

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 13, 1960

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

Our Father, God, in a world so greatly engrossed in the pursuit of material goals and so largely under the tyranny of things, we would keep clear the path to a hallowed temple of the spirit where, in all our concern for the Nation and the world, we bow in humility and reverence, guarding with unceasing vigil the sacred flame of faith, and hope, and love on the altar of the unseen and eternal.

Give us to know with a solemnity that awes our spirits that if a nation values anything more than freedom under God, it will lose its freedom; and that if it is comfort or luxuries, security or money, that it values more, in the long run it will also lose them. So, in this day of contending values gird us at any sacrifice to incarnate and exemplify the faith we proclaim and to be ever loyal to the deathless principles for which even the stars in their courses fight. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

ATTENDANCE OF A SENATOR

STROM THURMOND, a Senator from the State of South Carolina, appeared in his seat today.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, January 11, 1960, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,
The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.
(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

DISCLOSURE OF FINANCE CHARGES IN CONNECTION WITH EXTENSIONS OF CREDIT—EXTENSION OF TIME FOR BILL TO LIE ON THE DESK

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill (S. 2755) to assist in the promotion of economic stabilization by requiring the disclosure of finance charges in connection with extensions of credit, introduced by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS],

lie on the desk for the remainder of the session today.

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

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

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

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY SENATOR GREEN OF RHODE ISLAND NOT TO SEEK REELECTION TO THE SENATE

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, out of the city of Providence last Monday night there came an announcement that reached into every nook and corner of our State of Rhode Island with a note of regret and a richness of recollection.

I am sure the same sentiments are aroused in all of us in the Senate today.

The announcement was by my colleague, U.S. Senator THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN, that he will not run for reelection.

It was as though a curtain were being drawn across a great chapter in the history of Rhode Island—yes, and our country's history—by the hand of the only man who could and would make that decision.

The name of THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN has been inseparable from the fortunes of the Democratic Party in the State of Rhode Island for all the years of this century.

If I seem to speak in a political vein, it is with no sense of partisanship, but merely to record the clear history of our times.

THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN was a Democrat when it was not traditional for a person of his wealth and position to enlist in the then minority party of Rhode Island. But it was consonant with his principles.

No man did more than he to make it the majority party.

Twenty-eight years ago he led his party to power in the State of Rhode Island as Governor. As Governor, he brought a fresh point of view—human and modern—to State government.

For 24 years he has graced this floor as a Senator from Rhode Island. These Halls have been abundant witness to his statesmanship in these critical decades of our Nation's dangers and destiny.

THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN rose to the heights of dedicated service and personal sacrifice when, last year, he surrendered the prestige and power of the chairmanship of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations.

He did this in order that his temporary physical handicaps might not impede full progress in a year critical in our international responsibilities.

On Monday night my colleague took another noble step—the voluntary surrender of his assured return for another 6 years in this Senate. This is the Senate that he loves. It is a Senate that loves him, as his associates have demonstrated on more than one occasion.

He has surrendered the rigors of a campaign—the call of the hustings to which he was always delighted to respond—and the thrill of victory which has been his constant reward.

What nights of victory they were—1954—1948—1942—1936—1934—1932.

How those dates, decisions, and issues stir the hearts of all of us.

It has been my good fortune to have shared many of these nights of victory with him and to witness the happy hysteria of the milling crowds, cheering to the echo the ever greater victories of their beloved THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN.

If there seems a touch of loneliness in the contrast between the crowds cheering a victory and the solitude of sacrifice, let no one misunderstand.

Today the hearts of all Rhode Island are with their neighbor, our colleague. Party lines have never stood against him as a candidate. Party lines melt into one glad acclaim for him as a citizen.

THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN is a man who gives and commands loyalty. Here in the Senate Senators have made their own assessment of his abilities by the honors and responsibilities they have placed upon him.

For him no task was too intricate, no journey too arduous, in fulfilling his obligations. He made himself familiar to and familiar with the far corners of our earth in order the better to discharge his duties.

THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN never ceased to be the student. He never ceased to be the servant of every good cause, educational, social, philanthropic.

In law, banking and business he lent the wisdom of his experience and the depths of his logic which we have often seen exercised here. Even the most modest account of his life sets something of a record in our official directory. This is altogether fitting his 92 years and his generous investment of them in public service.

Brown University—the school of his heart—continuously and continually honors him; and thus sets the pattern of recognition by all the facets of Rhode Island community existence in which Senator GREEN is a factor and a fixture.

I am sure that the announcement is not a signal of retirement from all this community responsibility.

There is no complete leisure for a man of his loyalties.

It is my hope that Senator GREEN may find time to record for posterity something of the personal history of his times. It will be an invaluable part of the Rhode Island and American record.

It will be an invitation to imitate; it will be a challenge to emulate the achievements of a great American.

As a living document it would continue to be an inspiration to those who had no opportunity to be close to him in the ever-growing years of his ever-expanding life.

This closeness has been the proud privilege of his colleagues of the Senate.

I know Senators join me in this prayer—

May God grant many more years of health, happiness and helpfulness to our beloved colleague—THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I believe that all of us felt a sense of loss when we learned of the decision of the distinguished senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] to retire from the Senate at the end of this term.

No Member of this body has ever been held in greater affection by his colleagues than has THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN, and no man has ever given more selflessly of great talents and great patriotism to his country.

The outstanding characteristic of THEODORE GREEN is that he is a kindly man who always has a desire to help others. I shall never forget how helpful he was to me, when I was a freshman Senator, in guiding my footsteps along paths of prudence.

THEODORE GREEN may retire from the Senate, but I know that in a real sense he never will leave the Senate. I believe his genial spirit and his sense of courtesy and fairness and justice will always dominate these Halls, and his friends will always be with him in heart wherever he may go.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I wish to join the majority leader in his salute and tribute to our very distinguished friend and colleague, the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN].

Let me say to the majority leader that I have always regarded Senator GREEN as certainly one of the most gracious individuals I have ever encountered in my life. He has been gracious on every occasion, both early and late, no matter what the circumstance, no matter what the provocation. Along with that, he has preserved great acuity and interest, which are indeed notable characteristics.

How richly we have been blessed and how this body has been enriched by his continued presence here. I value and esteem his friendship. May his days continue in great abundance, and may the new year bring him its choicest blessings.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I desire to join in the tributes which have been voiced on the Senate floor to that grand American, THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN, of Rhode Island.

Franklin D. Roosevelt once said that it mattered not whether a man was old in years if he were young in heart, because that is what really counts. THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN is young in heart. In fact, he is far more progressive and more enlightened than many who are barely half his age.

I consider it a great privilege to be able to salute THEODORE F. GREEN in person here today and to express my great admiration for his distinguished career. I wish him all possible happiness in the years ahead.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I wish to add a brief and perhaps more personal word regarding the retirement

of our colleague from Rhode Island, THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN.

I knew him first when he was Governor of Rhode Island. Following that, I knew him when he was a U.S. Senator, at the time when I was Governor of Massachusetts.

I have had many associations with him, through mutual friendships, and many occasions social in character. I have always found him to be an able and interesting conversationalist. I have always felt that if I gave him a little "dig" of a personal character or affecting his State of Rhode Island, I would get back an even better one. He has never failed me as the years have gone by.

I look forward to many more opportunities of friendly association and discussion with him. I shall miss Senator GREEN when he leaves this body, where he has been a very distinguished and honorable Member for many years.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I wish to join the distinguished Senators who have paid their tributes to our comrade of many years, THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN.

I served with Senator GREEN on the Foreign Relations Committee when he was its chairman. He always was a most courteous and level-headed presiding officer, and he did an extremely fine job.

I became acquainted with him many, many years ago, when he and I traveled far into the West to attend the funeral of a Senator. On our return on the train, I first became acquainted with this distinguished citizen of Rhode Island. Since that time there has been a close tie of friendship and understanding between us.

Of course, I realize that when this year has ended, THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN will no longer be a Senator in active service. But he will always be a Senator in another sense, and we shall always be glad to see him.

So I join with the other Senators who have spoken in paying the highest of compliments to Senator THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN, of Rhode Island.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, the distinguished senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] is a remarkable combination of many virtues: ability, integrity, love of fellow man, sense of humor. I know of nothing I could say uncomplimentary about the distinguished senior Senator from Rhode Island, even if I were sorely pressed to do so. He is beloved by all his colleagues.

When we repair to the little room where only Democratic Senators have lunch, the distinguished senior Senator from Rhode Island has a chair at the head of the table. Many a time I and others have gathered around, to partake of his wisdom, to enjoy his mirth and fellowship.

As a Member of the U.S. Senate, he has provided vigorous and progressive leadership. He has demonstrated wisdom. He has been foresighted. He has been compassionate and understanding. Never once have I heard an ill-tempered word from him; on the contrary, always he addresses himself to the merits of an

issue, and does so with a vision far greater than most of us are privileged to have.

I regret that Senator GREEN is to leave the Senate. We shall miss him greatly. We wish him Godspeed. Wherever he goes, he will take with him the love, the affection, and the best wishes of all his colleagues.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, as a very recently elected Member of the Senate, I wish to join in the kind and very true words which have been spoken by my senior colleagues with respect to the services of our good friend, the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], who has treated this new Member of the Senate with consistent courtesy, and has proffered the hand of friendship, and has guided me on many matters of important policy. His departure from the Senate will be a real personal loss to me.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I should like to join my colleagues in paying tribute to my genial neighbor from Rhode Island, Senator GREEN. It was with much regret that I noted he did not intend to run again for office as a Senator of the United States.

To all Senators he has been an example of real durability. I think there is no precedent in the history of the Senate for service such as his, since he was originally elected at the age of 70, and is retiring some 22 or 23 years later.

I certainly congratulate him upon his remarkable accomplishments, and on his outstanding service to his State and his country; and I wish him the best of good health and happiness in the years to come, which I hope may see him attain the age of 100.

Mr. MCGEE. Mr. President, I should like to add my voice to the voices of those paying tribute to the senior Senator from Rhode Island. As one of the most junior Members of this body, I think I can offer an observation to one of the most senior Members that comes from experience as well as from the heart; that is, as one newly arriving in the Senate, looking for new ideas and for inspiration, the junior Senator from Wyoming found them in the person of the senior Senator from Rhode Island. I want him to know what his young ideas have meant to a relatively young Member of this body. I pay my very deepest respects to him for his inestimable service in the Senate.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, as a Senator from a New England State and as a neighbor of the distinguished senior Senator from Rhode Island, I wish to add my voice to the voices of my colleagues in expressing my appreciation, respect, and affectionate regard for our beloved colleague from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I should like to join my colleagues in wishing good health and happiness to our friend and colleague, Senator GREEN, of Rhode Island.

To his colleagues in the Senate he is a joy and an inspiration. His example is an indication that there must be something about the air in this Chamber which gives men a zest for living and

enjoyment in dealing with the Nation's problems, if they but know how to deal with them. The Senator from Rhode Island knows how to do it. I congratulate him for his honored presence in this Chamber for so many years.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I should like to join with my colleagues in conveying best wishes to Rhode Island's first citizen, THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN.

The newspaper article which I read stated that Senator GREEN would not be a candidate for reelection this year and that his decision was reached because he felt that his health would not permit him to serve another 6-year term. For a brief time last evening I was inclined to agree with that account, because when I was driving home I saw Senator GREEN standing on a loading platform, waiting to take a street car to his place of residence, instead of walking, as he usually does. But upon reflection, I was willing to excuse him because it was then almost 7 o'clock in the evening, and I knew personally that he had started his working day very early.

Seriously, these Legislative Halls, Rhode Island, and the Nation have profited by the fact that when THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN, who was born 92 years ago, reached manhood, he decided to place his talents, energy, and ability at the disposal of the people of his State, and then of the people of the Nation.

During his service at home in Rhode Island and during his service here, he has made, as all of us so well know, a magnificent contribution to the public welfare.

I, too, wish him many more years, each of them happy and rewarding.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, it was with great regret that I read the news stories yesterday of the decision of the distinguished senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], chairman emeritus of the Committee on Foreign Relations, not to seek reelection to the Senate when his term expires this year. I had hoped and expected that he would stay with us until he reached 100 years of age. I thought that was the general understanding of all his colleagues. But he has changed his mind.

THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN is, I believe, the only man in the history of the U.S. Senate to have been honored with the title of chairman emeritus, following his retirement as chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee.

Except for the interlude of the 80th Congress in 1947-48, Senator GREEN has served on the Foreign Relations Committee since a few months after he entered the Senate in 1937. He and I have served together for the last 10 years, and it was my difficult task to succeed him as chairman last year, when, despite the unanimous protests of members of the committee, he sought relief from that exacting assignment.

When Senator GREEN retired as chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee last year, he lost not one whit of his interest in the committee or his devotion to its work. I have a particular personal debt to him for his great assistance to me and for his never-failing

readiness to relieve me in presiding over the committee and to undertake any assignments which were appropriate to the occasion.

Senator GREEN has brought to the work of the Foreign Relations Committee the wisdom which comes only from long experience, the knowledge which comes only from personal acquaintance with most of the world's statesmen, and the courage of his convictions. All of these things he has combined with a gentle yet penetrating humor which on many occasions has illuminated an issue at the same time that it has enlivened a tedious meeting.

As all of us know, Senator GREEN has traveled widely throughout the world. In fact, I believe he has traveled far more than has any other Member of the Senate, and he probably knows more of the leading citizens of the world than does any other Senator.

Senator GREEN has indefatigably sought to find out for himself. If there is any aspect of human affairs in which he is not interested, I do not know what it is. He is equally at home poking into archeological ruins in the jungles of Cambodia or discussing world politics in a European chancellery.

He has likewise been equally at home and equally successful as a college professor, as a lawyer, as a businessman, as a politician, and as an amateur wrestler.

I am sure I speak for all of my colleagues on the committee when I say we will miss Senator GREEN very much, next year; and we look forward with interest to learning which career he will choose to pursue next. Whatever it is, I am sure it will be a great success. He will take with him our wishes for every happiness.

Mr. President, I anticipate a very busy session this year, and I look forward to Senator GREEN's active assistance and participation in the work of the committee during the remainder of this Congress.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I wish to join with the other Senators who today have spoken on the subject of the retirement from this body of our beloved colleague, the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN].

I first heard about Senator GREEN's proposed retirement over the radio, the night before last. Actually, I could hardly believe that news. In fact, when I saw Senator GREEN yesterday morning, I told him that I felt that he had let me down, because 5 years ago, immediately following his last election, he had told me that he intended to serve in the Senate until he was 100 years of age; and I remember that at that time he said, "The only thing that disturbs me about doing so is that in order to serve that long, I shall have to run for election twice more, because when I finish my next term, I will be only 99."

On yesterday, I said to him that I had told many groups about that statement by him, and I had added to it, "And I will be willing to wager that he will be there, too." But now he is taking himself away.

I wish to say that one of the high-lights in my service in the Congress of

the United States has been the privilege of enjoying the friendship and the fellowship of this wonderful man.

Since he retired from the active chairmanship of the Foreign Relations Committee—in fact, Mr. President, I do not quite know what that really means, because even as chairman emeritus of the committee, he has been about as active as he was when he was the chairman of the committee—but since he has given up the responsibility of the active chairmanship of the Foreign Relations Committee, it has been my privilege to sit by him in the committee. I have enjoyed my service with him in the committee and here on the floor of the Senate, during the years I have had that privilege. And, of course, I have especially enjoyed also the privilege of his friendship.

Mr. President, there are very many other fine things that can be said about this very estimable gentleman. After all, a great many things add up the total of the wonderful, genial companion and man that Senator GREEN is.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] has referred to Senator GREEN's travels. He has traveled to many parts of the world; and some of us have had the privilege of traveling with him, as I have done. I remember that in 1951, nine members of the Foreign Relations Committee, under his chairmanship—at that time he was the senior member of the committee who took the trip, although he was not then the committee chairman—went to Europe, where we visited several of the NATO countries, and held hearings and made a study, over a protracted period of time. I had heard a great deal about Senator GREEN's stamina on trips, and I saw it manifested then. Many of us thought we were young fellows; but many a time we would seek the opportunity to take a midafternoon rest, during the heat of the day in some of those countries. But not so Senator GREEN. He was always ready and on the go.

I remember that on one occasion, when we were in the city of Athens, the weather was very warm. We had lunch that day at a yacht club; and after the lunch, we were told that it might be well for us to return to our hotels and rest during the hot part of the day, and then late in the afternoon go to the Acropolis. Most of us took that advice. But did Senator GREEN? No, Mr. President; quite the contrary. Later, when I talked with a young Foreign Service official who was accompanying Senator GREEN, he told me that Senator GREEN almost worked him to death. First of all, when returning to the city, the road led along a beautiful stretch of water; and Senator GREEN stopped there and took a swim. Then, while the others of us were resting in the cool of the hotel, Senator GREEN was out in the city, visiting some of the excavations of the ancient ruins, studying archeology.

In the late afternoon we went to the Acropolis; and as we were going up to it, we heard someone climbing behind us. When we turned around and looked back, we saw Senator GREEN rapidly climbing the hill; and the young man who was

accompanying him was several steps behind him, with his tongue virtually hanging out.

Many other stories could be told about the stamina and the durability of Senator GREEN. Much more could be said of his great interest in a host of subjects. He is a wonderful person.

I have known Senator GREEN best during the course of my service on the Foreign Relations Committee. He is a magnificent Senator and a priceless friend.

It is with genuine regret that I think of his retiring from membership in this body.

Wherever Senator GREEN goes, whatever occupation he takes up, even if he decides to get married, as the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] has suggested as a possibility—for Senator GREEN is the most eligible bachelor in the entire Senate, and perhaps in the country at large—whatever his future endeavors may be, I certainly wish for him, and I am certain this is equally true of all the other Members of this body and of all other persons who know him, many, many years of great happiness.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the Good Book tells us that when a man has lived a life span of 3 score years and 10, the time then comes when he can rest on his laurels and spend his declining years enjoying well-earned rest and retirement. It is a rare privilege to rise today to honor a man who began a completely new, vigorous, and demanding life at the time he reached 3 score years and 10. I say with confidence that the record he has made will never be duplicated in the history of this country. Now, at the age of 92, he has served 23 fruitful years in the U.S. Senate.

THEODORE GREEN has played a large part in charting our Ship of State through the most perilous periods this country has ever known. Next to the occupant of the White House and his Secretary of State, no individual has a more responsible and demanding position in regard to the external affairs of the United States than does the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. As a member or as chairman or chairman emeritus of this committee, Senator GREEN has served with three Presidents and seven Secretaries of State. The duties and responsibilities that were inherent in this position would have taxed both the physical and mental facilities of even the youngest of men. No man, regardless of age or intellect, could have done a better job than has been performed by Senator GREEN in this long period of service.

Our country is most fortunate when it has public servants whose driving motivation is based solely and alone on a passionate love and devotion for the welfare of this country. Senator GREEN is one of those rare individuals to whom emoluments of office and material gain have no attraction whatsoever. His reward could only be the self-satisfaction of a job well done and the knowledge that his efforts contributed substantially to the security, welfare, and future of this country.

When the 87th Congress convenes next January, there will be a void that will be keenly felt by every present Member of the U.S. Senate. Not only do we love and respect THEODORE GREEN, but we have learned to rely on his acumen in so many fields of legislative effort. He is an elder statesman who never became an elder. No man in public life today and few that will come tomorrow will ever deserve of their country a higher niche in the honor, adulation, and respect of all the people of these United States.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to join with my colleagues in paying a very just and much deserved tribute to the illustrious and distinguished senior Senator from Rhode Island, THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN.

Senator GREEN has been described this morning by my colleagues in most illustrative and definitive terms. The Senator from Arkansas spoke of him as a teacher, as a businessman, as a Governor, as a political leader, as a statesman, and as a wrestler—an amateur wrestler, but with the qualities of a professional. I should add. And this great man has wrestled with many a problem and, insofar as my memory recalls, he has always pinned those problems to the mat.

Senator GREEN is an example of a forever youthful spirit, not only here in the Senate, but in all his many activities. I have admired this man much, not only because of his attention to detail in the Senate, his dedication to public service, his remarkable qualities, character, and integrity, but I have admired him because he has had such a full life. He is interested in everything in God's creation.

He has always attracted great public attention, not because of some particular twist of a phrase, even though he is very capable of that, but primarily because of his wholesome activities, his diversity of interests, and the vigor and vitality with which he throws himself into these many areas of activity.

Senator GREEN is a partisan, too, and he is a good partisan. He is a real Democrat, with a capital "D" and a small "d." I know of no man who has a more progressive and liberal record in Congress, and yet he maintains the respect of persons of every political persuasion.

He has apparently no doubts, either, about his votes. I myself have many times been concerned as to how I should vote. That doubt was resolved when I looked over and heard Senator GREEN vote, with a true tone and with complete confidence and understanding and assurance. He has said either "yea" or "nay," and there has not been even a quaver in his voice when he has spoken his judgment. The trumpet is certain, not uncertain.

Though a great partisan, he has been a great public servant, and as a Governor of his State he attained the respect of other Governors, both before and after he was Governor. He was a political leader who built a political organization in the State of Rhode Island that was

the envy of political leaders in every State in the Union.

Of course, I think one of the finest demonstrations of his great leadership and qualities is a gentlemen who followed in his footsteps, the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], and I say this most sincerely and respectfully. Of course, the junior Senator from Rhode Island has his own standards and leads his own life, but he has told his colleagues and friends of his profound respect and admiration for Senator THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN.

I therefore pay my respects to this man who has decided to do something else, who has decided to turn over his place in the Senate to someone else, so that he can return to amateur wrestling, business, teaching, or whatever he desires. I know it will be something, and it will be interesting and it will be done well.

Of course, I am not sure whether he will change enough to cease being the Nation's most eligible bachelor. I know this man can adapt himself to anything. I merely wish to say to him that now, his duties as a Senator having been fulfilled, this Nation's most eligible bachelor will be more eligible than ever.

So I pay my sincere respects to a wonderful man and a fine friend. I should like in this message to extend to him the respects of one of his lady friends, Mrs. Humphrey, who thinks very well of him. On one occasion I found them both standing on a street corner, ready to get into a cab together, until I interfered. I think the fact that the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island would want to escort her is as nice a compliment as could be paid to any lady. He has done that for other ladies, but, of course, I have not told this to Mrs. Humphrey.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I rise to salute the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island, and to add my inadequate words to the tributes which have been pouring in from all over the Senate floor this morning.

First, I wish to say that I am sorry to note this depletion in the ranks of our younger Members of the Senate, because in spirit the Senator from Rhode Island has more vigor, more imagination, and more drive than any of us who are members of the so-called freshman class.

I appreciate fully that the Senator from Rhode Island is a distinguished national figure. I particularly appreciate, from the tributes which have been paid to him this morning, that he has a warm place in the hearts of his colleagues in the Senate. At the same time, I should like to claim a part of him for our common region of New England. His life, his career, and his accomplishments have a particular meaning for us in that six-State region of the country. He is a New Englander and a New England figure, radiating warmth, great capacity, humility, and deep concern in regard to the needs of New England, as well as the overriding problems of our country.

I have a personal regret, in that my service with him in the Senate will be

so brief. I have looked forward to the 8 years which the distinguished Senator from Alabama believed would be available to us of his service in the Senate, as an opportunity to learn from his great experience. I regret deeply that I shall not be able to share much longer the companionship which many of our other colleagues in the Senate have enjoyed for a long time.

Speaking for my own State of Maine and for New England as a whole, I should like the Senate to know, if there is any doubt—and I am sure there is none—that we admire Senator GREEN, we love him, and we regret his decision to terminate his service in the Senate.

Because of the fact that I come from a State which for a very long period had not elected members of my party to office, I have had to admire him, up until last year, from afar. As a Democrat I took considerable satisfaction from the fact that he was among those who led the Democratic Party in Rhode Island out of the wilderness. We undertook to emulate his fine example in the State of Maine, with some small measure of success, which I think he also enjoyed.

So I say to Senator GREEN, it is with great personal regret I note his decision to terminate his service in this great body.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, I think one of the greatest forces that is met in the experience of a Member of this body is pressure. The senior Senator from Rhode Island, in my opinion, is immune to pressure. He has proved that for 92 years.

However, now that he intends and plans to give up his membership in the Senate, I doubt if he will be quite so immune to pressure. On many occasions I have stood in amazement and listened to how he has resisted the pressure of matrimony. Now that he has shown in the Senate so many fine traits and characteristics, which many of us would like to emulate, and henceforth his duties will be less onerous and burdensome, there will be more pressure. I am sure Mrs. Humphrey is not the only person who has had designs on the senior Senator from Rhode Island. I can speak for a 17-year-old daughter who cherishes more than any other picture in her collection one she had taken on a birthday with the senior Senator from Rhode Island.

We have in our hearts a certain sadness because of his determination to retire. There is also, however, a feeling of gratefulness for the service he has performed. He will leave the duties of the senior Senator to a qualified and respected Member of this body, Mr. PASTORE.

All of us wish that the future life of the distinguished senior Senator from Rhode Island will be one of continued happiness and pleasure, and that in whatever activity he may engage after his retirement from the Senate, it will be not only statewide, but also national and international.

I am very happy for the few years I have had the pleasure of being in the body with him, for the many moments I have had at the lunch table with him,

and for the sound advice which he has so generously given.

So to you, Senator GREEN, many, many years of continued good health and happiness.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I too wish to join with other Senators in expressing my sadness and regret on hearing the announcement of the distinguished senior Senator from Rhode Island that he does not intend to be a candidate for reelection in 1960.

He is indeed a rare man—a great man—and I consider it a privilege to have the honor of serving with him throughout the sessions of the 86th Congress.

It is noteworthy, Mr. President, that the senior Senator from Rhode Island is a frequent user of the Senate gymnasium facilities, where he exercises with remarkable vigor. Whether in the gymnasium, the Senate floor, or wherever he may be approached, he is never too busy or too preoccupied to discuss a problem or offer advice to his colleagues. We hold him in the highest admiration.

Furthermore, it is noteworthy that last year, shortly after the 1st session of the 86th Congress commenced, a seminar was organized to aid newer and younger Senators of what we call the class of 1958. We would meet on Monday evenings in the Old Supreme Court Chamber and have a social hour. Following dinner, we would listen to an address by some distinguished American. The purpose of this was to help us, as Senators, to better understand the problems of the Nation and the world, so that we could serve our constituencies and the Nation more adequately.

Among the younger Senators who frequently attended those seminars was the distinguished senior Senator from Rhode Island, THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN.

His devotion to duty, his long experience in both executive and legislative office, and his unrelenting efforts in the interests of our country will be sorely missed. His achievements will be long remembered. There is no finer example of patriotism than his. In this day and age, with so much emphasis and value placed upon power and influence, he voluntarily stepped down as chairman of one of the most powerful standing committees of the Senate, despite the unanimous vote of the committee members that he remain as chairman.

If the Senator from Rhode Island cannot be prevailed upon to change his mind, I join my colleagues in expressing my sorrow at his decision, and in wishing him a happy retirement, knowing, as all of my colleagues do, that the senior Senator from Rhode Island, THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN, will always be available to the Nation for counsel and advice.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I wish to join in what I know is the unanimous feeling of regret on the part of our colleagues in the Senate at the retirement of our very esteemed, beloved, and distinguished colleague [Mr. GREEN], our alltime senior Member. His departure will be a great loss to this body.

I do not know of any man who is more universally loved, respected, and admired. The fact that he has no enemies is not due to any lack of determination

or courage, or forthrightness of expression. He has been a leader in the field of his interests. He has contributed to the information and enlightenment of his colleagues in all the discussions in which he has participated. He will be missed.

He leaves behind him a distinguished career of service which will never be forgotten, and which will be inscribed indelibly in the annals of this body.

I really do not know why the very youthful senior Senator from Rhode Island wishes to retire. A man of his years, who has retained the viewpoint and spirit of youth, ought not to take this conservative position. It is the first time I have ever known him to make such a serious error.

I know that if he were to change his mind in the next few months and decide to remain with us, his decision will be universally applauded. I hope his decision is not irrevocable. I think he will be prepared to live to be a hundred, and serve very usefully here or outside the Senate.

We love you, THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN, and we regret to see you go.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to join with the distinguished junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the leadership on both sides of the aisle, and all my other colleagues in expressing deep regret upon the announced departure from the Senate of the distinguished senior Senator from Rhode Island, the Honorable THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN.

Senator GREEN has been chairman of two of the most important committees of the Senate, the Committee on Rules and Administration, and the Committee on Foreign Relations. I am sorry to know that he is voluntarily retiring at the end of his present term, because I know his loss will be felt, the advice which he has always so generously given will be missed, and the humor which he has always displayed will be lacking. He has performed great service, not only in behalf of his State, but also in behalf of our country and the entire free world.

I express the hope that even though our distinguished and lovable colleague is retiring on a voluntary basis, he will not forget us but will come back many times to see us, so that we can partake of his wisdom and advice.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I wish to join the distinguished junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] and other Senators who have preceded me in expressing my very great pleasure at having been privileged to serve in this body with the distinguished senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], and my regret that he has announced that at the end of the current session he will not be a candidate for reelection.

It has been one of the great pleasures of my life to know a man of his character and vigor, and who has made so great a contribution to good government at home and abroad, throughout a long and useful life. I shall remember with great pleasure the privilege of serving with him here and of being with him, as the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] said, on one occasion in a

foreign land, when he was the youngest member of the group; of seeing him, as another Senator said, in the gymnasium; and in all the other fields of our activities.

I have had many contacts with him. It has been an inspiration to have served with a man who, though old in years, is young in vigor and spirit.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I desire to add my voice to the very fine tributes paid today to THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN, our distinguished colleague from Rhode Island. It was with a profound sense of regret I learned of his decision not to seek reelection.

Regardless of political affiliation, I am sure all of us are very sorry that this distinguished public servant and statesman has decided not to attempt to return to the U.S. Senate. He has served his State and our Nation with distinction, both as a State official and as a Federal official. To all his activities he has brought wisdom and sound judgment rarely equaled. He has been a particularly astute student of international affairs, and in his work as chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations he contributed substantially to this Nation's efforts to solidify the free world alliance in the cold war struggle with international communism.

It is reassuring to know that his keen intellect and sage advice will be available to the Senate throughout this session. I am confident that in the many years which lie ahead for our beloved colleague, THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN will continue to work for those causes he feels best serve the welfare of the State of Rhode Island and of the United States. He would have it no other way. All of us are the richer for having had the privilege of working with him and knowing him.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, no Member of the United States Senate is held in higher esteem by his colleagues than the distinguished and beloved senior Senator from the State of Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN]. Lawyer, educator, scholar, State legislator, successful businessman, elected and reelected chief executive of his own State, and elected to the U.S. Senate, he has served the public with distinction for many years.

THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN has carved for himself a long and unique chapter in his life of service to the people. During every moment of it he has held steadfast to the principles of good government as he saw them, and to all his work he has always brought a smile and a whimsical outlook which has delighted his colleagues and all others who have had the privilege of hearing him.

At a time when most persons would have long since been in retirement, THEODORE GREEN determined to become a candidate for the Senate; and at the age of 70 he held up his hand and commenced 22 years of honorable service here.

I have known him in the short 7 years I have served in the Senate, as an able presiding officer over the Foreign Relations Committee when I would go there and listen to the deliberations of that important group of the Senate. I have also had the honor of being associated with him as a fellow member of the dele-

gation from our country to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization parliamentary conference on three occasions, in which capacity, as here, he gained the respect of those who knew him and worked with him.

I am one more Republican to speak in praise of the record of THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN. Other Republicans may speak for themselves. Each of us may speak for himself. I am happy to join our Democratic colleagues in wishing THEODORE the best of health as he retires, looking forward, nevertheless, to his friendly counsel and his visits to the Capital of our beloved Nation again and again and again.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, like the other Members of the Senate and the hundreds of other friends and admirers of Senator THEODORE GREEN, of Rhode Island, I read the announcement of his planned retirement with deep regret.

Few men in the history of our Nation have served so actively, so capably, and so long as has Senator GREEN. His public service goes back before the turn of the century and includes military and civilian service during four wars and other periods of crisis of our Nation. His almost three-quarters of a century of service could never be completely appraised or evaluated, but I know we all can agree that Senator GREEN, throughout his public life, has treated public office as a public trust.

The confidence which the people of Rhode Island have in their senior Senator is shared with the rest of the Nation.

I sincerely regret that he is retiring from the Senate, but I am confident we will be hearing from him right along, even past the centenarian point of his life.

I hope Senator GREEN will have many more years in this world, and I hope he will continue to serve in the future as he has in the past. I know that he will do that.

Mr. LONG of Hawaii. Mr. President, I wish to join with the group of distinguished Senators who have paid tribute to Senator THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN. When I first had the privilege of coming to the National Capital to work in behalf of statehood for Hawaii, I found him to be not only courteous, but most helpful.

In the new State of Hawaii, we are rather proud of the basis on which the people of every racial group and every cultural background live. We refer to it as the spirit of aloha. I think of our distinguished colleague as one who in his thinking, in his speaking, and in every other way exemplifies that spirit. It is a privilege to pay tribute to him.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I wish to add my tribute to the many which have been bestowed upon the distinguished senior Senator from Rhode Island, Mr. THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN.

It was with great sorrow that I received the news of Senator GREEN's decision not to seek reelection to the Senate. His keen perception, outstanding foresight, and brilliant mind will be sorely missed by those of us in the Senate and by Washingtonians generally. His wisdom, character, and vigor have been demonstrated on innumerable occasions

throughout his successful career. Senator GREEN's friendship is treasured by all those who know him.

I welcome the statement by this great gentleman that his decision not to seek reelection is not equivalent to retirement from public life. I trust that his invaluable service will continue to be available to the people of Rhode Island and of the United States.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I join my colleagues in the Senate today in expressing respect and affection for Senator THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN. I became a Member of the Senate long after Senator GREEN had earned his place as the "Grand Old Man" of the Senate. But to Senator GREEN age differences have never been important. He has always been as interested in the work of a freshman Senator as of a senior Senator. From my first day in the Senate I always felt I could turn to him and receive wise advice and helpful encouragement. I count it one of my great good fortunes that I will have been in this body during 8 of the 24 years of Senator GREEN's tenure.

