over and above the regular savings made possible by coal heating.

I quote now from a letter written last January, following the change, from Mr. Coleman to Mr. Tom Pickett of the National Coal Association. Mr. Coleman said:

> The contract price of the coal is less, the plant is operating more efficiently, our handling problems have been licked, we had no smoke problems last fall or during this severe cold spell, and the plant personnel are all happy. The engineer told me that the coal purchased under the revised specifications was the smoothest operating and most economical that had ever been used at the Pentagon heating plant.

Let me point out that the example I have given does not merely illustrate the value of modern coal engineering, but of the value of alert, cost-conscious public servants. While we are free with our criticism, we are too often grudging in our praise of Government employees who are earnestly seeking ways to save the taxpayers' dollars. I believe Mr. Galloway, Mr. Coleman, and the other officials and engineers responsible for this additional saving deserve credit and commendation.

The Pentagon then is a satisfied coal customer, and the taxpayer is the chief beneficiary. Mr. Coleman writes of economy, efficiency, and yet another attribute of modern coal equipment which should correct some misconceptions about coal's place in today's energy picture.

I quote again, in part:

> We had no smoke problem last fall or during this severe cold spell.

Consider now that over 300,000 tons of bituminous coal are used each year by the Pentagon plant and the other three Government heating plants. Yet the Nation's Capital, as we all know, is recognized as one of the cleanest, most beautiful cities in the world. Of all major metropolitan areas, Washington suffers least from smog, fumes, and the air pollution problems which plague other cities.

There can be no better refutation of the spurious old dictum that coal is a dirty fuel. The Nation's Capital itself is the proof of the pudding, and I for one can think of no prouder example of the success of modern coal technology and equipment.

The example of our Capital City might well be considered by Government officials and engineers responsible for heating Federal installations throughout the country, particularly those of the executive branch and the Department of Defense.

As William W. Bayfield of the American Coal Sales Association recently pointed out:

> Coal today represents the best buy on the American industrial counter for installations of this type because the industry has spent vast sums and thousands of man-hours in research and development programs to make modern coal utilization a convenient, efficient, and economical process.

One of the results of this research and development is the practicability and use of modern scientific devices, such as the electrostatic precipitators which efficiently capture and dispose of the products of combustion which lead to air pollution. These precipitators are used in our Washington heating plants.

Still another result is increased productivity at the mine. Coal's economy and market price stability are the results of the technological advances made in coal production methods. To quote from recent speech by Mr. Joseph E. Moody, president of the National Coal Policy Conference:

> In 1948, the output per miner per day was 6.32 tons. Today, it is close to 12 tons per man. Our price at the mine in 1948 was $4.99 a ton. Today, it is $5 a ton. The price of coal at the mine has risen 1 cent in 11 years.

Considering that the past decade has been one of spiraling high costs, we can agree with Mr. Moody that coal can well be termed America's number one anti-inflation commodity.

Government experts and engineers in the Washington area have taken advantage of this economy, and they are supported in their judgment by the experts of private industry. The electric utilities have long recognized the savings possible with coal-fueled power. Bituminous coal's place in our local energy picture therefore does not end with the passing of winter.

I have considered that the midst of a typical Washington summer is not the most appropriate time to discuss our local heating system, regardless of the economy story involved. But coal has its place in Government building air conditioning as well.

The electricity which operates air-conditioning compressors and machinery in our Government buildings is provided by a local utility. The fuel used to power the electrical plant is bituminous coal. We have discussed coal heating, but we might well think in terms of coal cooling, for the coal industry serves an ever-increasing number of Americans—in public buildings, in plants, in homes—through furnishing power for electricity.

It is appropriate then that this Capitol, the White House, and the other centers of Government in the Nation's Capital are meeting their fuel needs through coal, America's basic energy source of yesterday, today, and tomorrow. It is a tribute to the coal industry that, by adapting to modern energy demands, it has kept pace with the fuel needs of the Nation's Capital. And it should be some comfort to the Nation's taxpayers, beset as they are by high taxes and Government operational costs, to learn that Washington has its share of persevering Government officials who can and are achieving economy in Government by studying all the facts about fuel engineering and guiding their decisions accordingly.

Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

TRIBUTE TO MRS. LYDIA CADY LANGER

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I know I voice a sentiment that is held by all in this body when I say that I was saddened when I learned of the death of Mrs. Langer, the wife of our friend and dear colleague, the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER.]

I shall never forget that I met Mrs. Langer when I first came to the Senate in 1947. It was the day the new Members of the Senate were sworn in. The gallery was crowded, and it seemed that Mrs. Langer was unable to secure a seat in the gallery. So the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] had brought her to the floor of the Senate.

Some one raised a point of order about non-Members of the Senate being on the floor of the Senate, and I shall never forget that the Senator from North Dakota rose and said, on that occasion, when he was being sworn in again, that he wanted to have by his side the one who had been his inspiration throughout the greater part of his life.

In the years which have passed I came to know Mrs. Langer's beautiful qualities of mind and spirit and heart. We know of her devotion to her husband. We know of his devotion to her.

As I have said, I know that all of us are saddened by Mrs. Langer's death. We are saddened at the loss to our colleague from North Dakota and I extend to him and to his family my own sympathy.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, pursuant to the order previously entered, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 29 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Friday, August 7, 1959, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate August 6, 1959:

U.S. ATTORNEYS

Francisco A. Gil, Jr., of Puerto Rico, to be U.S. attorney for the district of Puerto Rico, for a term of 4 years.

Edward G. Minor, of Wisconsin, to be U.S. attorney for the eastern district of Wisconsin, for a term of 4 years.

U.S. MARSHAL

M. Frank Reid, of South Carolina, to be U.S. marshal for the western district of South Carolina, for a term of 4 years.

ADVISORY BOARD OF THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

Frank A. Augsbury, Jr., of New York, to be a member of the Advisory Board of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation.

CALIFORNIA DEBRIS COMMISSION

Col. Howard A. Morris, Corps of Engineers, to be a member and secretary of the California Debris Commission, under the provisions of section 1 of the act of Congress approved March 1, 1893 (27 Stat. 507; 33 U.S.C. 661).

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Frederick Henry Mueller, of Michigan, to be Secretary of Commerce.

U.S. COAST GUARD

The following-named persons for appointment in the U.S. Coast Guard:

To be lieutenant commander

Thomas H. Carter

To be lieutenants

Kenneth D. Urfer
Howard E. Mickelson

To be lieutenants (junior grade)

Richard L. Burns
Francis J. Flynn

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, AUGUST 6, 1959

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Hebrews 10: 22: *Let us draw near unto God with a true heart in full assurance of faith.*

Almighty God, we have come from Thee, and belong to Thee and our lives only have reality and value as we live in Thee and Thou in us.

Help us to feel that we cannot attain unto the more abundant life, which Thou hast ordained for us, until we surrender and commit ourselves completely to Thy guidance and control.

Grant that in all our relations and contacts with our fellow men may we manifest the spirit of our blessed Lord who came to heal the hurts and heartaches of humanity.

May we have more of His sympathy and compassion, more of His trust in Thee and more of His burning passion to break down the barriers which separate the members of the human family from Thee and from one another.

Hear us in His name. Amen.

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, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 7629. An act to make permanent the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to make loans under section 17 of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists on its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. TALMADGE, Mr. AIKEN, and Mr. MUNDT to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.