Senator GREEN's life spans the greatest period of change America and the world have seen. It is startling to realize that the Civil War had ended just 2 years before he was born. Great events have happened since, and Senator GREEN's career has matched those events.

In one lifetime he has done enough to satisfy the ambitions of several other men. He has been soldier, statesman, politician, lawyer, banker, teacher, philanthropist, and Senator. When he entered the Senate, he had already achieved the greatest success and honor in at least seven careers. Perhaps this helps to explain his youthful approach as a Senator, for he tackled this new challenge with all the vigor and enthusiasm of an ambitious and capable man, determined to make his mark in the world. And make his mark he did.

If the Senate was THEODORE GREEN's eighth life, and if he is limited to the proverbial cat's nine—although this seems unlikely, considering the subject—then we must look with interest and some envy to his new achievements and honors.

Mr. HENNINGS subsequently said: Mr. President, at the outset I should like to say that I regret I was called from the floor during the period of time when tributes were paid to the distinguished dean of the U.S. Senate, our beloved friend and colleague, the great Senator from Rhode Island, THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN.

I hope, at an appropriate time in the next few days, to make a more complete statement, in an effort at least partially to express some of the admiration, the affection, and the appreciation which, together with all my colleagues, I have for Senator GREEN, and to express again, as I have to him personally, my deep regret that he has come to the decision at which he has arrived.

He will always be one of us in spirit, even if he is not always with us, sitting on the floor and in committee, as he has been for these many years.

During the greater part of his life, Senator GREEN has devoted himself to

the public service, as Governor of his State, as a U.S. Senator, as a member of the board of Brown University, and in many other activities which I shall later mention.

I should like to say that I have had the opportunity and privilege of serving with him for 10 years on the Committee on Rules and Administration, and that it was when he relinquished the chairmanship of that committee that I became chairman of it. I am making every effort to follow in the path which, as chairman of that committee, he so well delineated. I have been guided and influenced and immeasurably assisted on many, many occasions by his unflinching good counsel and his expression of friendship and statesmanlike courage on so many matters which have come before that committee, this body, and the Democratic policy committee, on which I have served for 7 years with Senator GREEN. I look forward during the remainder of this year to continue to be guided and assisted by his presence and his very active participation, indeed, in the deliberations of that body as well.

Mr. CHURCH subsequently said: Mr. President, unfortunately, I was unable to be in the Chamber when, earlier today, the distinguished junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] and many other Senators joined in tributes to the beloved senior Senator from Rhode Island, the chairman emeritus of the Committee on Foreign Relations, and mentor and friend of a generation in the Senate, THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN.

But I cannot let this day pass without adding my voice to this chorus. Senator GREEN and I have had our names linked frequently since I have been here, representing as we have the two poles of chronological age in the Senate. I have been pleased and proud when this has happened. When we shared a birthday cake for the photographers once, the twinkle in his eye and the cheer of his smile made him look the younger.

I served under him on the Committee on Foreign Relations when he was its chairman, and his kindness and wisdom will be cherished by me always.

His friend, a friend of the Senate, William S. White, paid a wonderful tribute to Senator GREEN in the Washington Star today. He has spoken, I think, for all of us who have known and worked with Senator GREEN, for a long or for a short time, in characterizing him as a "combat soldier, and not a talking soldier."

We all shall miss him when he retires.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "Senator GREEN Nears Retirement," written by William S. White, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Jan. 13, 1960]

SENATOR GREEN NEARS RETIREMENT—RHODE ISLANDER LAUDED AS TRUE LIBERAL, AND YOU KNEW WHERE HE STOOD

(By William S. White)

The old, old man is going at last from the Senate.

In the 93d year of his life, Senator THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN, of Rhode Island, has announced he will not seek reelection to his fifth term because he does not feel well enough.

He is not, of course, indispensable. And a man can work only so long as strength remains. Too, his State will have no trouble in finding a replacement.

All the same, when THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN leaves, the Senate will be the poorer, in the strictly human sense, anyhow, for his departure. For, oddly, in this correspondent's time it has been mainly the very old men there who have given a special quality to the place.

There, more often than not, it is the very old who will take the greatest risks. Who are the least influenced by today's universal urge for personal security. Who are the most ready to run forward to meet the possibly menacing tomorrow. They are, again more often than not, the best of the individual men, the free and fighting spirits who make the youngsters look rather like conscientious objectors.

To be sure, the problems of the aged—which is a Nice-Nelly phrase admitting that society tends to throw the aged upon the ash heap—exist in the Senate, too. Even there, men can grow too old to go on any more—but happily it takes an awfully long time to grow that old in the Senate.

Senator GREEN at a mere 70 carried not simply a full load but a great load, as a personally aristocratic and privileged man who went all the way with the Roosevelt New Deal. Senator GREEN at a ripe 80 was tough enough and strong enough to take on one of the hardest and most thankless jobs the Senate had handed out in this century.

This was to serve on the first committee that investigated Senator Joseph R. McCarthy's charges of communism in the State Department. Nobody could hope to win in that mare's nest—nobody but, in the short run, Senator McCarthy himself. For fear and suspicion were loose in a country that had suffered great and undeniable setbacks from imperialist communism. The Nation was ready for a devil hunt; it was all there to be exploited.

But old Senator GREEN, unlike some of his committee colleagues, faced the unalterable facts with the special candor and realism of the Senate's aged men. He knew Senator McCarthy and his associates were making a bitter brew that at length would spill over on the Republicans as well—as it did when the Eisenhower administration came to power. But he knew that, first of all, Senator McCarthy was reaching for the throat not simply of President Truman and Secretary Acheson, but of the Democratic Party which Senator GREEN loved.

So, full of the self-honesty of the old Senate types, T. F. GREEN from the first moment made no pretense to an objectivity that could not exist here. From the first moment he hit Senator McCarthy with everything to which he could lay hand.

He was a true liberal, as distinguished from a knee-jerk liberal. And he was a loyal liberal, instead of a cut-and-run liberal.

He stayed with Mr. Truman in the good times, and also in the bad times. In the times, indeed, when some of the knee-jerk liberals were self-righteously rushing into print (to coin a sparkling phrase) to run out on a liberal President who had represented the views which they had always said were also their own. But this was a President who also now had the bad luck to get into trouble. So though they were just terribly, terribly liberal, they also managed to be terribly, terribly safe.

It was only the true liberals like old Senator GREEN, plus some nonliberals who believed in most but not all of what he was doing, who stood with Mr. Truman when the heavy firing about corruption and cronyism broke out.

Mr. Truman has never hated, or even much disliked, all those who had fought him from conviction, the Republicans and the ultra-conservative Democrats. But he has an unforgettable contempt for those who really agreed with his policies but prudently left the firing line when it became evident that his troops were going to be overborne.

Old Senator GREEN may have been intellectually wrong in staying in the line to the end. But he was a combat soldier, and not a talking soldier. He had guts.

Mr. MONRONEY subsequently said: Mr. President, I should like to say a few words in regard to the retirement of the distinguished senior Senator from Rhode Island, THEODORE GREEN.

Certainly a man who has managed to serve ably and well at the most advanced age a Senator has ever attained in this body has achieved a distinction; but to have served so ably and well with such great good humor, such energy, and such a desire to discharge to the fullest his responsibilities as a Senator marks him as perhaps one of the most unusual and one of the most devoted Senators it has ever been my pleasure to know.

Senators will remember that because of his advancing age and a diminishing of his faculty of sight he voluntarily called into session the great Committee on Foreign Relations, of which he had the honor to be the chairman, and announced his retirement from the chairmanship. This marked Senator GREEN, I believe, as a man who put the love and performance of duty far ahead of any personal desire for power, standing, attainment, or continued control of this very vital activity of the U.S. Senate. Knowing that he would probably later relinquish control, he wanted to help pass it on at an earlier time to younger hands, so that the younger hands could gain experience, with the passing of time, in order to properly direct the great committee.

Senator GREEN is an unselfish man, a man of great personal wit and humor and charm. He is a man whom every one of the 99 other Senators is proud to call a friend.

The only act he has performed during my long acquaintanceship with him which I did not like and approve of was to announce his voluntary retirement at the end of his present term. I should like to see him continue to serve, and I still hope perhaps he may change his mind and decide to follow the wishes of his friends and again serve in the great U.S. Senate.

He is a man whom history will record as having attained new heights in many, many ways. We will miss him deeply.

Mr. YARBOROUGH subsequently said: Mr. President, I wish to take the opportunity to associate myself with the remarks of my many colleagues who this afternoon have paid tribute to the distinguished senior Senator from Rhode Island, that unforgettably courageous and dedicated Democrat, the Honorable THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN.

Few men in the history of this Nation have had the iron will and fortitude to proudly swallow defeat after defeat at the polls and return again and again in subsequent elections until the people learned that in him they had oppor-

tunity to elect a dedicated public servant. Courage and tenacity characterized his fight to serve the people, and once he attained office, he used that same courage and tenacity almost invariably to stand on the side of the people.

In fact, it should be considered by all of us, I believe, that that same courage marks his decision of retirement, for the temptation must have been very great for him to simply return to the Senate. And there is surely no question that his millions of friends would have seen to it that he came back to Washington for as long as he wished. But as a man who had the courage to fight for what he believed in, he still has the courage to face up to the realization that his health would be further impaired by adding to his already long and great record of public service.

All of us who know what a fine, friendly, devoted, kindly, scholarly gentleman he is, all of us who have had the great benefit and pleasure of his warm friendship and support, will miss him a great deal. And our hearts go out to him for many, many more years of health and happiness.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I think my colleagues in the Senate will realize that this is an embarrassing moment for me. I have sat here and listened to descriptions purporting to be of myself, but which I could hardly recognize. I have however, found the occasion to be very pleasant.

After listening for some time I began to wonder whether or not a great mistake had been made. My mind wandered a little, and I thought of myself as lying in a coffin in front of the dais of the Presiding Officer, with my colleagues going by and dropping a flower or two as they passed.

I do not believe very much in that sort of thing. I am afraid I do not bestow compliments as often as they are deserved. Today I certainly have received them far beyond my deserts.

Various speakers have referred to incidents which I had almost forgotten, and which they recalled to my mind, much to my pleasure.

There is one impression I wish to correct. It should not be assumed that because I had said I would not be a candidate for reelection in the next election, I was retiring from public life. I do not want that impression to get abroad, especially in Rhode Island. I am ready to serve my friends the people—who really are my friends—when ever they feel that they need me.

However, because of physical infirmities which are creeping up on me in my advanced years, I do not feel that I can adequately represent, for another 6 years, my people of Rhode Island, the State of Rhode Island, or the United States of America, as I should.

I am very happy in my life here. I am very happy in the associations which have been formed. I have found them to be most stimulating, even when my colleagues have disagreed with me, which has often been the case. It has been a wonderful experience, which relatively few men can have. I am very grateful for the way my colleagues have learned to put up with the objectionable

features of their colleague in formal oratory, discussion, or conversation.

I have made many good friends. I hope I have not lost any previously made. It is a wonderful experience to be a Senator of the United States. It is an office which calls for every mark of kindness and friendship which one human being can show toward others.

I highly cherish my service in this body, for what it has done for me. Judging from what I have heard today on the floor of the Senate, it is thought by some that I have done something for my countrymen.

I am very grateful to the people of my State for having given me this privilege. I am very grateful to Almighty God, Who has kept me in good health and enabled me to take advantage of my opportunities here. I promise that the remainder of my life shall be heartily devoted to the service of the people, for at least 1 year more in the Senate, and after that just as heartily at home.

I thank my fellow Senators heartily for what they have said. Though undeserved much of it may have been, it was very pleasant to hear it. I want them to feel free at any time to call on me for any service I can render them, or which they think I can render them, and to forgive anything I may have said or done in the past to which they have taken exception.

Again thanks to all of them for what they have said this morning, in addition to what they have been to me in the years past. [Applause, Senators rising.]

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

REPORT OF FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE CORPORATION

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation for 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT ON PUERTO RICAN HURRICANE RELIEF LOANS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, reporting, pursuant to law, on Puerto Rican hurricane relief loans; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

STATISTICAL SUPPLEMENT TO STOCKPILE REPORT

A letter from the Director, Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a secret statistical supplement to stockpile report for the period ending June 30, 1959 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Board for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT OF GEORGETOWN BARGE, DOCK, ELEVATOR & RAILWAY CO.

A letter from the president, Georgetown Barge, Dock, Elevator & Railway Co., Baltimore, Md., reporting, pursuant to law, on activities of that company for the calendar

year of 1959; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT OF VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the activities of that Administration for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

REPORT PRIOR TO RESTORATION OF BALANCES, BUREAU OF CUSTOMS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Bureau of Customs covering restoration of balances withdrawn from appropriation and fund accounts in that Bureau (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AUDIT REPORT ON EVANSTON COMMODITY OFFICE, COMMODITY STABILIZATION SERVICE

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on Commodity Credit Corporation activities, Evanston Commodity Office, Commodity Stabilization Service, Department of Agriculture, fiscal year 1958 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON DISPOSAL OF FOREIGN EXCESS PROPERTY, VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Administration on its activities in the disposal of foreign excess property, for the period January 1, 1959, through December 31, 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

RULES AND REGULATIONS RELATING TO BOATING

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of the rules and regulations published in the Federal Register, dated December 29, 1959, relating to boating (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 4248, TITLE 18, UNITED STATES CODE, RELATING TO TERMINATION OF CUSTODY OF CERTAIN PRISONERS

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 4248 of title 18, United States Code, relating to the termination of custody of mentally incompetent prisoners (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AUDIT REPORT OF RESERVE OFFICERS' ASSOCIATION OF THE UNITED STATES, INC.

A letter from the executive director, Reserve Officers' Association of the United States, Inc., Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report of that association, dated March 31, 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON EXTENSION OF NATIONAL SYSTEM OF INTERSTATE AND DEFENSE HIGHWAYS WITHIN ALASKA AND HAWAII

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the extension of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways within Alaska and Hawaii, dated January 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORT OF PERMANENT COMMITTEE FOR THE OLIVER HOLMES DEVISE

A letter from the chairman, Permanent Committee for the Oliver Wendell Holmes Devise, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that committee, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of American Samoa; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

"Concurrent resolution requesting the Congress of the United States of America to enact organic legislation establishing a civil government for our country

"Whereas our people expressed a keen desire for organic legislation in a petition signed by all our leaders, the matais of Tutuila and Manu's, at a general assembly held in 1945 at Gagamoe, a historical meeting place of our people; and

"Whereas a committee consisting of the Secretary of State, the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of the Interior, recommended to the President of the United States in 1947 the enactment of organic legislation for our territory as a step toward the fulfillment of the obligation assumed by the United States under article 73 of the United Nations Charter; and

"Whereas in 1949 the Department of the Interior, with the strong support of the President of the United States, recommended immediate enactment of organic legislation for our country in order to extend to us U.S. citizenship, a bill of rights, local legislative powers, an independent judiciary, and a representation by a Resident Commissioner in the U.S. Congress; and

"Whereas we firmly believe that the enactment of organic legislation for American Samoa is the most effective and satisfactory way to discharge the responsibility of the United States under the United Nations Charter and to maintain fully its traditional role as the champion among nations of dependent people, of representative government, of justice under law, and of fundamental rights and human freedoms for everyone everywhere; and

"Whereas with respect to organic legislation, it is the policy of the Department of the Interior to support such legislation when our people desire it and are ready for it, and our people, through their duly elected representatives, are asking for such legislation, believing firmly that our people are ready to begin their God-given right to make their own local laws; and

"Whereas the enactment of organic legislation for our country will not only furnish our people the fruits of democracy but will also serve notice to all nations in the Pacific Ocean area that the right of self-determination and freedom from oppression are granted by the Constitution of the United States by acts as well as by words; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Sixth Legislature of the Territory of American Samoa (the Senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States of America be, and it is hereby, respectfully requested to enact H.R. 4500, introduced in the House of Representatives of the 81st Congress of the United States of America, as the same will be amended by the Sixth Legislature of the Territory of American Samoa and approved by a convention of the people of American Samoa called for that purpose; and be it further

Resolved, That duly certified copies of this concurrent resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States of America, to the President of the Senate and Speaker of the House of Representatives of the 86th Congress, to the chairman of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, to the chairman of the Senate Committee on

Interior and Insular Affairs, to the Secretary of the Interior, and to the Governor of American Samoa."

Two petitions, signed by Thomas Hugh Latimer, executive vice president, Free World Committee, Chicago, Ill., relating to Communist domination of independent people; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The petition of H. Joseph Mahoney, of Bronxville, N.Y., praying for the adoption of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 106) expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the recognition of the grave of Samuel Wilson, progenitor of the symbol "Uncle Sam"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

RESOLUTION OF BOARD OF TRUSTEES, FREE SYNAGOGUE, FLUSHING, N.Y.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the board of trustees of the Free Synagogue, of Flushing, N.Y., relating to the defacement of synagogue property.

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

The board of trustees of the Free Synagogue, of Flushing, N.Y., at its regular meeting held at the community house of the synagogue last evening, January 4, 1960, unanimously adopted the following motion concerning the recent defacement of synagogue property with symbols of religious bigotry:

1. The board registers its indignation and dismay at the recent defacement of the property of the Free Synagogue of Flushing, as well as other houses of Jewish worship and Jewish institutions in the city and elsewhere, with swastikas, the infamous symbol of religious bigotry and hateful intolerance;
2. Approves and applauds the prompt and determined efforts of the mayor of the city of New York in activating the forces of law and order and religious amity to detect and prosecute the perpetrators of these foul acts of ignorance and intolerance; and
3. Pledge themselves, collectively and individually to do all within their power to aid and cooperate in all lawful efforts to prevent the recurrence of such incidents of infamy.

RESOLUTION OF TOWN BOARD OF SOUTHOLD, N.Y.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Town Board of Southold, N.Y., relating to an infestation of the golden nematode.

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

Whereas the Town Board of the Town of Southold, Suffolk County, N.Y., being apprised of the increase of golden nematode infestation of the farmland of Southold Town and also in the farmland of other towns of Suffolk County, and furthermore, that this infestation poses a serious threat to the economy and well-being of the residents of Southold Town and the other towns of Suffolk County: Be it

Resolved, That the Town Board of the Town of Southold does strongly urge that the State of New York and the U.S. Government, not only continue the present program for the control and eradication of

the golden nematode but also expand and expedite this program so that this serious threat to the agriculture of this area as well as the whole Nation may be speedily and permanently eliminated; furthermore be it

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to Assemblyman Irving Price and State Senator Elisha Barrett, Congressman Stuyvesant Wainwright and U.S. Senators Kenneth Keating and Jacob Javits, and also to the Board of Supervisors of Suffolk County so that the rest of the towns of the county may be apprised of the serious situation and take appropriate action.

RESOLUTION OF BOARD OF EDUCATION, WYANDANCH, N.Y.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the board of education, Union Free School District No. 9, of Wyandanch, N.Y., relating to aid to education.

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

Whereas too much of the cost of education is now on the shoulders of the local homeowners;

Whereas any new scheme of local taxation, such as local sales taxes, will only increase the burden on homeowners with large families, families with small incomes, etc.; and

Whereas such plans will lessen the sense of responsibility on the part of the State government and Federal Government toward contributing a fair share of the cost of education: Be it therefore

Resolved, That the Legislature of the State of New York increase State aid to at least \$409 per pupil.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

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

H.R. 5887. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to place ground, powdered, or granulated seaweeds on the free list (Rept. No. 1020);

H.R. 6132. An act relating to the rate of tax on the issuance of shares or certificates of stock by regulated investment companies (Rept. No. 1021); and

H.R. 7456. An act to extend for 3 years the suspension of duty on imports of casein (Rept. No. 1022).

INVESTIGATION OF NATIONAL PENITENTIARIES

Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 226) providing for an investigation of national penitentiaries, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate to examine, investigate, and inspect national penitentiaries.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1960, to January 31, 1961, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems ad-

visible; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1961.

Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$5,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF CERTAIN COMMITTEE PRINTS RELATING TO DEVELOPMENTS IN MILITARY TECHNOLOGY AND FOREIGN POLICY IN AFRICA

Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 227) to print for the use of the Committee on Foreign Relations copies of certain committee prints relating to developments in military technology and foreign policy in Africa, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Foreign Relations 3,000 additional copies of the committee print "Developments in Military Technology and Their Impact on United States Strategy and Foreign Policy," and 3,000 additional copies of the committee print United States Foreign Policy "Africa," issued by the Committee on Foreign Relations during the Eighty-sixth Congress, first session.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF CERTAIN COMMITTEE PRINTS RELATING TO FOREIGN POLICY ON ASIA AND WESTERN EUROPE

Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 228) to print for the use of the Committee on Foreign Relations copies of certain committee prints relating to foreign policy on Asia and Western Europe, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Foreign Relations 3,000 additional copies of the committee print United States Foreign Policy, "Asia," and 1,000 additional copies of the committee print United States Foreign Policy, "Western Europe," issued by the Committee on Foreign Relations during the Eighty-sixth Congress, first session.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF CERTAIN COMMITTEE PRINTS RELATING TO FOREIGN POLICY ON WORLDWIDE AND DOMESTIC ECONOMIC PROBLEMS AND THEIR IMPACT ON THE FOREIGN POLICY OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, reported an

original resolution (S. Res. 229) to print for the use of the Committee on Foreign Relations copies of certain committee prints relating to foreign policy on worldwide and domestic economic problems and their impact on the foreign policy of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Foreign Relations 3,000 additional copies of the committee print "Worldwide and Domestic Economic Problems and Their Impact on the Foreign Policy of the United States," 2,000 additional copies of the committee print "Possible Nonmilitary Scientific Developments and Their Potential Impact on Foreign Policy Problems of the United States," and 2,000 additional copies of the committee print "Basic Aims of United States Foreign Policy," all issued by the Committee on Foreign Relations during the Eighty-sixth Congress, first session.

STUDY OF FEDERAL JUDICIAL SYSTEM

Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 231) authorizing a study of the Federal judicial system, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to conduct a further study and examination of the Federal judicial system with a view to determining the legislative or other measures, if any, which may be necessary or desirable in order to increase the efficiency of the Federal courts in justly and expeditiously adjudicating or determining the cases, controversies, and other matters which may be brought before them.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1960, to January 31, 1961, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than \$1,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1961.

Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$150,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon voucher approved by the chairman of the committee.

INVESTIGATION OF JUVENILE DELINQUENCY IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original

resolution (S. Res. 232) to investigate juvenile delinquency in the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134 (a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to juvenile delinquency in the United States, including (a) the extent and character of juvenile delinquency in the United States and its causes and contributing factors; (b) the adequacy of existing provisions of law, including chapters 402 and 403 of title 18 of the United States Code, in dealing with youthful offenders of Federal laws; (c) sentences imposed on, or other correctional action taken with respect to, youthful offenders by Federal courts; and (d) the extent to which juveniles are violating Federal laws relating to the sale or use of narcotics.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, from February 1, 1960, to January 31, 1961, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ, upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than \$1,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1961.

Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$150,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

STUDY OF MATTERS PERTAINING TO CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS

Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 233) authorizing a study of matters pertaining to constitutional rights, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to constitutional rights.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1960, to January 31, 1961, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected

shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than \$1,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1961.

Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$140,000 shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

STUDY OF ADMINISTRATIVE PRACTICE AND PROCEDURE IN GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES

Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 234) authorizing a study of administrative practice and procedure in Government departments and agencies, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to make a full and complete study and investigation of administrative practice and procedure within the departments and agencies of the United States in the exercise of their rulemaking, licensing, and adjudicatory functions, including a study of the effectiveness of the Administrative Procedure Act, with a view to determining whether additional legislation is required to provide for the fair, impartial, and effective performance of such functions.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1960, to January 31, 1961, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than \$1,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1961.

Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$115,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

INVESTIGATION OF PROBLEMS OF CERTAIN FOREIGN COUNTRIES ARISING FROM FLOW OF ESCAPEES AND REFUGEES FROM COMMUNIST TYRANNY

Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 235) to investigate problems of certain foreign countries arising from flow of escapees and refugees from Communist tyranny, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to the problems in certain Western European nations, and in certain Near Eastern, Middle Eastern, and Far Eastern countries, created by the flow of escapees and refugees from Communist tyranny.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee from February 1, 1960, to January 31, 1961, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ on a temporary basis technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than \$1,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for such legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1961.

Sec. 4. The expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$25,000 shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate by vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

INVESTIGATION OF ADMINISTRATION OF THE TRADING WITH THE ENEMY ACT

Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 236) to investigate the administration of the Trading With the Enemy Act, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under section 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to conduct a further examination and review of the administration of the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended, and also the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, and consider bills affecting said Acts.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, from February 1, 1960, to January 31, 1961, inclusive, is authorized

to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than \$1,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1961.

Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$65,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon voucher approved by the chairman of the committee.

INVESTIGATION OF MATTERS PERTAINING TO IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 237) to investigate matters pertaining to immigration and naturalization, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to immigration and naturalization.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1960, to January 31, 1961, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than \$1,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1961.

Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$116,000 shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

INVESTIGATION OF ANTITRUST AND MONOPOLY LAWS

Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 238) authorizing an

investigation of the antitrust and monopoly laws of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134 (a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to make a complete, comprehensive, and continuing study and investigation of the antitrust and antimonopoly laws of the United States and their administration, interpretation, operation, enforcement, and effect, and to determine and from time to time redetermine the nature and extent of any legislation which may be necessary or desirable for—

(1) clarification of existing law to eliminate conflicts and uncertainties where necessary;

(2) improvement of the administration and enforcement of existing laws;

(3) supplementation of existing law to provide any additional substantive, procedural, or organizational legislation which may be needed for the attainment of the fundamental objects of the laws and the efficient administration and enforcement thereof.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1960, to January 31, 1961, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than \$1,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1961.

Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$425,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

STUDY OF MATTERS PERTAINING TO CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS

Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 239) authorizing a study of matters pertaining to constitutional amendments, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to constitutional amendments.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1960, to January 31, 1961, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems ad-

visable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That, if more than one counsel is employed, the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than \$1,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1961.

Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$25,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the Chairman of the Committee.

INVESTIGATION OF ADMINISTRATION OF PATENT OFFICE

Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 240) authorizing an investigation of the administration of the Patent Office, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to conduct a full and complete examination and review of the administration of the Patent Office and a complete examination and review of the statutes relating to patents, trademarks, and copyrights.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1960, to January 31, 1961, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than \$1,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1961.

Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$135,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

STUDY OF MATTERS PERTAINING TO REVISION AND CODIFICATION OF STATUTES OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original

resolution (S. Res. 241) authorizing a study of matters pertaining to the revision and codification of the statutes of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to revision and codification of the statutes of the United States.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1960, to January 31, 1961, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That if more than one counsel is employed, the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than \$1,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1961.

Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$25,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

INVESTIGATION OF ADMINISTRATION OF NATIONAL SECURITY LAW AND MATTERS RELATING TO ESPIONAGE

Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 242) authorizing an investigation of the administration of the national security law and matters relating to espionage, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, insofar as they relate to the authority of the committee hereunder, to make a complete and continuing study and investigation of (1) the administration, operation, and enforcement of the Internal Security Act of 1950, as amended; (2) the administration, operation, and enforcement of other laws relating to espionage, sabotage, and the protection of the internal security of the United States; and (3) the extent, nature, and effect of subversive activities in the United States, its Territories and possessions, including, but not limited to, espionage, sabotage, and infiltration by persons who are or may be under the domination of the foreign government or organizations controlling the world Communist movement

or any other movement seeking to overthrow the Government of the United States by force and violence.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, from February 1, 1960, to January 31, 1961, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than \$1,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 3. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$239,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. COTTON (for himself and Mr. BRIDGES):

S. 2789. A bill to amend the effective date of section 2(b) of Public Law 86-376 relating to, *inter alia*, subchapter S of the 1954 Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. GOLDWATER:

S. 2790. A bill for the relief of Ritsuko Mori (Susan Belinda Luther); and

S. 2791. A bill for the relief of Yukio Nobuta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BIBLE:

S. 2792. A bill for the relief of Luigia Mion; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAVITS:

S. 2793. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Finance.

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

By Mr. EASTLAND:

S. 2794. A bill for the relief of Chin Hee; and

S. 2795. A bill for the relief of Georgios Tzotzolas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 2796. A bill to provide for the adoption in the Nation's Capital of the practice common to many other cities in the United States with regard to cultural activities by depositing in a special fund 1 mill out of each \$1 of tax revenue of the government of the District of Columbia to be used for the National Symphony Orchestra, the Corcoran Gallery of Art, and other nonprofit art programs of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, by amending the act of April 29, 1942; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

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

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 2797. A bill to increase and extend the special milk program; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 2798. A bill for the relief of MiJo (Mike) Sipusic; and

S. 2799. A bill for the relief of Santo Scardina; to the Committee on the Judiciary. (See the remarks of Mr. WILEY when he introduced the first above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware:

S. 2800. A bill to provide for the appointment by the Postmaster General of postmasters at first-, second-, and third-class post offices; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

S. 2801. A bill to authorize and direct the conveyance of certain tracts of land in Marengo County, Ala., to the Greif Bros. Cooperage Corp.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 2802. A bill to provide for a comprehensive study of the disposition of claims for just compensation for persons affected by the acquisition of property by the United States or under Federal programs through condemnation proceedings or otherwise; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. RANDOLPH (for himself, Mr. BRIDGES, and Mr. BYRD of West Virginia):

S. 2803. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for voluntary apprenticeship in the District of Columbia"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

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

By Mr. MURRAY (by request):

S. 2804. A bill to donate to the Keweenaw Bay Indian Tribe, L'Anse Reservation of Michigan, a certain tract of Federal land with improvements located thereon; and

S. 2805. A bill to amend the act of July 1, 1932 (47 Stat. 564, 25 U.S.C. 386a), relating to the adjustment or cancellation of Indian debts; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HAYDEN:

S. 2806. A bill to revise the boundaries of the Coronado National Memorial and to authorize the repair and maintenance of an access road thereto, in the State of Arizona, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ELLENDER (by request):

S. 2807. A bill to amend the Commodity Exchange Act, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. JACKSON:

S. 2808. A bill for the relief of Shao Fong Sha; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

S.J. Res. 148. Joint resolution to authorize the President of the United States to confer a medal on Dr. Thomas Anthony Dooley III; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

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

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF PART I OF HEARINGS ON INQUIRY INTO SATELLITE AND MISSILE PROGRAMS.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 80); which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring). That there be printed for the use of the Committee on

Armed Services one thousand additional copies of part I of the hearings held by that committee on an inquiry into the satellite and missile programs.

RESOLUTIONS

ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. SPARKMAN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 225), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved. That the Select Committee on Small Business, in carrying out the duties imposed upon it by Senate Resolution 58, Eighty-first Congress, agreed to February 20, 1950, and Senate Resolution 272, Eighty-first Congress, agreed to May 26, 1950, is authorized to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of the problems of American small and independent business and to make recommendations concerning those problems to the appropriate legislative committees of the Senate.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1960, to January 31, 1961, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1961.

Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$125,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

INVESTIGATION OF NATIONAL PENITENTIARIES

Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 226) providing for an investigation of national penitentiaries, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

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

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF CERTAIN COMMITTEE PRINTS RELATING TO DEVELOPMENTS IN MILITARY TECHNOLOGY AND FOREIGN POLICY IN AFRICA

Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 227) to print for the use of the Committee on Foreign Relations copies of certain committee prints relating to developments in military technology and foreign policy in Africa, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

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

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF CERTAIN COMMITTEE PRINTS RELATING TO FOREIGN POLICY ON ASIA AND WESTERN EUROPE

Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 228) to print for the use of the Committee on Foreign Relations copies of certain committee prints relating to foreign policy on Asia and Western Europe, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

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

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF CERTAIN COMMITTEE PRINTS RELATING TO FOREIGN POLICY ON WORLDWIDE AND DOMESTIC ECONOMIC PROBLEMS AND THEIR IMPACT ON THE FOREIGN POLICY OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 229) to print for the use of the Committee on Foreign Relations copies of certain committee prints relating to foreign policy on worldwide and domestic economic problems and their impact on the foreign policy of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

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

INVESTIGATION OF CERTAIN MATTERS BY COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. MURRAY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 230), which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

Resolved, That the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to—

- (1) minerals, materials, and fuels;
- (2) irrigation, reclamation, and power development;
- (3) public lands;
- (4) Indians;
- (5) Territories and insular affairs.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1960, to January 31, 1961, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than \$1,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the

departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 3. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution which shall not exceed \$200,000 shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

STUDY OF FEDERAL JUDICIAL SYSTEM

Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 231) authorizing a study of the Federal judicial system, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

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

INVESTIGATION OF JUVENILE DELINQUENCY IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 232) to investigate juvenile delinquency in the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

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

STUDY OF MATTERS PERTAINING TO CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS

Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 233) authorizing a study of matters pertaining to constitutional rights, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

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

STUDY OF ADMINISTRATIVE PRACTICE AND PROCEDURE IN GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES

Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 234) authorizing a study of administrative practice and procedure in Government departments and agencies, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

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

INVESTIGATION OF PROBLEMS OF CERTAIN FOREIGN COUNTRIES ARISING FROM FLOW OF ESCAPEES AND REFUGEES FROM COMMUNIST TYRANNY

Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original

resolution (S. Res. 235) to investigate problems of certain foreign countries arising from flow of escapees and refugees from Communist tyranny, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

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

INVESTIGATION OF THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE TRADING WITH THE ENEMY ACT

Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 236) to investigate the administration of the Trading With the Enemy Act, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

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

INVESTIGATION OF MATTERS PERTAINING TO IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 237) to investigate matters pertaining to immigration and naturalization, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

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

INVESTIGATION OF ANTITRUST AND MONOPOLY LAWS

Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 238) authorizing an investigation of the antitrust and monopoly laws of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

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

STUDY OF MATTERS PERTAINING TO CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS

Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 239) authorizing a study of matters pertaining to constitutional amendments, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

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

INVESTIGATION OF ADMINISTRATION OF PATENT OFFICE

Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original

resolution (S. Res. 240) authorizing an investigation of the administration of the Patent Office, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

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

STUDY OF MATTERS PERTAINING TO REVISION AND CODIFICATION OF STATUTES OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 241) authorizing a study of matters pertaining to the revision and codification of the statutes of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

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

INVESTIGATION OF ADMINISTRATION OF NATIONAL SECURITY LAWS AND MATTERS RELATING TO ESPIONAGE

Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 242) authorizing an investigation of the administration of the national security law and matters relating to espionage, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

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

REMOVAL OF LIMITATION ON INCOME UNDER SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to remove the earnings limitations on the amount of outside income an individual may earn while receiving social security benefits.

Mr. President, I point out this is a bill with regard to which the late Senator Langer, our dear departed colleague, was the principal sponsor and I was a co-sponsor. In a sense, I am picking up the torch from the place where the late Senator Langer because of an act of divine providence laid it for someone else to pick up and run with.

At the present time, women over 62 years of age and men over 65 do not receive full benefits under the old-age and survivors section of the Social Security Act if they earn more than \$1,200 annually, or more than \$100 in any month, until they reach the age of 72 when the earnings limitation no longer applies.

In order that this important amendment to the Social Security Act which was previously introduced by our distin-

guished former colleague, the late Senator Langer, may be actively pursued in this body during the current session, I am submitting it this year. The House Ways and Means Committee is reported to be scheduling early consideration of social security amendments and this bill, introduced in the other body by several Representatives, is pending before it so that there is every reason to hope for action on it in the near future.

The Social Security Administration estimates that 2 million persons would benefit if this amendment were adopted. That is the approximate number of individuals who, although they or another wage-earning member of their family have already contributed the full amount required by law, are not receiving their full social security payments because either by choice or, more likely, by necessity, they are continuing to work full or part-time. They get a sum below the average annual payment of about \$850 which is received by the social security beneficiaries or their dependents who are fully retired.

If an individual's wages exceed the modest annual figure of \$2,080, he is not eligible to receive a single dollar in social security payments despite the fact that he is paid up in full under the system until he attains the age of 72.

In view of the impact of inflation on our economy resulting in a marked increase in the cost of such basic items as food costs, rent, clothing, and particularly hospitalization and medical care which are of special concern to older age groups, the present earnings limitations under social security are unrealistic and impose a severe hardship on many of our senior citizens who continue to contribute their talents and service to U.S. business and industry.

By adopting this proposed amendment, the Congress would be removing an inequitable provision of the Social Security Act and at the same time be taking full cognizance of the needs of our older citizens who have devoted their working lives to the upbuilding of our Nation and its economy.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2793) to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits thereunder, introduced by Mr. JAVITS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

CULTURAL ACTIVITIES IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide that 1 mill out of each \$1 of tax revenue of the government of the District of Columbia be set aside in a special fund to be used by the Recreation Board for the District of Columbia to defray in part the expenses of the National Symphony Orchestra, the Cor-

coran Gallery of Art, and other nonprofit art and cultural programs of the District.

There can be no doubt that the city of Washington is truly one of the most beautiful in the entire world. All who come here are impressed by the city's lovely tree-lined streets, beautiful parks, and its public buildings.

Throughout my service in the Senate, I have consistently supported measures to improve the city of Washington and to make it an even more beautiful and pleasant city in which to live. I shall continue to support such programs because I believe it is in the best interest not only of the city of Washington but the United States itself. After all, Washington is a picture window through which the people of other nations look and draw their judgments about America. Washington should represent the artistic and cultural aspirations of the American people.

Unfortunately, all too little has been done to promote the arts in the Nation's Capital. I was most interested in the study prepared last year by the Library of Congress for Representative HARRIS B. McDOWELL, of Delaware, which revealed that Washington's budget has allotted for civic cultural event only \$16,000—of which about \$10,000 helps to support the Watergate concerts. As compared with Washington, New York spends \$2,600,000, Philadelphia \$824,000, and Baltimore \$448,000. The small city of Hagerstown, Md., only a short distance from the Nation's Capital, gives its Museum of Fine Arts \$12,500 out of its regular annual budget—only \$3,500 less than the entire amount that Washington spends out of its more than \$200 million budget.

To date, the promotion and financing of opera, ballet, orchestras, and theaters has been left primarily up to the citizens of Washington itself. Precious little has been given by the District Government to promote the arts. If any city in the United States should be spending money to promote the arts, it should certainly be Washington, the Capital of the United States. I, therefore, believe it is time that Washington join with other cities of our great country to promote the arts by providing that at least a small portion of tax revenue go for such programs.

Under my bill, 1 mill out of every dollar of tax revenue of the District of Columbia, would be deposited in a special fund in the Treasury of the United States. The money in such fund would be made available to the Recreation Board for the District of Columbia to help in defraying at least in part the expenses of the National Symphony Orchestra, the Corcoran Gallery of Art, and other nonprofit art programs.

We can be proud of our fine National Symphony Orchestra and of the Corcoran Gallery of Art, but we in the Congress can take little pride in the fact that we as the City Council of Washington have done precious little to promote these institutions and other cultural programs of the District. We have an obligation to join with the citizens of the District to give financial support for the fine arts of Washington.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the study made by the Library of Congress at the request of Representa-

tive McDOWELL, to which I have referred, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

EXHIBIT A

Municipal financial support of certain artistic and cultural activities in selected U.S. cities, a compilation of answers to a questionnaire

City	Amount of municipal financial support	Source of municipal financial support ¹	Type of activity supported
Akron, Ohio	\$36,000 \$5,000,000	General fund (indirect support in lieu of tax for facility). Direct tax construction cost.	Art museum. Plans for the construction of a municipal auditorium and "cultural grouping for arts, library and arena."
Atlanta, Ga.	1 or 3 parts of a \$100,000 recreation program. \$7,500 \$6,000 \$288,000 \$5,000 \$10,000	General fund (part of "recreation program") do do do do	Band concerts. Atlanta Symphony Guild. Atlanta Pops Concert. Municipal Theater Under-the-Stars. Atlanta Art Association for Benefit High Museum and School of Art.
Baltimore, Md.	1959 appropriations: \$25,594 \$119,994 \$288,000 \$15,000	do do Endowment funds (estimated income) General funds (pensions)	Municipal Museum. Bureau of Music. Walters Art Gallery.
Birmingham, Ala.	\$90,000 (this year's appropriation)	General funds	Birmingham Museum of Art
Buffalo, N.Y.	Appropriated in 1958-59: \$73,430 \$30,000 \$27,300	Real estate tax and other current revenues do do	Albright Art Gallery. Buffalo Philharmonic Orchestra Society, Inc. Kleinhans Music Hall.
Chicago, Ill.	Calendar year 1958: \$232,405.87 \$232,369.11 \$232,405.92	Payments from Chicago Park District, an independent municipal corporation in the city of Chicago. do do	Art Institute of Chicago. Museum of Science and Industry. Chicago Natural History Museum (field museum). Fine Arts Museum;
Dallas, Tex.	\$80,000	General revenues, "the major part of which is ad valorem tax."	Arts Commission.
Detroit, Mich.	1959-60 gross appropriation, \$543,081	Local taxes, grants and gifts, and revenues	Evansville Museum of Arts and Sciences.
Evansville, Ind.	1959 contribution, \$9,200 Proposed budget for 1960, \$18,400 1959 contribution, \$9,200 Proposed budget for 1960, \$18,400	Civil City of Evansville School City of Evansville ¹	Do.
Hagerstown, Md.	\$12,500 (provided for in annual budget)	General revenues	Washington County Museum of Fine Arts.
Houston, Tex.	\$19,500 \$20,000 \$3,000 \$25,000	do do do do	Museum of Natural History. Museum of Fine Arts. Civic Theatre. Houston Symphony.
Kansas City, Mo.	For fiscal year ended Apr. 30, 1959: \$21,211 \$9,925 \$42,830 \$48,231 \$33,592	General fund; park funds General fund General debt and interest fund General fund do do	Nelson Art Gallery (buildings and ground maintenance). Philharmonic Orchestra (free rent). Starlight Theater (debt service for facility developed by park department). Museum (buildings and ground maintenance). Liberty Memorial (operation and maintenance). Department of municipal art; bureau of music. Newark Museum.
Los Angeles, Calif.	Appropriation for fiscal 1959-60: \$196,998	Tax and general revenues	Delgado Museum of Art.
Newark, N.J.	1959 appropriation: \$525,426	Appropriated by city	New Orleans Philharmonic Society. New Orleans Opera House Association. Crescent City Concerts. Metropolitan Museum of Art.
New Orleans, La.	\$40,000 annually Appropriated "this year": \$5,000 \$2,500 \$875	do do do do	Do.
New York, N.Y.	\$944,525 (operating budget, July 1, 1959, to June 30, 1960). \$904,989 (capital budget, Jan. 1, 1959, to Dec. 31, 1959). \$1,329,559 (operating budget, July 1, 1959, to June 30, 1960). \$1,071,985 (capital budget, Jan. 1, 1959, to Dec. 31, 1959). \$125,140 (operating budget, July 1, 1959, to June 30, 1960). \$95,866 (operating budget, July 1, 1959, to June 30, 1960). \$69,510 (capital budget, Jan. 1, 1959, to Dec. 31, 1959). \$127,000 (operating budget, July 1, 1959, to June 30, 1960). \$50,250 (capital budget, Jan. 1, 1959, to Dec. 31, 1959).	Tax levy and general fund revenues Capital allocations Tax levy and general fund revenues Capital allocations Tax levy and general fund revenues do Capital allocations Tax levy and general fund revenues Capital allocations	Do. American Museum of Natural History. Brooklyn Institute of Arts and Children's Museum. Brooklyn Institute of Brooklyn Academy of Music. Do. Museum of the City of New York.
Norfolk, Va.	\$2,000 \$69,083	General revenue do	Norfolk Symphony Orchestra. Norfolk Museum of Arts and Sciences.
Oakland, Calif.	1958-59: Salaries for a professional staff of 6 plus \$2,000 allowance for books and \$500 for pictures. \$70,377 \$57,212 \$31,577	Annual appropriations by city council to library department from which library and museums commission adopts an operating budget. do do do	Art and pictures department of main library. Oakland Public Museum. Art Museum. Snow Museum.
Philadelphia, Pa.	\$25,000 \$75,000 \$25,000 \$624,760 \$30,000 \$10,000 \$35,000 (1959)	General revenues do do do do do	Academy of Fine Arts. Robin Hood Dell. Philadelphia Grand Opera. Philadelphia Art Museum and Rodin Museum. Johnson paintings. Philadelphia Art Festival (every 2 years). Pittsburgh Symphony.
Pittsburgh, Pa.	\$20,000 to \$30,000 (annually) \$25,000 (approximate cost to city annually)	General revenues (through specific appropriations each year). do	Free summer band concerts. Arts and Crafts Center.
Providence, R.I.	Current appropriations: \$24,877 \$1,500	General revenue do	Museum in Roger William Park. Band concerts.
Reading, Pa.	\$140,000 (approximate expenditures for 1959)	General revenues (budgeted annually according to estimated needs). do	Recreation Bureau sponsors orchestra, Nature Museum, etc.). Bureau of parks weekly band concerts. Valentine Museum.
Richmond, Va.	\$3,028 (1959) \$5,000	Direct appropriation	

¹ City budget for 1960 based on 1 cent per \$100 valuation of the city. Funds provided by taxes earmarked for this specific purpose.

EXHIBIT A—Continued

Municipal financial support of certain artistic and cultural activities in selected U.S. cities, a compilation of answers to a questionnaire—Con.

City	Amount of municipal financial support	Source of municipal financial support	Type of activity supported
Rochester, N.Y.	1959-60 expenditures: \$10,000 \$20,000 Not indicated	General revenues or real estate taxes do Not indicated	Civic Music Association, "Opera Under the Stars," Museum.
Sacramento, Calif.	1959-60 budget amounts: \$4,500 \$4,000 \$66,866 \$17,000	General ad valorem taxes do do do	Philharmonic Orchestra. Park band concerts. Crocker Art Gallery (city-owned). Children's art and dancing classes (city recreation department).
St. Louis, Mo.	1958 Revenue: \$320,007.53	Permanent levy of \$0.02 per \$100 valuation on all real and personal property (established under State law in 1907).	St. Louis Art Museum.
St. Paul, Minn.	1959 city budget appropriations: \$13,500	Appropriations "financed as part of the overall city budget."	St. Paul Gallery and School of Art.
San Antonio, Tex.	\$10,000 \$81,000 (approximate budget for ensuing year). \$81,000 \$1,500	Supported primarily by general fund do do	St. Paul Civic Opera. Witte Museum. 2 municipal auditoriums. San Pedro Playhouse (auditorium devoted primarily to theatrical productions).
San Diego, Calif.	1959-60 city budget: \$57,159 \$19,289 \$48,715 \$45,949 \$10,000	General revenues do do do do	Fine Arts Gallery. Serra Museum (local history). Natural History Museum. Museum of Man (anthropology). San Diego Symphony.
San Francisco, Calif.	1958-59 budget: \$158,365 (taxes, \$120,665; other, \$37,700) \$35,493 (taxes) \$255,456 (taxes, \$254,856; other, \$600) \$367,942 (taxes, \$367,692; other, \$250)	Budget of the city and county of San Francisco. do do do	Art commission. War Memorial Art Museum. California Palace of the Legion of Honor (art museum). De Young (art) Museum, Everhart Museum.
Seranton, Pa.	An average of about \$28,740 per annum over the past 10 years.	General funds	Art commission.
Seattle, Wash.	\$233.37 \$34,097.55 \$18,000 \$62,743.57 \$33,127.93 \$31,092.45 \$18,161.40 \$1,267 Not indicated	City's annual budget funds without regard to income source. do do do do do do do do	Art museum. Public music. Art division of the library department. Museum of Natural History. George Walter Vincent Smith Museum. William Fynchon Memorial (Connecticut Valley Historical Museum). Springfield Museum of Fine Arts. Fine arts department of library. Syracuse Museum of Fine Arts (privately chartered institution).
Springfield, Mass. ²	\$18,161.40 \$1,267 Not indicated	General tax revenues do do	Art museum. Public music. Art division of the library department. Museum of Natural History. George Walter Vincent Smith Museum. William Fynchon Memorial (Connecticut Valley Historical Museum). Springfield Museum of Fine Arts. Fine arts department of library. Syracuse Museum of Fine Arts (privately chartered institution).
Syracuse, N.Y.	\$25,000 appropriation annually	General tax levy	Syracuse Museum of Fine Arts (privately chartered institution).

² Included in the library budget is the position of musical adviser, which is the way in which the city contributes to the salary of the conductor of the Springfield Symphony Orchestra.

Compiled by Anne M. Finnegan and Helen A. Miller, Education and Public Welfare Division, Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress, July 29, 1959.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that two letters to the editor, which appeared in the Washington Evening Star of December 23, 1959, and which deal with this subject, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SHORTCHANGING ITSELF ON CULTURE?

I want to commend the Star for the excellent article about the Corcoran Gallery of Art by John McKelway on Sunday, December 13. It is good to have the Star assure us that the Corcoran is vigorously alive on its 100th birthday and looking forward to its second century of service in art and the associated field of education.

But, naturally, along with many other people, it is Mr. McKelway's discussion of what will be needed during these coming years that holds my deepest concern.

To begin with, one point should be fully understood. It is useless and, indeed, misleading to compare the income of the National Gallery of Art with that of the Corcoran. These two great galleries represent two quite different setups. The National Gallery is federally owned and largely federally supported; the Corcoran is not and never has been, nor did William Wilson Corcoran intend that the gallery which bears his name would be a Federal Government institution.

The comparison, rather, should be between the Corcoran and, say, New York's Metropolitan Museum of Art, and with other municipal museums throughout the country.

These museums are greatly assisted by municipal tax funds and couldn't continue to remain open without such financial assistance.

According to a recent study made by the Library of Congress for Representative HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR., Democrat, of Delaware, included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 14, 1959, this city spends far less on cultural activities than any of the other 38 cities surveyed. Our budget for the fine arts is only \$16,000, as compared with New York's \$2,600,000, Philadelphia's \$824,000, and Baltimore's \$448,500.

Why, Hagerstown, Md., gives its Museum of Fine Arts \$12,500, which is provided out of its regular annual budget, only \$3,500 less than the entire amount the Nation's Capital spends out of its more than \$200 million budget.

The Star says the Corcoran Gallery needs a little outside help. No; what it needs is inside help, and judging from Mr. McKelway's remarks about lack of heat, of air conditioning, and of peeling walls and canceled exhibitions, more than a little help is needed.

Representative McDOWELL has introduced a bill to provide 1 mill out of each tax dollar for art and music programs. The bill is co-sponsored on a bipartisan basis by Representative CARROLL D. KEARNS, Republican, of Pennsylvania; Representative JOHN R. FOLEY, Democrat, of Maryland; and Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, Democrat, of Montana. Also, the intent of this bill has the support of a wide range of groups including the American Federation of Musicians, the AFL-CIO, and even the Washington Board of Trade.

The plan suggested in this bill is one currently in use in scores of cities where their appreciation of the value of their art gal-

leries, museums, and symphony orchestras produces significant civic support and action. Why should not such help be sought, and given, by Washington, D.C.?

We need not try to compete with the ancient capitals of Europe and Russia. We are still in the process of making our world. But let us compete with our fellow American cities so we can take our proper place in the growing cultural life of these United States.

HORTENSE AMRAM.

The Star's Sunday feature article, "The Corcoran, at 100, Is Still Looking Ahead," is commendable, but the Corcoran Gallery should have been compared, not with the National Gallery of Art, but with the Nation's local, city-aided museums and galleries.

The Star points out that the National Gallery receives a yearly grant from the Federal Government of \$1,853,000. This is true, but information on the amount of financial support given local museums by U.S. cities would have been more apropos and significant—and helpful.

Baltimore contributes \$303,000 to the Walters Art Gallery; Buffalo gives \$73,430 to the Albright Art Gallery; Chicago gives the Art Institute of Chicago \$232,405; Dallas gives its Fine Arts Museum \$80,000; Houston its Museum of Fine Arts \$20,000; Kansas City its Nelson Art Gallery \$21,211; Newark (N.J.) gives the Newark Museum \$525,426; New Orleans gives its Delgado Museum of Art \$40,000; New York gives the Metropolitan Museum of Art the magnificent sum of \$1,849,514; Norfolk gives its Museum of Art \$69,083. Philadelphia gives the Philadelphia Art Museum \$624,760; Pittsburgh gives its Arts and Crafts Center \$25,000; St. Louis gives its Art Museum \$320,007; San Diego

gives its Fine Arts Gallery \$57,150. San Francisco, with a population of 775,000, gives its three city-aided art museums a grand total of \$658,891.

Washington, D.C., with a population greater by 100,000, and one of the wealthiest cities in the United States per capita, doesn't give its splendid local art museums, such as the Corcoran Gallery, one red cent.

The District of Columbia Commissioners have requested \$10,000 for the Watergate Concerts for the past 2 years and Congress has gladly appropriated this sum. There is every reason for believing that if the Commissioners requested an equal or greater sum for the Corcoran Gallery from local tax revenues Congress would gladly appropriate this also.

It is high time the Commissioners displayed a concern for cultural matters at least equal to that of other U.S. city governing groups.

WILLIAM A. GRANT,
National Committeeman, Young Democratic Club of the District of Columbia.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2796) to provide for the adoption in the Nation's Capital of the practice common to many other cities in the United States with regard to cultural activities by depositing in a special fund 1 mill out of each \$1 of tax revenue of the government of the District of Columbia to be used for the National Symphony Orchestra, the Corcoran Gallery of Art, and other nonprofit art programs of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, by amending the act of April 29, 1942, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

EXPANSION OF SPECIAL SCHOOL MILK PROGRAM

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to improve and expand the special school milk program.

Generally, the bill would increase funds available as follows: The allowable \$81 million for fiscal year 1960 would be increased to \$85 million; for fiscal year 1961 and successive years, \$90 million would be made available.

The proposal, too, would establish the special milk program on a permanent basis.

Overall, this program has provided a constructive outlet for surplus milk, as well as made a real contribution to better health of the children of America.

In fiscal year 1959, over 2.2 billion half pints of milk were distributed to children in nursery schools, child care centers, summer camps, and similar nonprofit institutions devoted to the care and training of children.

As I understand, funds for the current year are running low. Although the Department may not spend more than the allowable \$81 million, the administration of the program requires elbow room for its operations. Unless additional funds are provided, the Department of Agriculture informs me that there will need to be cutbacks in the program beginning March 1, 1960.

Fortunately, a subcommittee of the House Agriculture Committee has scheduled hearings next week on this situation. I would respectfully urge that the

Senate committee consider the recommendations in this bill as early as possible.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2797) to increase and extend the special milk program, introduced by Mr. WILEY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

COMMISSION TO STUDY COMPENSATION FOR LAND CONDEMNED UNDER FEDERAL PROGRAMS

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, in recent years the Federal Government has instituted programs under which millions of acres of land have been acquired from private owners. While much of the land has been acquired by purchase, a great deal has been acquired through condemnation proceedings; and in the cases in which voluntary sales were effected, the threat of condemnation proceedings was in the background.

These Federal programs include some in which Federal agencies use the land directly—for example, in the military programs; in other cases, the land is owned by State or local agencies—for example, in most road programs; and, in other cases, the land may be resold for private use—for example, in the urban renewal program. But regardless of these differences in the purpose of the taking or the use to which the land is put, the individual or business dispossessed or otherwise affected by the acquisition suffers the same loss.

Probably the biggest acquisition program has been that of the military. I am advised that in 1940, the War and Navy Departments used about 2½ million acres of land. By the close of the war, these two Departments had the use of 52 million acres—about equal in size to Kansas or Utah.

By June 30, 1955, the land used for military purposes by the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, and the AEC, amounted to more than 23 million acres—about the size of Indiana, Virginia, Kentucky, or Tennessee. Other Federal programs have acquired or are acquiring substantial amounts of land.

In the urban renewal program under title I of the Housing Act of 1949, the first 400 projects have called for the clearance of about 15,000 acres, not including streets and alleys. Unlike much of the land used for military programs, these 15,000 net acres are located in urban areas, and consist mostly of developed land. The Federal highway programs also call for the acquisition of large areas, including both expensive developed land in cities, and farmland and wasteland outside cities. For the Interstate Highway System, \$621 million—of which the Federal share will be \$418 million—is authorized for the acquisition of rights-of-way during the fiscal year 1959. Under the regular Federal highway programs, \$126 million—of which the Federal share will be \$65 million—is authorized for acquisition of rights-of-way during the fiscal year 1959. Other Federal programs, such as the public works programs, involve the acquisition of large areas.

The acquisition of land in this volume is very different from the Federal acquisition of land during the 19th century, or even during the 20th century, up to World War II. The problems created when, under Federal programs, thousands of acres of land is acquired in rural areas, or scores of acres are acquired in developed urban areas, are different, both in kind and in degree, from the problems created in earlier days, when Federal acquisitions of land amounted merely to taking enough land for the construction of a post office, an arsenal, or even an army post. And the problem becomes particularly acute when an urban-renewal project cleans out an entire section of town—the houses, stores, office buildings, movie theaters, banks, churches, and all other structures.

The Banking and Currency Committee has heard testimony which has set forth in dramatic detail the problems facing businesses, both large and small, which have been wiped out by urban-renewal projects or by Federal highway projects. Three bills on this subject have been introduced: S. 1340, by Senator HUMPHREY; S. 1351, by Senator BEALL; and S. 1777, by Senator CLARK and Senator JAVITS, which would provide for loans to small business concerns affected by the highway and urban-renewal programs.

The problem, of course, is not limited to small businesses or to these two Federal programs. The problem affects all sizes of business, and it affects all Federal programs under which land is acquired—particularly, of course, when the land acquisitions are very extensive. It was, I think, for this reason that the Banking and Currency Committee did not take action on any of these three bills in connection with either the small business legislation or the housing legislation.

It seems to me the question is a matter of much broader concern, and one which basically goes back to the requirement of the fifth amendment to the Constitution that private property shall not be taken for public use without just compensation.

Over many years, this constitutional requirement has been spelled out in judicial decisions and in statutes within the framework of the constitutional requirement. For the most part, this occurred before acquisitions of land by the Federal Government were substantial or had drastic effects upon wide areas. As I have said, there is a difference in kind, as well as a difference in degree, between acquiring enough land for a Federal office building, or even acquiring the Federal Triangle, and acquiring a square mile of city land for an urban-renewal project or acquiring a whole valley for the purpose of flooding it in connection with the construction of a dam.

It is because of this change in the nature and the effect of land acquisitions under Federal programs, either by condemnation or under threat of condemnation, that I think it desirable to make a thorough and impartial study of condemnation under Federal programs. This study should be broad

enough to cover land acquisition under the highway program, under public works programs, under urban-renewal programs, under military programs, and any other Federal programs. It should also be broad enough to cover all the effects of land acquisition, including its effects on owners, on tenants, and on nearby property and businesses. The study should be made in the broad spirit of the just-compensation provision of the fifth amendment. It should not be limited to a determination of the legal bounds of that provision or of any particular statute. Instead, it should cover the broader subject of the extent to which the cost of Federal programs is paid by individuals or firms whose property is taken or whose property or business is either destroyed or is reduced in value by the taking of neighboring property, and the extent to which it would be feasible and proper to compensate these individuals and firms for the losses they suffer by reason of the Federal program.

Accordingly, I introduce a bill which would establish a bipartisan Federal Commission on Property Condemnation Compensation, to consist of 15 members, 7 to be appointed by the President, 4 to be appointed by the Vice President, and 4 to be appointed by the Speaker. The Commission would make a thorough study of compensation in connection with the condemnation of land, and would file a report with the Congress by December 31, 1961.

In introducing this bill, I do not, of course, wish to take the position that any particular judicial awards have been either too high or too low; nor do I wish to take the position that any condemnation statute now on the books needs to be amended. But the testimony, which has been presented to the Banking and Currency Committee, on the effects on individuals and businesses of the widespread land acquisitions under Federal programs convinces me that this matter should be thoroughly reviewed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2802) to provide for a comprehensive study of the disposition of claims for just compensation for persons affected by the acquisition of property by the United States or under Federal programs through condemnation proceedings or otherwise, introduced by Mr. SPARKMAN, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ISSUANCE OF GOLD MEDAL IN RECOGNITION OF SERVICES OF DR. THOMAS A. DOOLEY

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution to authorize the President of the United States to present to Dr. Thomas A. Dooley III, in the name of Congress, a gold medal in recognition of his heroic services to the peoples of Laos and other newly developing countries. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the joint resolution may be printed at this point in the RECORD, and

that the joint resolution lie at the desk until Tuesday of next week so that other Senators may become cosponsors if they so desire.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution will be printed in the RECORD, and held at the desk, as requested by the Senator from Connecticut.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 148) to authorize the President of the United States to confer a medal on Dr. Thomas Anthony Dooley III, introduced by Mr. BUSH, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in recognition of the gallant and unselfish public service rendered by Dr. Thomas Anthony Dooley III, in serving the medical needs of the people of Laos living in the remote areas of the Laotian jungles, and of peoples in other newly developing countries, the President of the United States is authorized to present to Dr. Thomas Anthony Dooley III, in the name of Congress, an appropriate gold medal. For such purpose, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to cause to be struck a gold medal with suitable emblems, devices, and inscriptions to be determined by the Secretary. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$2,500 for this purpose.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury shall cause duplicates in bronze of such medal to be coined and sold, under such regulations as he may prescribe, at a price sufficient to cover the cost thereof (including labor), and the appropriations used for carrying out the provisions of this section shall be reimbursed out of the proceeds of such sale.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, Dr. Dooley's private crusade to help his fellow man has captured the imagination of the free world. His dedication and his determination to fight disease and ignorance in newly developing countries is one of the great humanitarian efforts of our time.

A part of this may be found by reading Dr. Dooley's books, which are available at the Library of Congress, under the titles, "The Edge of Tomorrow"—1958, and "Deliver Us From Evil"—1956.

Much has been accomplished by this inspired man within a few years. In 1954, Dr. Dooley participated in the U.S. Navy effort to evacuate over 600,000 refugees from Communist encroachment in North Vietnam. He became so appalled at the stark poverty and misery of the thousands of refugees, that he decided to devote his entire energies in bringing them medical assistance.

His successful program in Laos has led to the establishment of medical centers in other parts of the world. He set up a nonprofit voluntary organization known as Medico, which promotes the establishment of medical centers in places where medical care is nonexistent. Medico already has medical teams in Cambodia, Vietnam, Kenya, Belgian Congo, Jordan, Peru, and Haiti.

Through a recent personal fund-raising effort, Dr. Dooley has obtained enough private subscriptions to Medico

to enable him to plan the establishment of medical services in 23 countries where governments have requested teams of medical specialists.

Communist propagandists have vilified Dr. Dooley, but those among whom he works refer to him with affection as "Dr. America." He has done much to create good will for America, particularly among the uncommitted countries of the world.

Dr. Dooley seeks no Government grant in connection with his work, nor is he solicitous of any personal aggrandizement.

In recognition of his unselfish public service and his great spirit of humanitarianism, I propose that Dr. Dooley be given a national award symbolic of the respect and admiration of his fellow Americans.

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

Mr. BUSH. I shall be glad to yield, if I may.

Mr. JAVITS. I know Dr. Dooley. I admire him greatly. I would like the privilege of joining in sponsorship of the joint resolution, which I think the Senator from Connecticut has taken splendid initiative in introducing today.

Mr. BUSH. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I ask that it be noted that the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] joins in sponsorship of the joint resolution.

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

CONVENTION WITH CUBA FOR CONSERVATION OF SHRIMP—CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, on September 12, 1959, there was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations a letter from the Acting Secretary of State, Mr. Douglas Dillon, to the President of the Senate, submitting a draft bill, "to give effect to the Convention between the United States of America and Cuba for the Conservation of Shrimp, signed at Habana, August 15, 1958."

I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be discharged from further consideration of the message and that the message be referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection it is so ordered.

FEDERAL ELECTION ACT OF 1959—AMENDMENTS

Mr. PROUTY submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 2436) to revise the Federal election laws, to prevent corrupt practices in Federal elections, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

Mr. KEFAUVER submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to Senate bill 2436, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

Mr. HENNINGS submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to Senate bill 2436, supra, which were

ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. HENNINGS (for himself and Mr. KEATING) submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to Senate bill 2436, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

APPOINTMENT OF ADDITIONAL CIRCUIT AND DISTRICT JUDGES—AMENDMENTS

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I submit amendments, intended to be proposed by me to the bill (S. 2673) to provide for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges, and for other purposes, which is Calendar No. 1045.

These amendments, Mr. President, would amend Senate bill 2673 so as to provide for an additional Federal district judge in the district of Massachusetts, raising from five to six the total number of judges authorized.

Since September 1956 the Judicial Conference has recommended an additional permanent judgeship for this district both to meet the heavy caseload and to bring all of the dockets of the court to a current status. The civil caseload in Massachusetts is well above the national average and in many instances litigants and the Government are forced to wait excessive periods before a case is brought to trial. I ask unanimous consent that a memorandum which has been prepared for me by Joseph F. Spaniol, Jr., in the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, be printed, with tables attached, explaining the necessity for this additional permanent judgeship.

The efficient and orderly disposition of cases before the courts in Massachusetts demands that Congress include this district in its omnibus bill for permanent judgeships.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendments will be received, printed, and lie on the table; and, without objection, the memorandum will be printed in the RECORD.

The memorandum presented by Mr. SALTONSTALL is as follows:

THE JUDICIAL BUSINESS OF THE U.S. DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

The district of Massachusetts has five judges all of whom reside in Boston and hold court in that city. From time to time trials have been held in Springfield, when there was sufficient business to warrant a term of court there. The last judgeship for the district was established in 1954. There have been no vacancies in office of any duration in the last 15 years, although one of the judges has been disabled by a heart condition which has kept him away from the court on various occasions.

In the years since the Second World War the civil business of the district has mounted steadily. In 1957 the private civil caseload reached a peak of 894 cases compared with 331 in 1941. Last year, however, as the result of the new statute curtailing the jurisdiction of the district courts in diversity of citizenship and certain Federal question cases, the private civil caseload decreased almost 30 percent from 831 in fiscal 1958 to 581 in fiscal 1959. On the other hand, suits to which the Government was a party increased from 596 to 645 and the criminal caseload of 216 cases in 1959 was about the same as the 227 cases commenced in 1958.

But even with the decrease in civil filings, the civil caseload per judgeship in Massachusetts remains well above the national average. In fiscal 1959 the total civil cases commenced per judgeship were 245 compared

with 215 civil cases commenced per judgeship nationally. The criminal caseload, except for certain protracted cases, has always been light in this district. In fiscal 1959, there were 42 criminal cases begun per judgeship compared with the national average of 108 cases per judgeship.

Reduced civil filings in 1959 have enabled the court to cut down somewhat on the backlog of civil cases from 1,658 on June 30, 1958, to 1,495 on June 30, 1959. Numerically the reduction amounted to 163 cases, or a little less than 10 percent of the total pending backlog.

The delay in getting cases to trial because of the sizable backlog is shown by the time requisite for the trial and disposition of cases terminated after trial in 1959. The median time interval from filing to disposition was 14.5 months, a little less than the national median time interval of 15.3 months. The median time from issue to trial of 13.1 months, however, was greatly in excess of the national median of 10.3 months.

As compared with the desirable interval of 6 months from the time of the filing of the average civil case until trial, as suggested by the Judicial Conference of the United States, half of the civil cases tried in the district of Massachusetts in fiscal 1959 had been pending more than 13½ months at the time of trial.

The Judicial Conference of the United States first recommended an additional permanent judgeship for this district in September 1956, both to cope with the heavy caseload and to bring all of the dockets of the court to a current status within a reasonable period.

Complete statistical tables showing the judicial business of the district for the last 19 years are attached.

Respectfully submitted,

JOSEPH F. SPANIOI, JR.,
Attorney, Division of Procedural Studies and Statistics, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts
JANUARY 12, 1960.

DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

TABLE 1.—Civil cases commenced and terminated, by fiscal year, and pending at the end of each year beginning with 1941

TOTAL CIVIL CASES

Fiscal year	Commenced	Terminated	Pending June 30	Fiscal year	Commenced	Terminated	Pending June 30	Fiscal year	Commenced	Terminated	Pending June 30
1941	849	761	855	1948	1,021	1,191	1,205	1955	1,242	1,230	1,907
1942	811	729	937	1949	981	962	1,224	1956	1,233	1,480	1,660
1943	655	762	830	1950	1,201	1,054	1,371	1957	1,349	1,344	1,665
1944	796	854	772	1951	1,269	1,289	1,351	1958	1,427	1,434	1,658
1945	1,284	1,077	979	1952	1,636	1,424	1,563	1959	1,226	1,389	1,495
1946	1,978	1,653	1,304	1953	1,552	1,241	1,874	1960			
1947	1,492	1,421	1,375	1954	1,185	1,164	1,895				

PRIVATE CIVIL CASES

1941	331	358	400	1948	515	525	489	1955	841	784	1,300
1942	372	355	417	1949	463	406	546	1956	883	929	1,254
1943	194	323	288	1950	490	393	643	1957	894	926	1,222
1944	204	220	272	1951	568	500	711	1958	831	907	1,146
1945	280	220	332	1952	736	583	864	1959	581	759	968
1946	320	287	365	1953	844	589	1,119	1960			
1947	460	326	499	1954	856	732	1,243				

TABLE 2.—U.S. civil cases and criminal cases commenced and terminated, by fiscal year, and pending at the end of each year beginning with 1941

U.S. CIVIL CASES (UNITED STATES A PARTY)

[Price and rent control cases are in parentheses 1]

Fiscal year	Commenced	Terminated	Pending June 30	Fiscal year	Commenced	Terminated	Pending June 30	Fiscal year	Commenced	Terminated	Pending June 30
1941	518	403	455	1948	506 (148)	666	716	1955	401	446	607
1942	439	374	520	1949	518 (169)	556	678	1956	350	551	406
1943	461 (59)	439	542	1950	711 (325)	661	728	1957	455	418	443
1944	592 (184)	634	500	1951	701 (379)	789	640	1958	596	527	512
1945	1,004 (599)	857	647	1952	900 (493)	841	699	1959	645	630	527
1946	1,658 (1,298)	1,866	939	1953	708 (272)	652	755	1960			
1947	1,932 (608)	1,995	876	1954	329	432	652				

¹ Price and rent control cases are separately listed from 1943 to 1953. In many of these years they constituted a large proportion of all civil cases commenced, although they required on the average a relatively small proportion of court time per case for disposition. They are included in the figure which they follow.

TABLE 2.—U.S. civil cases and criminal cases commenced and terminated, by fiscal year, and pending at the end of each year beginning with 1941—Continued

CRIMINAL CASES											
[Cases transferred are not included in "Commenced" and "Terminated" columns]											
Fiscal year	Commenced	Terminated	Pending June 30	Fiscal year	Commenced	Terminated	Pending June 30	Fiscal year	Commenced	Terminated	Pending June 30
1941	334	332	185	1948	243	249	87	1955	363	389	164
1942	321	314	192	1949	193	223	60	1956	234	301	119
1943	388	364	216	1950	238	241	76	1957	249	248	135
1944	484	481	219	1951	332	236	168	1958	227	249	119
1945	514	334	399	1952	248	352	71	1959	216	230	107
1946	231	469	161	1953	208	155	137	1960			
1947	202	290	79	1954	311	251	202				

TABLE 3.—Cases commenced per judgeship

Fiscal year	Number of judgeships	Total civil cases		Private civil cases		Criminal cases (less immigration) ²		Fiscal year	Number of judgeships	Total civil cases		Private civil cases		Criminal cases (less immigration) ²	
		Massachusetts	National average ¹	Massachusetts	National average ¹	Massachusetts	National average ¹			Massachusetts	National average ¹	Massachusetts	National average ¹	Massachusetts	National average ¹
1941	4	212	164	83	82	84	153	1951	4	317	204	142	111	83	106
1942	4	203	168	93	77	80	161	1952	4	409	236	184	126	62	112
1943	4	164	158	49	58	97	174	1953	4	388	261	211	146	51	114
1944	4	199	169	51	56	121	184	1954	5	237	210	171	127	61	103
1945	4	321	295	70	57	129	176	1955	5	248	212	168	126	70	104
1946	4	495	321	80	70	58	142	1956	5	247	225	177	135	46	102
1947	4	373	271	115	109	50	134	1957	5	270	236	179	151	47	105
1948	4	255	205	129	117	61	123	1958	5	285	259	166	167	44	108
1949	4	245	238	116	121	48	123	1959	5	245	215	116	129	42	108
1950	4	300	222	123	113	59	116	1960							

¹ This column includes 86 districts for 1949 and thereafter; 84 districts before 1949.

² Immigration cases have been eliminated from this table because they occur in volume in only 5 districts on the Mexican border and because the average judicial time per case for their disposition is small.

TABLE 4.—Time elapsing in civil cases tried ¹

Fiscal year	Number of cases tried	Median interval in months from filing to disposition		Median interval in months from issue to trial		Fiscal year	Number of cases tried	Median interval in months from filing to disposition		Median interval in months from issue to trial		Fiscal year	Number of cases tried	Median interval in months from filing to disposition		Median interval in months from issue to trial	
		Massachusetts	National median	Massachusetts	National median			Massachusetts	National median	Massachusetts	National median			Massachusetts	National median		
1945	56	11.5	9.0	8.0	5.3	1951	125	12.9	12.2	9.1	7.3	1957	156	18.2	14.2	15.3	9.0
1946	86	10.7	8.9	7.6	5.0	1952	141	12.3	12.1	9.4	7.0	1958	183	15.4	13.9	12.8	8.9
1947	74	10.9	9.0	9.4	5.1	1953	116	13.4	12.4	10.8	7.4	1959	153	14.5	15.3	13.1	10.3
1948	148	11.7	9.9	7.8	5.8	1954	117	14.5	13.5	11.8	8.1	1960					
1949	93	12.7	10.4	9.9	5.9	1955	138	20.0	14.6	16.8	9.1						
1950	107	17.0	11.2	12.5	6.7	1956	168	18.9	15.4	15.7	10.3						

¹ The median time interval in months is computed for the civil cases in which a trial was held, which were terminated during the year, excluding land condemnation, habeas corpus, and forfeiture proceedings. No median interval is shown for the years 1945 through 1952 where less than 25 cases were terminated after trial. For the year 1953 and subsequent years, where there were less than 25 cases terminated after trial, a median is listed with an asterisk (*) on the basis of the number of cases terminated after trial for the last 2 years, provided there were 25 such cases for the 2 years.

TABLE 5

CIVIL AND CRIMINAL TRIALS COMMENCED, BY FISCAL YEAR							CIVIL AND CRIMINAL TRIALS COMMENCED PER JUDGESHIP								
Fiscal year	Total trials commenced	Civil			Criminal			Fiscal year	Number of judgeships	Total trials		Civil		Criminal	
		Total	Nonjury	Jury	Total	Nonjury	Jury			Massachusetts	National average ¹	Massachusetts	National average ¹	Massachusetts	National average ¹
1951	106	106	62	44			1951	4	27	39	27	28		11	
1952	121	114	47	67	7	2	5	1952	4	30	40	29	27	2	
1953	128	120	52	68	8	1	7	1953	4	32	44	30	29	2	
1954	164	128	51	77	36	13	23	1954	5	33	40	26	25	7	
1955	159	128	57	71	31	1	30	1955	5	32	41	26	26	6	
1956	200	172	79	93	28	4	24	1956	5	40	43	34	29	6	
1957	181	160	60	100	21	8	13	1957	5	36	40	32	27	4	
1958	235	214	97	117	21		21	1958	5	47	42	43	28	4	
1959	179	158	65	93	21	1	20	1959	5	36	40	32	28	4	
1960								1960							

¹ This column includes 86 districts.

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARINGS ON LAW OF THE SEA CONVENTIONS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I wish to announce that on Wednesday, January 20, 1960, at 10:30 a.m. in room 4221, New Senate Office Building, the Committee on Foreign Relations will hold a public hearing on four conventions and an optional protocol on the law of the sea.

These items are as follows: Executive J, "A Convention on the Territorial Sea and Contiguous Zone"; Executive K, "A Convention on the High Seas"; Executive L, "A Convention on Fishing and Conservation of the Living Resources of the High Seas"; Executive M, "A Convention on the Continental Shelf"; Executive N, "An Optional Protocol of Signature Concerning the Compulsory Settlement of Disputes."

These conventions and the protocol were formulated at the United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea, held at Geneva from February 24 to April 27, 1958. They were signed on behalf of the United States on September 15, 1958, and on behalf of a number of other states. They were transmitted to the Senate by the President on September 9, 1959.

Persons interested in presenting their views on this subject should notify the clerk of the committee.

CONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN PUBLIC WORKS ON RIVERS AND HARBORS—AMENDMENT

Mr. MOSS submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H.R. 7634) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed.

MINERAL AND WATER RESOURCES OF WYOMING (S. DOC. NO. 76)

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the document entitled "Mineral and Water Resources of Wyoming," prepared by the staff of the United States Geological Survey, printed as a Senate document, with illustrations. In view of the concern of the Senate, as demonstrated by the adoption of Senate Resolution 48, and the subsequent work of the Senate Select Committee on National Water Resources, of which I am a member, I think the distribution of this study as a Senate document would be highly appropriate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wyoming? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

DISCLOSURE OF FINANCE CHARGES IN CONNECTION WITH EXTENSIONS OF CREDIT—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the orders of the Senate of January 7 and January 13, 1960, the names of Senators NEUBERGER, MORSE, BUSH, HUMPHREY, MUSKIE, YARBOROUGH, CLARK, LONG of Hawaii, GRUENING, MOSS, CHURCH, JACKSON, and KEFAUVER, were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 2755) to assist in the promotion of economic stabilization by requiring the disclosure of finance charges in connection with extensions of credit, introduced by Mr. DOUGLAS (for himself, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. LONG of Louisiana, Mr. PROXMIER, and Mr. ENGLE) on January 7, 1960.

AIR CARGO TRANSPORTATION—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of January 11, 1960, the name of Senator SYMINGTON was added as an additional cosponsor of the bill (S. 2774) to foster the national defense, the Postal Service, the development of civil aeronautics, air commerce in the United States and abroad, and for other purposes, by providing for Government guaranty of loans to certain air carriers for purchase of efficient, newly developed, modern cargo aircraft and components of a cargo airlift system, introduced by Mr. MONRONEY on January 11, 1960.

CONVENTION OF DELEGATES FROM ATLANTIC DEMOCRACIES—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] be added as a cosponsor to a resolution, Senate Concurrent Resolution 17, which I submitted last year on behalf of myself and other Senators, in support of a convention of delegates from Atlantic democracies looking to greater cooperation and unity of purpose.

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

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF THOMAS W. S. DAVIS TO BE A MEMBER OF THE FOREIGN SETTLEMENT COMMISSION OF THE UNITED STATES

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 10:30 a.m., Wednesday, January 20, 1960, in room 2228, New Senate Office Building, on the nomination of Thomas W. S. Davis, of Virginia, to be a member of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States, vice Whitney Gilliland, resigned.

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 OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF JAMES R. DURFEE, TO BE ASSOCIATE JUDGE OF THE U.S. COURT OF CLAIMS

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 10:30 a.m., Thursday, January 21, 1960, in room 2228, New Senate Office Building, on the nomination of James R. Durfee, of Wisconsin, to be associate judge of the U.S. Court of Claims, vice Benjamin H. Littleton, retired.

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 Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY]; and myself, as chairman.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF HEARINGS BY THE COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to make an announcement of committee hearings.

I wish to announce that on Monday next, January 18, the Committee on Rules and Administration will begin hearings on the subject of temporary Federal election registrars. The hear-

ings will continue on the 19th and 21st and will be held in the auditorium of the New Senate Office Building, room G-308, beginning at 10:30 a.m. each day. The hearings will probably be continued into the following week. The committee has not determined these dates as yet.

Three bills dealing with this subject have been referred to the Rules Committee. These bills are S. 2684, 2719, and 2783. In addition, there are two other bills related to this subject which have been referred to the committee, S. 2535 and S. 2722.

Since some of these legislative proposals have bearing on the civil rights legislation which the majority leader has indicated will be called up for action in the Senate in the middle or latter part of February, it seems urgent for this reason, as well as a proper consideration of these bills on their own merits, that our committee schedule the necessary hearings as soon as possible.

The U.S. Commission on Civil Rights in its report issued September 9, 1959, recommended legislation concerning the appointment of temporary Federal registrars. Having this in mind the committee hoped originally to commence the hearings with the testimony of the distinguished Chairman of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, Dr. John A. Hannah, president of the Michigan State University; the Vice Chairman of the Commission, Dean Robert G. Storey, of Southern Methodist University Law School; and the Honorable John S. Battle, a distinguished former Governor of Virginia, who dissented from the recommendations of the Commission concerning this subject. Because of a meeting of the Joint Defense Board in Florida the next day, Dr. Hannah has informed us he will be unable to attend, but that the Commission's views will be fully presented by Dean Storey. Dr. Hannah has agreed to appear at a later date. I hope to hear within a day or two that Governor Battle will be able to accept our urgent invitation that he present his dissenting views to the committee.

Beginning on the 19th, the committee plans first to hear from those Senators who have introduced bills on this subject referred to the committee and then from other Senators who wish to present their views and then from other informed and interested witnesses.

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

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

By Mr. BYRD of Virginia:
Address delivered by him in Chicago on December 15, 1959, before the American Farm Bureau Federation.

Correspondence between him and the Secretary of Commerce in regard to the Federal highway program.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:
Address entitled "The Obligations of Freedom," delivered by Senator RANDOLPH, of West Virginia, to Veterans of Foreign Wars, Post 629, Fairmont, W. Va., January 10, 1960.

By Mr. SCOTT:

Article by him relating to Adlai Stevenson's attitude toward Red China, and editorial from the United Daily News, of Taipei, Formosa, of December 19, 1959.

By Mr. CLARK:

Article entitled "Security With Solvency," written by Senator SYMINGTON and published in the November 26 issue of Reporter magazine.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

Address dealing with the international cultural exchange program, delivered by Representative FRANK THOMPSON, JR., of New Jersey, before the American Educational Theater Association.

FRED FLORENCE, TEXAS CIVIC LEADER, AWARDED PAPAL MEDAL

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, during the time the Congress was in adjournment, a distinguished Texas civic leader, Mr. Fred F. Florence, of Dallas, received the highest award the Roman Catholic Church can bestow on a nonmember.

The award received by Mr. Florence is the gold Benemerenti Medal. The word "benemerenti" means "one deserving well." All who know, as I am privileged to know, of Fred Florence's unselfish service to humanity realize that here, indeed, is a man who deserves well.

Mr. Florence was singled out by Pope John XXIII to receive the medal because of his longtime efforts on behalf of community projects, and especially his support of Catholic institutions in the diocese of Dallas-Fort Worth. His name is synonymous with civic work in the Dallas area.

Mr. Florence is chairman of the executive committee of the Republic National Bank of Dallas. He is past president of the American Bankers Association, the Texas Bankers Association, and the Dallas Clearing House Association.

On behalf of Pope John, Bishop Thomas K. Gorman, of the Dallas-Fort Worth diocese, presented the Benemerenti Medal to Mr. Florence at a banquet in Dallas largely attended by citizens who have an intimate knowledge of the man and his works.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of Bishop Gorman's remarks and the citation awarding the Benemerenti Medal to Mr. Florence be printed in the RECORD as part of my remarks.

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

ADDRESS BY BISHOP THOMAS K. GORMAN ON OCCASION OF THE PRESENTATION OF THE BENEMERENTI MEDAL TO FRED FARREL FLORENCE—SEPTEMBER 15, 1959

Esteemed honoree, distinguished guests, a very happy purpose has summoned us to break bread together this evening. We have come to witness the bestowal of a decoration of merit upon an admired leader in our community, Fred Farrel Florence. This well-deserved honor naturally points directly to the well-known merits of our honoree, yet I think you will agree with me when I say it goes beyond merely personal greatness of a great leader to achieve a truly community-wide significance. Will you not bear with me for a few minutes, therefore, while I strive to point out why Pope John XXIII, in honoring one of our leaders in the person of Fred Florence has recognized the stalwart

character and effectiveness for good of the type of leadership with which the community of Dallas is blessed.

A city, be it large or small, may enjoy an important place in the world for a variety of reasons. It may have had a rich and varied history through the centuries, during which it contributed to the development of our civilization. It may have been and still continues to be the center of great institutions of national and world importance, civic, artistic, scientific, educational, recreational, industrial, religious. It may be a center possessing vital potential necessary for the growth and development of all these things in the years that lie ahead.

A city, too, may be powerful for a variety of reasons. Its geographical situation can give it enormous strategic advantages. It may be the center of a powerful political entity. It may possess enormous population, supported by great agricultural, mineral, industrial, and banking operations. All these things and many others of a material nature make for growth, wealth, power.

Yet, my friends, you and I well realize that a great city with all these resources may still be a destructive, materialistic brute, unless possessed of an ennobling, vivifying soul. Such a soul it gets and can only get from the spiritual, humanitarian leadership of the citizens who direct its destinies toward the common good and the noble life.

Our Dallas has grown important and powerful and great in the finest sense because it has such a soul breathed into it by its first citizens. Many who have had a hand in creating this living, vital, human city, I see here before me tonight. They and their fellows in the work of forming the soul of Dallas, of making the community a good place in which to live and work and play and worship may well view with pride the honor that comes tonight to one of their fellow Dallas soul builders, a coworker in the magnificent program through the years to create the spirit that is Dallas.

What need for me to retail here for you the lifelong services rendered by Fred Florence to this community in business and banking, in civic and charitable welfare. You know the stature he has achieved in his chosen banking field, both locally, statewide and nationally. You are aware of his services to various projects for our industrial and business development. You know well his untiring labors on behalf of the Community Chest, the National Foundation, Southern Methodist University, the State Fair of Texas, and the Texas Research Foundation. He is an active member, too, of the Congregation of Temple Emanu-El, which he serves as a member of its board of directors and treasurer.

What I do want especially emphasized here tonight, as giving point to this gathering and the presentation to follow, are the many years and understanding and generous cooperation with our Catholic educational, charitable, and welfare activities by Fred Florence.

Through the years his has been warm friendship for Mother Clement and a helpful, generous cooperation with Mount St. Michael and the program of the sisters there for underprivileged girls.

Fred Florence serves as chairman of the lay advisory board of St. Paul's Hospital. He it was who, in cooperation with Karl Hohlitzelle, a previous Dallas recipient of the Benemerenti Medal, laid the early foundation, stimulated the community interest, and led an enthusiastic group of civic leaders to the successful completion of the campaign for funds to build the new St. Paul's Hospital, one of the most effective and fruitful fund-raising efforts in the history of this community.

Mr. Florence and his family visited Rome a little over a year ago. They were received in private audience by Pope Pius XII, just a few months before his death. It was to the

late Holy Father that the civic and charitable merits of our honoree were pointed out. He died before he could act in the matter and thus there was delay while new medals were being designed and struck. Thus the citation comes from John XXIII and bears his friendly likeness rather than that of the inspiring Pius XII whom Fred had met.

It may be of interest to note that Fred Florence is surely among the first, if not the first, in the United States or anywhere to receive the Benemerenti Medal of the reign of the dynamic John XXIII.

Fred Farrel Florence, it now becomes my honor and privilege, standing a friend among your friends and associates, your fellow creators of the soul that is Dallas, to read the citation and present the medal indicating that you are deemed to merit well by the practice of civic, charitable, and religious virtues to so notable a degree. We are, therefore, pleased to join Pope John XXIII in felicitating you and praying for you and your dear ones many long years of health, happiness, and prosperity.

THE CITATION

"His Holiness Pope John XXIII has deigned to decree and to bestow upon Mr. Fred Florence the gold medal established for one who merits especially well with regard to affairs of the church and gives to the same the faculty of adorning himself with this decoration."

THIRTEEN NATION CONFERENCE ON PROBLEMS OF INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, a momentous 13 Nation Conference, of vital interest to the United States at a critical time in its trade and political history, opened in Paris yesterday, at which Mr. Dillon, our Under Secretary of State, is comporting himself with distinction.

The nations present are: Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Germany, Greece, Italy, Netherlands, Portugal, Sweden, Switzerland, the United Kingdom, and the United States.

The Conference is dealing with two questions:

First. The problems created for international trade, and indeed for Western unity, by the existence of two economic entities in Europe, the Inner Six, consisting of Germany, France, Italy, Belgium, the Netherlands and Luxembourg; and the European Free Trade Association, the Outer Seven, consisting of Britain, Sweden, Norway, Denmark, Austria, Switzerland, and Portugal.

Second. The need for accelerating the free world effort to aid the newly developing nations and areas by increasing economic aid and technical assistance—beyond that now afforded bilaterally by the United States and other countries, multilaterally through the United Nations, and through other international agencies like the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund, and the International Finance Corporation.

For this effort, the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference, to which the Congress adheres, and which held its fifth annual conference in Washington last November, is heavily responsible. Specific resolutions of the Conference were adopted at its plenary session in Washington on November 20, 1959, on these two subjects, upon the recommendations of the Conference's Economic Committee, of which I had the

honor to be the Chairman, and of which the other U.S. delegation member was Representative PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, of New Jersey.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the resolutions be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

NATO PARLIAMENTARIANS' CONFERENCE—
FIFTH ANNUAL CONFERENCE, ECONOMIC
COMMITTEE RESOLUTIONS

RESOLUTION 1

Resolved, That pending further consideration of a NATO Economic Council or an Organization for Atlantic Economic Cooperation the member countries should achieve within the framework of the OEEC more effective coordination of their economic policies and programs based on the existing groupings of the European Economic Community, the proposed European Free Trade Association, and the United States and Canada as represented in the North American Ministerial Committee on Economic Problems.

RESOLUTION 2

The NATO Parliamentarians' Conference recommends:

That no new barriers to trade be allowed to rise between member countries of NATO;

That the six member countries of the European Economic Community develop an understanding with the other Western countries envisaging an outward-looking solution of trade problems with Western Europe and North America; and

That governments should work to assure the development of harmonious relations between member countries of NATO and the creation of conditions which would serve to expand international trade.

RESOLUTION 3

Resolved, That urgent attention should be given to the problems of underdeveloped regions in the NATO countries and that the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference recommend to the European Economic Community and the proposed European Free Trade Association that the improvement of the economy of these regions should be a prime consideration in their present and continuing negotiations and in their activities.

RESOLUTION 4

The NATO Parliamentarians' Conference—

(i) Emphasizes that the accelerated development of the less developed areas throughout the world is a proper and desirable concern of the industrialized countries;

(ii) Considers that acceptable progress in the further development of the less developed areas requires the NATO countries and other more developed countries to do more than they are doing now to help accelerate such further development;

(iii) Calls attention to recent studies of the less developed areas, the present efforts of the economically more developed countries to help in such development and their capabilities to do so, and recommends that a definitive assessment should be urgently carried out with a view to formulating a program, which will command the support and the active participation of all the countries of the free world, as determined in detail by a commission of outstanding independent economists convened by the OEEC from both the developed and the less developed countries; and

(iv) Notes with approval the proposed establishment of an International Development Association.

RESOLUTION 5

Resolved, That the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference endorse the initiative of the OEEC in undertaking studies concerned with an International Convention for the Protection of Foreign Investments to be adhered to by all member countries, and consider such code or declaration to be highly desirable in the encouragement of private investment in the less developed areas, and offer its assistance and cooperation in the promulgation of such a code or declaration.

RESOLUTION 6

Resolved, That the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference welcome the increase in the resources of the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, and urge member governments to meet rapidly their commitments to the Fund and the Bank.

RESOLUTION 7

The NATO Parliamentarians' Conference recommends that, to take full advantage of the U.S. Government's undertaking to contribute 40 percent to the United Nations Special Fund and the expanded program of technical assistance, and to bring the resources of these programs to \$100 million, the member countries should make their proper contributions to the Special Fund.

RESOLUTION 8

Resolved, That the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference—

(i) Recommend that the member governments of NATO investigate what additional ad hoc assistance it may be possible to give to producing countries facing difficulties in respect of their particular primary commodities through structural market changes or technological advances which may necessitate some form of adjustment assistance;

(ii) Urge the member governments to investigate what can be done in the field of primary commodity markets stabilization, bearing in mind also the work of GATT and the various schemes described in the U.N. World Economic Survey; and

(iii) Emphasize the economic and security interests of the NATO countries in the stabilization of primary commodity prices and supplies.

RESOLUTION 9

Resolved, That, following the conclusions of the Atlantic Congress, the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference recommend that the NATO countries give watchful attention to any international trading activities which may constitute dumping, intentional disruption of markets, or economic warfare; and further

Resolved, That the NATO countries should be guided by the principles of the GATT, as criteria to determine whether activities of such a nature are taking place; and further resolved that the NATO countries through the Committee of Economic Advisers consider what further measures might be needed to insure against the effects of such activities.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the other U.S. delegation members were Representative FRELINGHUYSEN, of New Jersey, Representative SELDEN, of Alabama, and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], all of whom are close friends of many of us.

It must be recognized that unlike certain other diplomatic negotiations, this Congress and the parliaments of the other NATO countries are deeply concerned with the conference in Paris. Whatever is done in Paris will either require legislation or will have a material

impact upon legislation which we will be considering. It is extremely important, therefore, that from the very outset Congress be fully informed as to the negotiations and the proposals which result and be kept in the closest touch with what is taking place. The effort is so significant for world trade and economic relations, too, that through their parliaments the peoples of the respective countries need to have a very material and direct knowledge of what is taking place.

What is done in Paris will have a direct and perhaps even immediate economic effect upon us, too. For many years the United States enjoyed a favorable trade balance. In 1958 and 1959, the drain on the U.S. gold reserve totaled \$3.2 billion. The time has come to stem this outflow. There are several ways to accomplish this end:

First. European customers should reduce their remaining protective trade barriers against the United States;

Second. The United States should accelerate its efforts to sell its products abroad by greater productivity, greater efficiency, by longer term credit, by better salesmanship, by superior goods;

Third. Accelerating the development to newly developing areas;

Fourth. Developing new capital sources in partnership with the other free world industrial countries.

The new challenge facing the NATO alliance is to give it depth and content as we are phasing out of the cold war and into the economic struggle, and the corollary weapons competition between the free world and the Communist bloc, which is likely to distinguish the decade of the 1960's. This will call for a reevaluation of the role of the Organization for European Economic Cooperation and perhaps its reorganization; it will also call for acceptance by the NATO parliaments and the publics of the NATO countries of support for some form of economic integration between the European Common Market and the European Free Trade Association, and the North American members of the alliance, the United States and Canada.

Best wishes for success go today to Under Secretary of State Douglas Dillon and the representatives of the United States in Paris in their vital mission.

Mr. President, I desire to speak upon another subject.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New York.

ALIEN ORPHANS' BILL

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the program by which American families have been able to adopt alien orphans has been one of the important humanitarian services developed out of the miseries of World War II. Ways and means are presently being discussed and explored whereby the program can be continued on a permanent basis under which alien orphans less than 14 years of age who have been adopted or will be upon their admission to the United States are granted nonquota immigrant status.

Under proposed legislation which I introduced last year, extension was assured until June 30, 1960, of the statutory

authority for the admission of these orphans, namely Public Law 85-316, approved September 11, 1957.

I have participated actively in regard to legislation assuring continuation of this program for many years, first as a Member of the House of Representatives and more recently as a Member of the Senate. The alien orphans' program was begun as a part of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948 and has been extended by the act of July 29, 1953, the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, Public Law 85-316 and Public Law 86-253. It has enriched the lives of thousands of childless American couples and brought happiness and a chance for full productive lives as Americans to the parentless waifs whom they have adopted.

Regrettably, certain unforeseen abuses in this highly commendable program developed as the result of the activities of a few unscrupulous and irresponsible persons. It has therefore been found desirable to establish safeguards to prevent commercialism in proxy adoptions and also in assuring that the prospective adoptive parents are fit persons.

I have encouraged study in the jurisdictional and other problems involved to the end that measures which will have the effect of eliminating the undesirable results under Public Law 85-316 will be formulated. I am happy to report that substantial progress has been made.

I am hopeful that a solution which meets the needs and requirements of all interested parties will be reached in the very near future.

I expect I shall soon be able to introduce appropriate proposed legislation so that this program can then be made a permanent part of our law.

Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New York.

GEORGE WALBRIDGE PERKINS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I wish to invite the attention of my colleagues to the passing of a very dear friend, a great American and an outstanding public servant, George Walbridge Perkins of New York, whom I had the honor to know for more than 15 years and who served with me in the Army as an officer in the Chemical Corps.

By President Eisenhower's appointment Mr. Perkins became the U.S. permanent representative, with the rank of Ambassador, on the Council of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization in 1955. He was an Assistant Secretary of State who rendered unusual and outstanding service in the administration's policy regarding the Soviet Union and in our relations with nations behind the Iron Curtain.

Mr. Perkins also saw action as a colonel in Europe and in the Pacific, receiving the Legion of Merit medal for his war service. He was a director in the Industry Division of the Economic Cooperation Administration in Paris and served the United States in the formation of NATO in its early stages. He had a luminous career, but was taken from us at the relatively young age of 64.

I feel my colleagues would wish to have the passing of a citizen of such distinc-

tion, who has served so ably and effectively as a businessman—he was a leading executive of Merck & Co. for many years—as a statesman, & a representative of our country diplomatically, and as a soldier, signaled to them.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the obituary notices from the New York Times and from the New York Herald Tribune be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

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

[From the New York Times, Jan. 12, 1960]
GEORGE PERKINS, Ex-U.S. Aid, Dies—Assistant Secretary of State, 1949-53, Served NATO—Had Been Merck Official

George Walbridge Perkins of 1 East 66th Street, former Assistant Secretary of State for European Affairs, died Sunday at home of a heart attack. His age was 64.

Mr. Perkins, a Republican, was appointed to the post by former President Harry S. Truman in 1949. He served until 1953.

In 1955, President Eisenhower appointed Mr. Perkins U.S. permanent representative with the rank of Ambassador on the Council of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. He was succeeded on the Council in 1957 by W. Randolph Burgess.

That year Mr. Perkins, who had become associated with Merck & Co. in 1927, returned to the concern as a director. He was executive vice president of the Merck organization and a director of its Canadian subsidiary when he received a leave of absence in 1942 to serve with the Chemical Warfare Service of the Army.

Mr. Perkins saw action as a colonel in Europe and the Pacific and received the Legion of Merit for his war service. He returned to Merck in 1945.

Three years later he severed affiliations with Merck to accept an appointment as director of the industry division of the Economic Cooperation Administration in Paris. A year later, as an Assistant Secretary of State, he was the U.S. representative in the formation of NATO.

ADVISER TO ACHESON

Mr. Perkins also aided the administration's policy regarding the Soviet Union and other countries behind the Iron Curtain. He served as adviser to former Secretary of State Dean Acheson at several international meetings of foreign ministers.

He is said to have started this country's friendlier attitude toward Spain. He announced the new official policy to a group of labor leaders at a luncheon in Washington in 1950, explaining that it would not mean approval of the Franco regime.

He also helped to win from Congress financial aid for Yugoslavia in 1950. He explained then that the grant from the United States would be a weapon of economic warfare against the Soviet Union.

Mr. Perkins was born in Riverdale, the Bronx, on May 2, 1895. He attended the Hill School in Pottstown, Pa., and graduated from Princeton University in 1917. On his return from service with the Army in World War I, he became executive secretary of the Princeton Endowment Fund Committee. In 1921 he received a master's degree from Columbia University.

Later that year he went to Washington as executive secretary to the Postmaster General. In 1922 Mr. Perkins was named assistant treasurer of the Republican State Committee of New York.

SERVED PALISADES COMMISSION

At his death Mr. Perkins was president of the Palisades Interstate Park Commission, of which he had been a member since 1922. He was a trustee of the Hill School and Robert College in Istanbul, Turkey, and a

former trustee of Princeton. He had been president of the New York Presbyterian Foundation and of the Young Men's Christian Association of New York.

He was a former director of the City Bank Farmers Trust Co. He belonged to the University, Union League, and Princeton Clubs in New York and the Down Town and Century Associations.

Mr. Perkins also had a home in Cold Spring, N.Y., where he had served as president of the board of education.

He is survived by his widow, the former Linn Merck; a son, George W., Jr., of Millbrook, N.Y.; two daughters, Mrs. William B. Wilson of West Chester, Pa., and Mrs. Francis H. Cabot of New York; his mother, and a sister. His first wife, the former Katharine Trowbridge, whom he married in 1917, died a year later while he was serving in France.

A funeral service for Mr. Perkins will be held tomorrow at 11 a.m. in the Brick Presbyterian Church. The Reverend Dr. Henry P. van Dusen, president of the Union Theological Seminary, and the Reverend Stanley E. Niebruegge of the Brick Church will officiate.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Jan. 12, 1960]

GEORGE W. PERKINS DEAD, EX-OFFICIAL IN STATE DEPARTMENT

George W. Perkins, 64, former executive vice president and director of Merck & Co., Inc., chemical manufacturers, and an Assistant Secretary of State for European Affairs in former President Truman's administration, died Sunday at his home at 1 East 66th Street.

Born in Riverdale-on-Hudson, N.Y., Mr. Perkins attended Hill School and was graduated from Princeton University in 1917. The following 2 years he served as a private, regimental supply sergeant and second lieutenant with the 1st Army Division in France.

In 1920 he returned to civilian life to take graduate studies at Columbia University's Teachers College, where he received a master's degree. That same year he became a director of the Boy Scouts Federation of New York and in 1921 was made an honorary vice president of the Honest Ballot Association.

HEADED YOUNG REPUBLICANS

Active in Republican politics, Mr. Perkins in 1922 was assistant treasurer of the New York State Republican Committee and president of the New York Young Republican Club. He also was made secretary of the Palisades Interstate Park Commission. He became president of the commission in 1945.

In World War II, Mr. Perkins served in the Army Chemical Warfare Service as a colonel in both the European and Pacific theaters. When he again returned to civilian life he became chief of the industries division of the Economic Cooperation Administration in Paris in 1948 with the rank of Ambassador. In 1949 he became Secretary of State for European Affairs and served until the end of the Truman administration.

ACTIVE IN CHURCH, YMCA

Mr. Perkins was associated in an executive capacity with Merck & Co. from 1927 through 1943. He was active in the Presbyterian Church in New York and was a member of the board of managers of the Bronx Union branch of the New York City YMCA. From 1923 to 1945 he served on the church extension committee of the Presbytery of New York.

He also interested himself in overseas educational programs. He was a member of the finance committee of Robert College in Turkey and a vice president and member of the executive committee of the Near East College Association.

Surviving are his wife, Mrs. Lima M. Perkins; a son, George W. Perkins, Jr.; two daughters, Mrs. William B. Wilson and Mrs. Francis H. Cabot; his mother, Mrs. George W. Perkins, Sr., and a sister, Mrs. Edward W. Freeman.

A funeral service will be held at 11 a.m., tomorrow at the Brick Presbyterian Church, Park Avenue and 91st Street.

VOTING RIGHTS OF NEGROES IN LOUISIANA

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, on Monday, the U.S. District Court for Louisiana handed down a historic and far-reaching decision—the first positive result of the powers given the Attorney General under the Civil Rights Act of 1957—when Judge J. Skelly Wright ordered the restoration of 1,377 Negroes to the voting rolls of the State. The effort by which these voters, long qualified to participate, had been struck from the rolls through the efforts of a citizens' council shows exactly why we need law to back up the other such efforts to assure that people shall enjoy such civil rights as voting.

In an editorial appearing today, the New York Times makes it clear that this important step must be followed by effective legislation when the Senate proceeds to the consideration of civil rights bills next month. Certainly a most effective means for assuring the consideration of such legislation in its proper parliamentary framework would be passage by the House of the bill now bottled up in the Rules Committee, and I again urge the members of my party to join in making this possible.

I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial from this morning's New York Times printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

NO GREATER OFFENSE

Restoration to the voting rolls of 1,377 Negroes in a Louisiana parish by order of a Federal court is the first positive result of the Civil Rights Act of 1957. After this it will be impossible to say that the power given under this law to the Attorney General to institute civil suits to protect voting rights is ineffective or meaningless. The law certainly does not yet go far enough to insure the quality of citizenship that the American system demands; but it does represent a forward step—which must and will be followed by other and larger steps in the same direction.

Just what Congress proposes to do about additional civil rights legislation at this pre-election session is not yet clear. Majority Leader JOHNSON is committed to bringing up a bill next month; the question is: What bill? A moderate civil rights bill was reported by the House Judiciary Committee last summer and has been pigeonholed since then in the Rules Committee. If it should be forced out by petition (or by politics) and passed by the House in the next few weeks, the Senate would have something to go on—not much, to be sure, but better than the nothing it will get from its own Judiciary Committee headed by Senator EASTLAND.

The Civil Rights Commission made its contribution to the picture in its report last September, recommending that Federal registrars be used to insure Negro voting rights where necessary; but the President gave this idea scant backing in his state of the Union message the other day, urging merely that Congress "seriously" consider this along with his own previous, less far-reaching, proposals.

Meanwhile, the decision in Federal district court in New Orleans by Judge J. Skelly Wright will stand as a minor landmark in the long struggle to gain the franchise for

Negroes even in the Deep South. Judge Wright held that the 1,377 Negroes purged from the registration rolls were clearly victims of racial discrimination; and he has taken unusual judicial steps to insure that future registrations in the affected parish are untainted by racialism. "In a democratic society," this vigorous judge points out, "there is no greater offense than illegally depriving a citizen of his right to vote." The Citizens Councils of Louisiana and elsewhere ought to take these words to heart.

FEDERAL EMPLOYEES MERIT A PAY INCREASE BASED ON ADMINISTRATION-SPONSORED PAY RAISE FOR STEELWORKERS

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, on January 11, 1960, a letter was addressed by me to the Chairman of the U.S. Civil Service Commission asking what plans are underway by the Eisenhower Administration to provide pay increases for Federal employees generally and for employees of the Post Office Department.

My inquiry was prompted by the very generous wage and fringe-benefit increases recently sponsored by high officials of the administration for the steelworkers, who already were among the highest paid industrial workers in the Nation.

Any valid comparison of the wages received by steelworkers and Federal employees will demonstrate the greater average earnings of steelworkers.

STEELWORKERS EARN MORE THAN FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

In 1958 the average steel production employee earned \$5,616, as contrasted with \$5,193 for the average Federal employee and only \$4,809 for the average employee of the U.S. Post Office Department. Furthermore, the pay of steel production employees has increased some 127 percent since 1946, as compared with 94 percent for all Federal employees and but 77 percent for postal employees.

On top of this, many leading authorities believe that the settlement reached in steel will add to the inflation in consumer prices generally, and of course this will affect Federal employees and all other people in the Nation. In its issue of January 18, U.S. News & World Report has stated that "steel prices are not to be raised immediately but higher costs are expected to force prices up later. The steel wage boost will affect other industries.

ADMINISTRATION MIGHT FAVOR INCREASE IN PAY FOR FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

And so I have asked the administration what it intends to do for its own employees, now that this same administration has sponsored such substantial gains for the steelworkers. I have voiced the inquiry to the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission in my capacity as the member of the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service who held detailed subcommittee hearings several years ago on the entire question of Federal pay scales.

The cost of steel enters into every single item from baby buggies to trolley fares. The wages paid to the steelworkers enter into the cost of steel. Now that the administration has gained the

credit for the settlement favoring the steelworkers, can the administration shirk the problem created in other industries and, indeed, in the Federal Government itself? Millions of families will find their pocketbooks and budgets disturbed by the steel settlement, which has gained such plaudits from the Steelworkers Union for the Eisenhower administration officials who negotiated it. But with plaudits come responsibility, and I have asked Chairman Jones of the Civil Service Commission the very simple and direct question of whether or not the administration has any plans for its own Federal Government employees which are parallel to the bonanza discovered by the administration for the steelworkers.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD my letter of January 11 to Chairman Roger W. Jones of the U.S. Civil Service Commission, together with the cryptic reply which I have received from the Chairman. I also ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD an excellent article from the New York Times of January 10, 1960, by Joseph A. Loftus, "Steel Accord Stirs Fears of Inflation," which discusses the possible inflationary impact of the recent steel wage settlement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JAVITS in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oregon?

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

JANUARY 11, 1960.

HON. ROGER W. JONES,
Chairman, U.S. Civil Service Commission,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Now that the administration has taken the lead in sponsoring and promoting a handsome pay increase for the steelworkers, I should like to inquire as to the plans of the administration regarding its own Federal Government employees.

Let me call your attention to the fact that, in 1958, the average steel employee earned \$5,616 as contrasted with \$5,193 for the average Federal employee and only \$4,809 for the average employee of the U.S. Post Office Department. Furthermore, the pay of steelworkers has increased some 127 percent since 1946, as compared with 94 percent for all Federal employees and 77 percent for postal employees.

In view of the administration leadership which resulted in the substantial pay increases recently negotiated for the steelworkers, I naturally assume that this administration has somewhat parallel plans underway for those who serve the administration directly, in the general departments and agencies of Government and in the Post Office particularly. Such a pay increase could be effective July 1, 1960, or January 1, 1961, but in either case would require congressional approval this year.

We must remember that the weapon of the strike, used with such effectiveness by the steelworkers, is not available to men and women who serve the U.S. Government. Yet this does not make any less urgent their problems of supporting their families in a period of ever-increasing living costs. I must again emphasize that the administration has been a good deal less than hesitant in claiming credit for the large wage and fringe-benefit increases recently won by the steelworkers. This certainly places upon the administration an obligation to tell the American

public how it proposes, under such circumstances, to treat its own postal workers and other Federal employees.

As a member of the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, I shall await with interest your recommendations in this respect. I had assumed that the administration desired to "hold the line" on so-called pay increases. However, in view of the administration's own active role in promoting the very substantial salary increases obtained by the steelworkers, I now presume that Federal employees will receive somewhat similar gains. The cost of steel, after all, is a vital and integral feature of the cost of living of all Americans, including Federal employees.

May I hear from you at an early date?

With all good wishes for the new year, I am,

Sincerely,

RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
U.S. Senator.

U.S. CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION,
WASHINGTON, D.C.,
January 11, 1960.

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR NEUBERGER: In response to your inquiry of January 11, as to the position which the administration will take with respect to pay raises, it is my understanding that the President will discuss this issue in his budget message, now scheduled for presentation to Congress on January 18.

Sincerely yours,

ROGER W. JONES,
Chairman.

STEEL ACCORD STIRS FEARS OF INFLATION BUT NOT ALL ECONOMISTS AGREE ON THE DEPTH OF ITS IMPACT

(By Joseph A. Loftus)

WASHINGTON, January 9.—President Eisenhower this week compared the nagging specter of inflation to a fire in the old homestead. Everybody, particularly government, must fight it, he told Congress.

Since the war, price inflation has halved the value of the dollar. More recently, the rise has been called a "creep" and many economists accept it as the price of a booming economy.

The Consumer Price Index, loosely called the cost of living fever chart, is the principal indicator of the creep. Except for a pause in the latter half of 1958, the index has moved up slowly but steadily. So with the wholesale price index, if farm products and food are excluded from the count.

Inflation is the consequence of many factors—government spending in excess of income, excessively cheap consumer credit that makes demands on the supply of goods, wasteful work and managerial practices leading to low productivity, and profiteering, to use an old wartime epithet.

The upward pressure of the labor contract is being watched closely by the economists. No contract is considered more important in this context than steel, and the settlement in that industry has prompted a reappraisal of the general outlook.

If the steel companies follow the pattern of their own statistics, prices will go up about \$3.75 per ton per year.

This is not a prediction. It is a statistical implication in the speech of Roger M. Blough, chairman of the United States Steel Corp., to the Nation on Monday night. He said that for the last 20 years steel's employment costs have risen an average of 8 percent a year. The price rise of steel averaged 5.5 percent a year.

Since the employment cost rise under the new 3-year labor contract, according to Mr. Blough, will be less than half of the 20-year average, one might conclude that the price rise will be less than half the average, or 2.5

percent a year. The price of steel per ton averages \$150. A raise of 2.5 percent would yield \$3.75. This is small, as steel price increases have gone in the postwar years.

EMPLOYMENT COST

Any price projection involves assumptions. This projection assumes that 1960-62 will be average years. That could be wrong. Certainly 1960 is expected to be better than average in terms of total production. When production is high, employment cost per unit of output falls.

An assumption that productivity will not rise any faster than it has in the past is probably wrong, certainly for 1960. Data for the first half of 1959, when the mills were running close to capacity show a sharp rise in productivity.

Union cooperation and employee morale are important in the future price picture. As Mr. Blough said in that context, "the steel industry can witness one of the greatest improvements in its productive efficiency that it has known in modern times."

Since foreign steel and substitute products made at home are a threat, as Mr. Blough reported, the steel companies no doubt will consider these factors in making price policies.

So, political angles aside, it is possible that the steel industry will find 1960 so much better than average that it will be able to defer price increases until December 1, when the second step-up in employment costs takes effect. This, too, is no forecast.

STEEL'S EFFECTS

How do steel prices affect the rest of the economy?

In August 1956, Ewan Clague, Commissioner of Labor Statistics, observed that the 6¼-percent rise in steel prices then would have a negligible effect on the Consumer Price Index because the amount of steel in the consumer dollar is tiny.

Prof. Jules Backman of New York University told the Senate Antitrust Subcommittee in 1958 that his analysis "supports Mr. Clague's 1956 appraisal and that conclusion would be equally applicable today."

Not all authorities accept this method of measuring the impact of steel prices.

Otto Eckstein and Gary Fromm, two economists who did a special steel-inflation study for the Joint Economic Committee, said the Consumer Price Index "is particularly poorly suited to reflect the significance of steel."

They noted, for instance, that capital goods are completely excluded from the index, though in the long run they enter into consumer prices. Also excluded are the cost of Government purchases.

Besides, the impact of steel prices on other prices cannot be attributed wholly to the steel industry. About a third of the price increase in steel is attributable to higher prices paid by the steel industry for materials, transportation, and other items purchased from other industries.

Steel prices are sometimes credited with a psychological impact on the economy. As a basic industry, it is thought of as a bellwether. Yet, in the last 7 years the major steel consuming industries have not raised their prices as fast as basic steel prices went up.

The immediate effect of the wage settlement on the stock market was to drive up steel shares. Then these prices fell back, although other considerations appeared to have entered into the drop.

With the threat of another steel strike dissipated, it is hard to see any block to the flow of consumer goods to meet the rising demand.

PRICES HELD

The extent that production costs tend to push up prices, improved productivity (rates

of production) will tend to hold down prices. The outlook for this is generally good.

Rising imports, though they may create other problems, will tend to hold down prices.

As the experts hereabouts look ahead, the rise in the general price level, in the next year probably will not exceed 2 percent if it goes that high. In 1959, the Consumer Price Index went up 1.5 percent.

If steel is the key, that forecast surely should stand up. For, to go back to the beginning, the steel settlement is less costly than previous settlements, far less than the 3-year pact made in 1956.

If President Eisenhower's hopes are realized, we will reach June 30, 1961, with a \$4,200 million surplus in the Federal till. This is a deflationary force.

Tight money, which seems to be the current policy of the Federal Reserve, tends to brake the spiral, though an excessive use of such a brake could manufacture a recession.

Taken together, the pressures may not entirely dissipate the specter of inflation but the experts are not worrying about anything so real that it will burn the house down.

OUR STAKE IN FOREIGN AID

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in the days ahead, Congress will be faced with significant decisions on the direction and scope of the mutual security program.

The program—one of the most controversial in the postwar era—has served, nevertheless, as the foundation for free world efforts to combat communism.

As a unique effort in history by one nation to assist other nations in facing a common enemy, however, the program, unfortunately, has suffered, prestige-wise, from the inevitable mistakes of the "trial and error" road.

Despite the difficulties involved in successfully meeting a great challenge, however, mutual security nevertheless has experienced a large degree of success—not only in withstanding the pressure of expansionist communism; but also, to go one step further, in reducing—through economic and technological assistance—the areas of poverty and substandard living which serve as the breeding places for trouble in the world.

Today, changing conditions in the world require adjustments in the program. Particularly, there is a real need for assumption of greater responsibility for assistance to less developed nations by those countries—particularly Western Europe—which are now on their feet economically.

These nations, I believe, can well afford both in their own national, and the free-world interest, to assume greater responsibilities in this field.

Although there is a recognizable need for improvements in the program, however, mutual assistance still continues to be an essential part of our foreign policy.

Recently, the Deputy Director for Operations of the International Cooperation Administration, D. A. FitzGerald, gave an informative address on foreign aid at Marquette University in Milwaukee, Wis., entitled "Our Stake in Foreign Aid."

I ask unanimous consent to have the address printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

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

OUR STAKE IN FOREIGN AID

(Address by D. A. FitzGerald, Deputy Director for Operations, International Cooperation Administration, at the Institute on U.S. Foreign Aid, Marquette University, Milwaukee, Wis., December 11, 1959)

The subject which has been assigned to me for this evening is "Our Stake in Foreign Aid." I wish that the mutual security program had no future, that we had no stake in it. The greatest news for all of us would be an announcement by the President that this program could come to an end—that it was no longer needed.

Such an announcement would mean that the military threat to the United States no longer existed; that no defense partner of ours had a larger defense burden than its economy could reasonably bear; that there was no need for outside governmental financial help for economic and social development anywhere in the world; that each nation, new or old, had enough of the knowledge and skills it needed for progress; that emergencies such as famines, floods, fires, or political upheavals could be handled without U.S. Government assistance.

Unfortunately, this millennium is not within sight, much less within reach. In its absence, or any reasonable facsimile thereof, we will need, in our own national interest, a mutual security program to deal constructively and imaginatively with the hard facts of international life. Which are the most important of these facts? I shall deal with three.

1. The fact of tremendous military power in unfriendly hands.

2. The fact of surge for economic and social progress in the underdeveloped nations.

3. The fact of growing U.S. dependence on oversea trade.

1. Military power: Despite the talk of peace, negotiation, and coexistence, we still face a most formidable military problem. Milwaukee is only 15 minutes away from Moscow—by intercontinental ballistic missile, which the Russians say they possess. The conventional airpower of the Sino-Soviet bloc consists of about 25,000 planes in operational units and it is a well-known fact that Russian jets are good. In the Russian and Chinese armies are some 400 line divisions, totaling more than 6½ million soldiers. The naval strength includes some 3,000 combatant vessels, of which about 500 are submarines. There has been no reduction in the Sino-Soviet military power. These forces still exist and are being equipped with better weapons every day.

We are still faced with international communism devoted to an often-stated purpose of taking over the world. Mr. Khrushchev has never, for 1 minute, budged on this point. It is an article of faith with him that communism will follow capitalism as night follows day. The only apparent change is in tactics, and we do not yet know whether this relatively new phenomenon will be a permanent change, or only a temporary one.

In the past, the Sino-Soviet bloc has proved, over and over, and over again, that it will not hesitate to use armed force or threats of armed force to achieve its goals. The record of military occupation to install puppet governments in Eastern Europe; the record of the Berlin blockade; the record of the takeover of China; the record of Communist-abetted insurrections in Greece, Malaya, Indochina, the Philippines; the record of aggression in Korea—and now in India; the dismal record is on the books—clear for all to see.

It took time to realize that the Sino-Soviet bloc would keep on using armed forces to gobble up its neighbors unless stopped by military power. It took more time, working

with our defense partners, to put together the free world defense strength to stop that outward march. I do not know any way, at present, to keep the Sino-Soviet bloc from engaging in further military action except for us to make it too risky for it to do so. We have made that risk too great and we must maintain this position until such time as we get workable and enforceable agreements which can bring about real peace and disarmament.

It is not the U.S. defense forces alone; it is not the defense forces of our allies alone; it is not the air and naval bases made available to us—none of these individual defense items could have done the job. But a free world collective defense, with many partners working together, helping each other—with all partners undertaking burdensome expenditures, all partners putting great numbers of young men into armies, navies, and air forces; all partners devoting large amounts of materiel to defense—all this has done the job.

2. Economic and social progress: I turn now to the second hard fact we face—the surge for economic and social progress. The tens of millions, indeed the hundreds of millions of people, in the underdeveloped parts of the world in Africa, Asia, and Latin America are no longer content merely to exist. As communication improves and brings knowledge of the outside world to great masses of these people, their conviction grows that their lot can and indeed must be improved. This demand for progress is particularly insistent in the 21 new countries with a population of 720 million people who have obtained their political independence since the end of World War II. Other new countries, perhaps as many more, will appear on the scenes during the next decade.

In all the underdeveloped countries, whether new or old, annual incomes are likely to average less than \$100 a year. Illiteracy, disease, and malnutrition have been the rule rather than the exception. The leaders of these countries, either on their own or because of the pressure from within, or both, are committed to advance the well-being of their people. Whether this economic development takes place under a political system which is compatible with ours, a system which is based on the freedom and dignity of the individual, is vitally important to the security of the United States.

Let me stress that even though we may have convinced the Sino-Soviet bloc that the risk of military aggression is too great, we should not be lulled into believing that other forms of competition with international communism no longer exist or are declining. Indeed, it seems clear that the situation is exactly the reverse. As the advance of the retaliatory power of the free world makes the prospect for the achievement of the goal of world domination through overt military aggression more and more costly, the U.S.S.R. and its satellites are turning more and more to other means for achieving their ultimate goal.

During the past 3 years or so, the Communist bloc—largely the U.S.S.R.—has entered into agreements for the provision of \$2.4 billion worth of economic assistance to 21 countries, primarily underdeveloped countries on the periphery of the bloc itself. The bloc is probing—and probing deeply—on the economic front all over the free world and appears to be eyeing with increasing interest the great continent of Africa and its many newly emerging countries. As the productive capacity of the Sino-Soviet bloc grows, particularly in the U.S.S.R., we can confidently expect a continuous increase in Communist efforts at economic penetration and political subversion.

3. U.S. economic need: The third important fact of life in the international world today is the increasing dependence of the United States on the rest of the world for

raw materials and other imports to meet its ever-growing internal requirements, on the one hand, and as markets for its products, on the other. During the past two decades our imports have increased fivefold and our exports sevenfold. The latter amounted to nearly \$21 billion last year and exceeded our imports by nearly \$3½ billion. Nevertheless, this surplus in our trading account has not been sufficient to offset the red ink in our invisibles, principally the U.S. military expenditures abroad; the U.S. Government grants, loans, and other capital outflow; and private capital outflow for investment.

It is clear that the United States cannot run a balance-of-payments deficit of the current size indefinitely. Recently the Secretary of State commented on this matter as follows:

"The problem is to see to it that the deficit is reduced by means which enlarge international trade and do not restrict it—by methods which promote competition and the flow of development capital rather than restrict them. If this approach is to succeed, action is required of other countries, particularly Western Europe and Japan, to open their doors to American exports and to provide additional capital to the development of hungry nations of Asia, Africa, and the Near East and Latin America. At the recent meetings of the International Monetary Fund and the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, the United States called for an end to the discriminatory restrictions which many foreign countries had been compelled to maintain against American exports in earlier years, but which are no longer needed. Our request received gratifying support on all sides. Both the Fund and GATT institutions recorded the view that discriminatory restrictions can no longer be generally justified on balance-of-payments grounds and many countries have taken action to eliminate discriminations."

The United States has been built upon the energy and initiative of individuals and upon the belief that, under the broad rules of fair play, free competition and initiative are the sinews of our economic and political strength. This holds true of our international activities as well as our domestic affairs.

But let us make no mistake about it. If through indifference and lack of understanding on our part we ignore the legitimate requirements of the free world for the resources to help it make economic progress and it turns elsewhere for this help and if, as a consequence, it adopts the political and economic practices of communism, our present balance-of-payments difficulties will fade into insignificance.

Free, friendly, and forward-moving countries are not only our best markets, our best sources of supply for the mutual benefit of all of us, but are essential to the maintenance of our way of life. As our experience with the Sino-Soviet bloc demonstrates, freedom of trade and commerce and private competition are incompatible with Communist ideology.

As long as these three major facts of international life face us, the United States will have to have, in its own interests, a mutual security program of some kind and of substantial magnitude. No doubt there will be changes in direction and emphasis, and in character and composition, as the facts of international conditions require, and the U.S. interests demand.

The biggest single cost element in our mutual security program today is that involved in the maintenance of the extensive military strength of the free world—the strength needed to deal with the first fact of international life—the threat of overt Communist aggression. We undertake to provide military assistance to deter this threat for exactly the same reason that we have our

own domestic defense program—to help build up and maintain essential defensive strength. And let me emphasize we are only helping to maintain the military strength of our allies. Our allies contribute over \$6 to our mutual defense for every dollar of military assistance the United States provides to them. I am no military man, but let me quote the President of the United States, who certainly has a reputation in the military field. Here is what he said to the Congress in submitting last year's mutual security program:

"These two requests, one for own defense forces, the other for our share in supporting the collective system, are but two elements in a single defense effort. Each is essential in the plans of the Joint Chiefs of Staff for our national security. Each is recommended to you by the same Joint Chiefs, the same Secretary of Defense, and the same Commander in Chief.

"Dollar for dollar our [military] expenditures for the mutual security program, after we have once achieved a reasonable military posture for ourselves, will buy more security than far greater additional expenditures for our own forces."

Some of our allies, particularly our NATO partners, have made rapid economic progress in the last decade. Not only are they in a position to reduce the dollar discrimination to which I referred earlier, but they are in a position to, and are indeed, carrying more of the burden of our mutual defense.

But our military allies are not limited to the advanced countries of Western Europe, nor is the military threat limited to this area. Our allies in the Far East and Asia—Korea, Nationalist China, Pakistan, and Turkey, for example—are not capable of maintaining the military establishments that are needed in our mutual interest, and military assistance from the United States must be provided.

Korea and Nationalist China have the fourth and fifth largest armies in the world, exceeded only by the armies of Red China, the U.S.R.R., and the United States. As long as the military threat continues, I can see no possibility of the United States discontinuing some military assistance to these countries. We can hope that it will become less as time passes. But we must be realistic, and the cost of modern armies is going up and not down.

In addition to direct military assistance, we are providing a dozen of our allies with economic assistance to help them to maintain these same military establishments and hopefully some modest economic growth. U.S. military assistance is limited to materiel and training. There are other costs to supporting military establishments—troop pay, subsistence, etc. These costs for such countries as Korea, Nationalist China, Pakistan, Turkey, Greece, and Vietnam are larger than can be met from their own resources. So in 12 countries, in addition to the provision of direct military equipment, the United States is also providing modest economic resources to help the country carry the burden of the military establishments which are needed for our protection as well as theirs.

We have a vital interest in the economic progress of these countries, in addition to our military interest in their defense establishment. If with our help these countries can gradually increase their rate of economic growth, thus eventually taking on more of the cost of carrying their own military establishment, then we can indeed look forward to the time when this component of the mutual security program can be reduced and, hopefully, eliminated.

These two components of the mutual security program—military assistance for our allies, and defense support economic aid for 12 of them—make up almost two-thirds of the mutual security program appropriations for this year—over \$2 billion out of a total \$3.2 billion.

I now turn again to the second international fact of life—the demand for progress in that vast area of the world characterized as "underdeveloped," and the vital importance to the United States that this progress be made under political and economic conditions which are compatible with those of the United States. Perhaps we can hope that Soviet leadership, as Secretary Herter recently said, "is reaching a conclusion similar to our own—that unless the course of events is changed and changed soon, both sides face unacceptable risks of general nuclear war, which would approximate mutual suicide." But even if, in fact, this turns out to be the case there still will be no basis for relaxing our efforts in the nonmilitary field. Indeed, in view of the growing economic strength of the Soviet Union, we will need to redouble—not relax our efforts. Mr. Khrushchev still makes no bones about his ultimate aims. They are the same as ever, even though the means perhaps will be different.

So within the framework of mutual security we must be concerned with development as we are concerned with defense. Most of the balance of the mutual security appropriation, the remaining one-third, is used to help the underdeveloped areas of the world to develop both their human resources and their physical resources. It is my personal conviction that lack of trained human resources is more likely to inhibit economic, political, and social progress than the lack of physical resources.

An utterly essential prerequisite to development in this day and age is literacy. Yet in underdeveloped areas of the world as a whole the literacy rate is less than 25 percent. In addition to basic literacy, economic progress is dependent upon an adequate supply of trained manpower all the way from skilled workmen through private and public managers to nuclear scientists. By and large these trained human resources are either woefully inadequate or missing entirely.

One component of the mutual security program is devoted to helping train these human resources. This is our technical cooperation, frequently called point 4 program. Today we have some 3,500 American technicians and consultants abroad helping and advising in agriculture, industry, public administration, health, education, and transportation, while annually we are providing training in the United States or other more developed countries, for some 8,000 nationals of the less developed parts of the world, in the same broad fields of human knowledge and endeavor.

We are not alone in this activity. The United Nations technical assistance program is operating in this field as are many other more developed countries in bilateral programs of their own, along with many American foundations and religious groups.

In the field of higher education, we in ICA have been calling more and more upon American universities to provide help and guidance in the establishment of similar institutions overseas. As of today we have 90 contracts with 53 American universities for help in 33 countries.

But the need is enormous, and education, whether narrowly or broadly defined, takes time—it takes a great deal of time. I am convinced that, no matter what progress may be made in our efforts to find a solid basis for coexisting with international communism, we will find it in our very direct interest to continue for the foreseeable future the technical assistance—point 4—component of our mutual security program.

The second component on the development side of our mutual security ledger is help in providing the physical resources needed for economic development. Currently these resources are provided largely through the Development Loan Fund, first authorized by the Congress about 3 years ago. This Fund is authorized to make resources available on a

long-term-repayment basis, in local currency if the situation requires, for sound development projects for which no other reasonable source of financing is available.

The Development Loan Fund is not the only, indeed not even the major, source of capital resources for economic development. Others include the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the Export-Import Bank of the United States, resources from other more developed countries, particularly those in Western Europe and over the horizon, an Inter-American Bank to help meet the needs of our Latin American friends and the International Development Association. Nevertheless, even with all these potential resources in sight, the economic progress of vast areas of the world is inadequate to meet the challenge of the times or explicitly the security interests of the United States.

There is a considerable body of opinion in the United States that the U.S. contribution to this development must be sharply increased. One recent study prepared by the Maxwell Graduate School of Citizenship and Public Affairs, Syracuse University, at the request of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the U.S. Senate, proposes that the U.S. Government for a 10-year period, starting in the fiscal year 1961, devote one-fourth of its additional production each year over and above present levels of assistance, to the economic development of less developed areas. In monetary terms this would contemplate something in the order of an additional \$4 billion worth of assistance immediately and, as our own production grows during the decade, \$6 or \$8 billion a year a decade from now.

However, I am convinced, for the reasons elaborated earlier, that through one means or another we will need to continue for some time to contribute substantial resources to economic development in the less developed areas of the world. Much of this assistance cannot be on standard and traditional terms of repayment. Some of it should be provided initially as an outright grant and some more should involve flexible repayment provisions which permit the discharge of the obligation in local currency rather than convertible foreign exchange.

Let me remind this audience that in the early years of the United States, indeed through much if not all of the 19th century, this country relied heavily for its economic development on capital resources from abroad. Even today a major midwestern railroad—the Northwestern—runs on the left rather than the right—a heritage of its British origin. But, some will say, these investments were made on a business basis by private investors. True, but many of the enterprises defaulted on the bonds and thus in effect the project became a gift to the country.

One alternative proposal not infrequently advanced is that the U.S. Government, and thus the American taxpayer, should get out of the business of helping economic development overseas and permit, indeed encourage, American private investment to do the job. Nothing would please me better, but the possibilities must be looked at in perspective. The great underdeveloped areas of the world are the arc of Asia and Africa. I am sure it will surprise you to know, as it certainly surprised me, that U.S. private investment, exclusive of investments in oil, in all of Africa, in all the Near East and in all of South Asia and the Far East has amounted to less than \$60 million a year during the past 5 years. The total for this vast area is less than the annual budget of Montgomery County, Md., where I live.

In saying this I have no intention of being critical of the American private investor. He wants reasonable security for and reasonable returns on his investment. Everyone in this audience could think of many countries in which he would be not

only hesitant but completely unwilling to make any investments. But yet these countries are very likely indeed to be countries in which, from the point of view of the interest of all Americans, economic development is the most vital.

The U.S. Government is working hard at its job to make the climate overseas attractive to American private investors, through treaties of friendship, commerce and navigation, tax treaties and the like. We in ICA for 10 years have been offering for a modest fee to guarantee the American private investor against losses from either expropriation or inconvertibility. More recently the Congress has extended this coverage to include damage resulting from war. The past year or so our coverage expanded sharply and now amounts to \$432 million. Much of this guarantee coverage was, however, in the more advanced countries. During the past session the Congress limited this guarantee authority, effective January 1, 1960, to underdeveloped countries.

We are most anxious to have private investment take on more of the responsibility. In addition to our investment guarantee program, we have established a senior officer with staff to devote his attention exclusively to the job of encouraging and facilitating American and other foreign private investment in underdeveloped areas of the world.

We believe also that the countries of Western Europe, and now perhaps Japan, can, both bilaterally and multilaterally, contribute more to this economic development. It seems to us clear too that the contribution of other developed countries must also include a larger component of noncommercial grants and loans and it is for this reason the United States recently proposed the formation of the International Development Association which under the expert management of the most successful International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, can help provide more of the noncommercial requirements for development.

Now before closing I should like to turn briefly to one other aspect of the mutual security program, namely its administration. The mutual security program seems to generate, for reasons not wholly clear to me, more than the usual number of charges of poor administration. Of course we make mistakes. The only person who never makes a mistake is one who never makes a decision.

The International Cooperation Administration in helping to carry out more than 1,000 projects every year, scattered in 60 countries, where working conditions, local standards of conduct of managerial capacity and of business experience are completely different from those existing in the United States. Despite these additional handicaps, I am wholly satisfied that our batting average is very high. We have a loyal, competent, devoted staff who take pride in getting things done well under conditions which would, I can assure you, baffle and frustrate many of us. But to repeat, we do make mistakes and I can have no legitimate complaint when these mistakes are reported fully to the American public. Obviously the taxpayer is entitled to this knowledge. I could wish that the successes were as widely publicized as are our mistakes, but perhaps this is too much to hope.

About 2 years ago we devoted the time and effort necessary to investigate and report on a list compiled by the House Foreign Affairs Committee of charges which at that time were being commonly made against the mutual security program, including allegations that we were giving iceboxes to Eskimos and dress suits to Greek undertakers. The committee listed some 96 of these charges. Some of these like the two I mentioned were pure fiction. Eight did not apply to the mutual security program at all; some 20 were errors in fact; over one-half were misinterpretations or differences in judgment. Not one

represented an error or mistake not corrected. I have here in my hand part 6 of the hearings before that committee. The list of questions and the responses thereto occupy 55 printed pages. How many of you are aware, I wonder, that such a list had been compiled, analyzed, and made publicly available?

There is in Wisconsin, I believe, an organization which around the turn of the year annually makes awards for the tallest "tall story" of that year. I am seriously considering entering in this contest some of the fabrications dealing with the mutual security program. I feel confident that one or more of them would win the award hands down. The regular entries in the competition are submitted in the spirit of good clean fun and are accepted and understood for what they are. No harm is done. Unfortunately, incorrect reporting, or even worse, pure fabrications, on the mutual security program could be seriously detrimental to the security of the United States.

Now to return to the main theme. In summary the major components of the current mutual security program or some alternative thereto will in my opinion have to continue in some magnitude for the foreseeable future. This program does cost money—does require U.S. resources that might otherwise be used for different purposes but in our concentration on costs we have many times I fear lost sight of value. The real question about the mutual security program is not "What does it cost?" but "What is it worth?" Value and price are not the same; nor is a thing automatically good because it is cheap and bad because it is expensive.

What is it worth to the United States that the balance of power for peace remains with the free world and has not been moved to the Communists' side of the scales? What is it worth to the United States to have strong and willing partners for defense? What is it worth to the United States to have the use of air, naval, and communication bases at strategic spots around the world? What is it worth to the United States to have strong trading partners able to stand on their own feet and pay their own way? What is it worth to the United States to have prevented economic and perhaps political collapse in Western Europe and in countries like Iran, Turkey, Korea, Vietnam, Taiwan, the Philippines, and Pakistan? What is it worth to the United States that most of the developing nations turn first toward the West when they look for outside help in developing their resources and their institutions? What is it worth to this country that there are being created, by and large, whole societies whose institutions, of government and business, are compatible with our own? What is it worth to the United States that we do not have to go it alone and do not have to incur increased taxes and draft calls to supply U.S. Armed Forces equal to free world totals?

These are the kinds of questions we should be asking ourselves and we should try to find out what part the mutual security program has in the answers. We should go further. In this era of change we should ask if there are available better or less costly alternatives for achieving the goals we have set ourselves. Even should the need for defense disappear completely there will still be need for development programs for years to come. We would have an interest in these programs even should there be no competition from international communism. In the years ahead I am convinced that the economic and technical parts of the mutual security program will become even more important than they have been up until now.

Tomorrow you will hear from several distinguished gentlemen on various aspects of the subject before the conference. From the information you receive, from the points of view presented, you can then draw your own conclusion about our stake in foreign aid.

UNIVERSITY OF THE AIR

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, in our current discussions of television, it is imperative that we consider some of the substantial and unique contributions that medium has made to our society.

Through the wonders of electronics an experiment was undertaken 9 years ago this month which has helped enrich the lives of people in four States. "The University of the Air" was founded, in cooperation with 22 leading colleges and universities, to offer college-level training for anyone motivated enough to flick a dial.

It began on station WFIL-TV, the Triangle television station in Philadelphia, and is now carried also by the following Triangle stations: WBNF-TV, Binghamton, N.Y.; WFBG-TV, Altoona-Johnstown, Pa.; WNHC-TV, Hartford-New Haven, Conn.; WLX-TV, Lebanon-Lancaster, Pa.; and KFRE-TV, Fresno, Calif.

Participating colleges and universities include: Albright College, Reading, Pa.; La Salle College, Philadelphia, Pa.; Beaver College, Jenkintown, Pa.; Bryn Mawr College, Bryn Mawr, Pa.; Lehigh University, Bethlehem, Pa.; Jefferson Medical College, Philadelphia, Pa.; Division of School Extension, School District of Philadelphia, Philadelphia, Pa.; Eastern Baptist College, St. Davids, Pa.; Haverford College, Haverford, Pa.; Pennsylvania Military College, Chester, Pa.; Pennsylvania State University, Ogonz Center, Abington, Pa.; Princeton Theological Seminary, Princeton, N.J.; Rutgers University, New Brunswick, N.J.; Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, Pa.; the Pennsylvania State College of Optometry, Philadelphia, Pa.; University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.; Drexel Institute of Technology, Philadelphia, Pa.; Glassboro State College, Glassboro, N.J.; Lincoln University, Lincoln University, Pa.; New Jersey Education Association, Trenton, N.J.; Philadelphia College of Pharmacy and Science, Philadelphia, Pa.; Rider College, Trenton, N.J.; St. Joseph's College, Philadelphia, Pa.; Temple University, Philadelphia, Pa.; the Philadelphia Textile Institute Foundation, Philadelphia, Pa.; Ursinus College, Collegeville, Pa.

In the semester now ending the "University of the Air" has offered its 188th course. Its audience has been estimated at more than 250,000 "students" who see one or more shows each week.

Today the "University of the Air" is the oldest and largest continuously run adult education program in commercial television. It has been called television's most ambitious program of mass education.

This ninth birthday of the "University of the Air" is a good occasion to remind ourselves that commercial television, when in the hands of intelligent, civic-minded people, can make an important contribution to the culture of our society.

ARTICLE FROM FOREIGN AFFAIRS QUARTERLY BY HON. ADLAI E. STEVENSON, OF ILLINOIS

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, one of the truly great leaders of this era, both in our Nation and in the world, is

former Gov. Adlai E. Stevenson, of Illinois. Governor Stevenson has a profound knowledge and wisdom regarding foreign affairs and international questions. In the January 1960 issue of *Foreign Affairs*, Adlai Stevenson has contributed an article, "Putting First Things First." In this thoughtful and informative article, Governor Stevenson has called attention to our great responsibilities in maintaining freedom in the world and in expanding economic opportunity for underdeveloped nations. He has rallied us to the urgency of the sacrifice which is necessary if we are to survive. Anybody reading this article will realize anew that Adlai Stevenson has the stature, integrity, and intellect to head our Nation at a time of world crisis. Because Governor Stevenson's message is so important to all Americans generally and to those who sit in the Senate and the House in particular, I ask unanimous consent that his splendid article from *Foreign Affairs* for January be printed in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

[From *Foreign Affairs*, January 1960]
PUTTING FIRST THINGS FIRST—A DEMOCRATIC VIEW

(By Adlai E. Stevenson)

Peace is the most imperative business in the world today. It is the world's most universal desire and most powerful force. The mass of humanity seems to understand better than its rulers the idiosyncrasy of war and its mortal danger to the human race. Everywhere I travel the people appear to know that all their aspirations for freedom and dignity and a better life are going to be destroyed if mankind ever fights a modern war.

The United States has been the source of the most revolutionary and glorious concepts of human and political freedom. It had been my hope that in this revolutionary century the United States, which first split the atom, would be the tireless, fearless, indomitable leader of the cause of freedom from war. And I still think that to seize that role and pursue it with passion should be the top priority of American foreign policy.

Why haven't we really led the postwar world since the Korean war? Why are many Americans fearful that we have lost our sense of national purpose? Why is there confusion about intellectual and moral values? Why is there a slackness about public problems and a wholesale retreat to the joys of private life? Why is balancing the budget a greater national concern than exertion, self-denial, and hard work? Have we confused prosperity with security? Why is there a growing uneasiness over the contrast between a society like that of the Soviets which believes in its destiny and our own which seems to regard itself as fulfilled?

Personally, I think the trouble is not in the Nation's energy, its will, or its nerve; and if wealth and comfort have softened us I am sure we are not yet beyond repair. The root of the trouble lies in this: the Nation faces a series of massive changes in the world scene; they call for new ways of looking at the world; for new policies; for increased efforts. But since Korea our political leadership has not clearly and insistently acknowledged this fact. American policy has thus moved further and further away from the reality that surrounds us. Unchallenged by the realities, Americans have turned their energies and idealism to second-order business.

The main lines of American military and foreign policy are still those of 1947-52. Although Messrs. Dulles and Eisenhower crusaded for a policy of liberation and denounced containment as immoral in operation their policy was to construct a chain of military alliances around communism and to attempt to restrain the spread of Soviet power wherever it threatened. Oddly enough, Mr. Dulles' faith that communism would disintegrate from its own internal contradictions resembled Lenin's conviction that capitalism would do the same.

But to win such an endurance contest we must have superior endurance. Yet instead of making massive efforts to improve or preserve the balance and to encourage attrition or benign change on the Soviet side, we emphasized conservative policies and fell behind on all fronts, while the Soviet Union, and other industrial areas, forged ahead at a rapid pace.

In short, while our Government adopted the Dulles foreign policy it did nothing to make it effective. Indeed, it was not long ago that Vice President Nixon saw something disloyal in my warnings about the Soviet rate of economic growth. (It is now double that of the United States.)

So for the most part the response of the United States to the great changes of this century has been only negative and defensive. An administration which has defined its overriding task as keeping the budget down has dealt with them more with rhetoric than action. And unwillingness to acknowledge reality has led to a progressive erosion of the American stature on the world scene. (Sometimes I thank God for Russians—their rapid progress may even make economic growth, risk, and adventure essential, if not respectable, here.)

But it is not my purpose to indict the small aims and large fears of the Eisenhower-Dulles era. Things had to change, and I applaud Secretary Herter for the recent signs of more enterprise and flexibility in the conduct of our foreign policy. I hope, however, that we Americans do not mistake the President's ceremonial travels for negotiation and settlement.

What are some of the realities we must face in this age of many revolutions? The old colonial order has all but vanished. New nations—and new imperialisms—strive to fill the vacuum in a vast political revolution. Most of these new nations seek to bring their economies through the sound barrier of modernization in a few decades. This is the economic revolution. But they do so against the background of exploding population which will double the inhabitants of underdeveloped areas in the next generation. This is the biological revolution. Meanwhile, supersonic flight, atomic energy, and the missile have opened up two opposite possibilities of equal magnitude—the exploration of planetary space and self-extermination within the space of this planet. This is the scientific revolution.

What lies ahead of us in this bewildering century is invisible but it may be even more significant. In the past the North Atlantic nations dominated the world. But they could not control themselves, and after their great world wars the power and influence of Europe declined; Russia and the United States suddenly emerged as the two dominant powers. Already the brief day of two-power domination is passing and new centers of power are rising from old ashes in Asia. By the end of the century China and India will be industrialized, and China's population will be close to a billion. Then, as Europe becomes more unified, it too will reemerge as a great center of power. And who can doubt that regional unification is going to take place in Latin America and emerging Africa?

So, this is not the beginning of the American century, or anyone else's. It behooves us to face the reality that we Americans are

not going to be alone at the center of the stage very long—and that modesty is always becoming. But if our tradition does not require us to be the world's boss, it does require us to keep alive and vigorous the great traditions of political freedom and legal order which underlie Western society.

To guide us through these uncharted seas, to comprehend and direct the prodigious forces now shaping the new world, is going to make heavy demands on our resources of wisdom, leadership, self-discipline, and magnanimity. I would say that this reality belongs at the top of the list, because it has not yet been proved that democracy and the processes of persuasion can match the efficiency of central planning and dictatorship.

Multiple and universal change is thus the setting for policy in this age. Another reality we have been slow to admit is the present advantage this gives to the Communists. They did not invent the world's revolutions. All of these were, wittingly or unwittingly, launched in the West. But communism, in itself a philosophy of change, exploits them worldwide. It uses all the anti-imperialist jargon and proclaims the brotherhood of—Communist—mankind. To our everlasting shame it has led the way through the frontiers of space and even pinned the Soviet colors on the moon. It proposes its own sweeping totalitarian planning as the only way out of economic stagnation, and the Soviet example of how to modernize and grow strong quickly has a powerful appeal to backward countries.

Mr. Khrushchev states his purpose plainly. He says, let's throw down our arms and we will beat you at peaceful competitive co-existence. He says that Russia will outstrip the United States in production and that one by one the neutrals will fall in line, while the Communist system spreads around the globe, and finally surrounds and isolates capitalism's last refuge in the United States. The Soviet planners expect that, as in China, the non-Communist regimes in Asia, the Middle East, Africa, and parts of Latin America will be unable to solve the problems of modernization and economic growth and will turn to the Communist alternative, encouraged no doubt by Communist trade, aid, and penetration.

This, I am convinced, is the route to world power which the Soviets now regard as the safest and surest. And I was impressed by Khrushchev's confidence, shown both in his country and ours, that history is working with him and that the system under which Russia became so strong so quickly is the system which other countries must follow. We refused to believe that Hitler meant what he said, to our sorrow. We should not do ourselves the same injury again.

To me the two most dangerous realities we now face are the multiplication of nuclear weapons and the disparity in living standards between the rich nations and the poor. So I suggest we must meet the crises of our time in four major areas: First, we must end the growing gap between wealth and poverty. In doing so, we must create new supranational patterns and institutions of cooperation. Thirdly, as long as nuclear weapons exist, the danger of their use exists. We must work for a disarmed world under law and organized police power—the only final answer to the threat of annihilating war. And, lastly, we must extend as far as lies in our power the concept of an open world. For it is in our acceptance of variety and differences, harmonized but not suppressed, that we in our turn work not only with the trend of history but in accord with the ingrained diversity of mankind. Our faith is that in the long contest the totalitarians will gradually be converted to our way of thinking rather than to theirs. Our goal is not just to win a cold war but to persuade a cold world.

These are, of course, statements of high generality. We turn them into policy only

by specific application and negotiation. Some aims we can pursue with like-minded nations, and we should proceed with them at once. Others depend on Communist assent and may take years of stoic negotiation.

The beginning of wisdom in the West, I think, is to have our own creative policy—not just a negative policy to stop the Communists, but one that reflects our own vision of a viable world society and our own understanding of the revolutions through which we live. The voluntary ending of colonialism by most of the Western colonial powers, the Marshall plan, Europe's moves toward unity, and the various programs of economic aid, are creative innovations already to the West's postwar credit.

Once we know what we want, what our aims are, then we shall have to pursue them by every means with the same resolution and sacrifice that the Communists pursue theirs. It will not be easy to agree on them in view of the divisions among the Western Powers, combined with the fact that Russia controls Eastern Germany and, therefore, the possibility of German unification. I suspect the hardest task will be to pursue our aims resolutely in common with our partners. For in peacetime democracies are at a particular disadvantage. Immediate domestic concerns take precedence over distant national goals. Too many selfish, thoughtless people prefer the easy option and too many ambitious politicians prefer office to duty. But we cannot live by tall fins, TV, and a sound dollar alone. Somehow we must lift our sights to the level of the tasks. I will try to suggest some of them.

II. ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

The average annual income in the United States is more than \$2,000 as against less than \$100 for a third of the world's population. And the worst thing about this disparity is that the rich nations are getting richer and the poor poorer. Happily, there is, at long last, a growing realization here and among our friends that these are the decisive areas and that we must assist the underdeveloped peoples to advance to self-sustaining growth while preserving their independence and some hope of evolving a political democracy. Without an alternative to Communist methods of development, we face grim prospects indeed in poor countries where literacy is low, hunger high, and the gap between resources and population widening.

Five conditions of success are, I think, clear. We shall be engaged on this program for at least 40 years. We shall require a professional staff, with the languages and skills needed in this whole new field of activity. Informed opinion tells us that at least \$5 billion a year is needed—from all sources, public and private, domestic and foreign. We shall have to coordinate all aspects of the effort with other nations—not only investment but opportunities for trade, international liquidity, and so forth. To get the maximum results the developed nations must all cooperate. The time has certainly come for other countries to share more of the common burden of assistance. In such circumstances the United States cannot expect to have full control of the use of all its expenditures for development purposes.

These five conditions are not yet fully understood, let alone accepted. There is still more than a hint that if the Communists would behave, the economic development program could be canceled. Partly as a result, our staffing policies are haphazard, our linguistic programs inadequate, and we are acquiring so many competing agencies, both national and international, that policies tend to be tangled and obstructed at the base and overlapping and bewildering in the field.

I regret that the administration rejected the recommendation of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee last winter for a soft loan fund of about a billion and a half dollars for about 5 years. With Europe pros-

perous and dollars flowing to that area, Europe should mobilize an equivalent sum. With something like \$3 billion a year available for public investment, with the West's great resources of skill and experience, and working with the World Bank, the Monetary Fund, and the new International Development Association, we should be able to plan an effective, concerted attack upon all aspects of backwardness—lack of capital, lack of skills, low reserves, single-crop exports and fluctuating world prices.

It is difficult to establish priorities, but I believe there is general agreement that the whole political future of free Asia may depend on the success of India's great experiment. Certainly, too, the need is obvious for more rapid modernization and economic cooperation in Latin America. And the vision of a common market for the Western Hemisphere is even more exciting if it points toward economic federation in the whole non-Communist world.

For years I have urged that the United States put economic development on the same level of urgency as national defense, and press other advanced countries to join in a concerted effort. That in actuality we have no such joint program for world investment and growth springs in part from another weakness—our failure to develop an organic Atlantic community with common institutions and purposes. The ghost that has haunted every NATO conference for 10 years is the ghost of the emperor without clothes. "The wise men," committees, resolutions—all have spoken of NATO's positive tasks. We still have to find them. Worse, even the present measure of unity is being fretted away.

III. THE ATLANTIC COMMUNITY

Beneath the surface there are dangerous cross-purposes within our alliance. They are not to be overcome by ceremonial travels and by hasty diplomacy in preparation for meetings with Mr. Khrushchev.

The reconciliation of France and Germany is an historic achievement of postwar diplomacy. The Common Market is a creative effort to pass beyond narrow nationalism in the search for economic and social well-being and finally political union. But the price is high if France by moving closer to Germany moves away from Britain, and if the Common Market of the six nations and the free trade associations of the seven between them divide Europe into rival trading groups behind rising economic barriers which embitter not only commerce but politics as well. Nor do the divisions affect Europe alone. The frictions will be spread to Africa as a last divisive legacy of colonialism.

I believe it is a profound interest of American policy to see these nascent divisions overcome. We should urge the six and the seven to return to negotiation to mitigate tariff discrimination and liberalize trade. The United States and Canada should also cooperate systematically with the six and the seven to enlarge and use our influence vigorously to help solve in common the tough problems of commercial policy, including such questions as the stabilization of commodity prices in which the industrialized countries must of necessity take the lead. The last 3 or 4 years have demonstrated how even our own trade is becoming dependent upon European prosperity and how policies on each side of the Atlantic vitally influence the rest of the community. The unfavorable American balance of payments and fears for American reserves are already leading to a new isolationism, to creeping protectionism, to reduced foreign aid, and to further divisions in our unity and strength. The administration's "Buy American" policy in our lending will have negligible effects on our exports, and it repudiates the liberal trade and payments policy which we have been urging on our allies at the very moment they are adopting it.

Nor can we safely confront the Communist challenge with inferior military deterrent capability. If we fall too far behind or reduce our military strength—without equivalent Soviet concessions—we may find Mr. Khrushchev's interest in negotiation has diminished. We must not tempt the Russians with weakness. The possibility that they could destroy our retaliatory power at a single blow must never appear to them to be realistic. Even then, the only safe assumption for us to make is that the Soviet Union may use force, as in Hungary or East Germany, wherever there is no risk of general war. As I said to Mr. Khrushchev, equality of strength and equality of risk are the only starting points for disarmament discussions.

In maintaining the military balance pending a reversal of this senseless and bankrupting arms race, Western Europe also should play an expanded role and assume a larger burden. The cooperative control and use of atomic weapons may now be the best way to prevent the divisive, costly, and inefficient duplication of nuclear capabilities. Each one of the European nations cannot develop defenses capable of countering the Soviet threat, and should not try. I think we must take a hard, fresh look at our common military problems. I don't see why we cannot distribute the nuclear, the naval, and the conventional burdens more economically and efficiently. The objective should be an interdependent military system in which each nation's role would be geared to its full technological and economic capabilities.

Let us, then, recognize the fact of our economic, military, and political interdependence formally. An Atlantic Council with real powers could formulate joint policies for sharing our responsibilities and bringing about the genuine and equal partnership between the United States and Western Europe which our successes in the past—notably the Marshall plan—make feasible and the greatest challenge we have ever known now makes necessary.

I believe a North Atlantic Conference should be held to outline new common policies for defense, disarmament, space exploration, monetary reserves, tariffs, and a larger economic sphere, and aid to the underdeveloped areas, giving, I hope, new terms of reference to NATO and to other organizations. I think Europe should take the initiative toward creating some such new organization to deal with our great and growing problems and to promote more systematic Western cooperation.

Meanwhile, if our partners, including Japan, are to mitigate the harmful political pressures building up in the United States, a number of steps—toward which, I am glad to say, some progress has already been made—should be taken promptly.

Discrimination against dollar imports from the United States and all quantitative restrictions should be eliminated.

I have long urged that the nations whose economies the United States has helped to restore should assume a much larger share of the burden of aiding the underdeveloped countries.

The heavy task of maintaining large forces overseas aggravates America's balance of payments deficit; our European allies should now assume greater responsibility for the defense of the West.

While our balance of payments deficit may be a short-range problem, the liquidity shortage of the trading nations is not, and the West should move to correct this deficiency promptly.

A working cooperative Atlantic system would do more than enhance the basic strength of the West. It would demonstrate to other areas—to Latin America, for instance, or to free Africa—methods by which political autonomy can be combined with supranational cooperation. In any case, the alternative is to see the centrifugal

forces which are always at work between separate national entities pull us ever further apart. One thing is sure—we cannot deal with the Communist challenge divided and in disarray.

IV. ARMS CONTROL

Most of all, a stronger Atlantic community will show the way to disarmament and peace. The implications of war and of the nuclear stalemate are as visible in Moscow as in Washington. After talks with Mr. Khrushchev in Russia and America, I have the feeling that some fixed Communist attitudes are changing; some, at least, of the Russian leaders seem to have concluded that the capitalist countries do not conform in all respects to the Marxist blueprints of misery and despair; Mr. Khrushchev has even changed his mind about the established Communist conviction that the United States could not cut arms spending without bringing on a depression. (I confess I get indignant when I listen to some of my fellow Americans who seem less confident than Khrushchev is about our economy's resilience, especially when we have so many neglected tasks at home to which we could turn our energies and resources.)

The more the Communists see of the realities of Western society, the better for truth and so the better for us. Knowing something of the frightening darkness in which most Russians have to live, I favor the widest extension of exchange programs and cultural contacts. I would like to see the United States take the initiative in bringing Western and Soviet teams together in joint work. The principle of the Geophysical Year should be extended to a joint international Geophysical Commission. Other fields are Antarctic exploration and control, oceanography, medical and atomic energy research, exploration of outer space, and even joint operations in certain areas of economic aid. Such communion of scholars and technicians could do more than awaken Communists to the reality of Western life and to the possibilities of an open world society. They could be forerunners of supranational cooperation and organs of international control.

There is no difficulty in finding reasons why peace is so precious to the Russians after the desolation and destruction of two world wars. In addition, they now have much to lose, and their taste for the good life is rapidly developing. It is said that the Soviet defense effort takes about 25 percent of the national income as against 10 percent in this country. So for them another weighty reason for reducing the arms burden is to release more manpower and resources to improve the living conditions of the long-suffering Russian people and to strengthen the Soviet potential for economic competition and the paramount struggle for the uncommitted countries.

I am confident that some, at least, of the Russian leaders are anxious to halt testing and development of nuclear weapons before the danger becomes even more uncontrollable. But I wish I could be more sanguine that the Soviet Union was equally ready for the kind of inspection and control that would make possible any general arms reduction, let alone total disarmament. I suspect the conversion of the Soviet Union from a closed to an open society is still a long way off. But we should not hastily and cynically dismiss Mr. Khrushchev's disarmament proposals as propaganda and insincere. The question is not whether Communists are sincere but whether they are serious.

The root of East-West tension is fear. Whether it is rational or irrational, justified or not, hardly matters. It exists, and the peoples, especially Americans and Russians, have been indoctrinated with this fear of one another—these devil images—for years. Arms are a symptom of the fears and ten-

sions between nations. Therefore, the argument goes, disarmament is impossible until political settlements have been reached and confidence restored.

I disagree. I believe the nuclear arms race with weapons of mass destruction is a new element and in itself a cause of tension. Of course, as I have said, we must try everlastingly to improve relations by exchanges, negotiations, common projects, trade, and agreements when possible. But fear will not vanish until the arms race is arrested. We will have to proceed on all these matters simultaneously. As Mr. Selwyn Lloyd, of Great Britain, said in presenting the British plan for comprehensive disarmament which preceded Mr. Khrushchev's: "If we get political settlements it will make agreement on disarmament easier; and if we get an agreement on disarmament, it will make political settlement easier."

From what he said to me, I think Mr. Khrushchev agrees too. And I am much encouraged by evidence from many quarters that the Russians are genuinely worried about the political and technical dangers and cost to the U.S.S.R. of continuing the arms race indefinitely. Moreover, the United Nations disarmament resolution, agreed to, *mirabile dictu*, by the United States and the Soviet Union, recognizes that disarmament itself will promote trust between nations and declares that disarmament is the most important question facing the world today.

In short, it looks as though controlled disarmament was back at the top of the world's agenda where it belongs. I am sorry that the United States did not take and hold the lead as I urged in the 1956 presidential campaign. The recent proposal by some of our leaders that the United States resume underground nuclear tests, just when the first break in the arms deadlock seems possible, shocked me. I can think of few better ways to chill the prospects, deface our peaceful image, and underscore the Communist propaganda that they are the peace-makers and we the warmongers. We should extend our test suspension so long as negotiations continue in good faith and Russia maintains a similar suspension. The good faith of the negotiations is decisive, because indefinite suspension amounts to a test ban without inspection.

Whether Mr. Khrushchev and his associates in the Kremlin really mean business depends on agreement to two main principles: (a) That conventional and nuclear disarmament must go hand in hand, so that the balance of security between nations is not upset, and (b) that progress at each stage must be subject to effective international control.

If universal and total disarmament should ever take place, a third need will arise: a supranational force of some kind, as I have insisted to Mr. Khrushchev, in order that the sheer weight of such powers as Russia and America—or China—may not intimidate smaller neighbors. The composition, control, and use of such a force, of course, present a host of further questions.

Meanwhile, pending the disarmament millennium, we must, as I have said, make good the deficiencies in our defenses to keep at least an equality of strength with the Russians. And I think it would be naive to assume that they are yet ready to embark on the kind of positive cooperation in other respects which would establish real collective security. The conspiratorial tradition is very old and deep rooted in Communist thinking, and when they talk of peaceful competition, for example, I suspect that most Communists would include under that label political subversion, coups d'état, and even revolution under Communist Party leadership.

Nevertheless, I think we may be approaching the time when the arms race with Russia can be arrested. Once a revolutionary regime leaves behind its adolescent fanati-

cism, risk, and cost become powerful considerations. I believe they exercise genuine influence in Moscow today and that we should do what we can to encourage the trend.

V. CHINA

In Peking, however, I doubt if cost and risk are decisive factors. At this stage, pressure from "foreign devils," real or contrived, provides excuses for the austerity and brutal repression involved in the massive modernization. In this mood, China might conceivably be ready to risk a war which could involve its more prosperous Communist neighbor in disaster. Today, Moscow can still perhaps limit Chinese aggressiveness by control over its military aid. But as China develops, the influence will dwindle. Has Russia therefore an interest in establishing some form of control now while her influence is still sizable? We do not know, but we must try to find out. And if we are going to make any important progress on disarmament, Russia will have to accept responsibility for bringing China in.

While there is little prospect of reasonable dealing with Red China at this time, it is apparent that Asians have become disillusioned and distrustful because of her imperialistic attacks on her neighbors and disregard for the "five principles of coexistence." I see hope in the fact that Mr. Khrushchev used Peking as his sounding board when he warned Communists not to use force against capitalism. I see further hope in his proposal—ignored by Peking—for an atom-free zone in the Far East. And even at this late date I suggest we explore with him the possibility of pacification in the area based upon a broad settlement of issues—including Formosa—by negotiation, not force.

On the Communist side, the concessions would include the extension to China of any system of international inspection of disarmament, ending the threat of force against Formosa and subversion in Indochina, a peaceful frontier settlement with India, free elections under United Nations supervision in Korea, and acceptance of the right of the inhabitants of Formosa to determine their own destiny by plebiscite supervised by the United Nations. On our side, concessions would presumably include an end to the American embargo on China's admission to the United Nations (not to be confused with diplomatic recognition), the evacuation of Quemoy and Matsu, and the inclusion of Korea and Japan in the atom-free zone and area of controlled disarmament.

Perhaps neither the Russians nor we ourselves are yet prepared to talk in such concrete terms. Yet it is clear that no general control of disarmament has any value unless it includes China, and it is difficult to see how China can accept international control when it is not, formally, a member of international society. Moreover, as a member of the United Nations, Communist China, with a quarter of the world's population, would be more accountable to world opinion than as an outcast.

In the long run, the degree to which Russia is willing and able to moderate China's imperialistic designs will be a major factor in world peace. And it is likely that in its diplomacy as in its internal development Moscow is reaching the point where Mr. Khrushchev's peaceful coexistence with the West must grow into positive cooperation. The Russian door to the West must be pushed wider open—or slammed shut again.

VI. EUROPE AND THE MIDDLE EAST

The areas of the world where the interests and security of the great powers collide are the areas of tension where negotiation must be concentrated if it is to be effective. I do not believe that local military blocs, directed against the Communists, always provide the answer. If we seek military clients, Russia

can play that game, too, and more cynically. Moreover, she is not embarrassed by ties to the former colonial overlords. I do not mean that endangered countries should be left unprotected. The Eisenhower doctrine is hardly more than a restatement of our commitment under the United Nations Charter and the Truman doctrine to come to the aid of a victim of direct aggression. If the Soviets were directly to invade Iran, though it is not likely, American intervention would be unavoidable. And that is precisely why it is not likely. But Iran is no more secure because of military links with Pakistan, and the fate of Iraq shows how easily an unpopular alliance can be exploited to undermine a pro-Western regime.

I believe that we must look rather to disarmament and nonalignment, to political and economic collaboration, in the areas where great-power interests collide, as in the Middle East. We still have a little time, for atomic weapons are as yet in the possession of only three powers. Ten years from now, who knows how many local dictators may have them—to the detriment not only of our security but of Russia's as well. Here may be another common interest to explore. We might examine the possibility of an atom-free zone for the Middle East. We might also reconsider an earlier suggestion of an embargo on arms shipments into the Middle East—a plan which the Soviets have endorsed.

Neither Russia nor the Western nations have gained much from their recent policies of intervention in the Middle East. I suggest we now give organized nonintervention a trial. Some international problems are never solved; they just wear out. And the Arab-Israeli conflict may wear out before it is worked out. But meanwhile the United States should call upon the Soviet Union and everyone in the United Nations again and again to use their influence to harmonize relations between the Arab States and Israel and end this prolonged and useless hostility.

In the immediate future, however, the critical point of tension lies in Europe and Germany. There we have a perilous deadlock from which neither side can disengage without grave risk. On our side the fear is paramount that any withdrawal either from the exposed enclave of West Berlin or from West Germany would prove the first step in a general retreat from "positions of strength" in Europe. The end of the process could denude the Continent of American forces and undermine the defenses against a Russian advance to the channel.

But the Soviets have comparable fears. The withdrawal of their troops to Russia would imperil the insecure Communist governments friendly to Russia and lead to the resurgence of a powerful and potentially hostile Germany. After suffering two shattering invasions in a generation, Russia's deep-seated fear of a rearmed Germany should not be hard for us to understand.

Russia's risk is probably greater than ours. After 15 years of communism, East Germany and Eastern Europe are still probably hostile to Russia. On our side, communism has steadily lost ground. A Europe free to choose its destiny would not be Communist, and could be very anti-Russian. For this reason I believe we in the West play from strength in Europe.

I agree with Dr. Adenauer that the key to settlement in divided Europe lies in controlled general disarmament. The only satisfactory settlement for divided Berlin will be the unification of divided Germany. The road to unification lies through a reduction of fear in Russia and the West. And fear will subside only when there is progress toward disarmament with adequate controls. I doubt if we can reach more than provisional settlements or postponements of the problems of divided Europe until then.

With summit conferences soon to take place, I think it would be improper and useless for me to discuss proposals that have been made for an atom-free zone in central Europe, scaling down of Berlin garrisons and occupation armies, security guarantees, and the other detailed components of possible interim solutions.

VII. A SENSE OF PURPOSE

In all of these great issues of international policy—whether they concern a world investment program for the underdeveloped countries, or methods of closer association with Europe, or the creation of communities of common work and interest with the Soviets, or the whole long arduous search for controlled disarmament—the first priority for the West is to recover the initiative. Out of a perpetually defensive attitude no lasting gains can come. Surely the West, which has been preeminently the challenger in human affairs since the dawn of the modern age, should not let the initiative slip from its hands.

Today, let us be clear, we do not have the initiative. Having caught up with us in weapons, it is the Soviet Union that is shouting about disarmament and peaceful competition; and it is the Soviet Union, strong and self-confident, that is now usurping the role of leader in the efforts toward peace. Mr. Khrushchev is the challenger—from outer space to inner Berlin. We react to his policies and conduct the world's dialog on his terms. Between hasty improvisations and snap decisions we seem largely to have lost our own sense of direction.

We are ourselves to blame for this. The truth is that nations cannot demonstrate a sense of purpose abroad when they have lost it at home. There is an intimate connection between the temper of our domestic leadership and the effectiveness of American influence in the world at large. President Wilson gave a profound new direction to international thinking because he was a pioneer of the new freedom at home. President Franklin Roosevelt's universal prestige as a liberal force in the world was deeply rooted in the New Deal, and this was the tradition carried on by President Truman in such great ventures as the Marshall plan and the point 4 program. The link is no less vital today. If we cannot recover an aspiring, forward-looking, creative attitude to the problems of our own community, there is little hope of our recovering a dynamic leadership in the world at large. By our default as much as by his design, Mr. Khrushchev is enabled to continue dictating the terms of the world's dialog.

I see little sign of any challenging approach in positive terms to our problems at the present time. In the most radical and revolutionary epoch of man's history, the dominant concerns of our leadership have been almost wholly defensive. We have not been urged and spurred on by the positive opportunities of world building and nation building inherent in our position as the most fabulously endowed people mankind has ever seen. On the contrary, our foreign policy has been dominated by fear of communism, our domestic policy by fear of inflation. Economic assistance programs have been sold to the American people chiefly as a means of checking the Communists, never as our creative part in extending our technological revolution to the rest of mankind. The spur to our exploration of the solar system has not been our restless desire to extend the boundaries of human knowledge. It has been the irritation of seeing the Russians hit the moon first. Our interest in greater excellence in research and education flared up not because we want every free citizen to exercise to the full his innate talents and capacities, but because the Russians are producing more scientists and technologists than the West.

Even where we accept the Soviet challenge—as I assume we do in defense, science, and education—our sense of urgency is not yet sufficient to override our obsessive fear that, in some way, in spite of having a gross national product of almost \$500 billion and a per capita income almost twice as high as any other country's, we are staring bankruptcy in the face. How otherwise can we explain the fact that, with over twice the Soviet Union's national income, we have let them outpace us in arms, in space research, in proportional spending on education? How else are we to explain why our leaders see their most urgent task not in telling us the realities of our world and the duties and opportunities that lie ahead for a great and confident nation, but in warning us of all the insidious ways in which it can spend itself into penury?

The time has come to put an end to this unnatural timidity. There are other ways of securing a "sound dollar" than by stunting our national growth or—much worse—stunting our aspirations and our confidence in the great aims of our own society. Let us not measure our essential security, our standards of education, and our public needs by what we can afford. This is a static concept. What we could afford with a national income of \$250 billion is not the same as our capacity today with nearly double the figure. Nor does it measure what we could afford if our rate of growth were purposefully increased.

Let us rather assess our needs—our need to maintain equality of strength, in missiles and men, until controlled disarmament takes its place, our need to double our spending on education, our need for wider research, our need for decent and gracious cities where segregation and delinquency give ground in the wake of redevelopment and renewal, our need to conserve our national resources—above all, water, the most basic of them all.

All these needs—domestic, foreign, and military—will cost more money, at least until we can make some progress with disarmament. But keeping the budget down is not as imperative as keeping our heads up. It is worth noting that before the Korean war thoughtful men solemnly declared that if the military budget rose above \$15 billion capitalism, democracy, and the American way of life were doomed. Then came the war. The military budget was tripled. And now, once again, the present level of spending is being defended with the same ideological fervor.

I think our needs could be covered by existing tax rates at higher levels of economic growth. But I am sure that if our political leadership defines the tasks with clarity and conviction, we will approve what is necessary to fulfill our national purpose whatever the sacrifice—higher taxation in years when the private economy is running at full stretch, for instance, budgetary deficits in times of slack, restraint upon wages and profits to slow down inflationary pressure, less emphasis on sectional interests, more on the common good. The recompense will be to see American society once more the pace setter in human affairs, to see freedom once more the great challenger on the human scene.

For this, surely, is the crux. An attitude of unadventurous conservatism cannot stand for long as the creative image of freedom. I tremble for our future—and for the world's future—if growth, thrust, initiative, and the vast new frontiers of science are felt to be the prerogative of Communist discipline and drive—if "the shot heard round the world" has been silenced by the shot round the moon.

Freedom is not an ideal, it is not even a protection, if it means nothing more than freedom to stagnate, to live without dreams, to have no greater aim than a second car and another television set—and this in a world where half our fellow men have less than enough to eat. Today not rhetoric but

sober fact bids us believe that our present combination of complacency and apprehension, of little aims and large fears, has within it the seed of destruction, first for our own community, and then for the larger hope that, as science and technology bring the nations inescapably together, freedom, not tyranny, will be the organizing principle of the society of man.

I end where I began. I believe the United States is ready for a new awakening and the achievement of greater goals. Within it are the moral and material elements of new purpose and new policy. It is the task of leadership to marshal our will and point the way. We had better start soon for time is wasting.

BENEFITS FROM AGRICULTURAL PROGRAM TO ABSENTEE OR CORPORATE-TYPE FARMING OPERATIONS

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, on several occasions I have emphasized that a substantial part of the benefits of our present agricultural program accrue to the large corporate-type or absentee farming operations.

Today I am incorporating in the RECORD a list of the 1958 crop price-support loans on cotton of \$100,000 or more as compiled by the Department of Agriculture.

Three of the largest of these received more in price-support loans on cotton than did all of the farmers of the four States of Delaware, Maryland, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania on all of the crops they produced in that same year.

The large firm of Anderson, Clayton & Co. received \$707,907.71 in Government loans on cotton it produced. This is nearly twice as much as was received by all the farmers in the States of Delaware and New Jersey on all crops they produced that year.

One of these large corporations, the Delta & Pine Land Co., Scott, Miss., which received price-support loans of \$1,212,699.80 on its 1958 cotton crop, is a wholly owned British corporation.

Why should this wholly owned British corporation receive more assistance in

the form of price-support loans on its 1958 cotton crop than did all the farmers of the great State of Pennsylvania on all the crops they produced?

Why should our taxpayers support this British-owned corporation in its farming operations here in America? Remember, all this is being done under legislation enacted in the name of our small farmers.

It is argued that the taxpayers do not lose under this program because these price-support loans are often repaid to the Government as the cotton is moved into commercial channels. That is ridiculous. In many instances the cotton is turned over to the Government as full payment for the loan, and remember that on that portion which is sold in commercial channels and where the loans are repaid by the producer those sales are subsidized by the U.S. Government. Under its cotton subsidy export program, our Government is buying through commercial channels this same cotton at artificially high prices and then subsidizing at the taxpayers' expense its exports.

In the past 3 years the Government, under its export subsidy program, has purchased over 16 million bales and then exported this same cotton at a direct loss to the American taxpayers of over \$800 million.

This is an average loss of over \$20 for every bale of cotton which has been produced in America during the past 3 years. Therefore, the fact that many of these loans are being repaid does not mean that the Government is not losing money on these transactions.

These loans are being repaid by sales in commercial channels only by reason of the fact that the Government is spending nearly \$300 million annually in supporting our domestic cotton market at its artificially high level.

Nor is this extravagant program actually helping the cotton farmer. In addition to wasting millions in paying for those subsidies, under our present programs we are seeing our domestic market for cotton goods destroyed.

Synthetic fibers are replacing our cotton and wool fabrics. Foreign imports are replacing our domestic products. The final result is that the cotton industry and our American textile industry are both being destroyed.

Last year I sponsored an amendment which the Senate adopted placing a limitation on the amount of support loans any one individual could obtain. This amendment will be in effect on the 1959 crop year; however, I regret that in conference this amendment was watered down in such a manner as to create a grave doubt as to its real effectiveness.

Our whole farm program needs a complete overhauling. Congress by failing to face this situation and by continuing these high price supports on cotton and other crops long after the war ended and long after our need of increased production had passed has created a monstrosity, and now it has a responsibility to correct the situation. But it cannot be corrected by any piecemeal legislation.

There can be no justification for continuing support at the taxpayers' expense of these million dollar farm operations whether they be in cotton or in any other crop.

At this point I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the RECORD a list of the 1958 crop cotton price support loans of \$100,000 or more as furnished by the Department of Agriculture. This tabulation includes only loans made on the 1958 cotton crop. Many of the companies listed in this report also received price support loans on other commodities.

Also, in order that other States may see what assistance their farmers get under this program as compared to the assistance given some of these large corporate-type operations, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a chart giving a breakdown by States on all loans made on the 1958 crops.

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

1958 crop cotton price-support loans of \$100,000 or more, by producer

Producer	Address	Number of bales pledged	Amount	Producer	Address	Number of bales pledged	Amount
ARIZONA				ARIZONA—continued			
Church, Bruce, Inc.	Yuma, Ariz.	2,887	\$487,460.50	K. and Clarence Skousen	Chandler, Ariz.	913	\$153,564.80
A. S. & R. Farms, Inc.	Marana, Ariz.	2,204	427,181.57	L. D. Ulmer	Marana, Ariz.	858	151,324.91
Morrison Bros.	Higley, Ariz.	2,376	400,851.38	Holland & Ladd	Coolidge, Ariz.	732	151,116.50
J. L. Hodges	Buckeye, Ariz.	2,136	368,063.70	J. G. Waggoner	do	868	149,032.82
Y. F. Ranches	Stanfield, Ariz.	1,707	317,372.52	Empire Farms	Eloy, Ariz.	879	148,296.61
Howard Wuertz	Coolidge, Ariz.	1,710	295,903.00	J. Boyd White	Casa Grande, Ariz.	810	147,448.78
Phillips & Ellsworth	Mesa, Ariz.	1,731	294,763.06	L. E. Anway	Marana, Ariz.	721	147,019.23
Chas. Urrea & Sons	do	1,731	289,520.37	Jackson & Perkins Co.	Peoria, Ariz.	872	147,011.50
W. R. Neely	Chandler, Ariz.	1,705	286,535.10	A. & C. Hill	Chandler, Ariz.	841	145,872.07
Hooper & Rugg	Casa Grande, Ariz.	1,648	285,878.66	Wilbur Wuertz	Casa Grande, Ariz.	844	144,799.50
Smith & Enke	do	1,641	282,903.00	Phelps and Palmer	Mesa, Ariz.	847	143,562.50
Bing K. Wong, Inc.	Marana, Ariz.	1,519	269,212.08	Jack Crain	Casa Grande, Ariz.	811	137,988.40
J. B. Colletterie	Vicksburg, Ariz.	1,390	236,140.77	J. S. Hoopes	Chandler, Ariz.	810	137,730.95
H. L. Holland	Coolidge, Ariz.	1,308	236,022.21	J. D. Johnson	Mesa, Ariz.	840	136,496.41
Crouch Bros.	Maricopa, Ariz.	1,365	230,139.00	Eloy Farms	Stanfield, Ariz.	770	135,754.50
C. S. Anderson	Phoenix, Ariz.	1,320	228,618.88	Pinal Farms	Casa Grande, Ariz.	743	133,191.17
J. G. Boswell Co. Corp.	Litchfield Park, Ariz.	1,263	227,361.85	C. S. O. Farms	Florence, Ariz.	782	132,809.54
Herman Diwan	Casa Grande, Ariz.	1,288	218,841.57	E. A. Wing	Coolidge, Ariz.	714	132,808.44
B. Riggs & Son	Chandler, Ariz.	1,247	212,539.30	C. R. Johnson	Eloy, Ariz.	749	132,542.16
C. W. Neely	Gilbert, Ariz.	1,235	209,146.22	S. L. Claridge and Morris Bros.	Safford, Ariz.	571	131,850.23
John Kai	Marana, Ariz.	1,073	208,826.91	Donald Ellsworth	Queen Creek, Ariz.	577	130,220.35
Wilker S. Conner	Maricopa, Ariz.	1,162	201,696.90	Ott Bros.	Yuma, Ariz.	752	130,457.44
Power Bros.	Higley, Ariz.	1,176	200,796.58	C. P. Peterson	Mesa, Ariz.	762	129,917.87
Westside Ranches	Glendale, Ariz.	1,187	200,450.16	R. D. Beebe	do	743	128,138.75
Frontier Farms	Casa Grande, Ariz.	1,163	197,277.82	Max Nichols	Casa Grande, Ariz.	737	127,075.23
Double S. Ranches	Chandler, Ariz.	1,126	193,908.90	Harlan Russell	do	739	124,435.80
Cecil W. Howe and R. W. Drake	Litchfield, Ariz.	1,043	176,472.15	R. P. Anderson	Coolidge, Ariz.	717	123,441.04
Barney & Mecham	Queen Creek, Ariz.	1,011	170,918.32	H. L. Early	Casa Grande, Ariz.	656	121,345.16
L. Ellsworth	do	988	170,704.80	Kempton & Smedigan	Tempe, Ariz.	688	118,904.88
H. C. Dobson	Mesa, Ariz.	966	165,887.75	Collier and Evans	do	692	118,236.54
Fred Jones	Coolidge, Ariz.	922	165,843.45	Otto B. Neely	Gilbert, Ariz.	679	117,923.40
G. and V. Ellsworth	Mesa, Ariz.	939	159,996.90	Holland and Thompson	Casa Grande, Ariz.	677	116,946.56

1958 crop cotton price-support loans of \$100,000 or more, by producer—Continued

Producer	Address	Number of bales pledged	Amount	Producer	Address	Number of bales pledged	Amount
ARIZONA—continued				CALIFORNIA—continued			
L. R. Layton	Chandler, Ariz.	686	\$115,891.10	Bruce Kratka	Ripley, Calif.	804	\$127,067.64
B. & W. Farms	Coolidge, Ariz.	565	110,435.87	Brock Ranches	El Centro, Calif.	742	124,945.20
C. P. Gould	Litchfield, Ariz.	631	107,464.16	Wedderburn Bros	Lemoore, Calif.	739	122,989.58
Oscar Walls	Tempe, Ariz.	634	107,385.06	E. I. Baublitz	Buttonwillow, Calif.	708	121,806.40
W. L. Rice	Mesa, Ariz.	637	107,235.52	Sierra Dawn Farms	Firebaugh, Calif.	660	121,782.93
A. and W. Bartlett	Coolidge, Ariz.	616	106,609.26	Benson Bros	Tulare, Calif.	698	120,089.30
Glen J. Layton	Thatcher, Ariz.	445	105,964.49	Raven Land Co.	Selma, Calif.	703	119,586.82
Grant E. Peterson	Coolidge, Ariz.	617	105,645.80	L. C. Kreim	Delano, Calif.	697	117,737.24
Jerry Montierth	Elfrida, Ariz.	527	105,358.25	Sandrini Bros.	McFarland, Calif.	693	117,033.20
C. L. Kenworthy	Coolidge, Ariz.	541	103,835.50	Meridian Farms, Inc.	Arvin, Calif.	684	116,891.00
Ricks Ranch	Queen Creek, Ariz.	603	102,544.00	Baldwin & Soureux	Bakersfield, Calif.	676	116,767.64
Maryvale Land Cattle Co.	Phoenix, Ariz.	579	100,656.22	W. K. King	Wasco, Calif.	670	115,051.06
ARKANSAS				CALIFORNIA—continued			
J. G. Adams & Son	Hughes, Ark.	2,550	402,050.89	E. O. Ehlers	Bakersfield, Calif.	671	114,515.98
Tillar, Ark.	Tillar, Ark.	1,766	253,486.90	Lakeview Properties	Blythe, Calif.	675	113,966.06
S. O. Chapin	Truman, Ark.	1,276	215,772.15	M. and W. Snow	Buttonwillow, Calif.	660	113,871.06
Miller Lumber Co.	Marianna, Ark.	1,091	184,815.41	Virgil Boyd	Tipton, Calif.	647	111,674.24
E. H. Clarke Co.	Hughes, Ark.	912	144,676.09	Cooper & Hutsell	Tulare, Calif.	654	111,559.91
Lindsay Mercantile Co.	Caldwell, Ark.	780	141,663.22	Vista Farms	Buttonwillow, Calif.	655	110,372.06
J. O. Ellis	Blytheville, Ark.	720	129,816.80	J. H. Maurer	Shafter, Calif.	642	110,009.12
CALIFORNIA				CALIFORNIA—continued			
Westlake Farms, Inc.	Stratford, Calif.	8,473	1,442,595.00	C. E. Slaughter	Tipton, Calif.	652	109,844.36
Kern Land	Bakersfield, Calif.	4,505	761,408.20	Finni & Janell	Visalia, Calif.	643	109,612.44
Anderson, Clayton & Co.	Los Angeles, Calif.	3,900	707,907.71	James Taylor	Brawley, Calif.	630	108,519.60
Shannon & Sons	Tulare, Calif.	3,314	563,822.08	Orlando Torrigiani	Bakersfield, Calif.	622	107,774.04
Salyer Land Co.	Corcoran, Calif.	2,964	522,189.01	Nagatani Farms	Delano, Calif.	672	107,300.41
McCarthy & Hildebrand	Bakersfield, Calif.	2,967	506,362.30	Torrigiani Bros.	Buttonwillow, Calif.	619	105,948.60
Giffen, Inc.	Huron, Calif.	2,830	494,353.97	L. Neufeld	Wasco, Calif.	625	105,715.56
Wheeler Farms Co.	Bakersfield, Calif.	2,634	448,654.88	Martin Dairy	Hanford, Calif.	626	105,293.20
Wilco Produce Co.	Blythe, Calif.	2,546	428,876.32	John X. Bettencourt	Tipton, Calif.	624	105,075.01
R. M. Mettler & Sons	Bakersfield, Calif.	2,188	373,722.09	Riccomini Bros.	Buttonwillow, Calif.	616	104,118.03
David Bryant, Jr.	Pond, Calif.	2,022	355,839.07	Raymond O'Connell	Brawley, Calif.	619	104,078.56
Robert Farms	McFarland, Calif.	2,034	348,519.89	W. L. Smith	Bakersfield, Calif.	611	103,970.54
F. and J. Garone	Bakersfield, Calif.	2,046	346,642.40	Robert Burhans, Jr.	Wasco, Calif.	600	103,847.99
Murray Land Co.	Hanford, Calif.	2,037	345,070.10	Floyd Griffeath	Earlimart, Calif.	611	103,354.03
Waldo W. Weeth	Coalinga, Calif.	1,936	331,717.99	Rancho Poco Dinero	Blythe, Calif.	606	103,068.36
W. E. Young	Calipatria, Calif.	1,704	318,734.33	Wayne Dill	do	598	102,225.20
Robert Pelletier	Bakersfield, Calif.	1,762	318,038.23	John C. Johnston	Bakersfield, Calif.	587	102,015.03
Buller & Neufeld, Ranch 1	do	1,877	316,865.99	D. M. Steele	Delano, Calif.	592	101,100.56
A. Shrier & Sons	Delano, Calif.	1,809	311,332.56	Manuel I. Rocha	Tulare, Calif.	594	100,935.92
Bidart Bros.	Bakersfield, Calif.	1,765	302,918.20	J. O. and Oscar Cooper	Fresno, Calif.	586	100,613.20
B. A. Hildebrand	do	1,698	295,491.50	Ludy Bros	Pond, Calif.	578	100,466.00
J & R Enterprises	Blythe, Calif.	1,663	280,499.12	Archie Swindle	Dos Palos, Calif.	583	100,131.20
Cerro Bros	Bakersfield, Calif.	1,619	278,723.52	LOUISIANA			
Jones Farms	Stratford, Calif.	1,627	273,734.00	Delta Farm & Timber Co.	Epps, La.	1,046	176,270.66
E. O. Mitchell, Inc.	Arvin, Calif.	1,584	267,407.30	George B. Franklin & Son	Holly Ridge, La.	716	121,613.36
A. H. Wegis & Sons	Bakersfield, Calif.	1,559	264,469.55	M. P. Utz Estate	Tallulah, La.	695	100,464.74
Circle L Farms	Stratford, Calif.	1,562	263,806.18	MISSISSIPPI			
Mirasol Co.	Buttonwillow, Calif.	1,549	262,561.54	Delta & Pine Land Co.	Scott, Miss.	7,326	1,216,699.80
F. McCarthy & Sons	Tulare, Calif.	1,514	259,154.96	S. H. Kyle	Clarksdale, Miss.	1,990	335,480.98
A. H. Karpe	Bakersfield, Calif.	1,480	252,714.52	D. Seligman	Shaw, Miss.	1,870	331,449.95
Gilkey Farms, Inc.	Corcoran, Calif.	1,334	238,180.09	Yandell Bros.	Vance, Miss.	1,642	267,546.48
Parsons Ranch	Buttonwillow, Calif.	1,341	231,232.80	C. S. Whittington Planting Co.	Greenwood, Miss.	1,417	226,598.69
Boyet Farming Co.	Corcoran, Calif.	1,220	221,763.41	M. S. Knowlton	Northshire, Miss.	1,311	217,471.41
O. Fry & Sons	Bakersfield, Calif.	1,282	218,904.91	B. W. Smith Planting Co.	Louis, Miss.	1,166	211,971.39
Hudson Ranches, Inc.	Calipatria, Calif.	1,264	216,976.80	Kline Planting Co.	Algator, Miss.	1,155	209,433.07
John Norton Farms	Blythe, Calif.	1,210	203,420.55	O. F. Bledsoe Estate	Greenwood, Miss.	1,263	204,604.10
Mitchellinda Ranches, Inc.	Alpaugh, Calif.	1,178	203,403.80	W. P. Scruggs	Doddsville, Miss.	1,164	199,703.71
C. Est. Graham	Calipatria, Calif.	1,184	199,846.30	Cameta Plantation	Anquilla, Miss.	1,222	197,150.27
S. Stamosules & Co.	Mendota, Calif.	1,161	196,850.56	S. A. Arnold, Jr.	Tunica, Miss.	1,179	195,945.85
Davis & Mabry	Tranquillity, Calif.	1,090	189,502.75	J. Livingston Estate	Ruleville, Miss.	1,089	195,945.85
John C. Conn	Coalinga, Calif.	1,087	188,915.50	B. F. Harbert Co.	Robinsonville, Miss.	1,027	195,409.41
Chicoa Bros. Twin Farms	Buttonwillow, Calif.	1,071	183,891.04	Hood & Block	Dundee, Miss.	1,072	175,449.08
Porter Land Co.	Bakersfield, Calif.	1,061	180,965.61	Whittington Planting Co.	Greenwood, Miss.	1,052	173,900.61
Scott & Knappenberger	Blythe, Calif.	1,041	177,306.70	Smith Murphey Co.	Sumner, Miss.	1,046	170,989.19
Richland Farms	Corcoran, Calif.	957	176,482.80	W. M. Duncan	Inverness, Miss.	969	169,019.62
A. and F. Palla	Buttonwillow, Calif.	1,042	176,472.06	Keith Bros.	Leland, Miss.	1,005	163,284.93
Cheney Ranch	Tulare, Calif.	988	170,846.04	Race Track Plantation	Greenwood, Miss.	889	151,507.70
C. C. Passmore	Ripley, Calif.	1,010	170,734.04	J. R. Smith	Merigold, Miss.	849	148,308.93
Coelho Farms	Riverdale, Calif.	984	168,057.36	Billups Plantation	Greenwood, Miss.	855	145,047.10
Delta Farming Co.	Corcoran, Calif.	923	167,841.94	C. P. Owen	Robinsonville, Miss.	895	144,421.45
Fannuci Bros.	Bakersfield, Calif.	983	166,941.30	Home Place	Benton, Miss.	782	142,589.76
K. Maloy & Son	Shafter, Calif.	944	162,770.10	M. L. Earnheart Co.	Tunica, Miss.	864	143,022.43
Air-Way Farms, Inc.	Fresno, Calif.	909	159,228.48	Eggen Plantation	Minter City, Miss.	771	135,626.63
Blythe Melon Growers	Blythe, Calif.	949	158,033.60	Lyndale Planting Co., Inc.	Gary, Miss.	813	132,613.68
Derby Farms	Arvin, Calif.	912	157,822.78	Delta Co.	Belzonia, Miss.	809	135,484.78
A. L. Suckut	Bakersfield, Calif.	926	155,890.48	E. D. Rayner	Merigold, Miss.	748	132,330.69
Kenmar Farm	do	920	155,619.40	Stovall Farms	Stovall, Miss.	831	131,633.88
Fox & Williams	Shafter, Calif.	897	155,135.98	Refuge Plantation, Inc.	Greenville, Miss.	795	129,920.28
Earl Royer	Strathmore, Calif.	887	152,410.82	R. W. Owen	Tunica, Miss.	791	129,309.66
Baker Bros.	Earlimart, Calif.	895	151,210.25	Torry Wood & Son	Hollandale, Miss.	670	127,930.24
G. Delfino & Sons	Bakersfield, Calif.	877	150,639.70	Runnymede Plantation	Itta Bena, Miss.	715	126,167.59
Arnold Kirschenmann	do	875	147,637.78	Circle X Plantation	Indianola, Miss.	789	125,717.87
Robert Neuman & Sons	Shafter, Calif.	851	145,044.32	Husbandville Plantation	Holly Ridge, Miss.	828	123,112.29
M. L. Rogers	Strathmore, Calif.	845	144,063.14	T. G. Flowers	Mattson, Miss.	838	122,549.26
Redfern Ranches	Dos Palos, Calif.	838	143,338.08	Garr Planting Co.	Clarksdale, Miss.	715	114,106.33
Eastside Farms	Stratford, Calif.	832	142,434.09	Oasis Plantation	Stovall, Miss.	751	113,143.12
Albert Angus Ranch	Arvin, Calif.	816	140,471.90	T. O. Earnheart Co.	Tunica, Miss.	674	112,788.38
Kennedy & Stephens	Bakersfield, Calif.	808	139,809.00	A. G. McLemore	Greenwood, Miss.	721	111,112.56
Fabbri Bros.	Wasco, Calif.	820	139,594.82	Mascot Planting Co.	Clarksdale, Miss.	645	108,761.52
William E. Ghotz	Tranquillity, Calif.	823	138,406.75	Halbrooke Farms	Belzonia, Miss.	625	107,935.80
J. E. Hareison	Calexico, Calif.	816	137,260.18	Roy Flowers	Mattson, Miss.	708	107,447.29
Frieborn Bros.	Buttonwillow, Calif.	802	137,113.00	J. T. Fargason & Son, Inc.	Lyon, Miss.	716	107,419.21
Harry R. Wiley	Los Angeles, Calif.	803	135,779.30	Vickland Plantation	Nitta Yuma, Miss.	645	106,590.93
Kagler & Roberts	McFarland, Calif.	782	132,386.20	Haloma Plantation	Rolling Fork, Miss.	619	105,017.16
Rex L. Neely	Chandler, Calif.	763	132,480.60	W. O. & E. E. Shurden	Draw, Miss.	625	104,316.31
B. S. Baldwin & Sons	Bakersfield, Calif.	768	131,861.20	Travis H. Taylor, Jr.	Friars Point, Miss.	577	104,216.25
J. B. Hawkins	Fresno, Calif.	700	128,488.98	Dockery Farms	Cleveland, Miss.	646	104,125.96
W. J. Williams	Blythe, Calif.	743	127,937.16	S. W. Owen	Tunica, Miss.	649	103,454.06
				M. Grundfest	Gary, Miss.	611	103,323.89
				Maynard Bros.	Clarksdale, Miss.	604	103,117.64

1958 crop cotton price-support loans of \$100,000 or more, by producer—Continued

Producer	Address	Number of bales pledged	Amount	Producer	Address	Number of bales pledged	Amount
MISSISSIPPI—con.				TEXAS—continued			
Couch & Parker Farms	Drew, Miss.	610	\$102,810.54	Rio Farms	Edcouch, Tex.	1,903	\$345,727.86
L. M. & W. F. Erwin	Duncan, Miss.	548	101,768.55	Crews Farms	Pecos, Tex.	1,345	250,257.19
Sunrise Dairy	Cleveland, Miss.	580	101,132.61	Davis & Gandy Farms	Edinburg, Tex.	1,371	230,945.30
Prairie Planting Co.	Stovall, Miss.	649	101,002.19	Kesey Bros.	Pecos, Tex.	1,165	228,792.36
Egypt Planting Co.	Cruger, Miss.	605	100,785.35	Ralphs Farms	San Elizario, Tex.	915	224,108.67
NEVADA				Bell Bros.	Elsa, Tex.	1,225	220,933.10
E. S. Bowman & Sons	Pahrump, Nev.	784	132,310.85	Island Farms	Fabens, Tex.	907	214,647.38
NEW MEXICO				Mike Maros	do	859	202,876.81
R. H. Wamel	Animas, N. Mex.	787	150,094.91	Clark & Roberts	Pecos, Tex.	992	188,147.08
Richins Farms	do	811	148,173.79	Beckwith Farms	Weslaco, Tex.	978	187,774.04
J. F. Apodaca	La Mesa, N. Mex.	618	112,193.54	Helen E. Stegle	Elsa, Tex.	893	155,796.72
OKLAHOMA				M. N. Lettunich & Sons	Clint, Tex.	694	153,573.17
Wayne Winsett	Altus, Okla.	1,015	172,551.91	A. J. Hoelscher	Pecos, Tex.	653	131,953.21
TENNESSEE				Peppy McKinney	do	654	126,174.22
C. B. Box Trust	Memphis, Tenn.	1,318	223,841.80	Clark & Davis	do	652	123,545.52
TEXAS				John J. Dorr	do	682	122,692.43
F. H. Vahlsing, Inc.	Mathis, Tex.	2,208	389,484.56	Gul Bant Singh Gil & Sons	El Paso, Tex.	510	116,887.85
				S. Y. Wilson and E. A. Strout	do	627	115,777.56
				George Lutich	do	511	115,390.24
				R. O. Wade	LeVillia, Tex.	599	111,524.45
				Walter J. Waters	Rio Hondo, Tex.	626	108,905.49
				Rolla D. Smith	Raymondville, Tex.	583	107,034.04
				R. E. Hart	Sinton, Tex.	612	106,217.64
				E. B. Adams	Harlingen, Tex.	605	105,517.64
				C. C. Slaughter Farms	Morton, Tex.	755	103,060.60
				James B. Toome	Pecos, Tex.	517	103,011.94
				J. T. McKinney	do	539	102,717.55

COMMODITY STABILIZATION SERVICE, COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

SCHEDULE 11.—Loans made on 1958 crops, by States, through Oct. 31, 1959

State	Wheat		Corn		Barley		Oats		Soybeans		Cotton		All other	Total
	Quantity (bushels)	Amount	Quantity (bushels)	Amount	Quantity (bushels)	Amount	Quantity (bushels)	Amount	Quantity (bushels)	Amount	Quantity (bales)	Amount		
Alabama	770	1,023	329,079	\$388,530			27,598	\$18,894	57,525	\$117,025	276,926	\$50,488,869	\$60,579	\$51,074,920
Arizona	94,929	132,558	11,586	13,672	346,351	\$344,458					458,410	\$2,735,548	2,820,458	86,046,694
Arkansas	115,876	213,448	30,501	33,605	5,531	7,531	272,553	184,237	10,376,210	21,591,250	388,000	69,437,477	16,347,355	107,811,957
California	2,251,649	4,409,283	443,778	530,497	6,721,478	7,003,955	187,289	127,198			848,480	149,302,306	6,150,181	167,523,420
Colorado	22,595,485	40,563,358	726,273	752,230	889,908	717,290	87,141	54,899					5,147,629	47,235,406
Connecticut													224,348	224,348
Delaware	14,855	28,827	72,671	108,419					3,066	6,255				143,501
Florida			10,003	11,285			12,042	696,387	203	408	2,399	408,064	2,092,396	2,512,738
Georgia	65,224	125,872	621,190	766,493	12,064	1,395,462	1,087,625	1,813,948	484,071	88,294	176,502	287,645	19,048,510	72,981,796
Idaho	12,522,217	19,575,960	106,897	117,246			1,395,462	1,813,948	1,031,599				1,943,918	23,756,348
Illinois	5,707,343	10,870,110	60,247,893	78,840,424	31,957	31,949	278,767	169,630	24,384,517	51,602,647	24	3,700	94,719	141,613,174
Indiana	1,529,558	2,870,317	15,085,354	18,987,164	7,508	7,293	63,702	39,467	4,320,335	9,069,103			47,390	31,020,783
Iowa	1,530,621	3,551,143	110,640,592	126,372,126	154,467	150,139	5,245,045	3,087,340	40,030,781	80,905,398			5,419,607	218,485,752
Kansas	180,153,745	335,557,159	7,677,099	9,343,608	3,231,883	2,780,076	154,209	96,813	1,304,613	2,611,395			75,000,703	425,889,766
Kentucky	468,260	853,583	1,754,093	2,357,826	1,189	1,139			446,021	910,314	3,261	500,965	7,372,949	12,056,472
Louisiana									86,445	178,694	110,453	19,111,427	4,824,062	24,114,188
Maine							133,496	93,038						93,038
Maryland	340,142	671,554	99,040	139,547					3,446	6,826			720,752	1,538,676
Michigan	3,218,849	5,984,372	2,498,368	3,060,241	74,165	70,579	292,303	184,285	635,916	1,328,260			5,775,580	16,403,317
Minnesota	7,128,400	13,512,661	38,070,303	41,104,848	12,162,894	11,335,336	16,619,108	8,561,282	21,466,012	42,307,571			5,037,902	121,859,905
Mississippi	1,749	2,379	181,531	198,028			239,805	161,212	2,029,475	4,093,804	581,319	102,337,094	7,306,344	114,998,865
Missouri	8,015,707	15,822,640	10,351,224	13,124,272	108,683	104,934	94,624	58,063	9,803,609	20,319,430	132,345	23,044,136	8,479,377	80,954,132
Montana	31,522,917	51,101,726	1,226	2,022	9,845,996	7,417,146	276,117	147,048					60,462,552	59,074,494
Nebraska	56,292,001	106,166,174	80,258,805	95,204,342	915,889	844,167	891,664	509,630	2,115,733	4,201,804			58,765,824	265,781,941
Nevada	6,617	9,353		1,494	1,255						2,118	371,462		382,070
New Jersey	128,178	258,329	24,575	36,660	963	982			8,731	17,911			1,937	315,819
New Mexico														
New York	2,634,578	4,563,675	27,967	31,606	23,194	19,914	12,894	9,029	21,922	41,632	177,939	32,628,648	1,967,047	39,261,548
North Carolina	995,088	2,015,652	137,318	157,127	17,127	17,774	63,955	44,769			114,624		114,624	2,350,734
North Dakota	39,176	76,103	246,588	335,909	11,591	11,815	45,958	32,151	93,286	190,249	161,344	28,706,635	88,107,640	117,460,002
Ohio	49,380,563	90,837,051	1,066,890	1,168,078	38,014,567	33,140,844	13,630,769	6,919,646	1,446,255	2,781,500			23,373,557	158,220,676
Oklahoma	3,318,517	6,026,426	4,485,057	5,655,257	16,203	15,555	186,220	120,807	3,559,213	7,388,005			5,900	19,211,950
Oregon	54,953,238	100,177,618	12,404	13,473	3,205,652	2,918,892	1,084,554	1,055,952	538,924	1,061,579	226,271	36,583,142	1,054,761	142,865,417
Pennsylvania	11,089,783	19,270,087	131,312	152,876	2,697,208	2,476,575	1,987,123	1,325,746					160,885	23,885,169
South Carolina	465,415	869,704	148,336	196,422	12,582	11,757	12,528	8,801	2,266	4,567			1,459	1,092,710
South Dakota	29,493	56,871	334,234	356,401	5,799	5,741	838,692	586,309	1,325,606	2,646,471	120,077	21,717,146	62,627	25,431,565
Tennessee	30,756,430	56,908,403	10,077,833	9,779,308	3,767,250	3,446,900	16,392,889	8,530,056	653,468	1,277,123			10,338,789	90,280,559
Texas	104,522	194,001	136,313	178,551			1,616	1,147	1,039,461	2,078,427	236,841	43,611,480	2,894,984	48,958,590
Utah	43,477,771	80,685,817	63,331	69,320	2,285,840	2,156,094	8,979,899	6,028,389	673,617	1,321,843	2,814,435	462,850,919	144,588,149	687,700,531
Virginia	415,198	631,458	1,383	1,645	46,262	36,195	2,842	1,989					22,064	693,351
Washington	422,334	808,932	20,459	29,146	2,418	2,368			128,262	255,693	3,590	621,281	5,268,643	6,986,063
West Virginia	30,643,483	49,808,009	484,408	558,092	2,995,235	3,274,382	1,069,598	617,855					5,760,253	60,018,591
Wisconsin			6,406	7,666										7,666
Wyoming	26,926	52,255	411,879	483,916	2,479	2,447	188,427	114,195	128,548	260,314			47,833	960,960
Puerto Rico	1,848,173	3,269,962	56,746	59,044	132,559	102,393	146,528	87,111					2,836,659	6,355,169
Not allocated											46	11,964	692,511	704,495
Total	564,605,781	1,028,533,853	347,091,645	409,817,708	90,143,346	79,553,096	72,618,928	40,494,465	126,768,910	258,752,000	6,831,925	1,184,775,444	520,387,801	3,522,314,367

NOTE.—Insofar as possible, loans are shown according to the location of producers receiving the loans. However, loans made on peanuts, tobacco, and naval stores to

cooperative associations for the benefits of members have been distributed according to the location of the association.

SOME PERTINENT FACTS ABOUT THE DEMOCRATIC POLICY AND STEERING COMMITTEES

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, while the question of the selection and makeup of the Senate Democratic policy committee, and the steering committee appears to be settled for this year, it will be little short of catastrophic if we do not reorganize these committees next year if, as we hope, we will have a Democratic President urging a liberal legislative program on the Democratic Senate. With this in mind I should like to reiterate for the Members of the Senate and call to the attention of the press some pertinent facts about the present composition of the policy and steering committees.

There were several points in the course of the discussion yesterday which were not reported by the press, and I believe it to be desirable to call to the attention of the Senate and members of the press certain facts relating to the present composition of the policy and steering committees.

On the policy committee the States north of Alabama and east of the Mississippi River, which contain 58 percent of the national population, are represented in the Senate by 23 of the 65 Democratic Senators, and have 297 out of 537 electoral votes. On the policy committee they are represented by one Senator out of the seven members, or one out of nine if the two ex officio members of the committee are included—or two out of 12 if the members of the calendar committee, who sit with the policy committee, are included. While these five Senators meet with the policy committee, it is not clear whether they have the status of voting members. Taking the maximum possible representation, these 21 States are represented by my distinguished and beloved colleague, the senior Senator from Rhode Island, [Mr. GREEN] and our youthful and energetic colleague, the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART].

On the steering committee the States north of Alabama and east of the Mississippi River are represented on the 15-man steering committee by 3 Senators, the distinguished junior Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the distinguished junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] and the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY].

These committees are obviously neither representative of the Democratic majority in the Senate nor the Democratic majority in the country.

It is also obvious that, while it has been decided that the policy committee is not to formulate policy for the Democratic Party in the Senate, there is at present no other mechanism short of the conference itself. The standing legislative committees cannot make policy for the Democratic Party; in many instances the standing committees give an opportunity to Democrats clearly not in accord with the Democratic majority in the Senate or in the country to join with members of the minority party and the administration in frustrating the legislative program of the Democratic majority.

Now that it has been decided that conferences will be held more frequently than in the past, it is imperative that the conference be used as a device for formulating Democratic Party policy on major issues.

It is of the first importance that a Democratic Senate be prepared to cooperate with the next Democratic President in passing a liberal legislative program. We must, therefore, consider making those changes in the policy and steering committee next year which we have failed to make this year.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks, a tabulation of the States east of the Mississippi and north of the Alabama line showing the number of electoral votes and the number of Democratic Senators.

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

	Electoral votes	Democratic Senators
Connecticut.....	8	1
Delaware.....	3	1
Illinois.....	27	1
Indiana.....	13	1
Kentucky.....	10	0
Maryland.....	9	0
Massachusetts.....	16	1
Maine.....	5	1
Michigan.....	20	2
New Hampshire.....	4	0
New Jersey.....	16	1
New York.....	45	0
North Carolina.....	14	2
Ohio.....	25	2
Pennsylvania.....	32	1
Rhode Island.....	4	2
Tennessee.....	11	2
Vermont.....	3	0
Virginia.....	12	2
West Virginia.....	8	2
Wisconsin.....	12	1
Total.....	297	23

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

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. What the Senator has said about the representation north of the Alabama line and east of the Mississippi is correct. However, I think he should also make it plain that so far as the policy committee is concerned, it does not make policy. All it does is to expedite legislation which has been agreed to in the proper legislative committees.

Mr. CLARK. That subject was discussed yesterday. The name is being changed now, as I understand.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is correct. The majority leader, the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], agreed to the motion by the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] that consideration should be given to this subject, in order that the true duties of this committee may be made plain.

To me it seems immaterial from what part of the country a Member comes, if legislation is expedited. Again I say that, so far as I am aware, there has been no holdup of legislation. I believe that, in comparison with similar committees elsewhere, this committee has really made an excellent record.

The Senator from Pennsylvania mentioned another item which I intended to discuss with him. I have

forgotten what it was, but it had to do with the second or third paragraph of the statement which the Senator made.

Mr. CLARK. Does the Senator refer to the steering committee?

Mr. MANSFIELD. No. I refer to a portion of the Senator's statement preceding his discussion of the steering committee.

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to engage in colloquy during the morning hour, if I may have unanimous consent to proceed further.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Pennsylvania be allowed to proceed for an additional 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator may proceed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. What I had in mind was the statement that the Senator did not know whether the members of the calendar committee, who have been sitting with the so-called policy committee for more than a year, had the right to vote in the committee. They do have the right to vote, in the same sense as have the secretary of the Senate majority, the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], and the Senator from Montana, who sits with that committee as majority whip. In other words, their views are taken into consideration. They are asked to make their views known, and when the time comes for a vote, it is taken by the full committee, and not by the majority leader. The Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], and the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE] do vote. I wished to make that clear.

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to have that elaboration of information from my friend from Montana. I regret very much that I find myself in disagreement with him. I am sure this will be one of the few times during the present session when we shall be in disagreement.

Mr. MANSFIELD. What is the Senator in disagreement about? I have stated the record as the Senator endeavored to do when he made his statement.

Mr. CLARK. I take it my friend from Montana is not in accord with the statement I made for the RECORD.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is not accurate. The Senator made certain statements, and I added something to them. The Senator stated that he wished the press to have the true story about the policy committee, what its functions are, and what responsibilities its members have, including the three members of the calendar committee who were added to it last year.

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to learn that we are not in disagreement.

THE INTEREST CEILING

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the President of the United States recently said in his address before the joint session of Congress:

In the management of the huge public debt the Treasury is unfortunately not free of artificial barriers. Its ability to deal with the difficult problems in this field has been

weakened greatly by the unwillingness of the Congress to remove archaic restrictions. The need for a freer hand in debt management is even more urgent today because the costs of the undesirable financing practices which the Treasury has been forced into are mounting. Removal of this roadblock has high priority in my legislative recommendations.

Will the Congress of the United States change its attitude, or will it continue in its stubbornness?

Already our failure to act has created what one writer said was "one of the catastrophes of the century." "Nothing like it," this writer said, "was ever perpetrated by the politicians of either party."

Now, who is this writer? He is our old friend David Lawrence, one of the shrewdest columnists and evaluators of facts this country has produced. He calls attention to the fact that the Democratic National Committee called this 5-year, 5-percent new issue a bankers' loan.

But it did not turn out that way. The general public and the people outside the financial houses bought up this issue.

In other words, it was not the banks, it was the people who saw that this was a good buy. But it cost the Government at least a half percent more than it would have had to pay if, as David Lawrence said, the Treasury could have sold a 10-year bond.

The money which was put into this recent issue, as we said, came by and large from the small investors. As a result, there was interference with funds which otherwise would have been available to the small businessman and private borrowers.

I think, Mr. President, we ought to get down to business and face this problem head on, before we find ourselves in the same boat with the Canadian Government, whose securities are selling at 6 percent and the British Government who had to pay 7 percent at the banks. If by our failure to act we put the Treasury into a straitjacket we had better act and get the Treasury out of the straitjacket.

I ask unanimous consent that David Lawrence editorial be printed in the RECORD following these remarks.

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

A FRAUD ON THE TAXPAYER—INTEREST CEILING HAS RAISED THE COST OF MONEY
(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON.—Few people are noticing it—largely because it's difficult for them to get the facts—but the taxpayers of America are suffering a huge financial loss.

More of their tax money will be used because the politicians of the Democratic Party in the last Congress wouldn't permit the Government to sell its long-term bonds above a 4¼-percent interest rate.

This is one of the catastrophes of the century. Nothing like it was ever perpetrated by the politicians of either party. It's a deliberate interference with financing the national debt.

The Democratic National Committee, anticipating the criticism that is bound to ensue, declares that the latest offering by the Treasury of 4-year 10-month notes at a 5

percent interest rate is a bankers' bonus and that the notes would be bought largely by bankers.

But it turns out that the general public, and buyers outside of financial houses, came flocking to the Treasury to buy the new issue. The non-institutional buyers gobbled up the bonds and asked for more. They recognized that it was a good purchase.

The tragic fact is that the Treasury could have sold a 10-year bond for a 4½-percent interest rate if the Congress had only authorized the Treasury to use its own discretion in meeting the market.

What the politicians have done is to compel the Government to concentrate on issues of securities that will mature in less than 5 years. This means that the Government will have to pay higher and higher rates to refinance in the next 12 months some \$76 billion of short-term securities.

Certainly this is going to cost the Government more. The Democratic Party's advisory committee is right in claiming that this will influence other interest rates—on house purchases and other long-term buying. This needn't have happened.

Actually, the Treasury is being forced to interfere in the realm of borrowing where consumers and small businessmen need credit. The Government thus absorbs short-term funds that otherwise would be available to private borrowers, at lower interest rates.

If the Congress had not yielded to the unsound doctrines of a few of its low-interest zealots, who thought they saw good political issue in keeping the ceiling on interest rates, the Treasury could gradually have reduced the amount of short-term debt. It could have put much of the borrowing on a longer-term basis. This would have stabilized the entire interest-rate structure and held inflation in check, and strengthened the dollar.

The crisis in interest rates is not confined to America.

The Canadian Government is selling securities at 6 percent, and recently England had a 7 percent borrowing rate at the banks. With such conditions internationally, it was a grave mistake for Congress to put the U.S. Treasury in a straitjacket.

It will do the Democrats no good to cry out that the administration is boosting interest rates to help the bankers. The impression building up now is that the Democrats are irresponsible.

The bungling of the interest-rate problem has done more to hurt the Democratic Party in 1960 than being charged with excessive spending and an unbalanced budget.

AMERICAN SAMOA: REAPPRAISAL OF U.S. POLICIES

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, at the close of the first session of the 86th Congress last year, the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], requested the distinguished junior Senator from Hawaii [Mr. LONG], to serve as chairman of a subcommittee to study the problems of American Samoa. The Senator from Hawaii subsequently traveled to Samoa for an on-the-spot view of Samoa's conditions.

The trip of the Senator from Hawaii and his report are particularly significant at this time since New Zealand has agreed to grant complete independence to West Samoa by 1961. Thus we are faced with the necessity of reappraising U.S. policies in neighboring American Samoa.

The Senator from Hawaii summarized his findings in an article written recently at the request of the Honolulu Star-Bulletin. In order to call it to the attention of all Members of the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that the article written by the Senator from Hawaii be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

ARTICLE BY OREN E. LONG, U.S. SENATOR FROM HAWAII

(NOTE.—Senator LONG has written this article at the request of the Star-Bulletin to sum up impressions and comment on American Samoa, which he visited recently on a swing that took him to Australia and New Zealand on the south and Manila, Philippines, on the west. A resident of Hawaii since 1917, he has been superintendent of public instruction, secretary of Hawaii, and held many other important public posts. President Truman appointed him Governor of Hawaii in 1951 and he served until February 1953, when he was succeeded by Samuel Wilder King. He was elected U.S. Senator in the first Hawaii State election last July.)

When anyone hears his family praised he experiences a glow of satisfaction. This is equally true when a citizen of a nation hears his country praised.

It has greater significance when the words of approval come from a people whose expression of faith is based on actual experience.

I recently had this satisfaction. At the close of the first session of the 86th Congress the chairman of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, JAMES E. MURRAY of Montana, asked me to serve as chairman of a subcommittee to make a study of American Samoa.

He stated that since I represent Hawaii, the State nearest Samoa, and particularly since I was the only member of the entire committee who had firsthand knowledge of this important community in the South Pacific, I was the logical member to conduct the study.

Because of the nature of his request and of my longtime interest in Samoa, I was pleased to accept the assignment.

CHANGES IMMINENT

Important governmental changes in the Samoan group are imminent. This made it urgent that the situation in American Samoa be reviewed at this time.

The people of the Samoan Islands, although a single ethnic group and of the same general culture, are divided socially, politically, and economically.

West Samoa with a population of approximately 100,000 is British (under a New Zealand trusteeship) and American Samoa with a population of 23,000 is under American control.

A development of international importance is now under way in West (British) Samoa. For a long period of time the people here have aspired to independence.

Under the wise tutelage of the New Zealand Government they have made great progress.

Their economy is self-sustaining; roads and other public improvements have been developed; educational facilities are far advanced.

DESIRE INDEPENDENCE

Of greater importance, they have demonstrated considerable ability to govern themselves and are united in a desire for independence.

In this aspiration they are following an age-old tendency. They feel as did our forefathers that "••• they are endowed by the Creator with certain unalienable rights,

that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness."

Holding this view it is only natural—and proper—that they should wish to institute a government of their own to assure that these rights will be secured.

The New Zealand Government has endorsed their hopes and has agreed that complete independence should be granted in 1961.

Naturally, there are critics of this action. Such critics hold that the people are not yet ready.

The emergence of a new nation is an inspiring event. Time will surely show that the West Samoans are ready to begin the great experiment.

NO REASON TO WAIT

During the last half century 22 new nations have been born. If each had waited for complete readiness there would not have been any change in the family of nations.

Independence presupposes experience in self-government, but complete constructive independence is never attained on a certain day. It is the result, rather, of experience and growth.

The chairman and members of the Interior Committee, the committee charged with the responsibility for governing territories and possessions, have naturally asked this question:

"What effect will the granting of independence to West Samoa have on the people of East Samoa?"

POSSIBLE RESULTS

They could see three possible results:

1. The people of American Samoa might see in the independent status being attained by their brethren in West Samoa an opportunity to unite all Samoans into one social-political group by their joining the new nation to form a Greater Samoa. This would seem to be a logical development.

2. The people of American Samoa, inspired by the fact that West Samoans are attaining their independence, might desire to become an independent nation, either now or sometime in the future.

3. The people of American Samoa might wish to remain American, working out their social and economic problems within the American system, but with a greater degree of self-government than they have been granted heretofore.

It was these three possible developments that I wished to discuss with Gov. Peter Coleman and his staff, with members of the legislature, and with the chiefs.

STAY WITH UNITED STATES

Their attitude was all the same. There is absolutely no thought of any political future apart from the United States.

This viewpoint was set forth eloquently by every speaker, whether a chief was speaking or a member of the legislature.

Rapi Sotoa, president of the senate, and A. P. Lauvao, speaker of the house, were equally forceful and clear in their interpretation of the desire of their people to be always a part of the United States.

They pointed out that the American influence has been strong in East Samoa since 1839 when Capt. John Wilks first visited the island.

President Sotoa said, "We are American. We were born under the American flag. Our homes, our churches, our schools are in the American pattern."

"We want to participate in the affairs of the nation—to help others. We aspire to the same place that other Americans have."

The various leaders with whom we conferred, spoke forcefully, not only in relation to their devotion to America; they also spoke pointedly in presenting their ideas as to what they expect under the American system.

WANT CONSTITUTION

They are especially interested in the following:

1. A constitution at the earliest possible date. They feel they are too much governed by men rather than by principles laid down in governmental documents.

2. The new constitution should protect the Samoan in the ownership and control of the land. This is of supreme importance in view of the limited land area and the unfortunate examples in other parts of the Pacific of native peoples losing their land.

3. Pending the adoption of a constitution, legislative powers should be granted to the legislature. The present two-house legislature serves only in an advisory capacity to the Governor.

This falls far short of the ideal of self-government and is no longer satisfactory.

This is true particularly since the people of West Samoa and also the people of the Cooke Islands have legislative control over all local questions, including local taxation.

4. More aid should be given by the U.S. Government, particularly in connection with education and health, roads and airports. This seems reasonable in view of the extensive aid that is given to the various States of the Union and to foreign nations.

5. Assistance is needed in developing a more adequate economy. The completion of the new runway for jet planes will have a bearing on tourism.

The present fishing cannery which employs 450 people can be enlarged.

The greatest need is for financial assistance in providing fishing boats capable of competing with the fishing craft used by other fishermen in Samoan waters. They hope that a carefully selected committee will make an on-the-spot study of the economic possibilities of the island.

AID PROGRAM

I am already working actively to promote a legislative program designed to give assistance to East (American) Samoa. Many people who know that situation feel that since the Navy withdrew in 1951 the economic situation has deteriorated.

While in New Zealand for conferences with officials responsible for governing territories, I met Congressman SILVIO CONTE, of Massachusetts.

He spent almost a year in Samoa during World War II. He has kept in touch with developments there and feels strongly that the United States should be more concerned about the welfare of the people.

Adm. Herbert G. Hopwood, whom I met in Fiji as he was returning from an inspection trip from Little America at the South Pole, expressed a similar viewpoint. He feels there should be a greater interest in this group of loyal Americans.

The Samoans need help to plan their economic future. The Civil Aeronautics Board should be more active.

The Fish and Wildlife Service (Bureau of Fisheries) should be of assistance. The services of agencies concerned with the planning and building of roads and the improvement of education and health facilities should be made more available.

There are two specific areas where the Federal Congress should act during the 86th session:

1. Provide adequate financial support to assure the completion of the runway now under construction which is designed to handle jet planes.

2. Assist the Samoan authorities in the completion of the constitution on which they are already working and secure its adoption. A new constitution granting greater powers to the legislature is a necessity.

If these accomplishments are brought about, two important steps in relation to

the development of Samoa will have been taken.

Of greater importance, these people who for generations have thought of themselves as being a part of America will feel they are receiving something of the consideration which they merit.

I thoroughly enjoyed the privilege of meeting old friends in Samoa and of making new ones.

Anyone who has been there will remember the beauty of the scenery, the colorful kava ceremonial which is always provided, the friendliness of the people; but most of all he should be aware of an opportunity for America to assist a people who believe in the United States and who want to be a part of it.

INCREASED MARITIME FREIGHT RATES FOR ALASKA

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, this is the fourth day since increased maritime freight rates were imposed upon Alaska and Alaskans by a verdict of the Federal Maritime Board. The Alaska carriers, as was explained to the Senate on Monday by my colleague, the distinguished junior Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], and myself, waited until the forepart of December to ask for a 10-percent rate increase. The State of Alaska, under the auspices of Gov. William Egan, intervened and asked the Federal Maritime Board to withhold any action until a public hearing had been held—a hearing, if you please, which would give an appropriate basis for a judicial determination.

Instead of acquiescing in that appropriate and proper request, the Federal Maritime Board allowed the rate increase to become effective January 11, and simultaneously allowed a public hearing, but said that if at a later date the increases are found to be unjustified, the money will be returned to the shippers.

My question is: What about the consumers in Alaska, who have a principal interest and a principal stake in this action? Will the increases they pay ever be returned to them? Of course not; that would be mechanically impossible.

Yesterday, as a member of the Subcommittee on Aviation of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, of which the distinguished junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] is the chairman, I listened to General Quesada, Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency, testify. I should like to quote one paragraph from his statement:

By the very nature of things, however, the special interests of many of these groups are often in conflict with each other. More importantly, they are often in conflict with the "public interest." Our job, then, often becomes one of balancing the equities among these groups and the great body of the general public, which, incidentally seldom has a vocal supporter. The public is traditionally silent and must often look to Congress and the bodies it creates to pursue their interests.

Mr. President, I can only express the wish now that the Federal Maritime Board had been equally solicitous about the public interest in the maritime trade of Alaska.

THE SPECIAL MILK PROGRAM

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on Thursday, January 7, I introduced, on behalf of myself and the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY], a bill to make additional Commodity Credit Corporation funds available for use in the special milk program for children for the remainder of this fiscal year, 1960, and to provide additional funds for 1961 to meet the natural expansion of the program. The bill asks that \$5 million be authorized to bring 1960 available funds to a total of \$85 million, and that the 1961 authorization be increased to \$90 million.

Mr. President, the special milk program has been one of the most successful programs to be authorized by Congress and administered by the Department of Agriculture in recent years. It was initiated in 1954 in order to expand the market for the abundant production of the dairy farms of this country, and at the same time fulfill our responsibility to improve the nutrition of our schoolchildren by providing them ample supplies of milk.

In 1959, the children in more than 81,500 schools, nursery schools, settlement houses, summer camps, and other child-care institutions, drank 2.2 billion half-pints of health-giving milk provided under the special milk program. This fact in itself is convincing proof of the need for this program.

In the spring of last year, the Department of Agriculture found the authorization of \$75 million inadequate to maintain the program at the established rate of Federal reimbursement to the participating institutions. Congress acted immediately to authorize an additional \$3 million so that children would not be forced to pay higher prices or possibly be denied an adequate supply of milk.

At that time, I asked that the appropriation for the special milk program be increased for each of the 3 years, 1959, 1960, and 1961, at an expanding rate to meet the growing number of children enrolled in our schools.

The actual administration of this law by the Department of Agriculture has been excellent. Administrative procedures have been worked out to encourage broad participation by schools and institutions. The policymakers of the Department of Agriculture, however, have attempted to hold the program back—in their own words, “to stabilize the program” by holding expenditures at the level of \$75 million annually. Such action would not result in a stabilization of the program. It would mean a gradual diminishing of the program in real terms, since the number of schools and number of school children continue to rise. Even though successful, the program at present reaches only about half of the schools. Instead of being satisfied at this level, we should be seeking ways and means to reach more and more child-care institutions.

The bill which was approved by Congress did not meet my original recommendations. As enacted into law, it provided \$78 million for fiscal 1959; \$81 million for fiscal 1960; and \$84 million for fiscal 1961. The inadequacy of last

year's legislation was revealed in November, when the Department of Agriculture informed the schools and institutions taking part in the special milk program that on March 1 of this year the reimbursement rate would be cut by half a cent per half pint of milk because funds were insufficient to maintain the Federal share of 3½ and 4 cents per half pint of milk.

The bill introduced by myself and the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY] last Thursday would prevent this planned reduction in the reimbursement rate by making immediately available \$5 million from Commodity Credit Corporation funds for program operation during the remainder of fiscal year 1960. The special milk program for children would continue to operate at its present level. Children would not have to pay more for the milk they drink. Schools would not have to reduce their participation in the program, or juggle their funds to meet the need for milk by cutting down on other essential activities.

Also, this proposal would, by providing an increased authorization for 1961, prevent the necessity for Congress to be faced with the same situation 1 year from now.

Representative LESTER JOHNSON, champion of Wisconsin's dairy farmers and chairman of the Dairy Subcommittee of the House Committee on Agriculture, has introduced a similar bill in the House of Representatives. Hearings on the proposal will be held by his subcommittee later this month.

Mr. President, I am sure that all of us know that this program is of tremendous value, both to the health of our schoolchildren and to the welfare of our dairy farmers. We need to act promptly on this proposed legislation in order to insure the continued successful operation of the special milk program.

OLD AGE WITHOUT FEAR

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I have been pleased to note that more thought and study is being given to the problems of our aged citizens. Due to the wonders of modern medicine and pharmacy, the lifespan of citizens has been steadily increasing. With these great advancements, however, new problems face us as to how we may best provide happy and secure lives for the elderly.

An excellent series of articles reporting on the problems of the aged and on current efforts to meet the needs of these people, appeared in the Minneapolis Tribune. The author of the articles, Daniel J. Hafrey, is a Minneapolis Tribune staff writer who specializes in reporting on welfare matters. I take this opportunity to commend Mr. Hafrey for this excellent series of articles, and also the Minneapolis Tribune for giving this issue the attention which it deserves.

I ask unanimous consent that the series of articles be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

GROW OLD WITHOUT FEAR—CLEARER VISION FOCUSES ON AGING

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—With the White House Conference on Aging scheduled for early 1961, the Nation is giving increasing attention to its growing number of senior citizens. This is the first of a series of articles on recent developments in the field of aging.)

(By Daniel J. Hafrey)

Donald K. will be 65 the day before Christmas. New Year's Eve he will leave the lathe he has tended 35 years for the last time—never to return to work.

And Donald K. is not afraid of retirement and old age.

The modest home in north Minneapolis is paid for. With the children gone long since, it is a little big, but Mrs. K. loves her flower beds, the nearness to the church where they were married 41 years ago, the familiar stores in the shopping center where she knows what shelf to find the things she needs.

She wouldn't think of moving to an apartment. Years ago Donald K. lightly suggested moving in with their oldest married daughter when he retired. She almost blasted him out of the house and he hasn't spoken of it since.

Mrs. K. has a bad back and can't do the heavy cleaning. But two daughters and a daughter-in-law take turns helping her with that. For the rest she takes a fierce pride in keeping—by herself—as spotless a house as any of the younger women.

Donald K. has high blood pressure and two fingers are gone from his left hand—a memento of a careless moment at the machine many years ago. But he sleeps well, has a hearty appetite, enjoys an occasional nip and keeps up with the younger men on hunting and fishing trips.

PENSION MODERATE BUT ADEQUATE

The savings are meager. With modest wages, three children to put through college, Mrs. K.'s mother to be kept in a nursing home the last 8 years of her life, a small lake cottage near Alexandria and a reasonably new car to be maintained there wasn't much left to put by.

But between his company pension and social security, the K.'s will be getting \$245 a month. He has \$15,000 in life insurance. And both will remain covered by the Blue Cross and Blue Shield health insurance policies taken out through K.'s employer.

Active in their church since newlywed days, the K.'s hope to continue working for it. Mr. K. plans to put in more time in his garage woodworking shop. Mrs. K. has a passion for old-country embroidery work and her eyes still are good and keen so she can keep it up. There are relatives to visit in several parts of the country.

Donald K. and the 1,000 other Americans who will turn 65 on his birthday—some 360,000 a year—are among the vanguard of our citizens beginning to reap the benefits of our maturing approach to the problems of aging.

For the first time the country is beginning to grasp the size of the needs of the aging, today as well as tomorrow, confident that it is well within our capacity to meet it.

CLEARER PICTURE OF NEEDS EMERGES

No longer are thoughtful people overwhelmed by the mushrooming numbers and demands. The dust of exaggerated worry, fear and concern is settling and a more realistic, factual picture of our senior citizens and their needs is emerging. Instead of chaos there is beginning to be understanding and planning. To be sure, this is only the very beginning.

A tremendous amount needs to be done. In many cases we are only glimpsing the direction in which we should move. In many others we haven't even found the direction yet. There are mountains of heartache, privation, illness, and loneliness on the part of hundreds of thousands of oldsters.

Yet, the most vital fact in the lives of America's 15,500,000 citizens over 65 today is that for the first time in history real grinding poverty—extended hunger and cold and inability to get medical care—largely has been banished.

Over the past 10 years there has been a veritable revolution in the way retired persons maintain their income: while 10 years ago 2 out of every 10 retired workers got social security, veterans benefits, or Government pensions, 7 out of 10 get such payments today.

Thus for the first time in history the majority of a nation's oldsters are dependent for their support neither on children and relatives, nor yet on the Government, but on a retirement fund they and their employers have financed.

PENSIONS SHOW GENERAL INCREASE

In addition to social security, more than a million retired workers also are getting private employer pensions.

The average social security benefit today is \$72 a month. Three out of every 5 persons 65 or older have an income of less than \$1,000 a year. Obviously, this doesn't go far in these days of 69-cent ground beef and 27-cent cigarettes.

But more and more thought is being given to gearing social security benefits not just to earnings in the long-ago past but also to the current price level—which would maintain purchasing power—and even to the wage level—which reflects the rising American standard of living.

A number of reputable economists agree that the American economy, with its rising productivity, can support a 50-percent increase in the income of the retired without missing a step.

And, finally, a determined attack is being launched on the most stubborn financial problem of old age: the high cost of medical care.

Nor are the moves slowed by the growing respect for the political power of the over-65 group. More than half the States now have offices dealing with problems of the aged. In 1961 a nationwide White House Conference on Aging will be held.

AGED REPRESENT POLITICAL FORCE

The retired today command 15 percent of the votes. They have been described as a political force second only to the farm bloc.

This comparison may be more apt than appears at first glance. For the slipping power of the farm bloc in Congress illustrates in some ways the different nature of the power of the aged.

It is not the naively crude Townsend movement of the 1930's, setting the aged apart as a pressure group whose interests are opposed to those of the rest of the population.

The power of the aged today is much more subtle. For America appears to be turning away just a bit from its worship of youth, physical vigor, and productive work. Note is being taken of the assets of other age groups.

It is only the barest beginning. Too commonly, as Dr. Maurice E. Linden, of Philadelphia, Pa., has said, there is a widespread tendency among people to regard progress through life as an uphill development from infancy to some vague plateau or prime called middle age, followed by a general decline.

There is a slowly growing realization that the older person, though declining physically, has a unique contribution to make to

society through greater experience and wisdom, that mental development can continue past the physical prime.

The view toward which we may be moving hopefully has been expressed by Bernard Baruch, who calls retirement the greatest achievement of our scientific civilization.

The stereotype of the older person who is ill, penniless, and in need of help slowly is being displaced. Dr. Wilma Donahue, of the University of Michigan, and Clark Tibbitts, of the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, who have done pioneer work in bringing on this change, make this point:

Age does not mean sickness and poverty. The new view of aging is that it can be a great social achievement.

As the educational level of those retiring rises and as more persons reach 65 who have had leisure time during their working life, the problem of how to spend retirement time becomes more manageable. It long has become plain that fishing and sitting in the rocking chair are not enough—and increasingly those reaching retirement have more varied interests.

GOLDEN AGE NOW OBJECT OF RESEARCH

As revolutionary as any of the recent changes is the growing recognition that old people are not all alike and cannot be treated as one uniform lump of "golden agers." It is accepted now that a personality at 65 is the result of development all through life and that personality differences between two 72-year-olds may be more important than their similarity of age.

The scientific tools of research and experimentation which have been so spectacularly successful in other fields now are being turned on the question of what "meaningful maturity" is, how to provide a useful and valuable substitute for work which will permit the retired person to hold up his head in pride.

Retiring at the end of this year, the Donald K.'s can expect to enjoy a period of retirement—maybe half as long again as their working life—with a reasonable income.

With better working conditions they enjoyed while employed, with better nutrition and easier homemaking, with radical new steps in preventive medicine and rehabilitation they have an even chance of fair health.

The likelihood of either one of them having to go to an institution such as a nursing home or home for the aged is only 1 in 33. And the chances that they may live out their lives without a disability which would interfere with normal activity is better than 4 in 10.

RETIREMENT AGE FUEL FOR DEBATE ON PROPER TREATMENT OF AGED

Should men and women be permitted to go on working at 65 or should they be forced to retire?

The extreme positions in one of the most hotly debated issues in America's attitude toward its aging today can be summed up thus:

Pro: The only fair way to end a man's working life is by fixed retirement age—say 65, or 67, or 68. Then everybody is treated equally, without favor or prejudice.

Con: A fixed retirement age is an irresponsible waste of the Nation's valuable manpower. And it may do shameful injury to a man who is perfectly capable of turning out good work for years. The only way to retire is to judge each person individually.

While there are some signs that Americans are beginning to accept other values beside those of productive work, holding a job still is the badge of self-respect for an overwhelming majority.

The urgency of the question is underlined by these figures: in 1890, more than

two-thirds of all American men 65 and older still were in the labor force. By 1955 this proportion was just a little over one-third. For women this figure had risen from 7.6 percent to 10.3 percent.

The U.S. Census Bureau has figures indicating that older men in the work force will be less than a third by 1975 and that their proportion will continue to decline. The proportion of older women may stabilize around 11 percent.

HOW TO MAINTAIN INCOME IN OLD AGE

What every man of 65 facing retirement knows has been stated thus by Philip M. Hauser, University of Chicago sociology chairman:

"The great increase in the number of older persons and decrease in their productive activity poses, of course, the major economic problem in respect to old age—the problem of maintaining income flow in later years."

This holds true despite vast increases in social security and other pension coverage. For even under the best circumstances they provide only a fraction of the income a worker and his family have gotten used to during his working life.

There are many reasons for the drop in the share of older persons at work. The numbers of self-employed craftsmen and small businessmen who in the past worked as long as they could lift a finger have dropped sharply.

In largely agricultural 19th century America there was room for a man to gradually quit work, so that a farmer of 65 or 70 or 75 could work as little or as much as his strength permitted. In today's urban economy a man generally is fully employed or out of work.

The urban way of life, which has so vastly increased the proportion of the aged in the population by reducing birth and death rates, also has broken down traditional patterns of respect, affection, and often prestige which the elderly enjoyed in rural America.

SKILLS OF OLDER PERSONS DEVALUED

Workers now approaching retirement age have lived through profound technological changes which may have made their job skills, once commanding good pay and status, valueless.

At the same time scores of new jobs have sprung up for which the older worker is completely unprepared. As the educational level of the general work force rises the older worker again is at a disadvantage, for he often quit school early or had no schooling at all.

In all, Hauser says, "Urbanism as a way of life has tended to leave the older person relatively insecure, dependent and with an ill-defined position in the social order."

While the family and community supports which the elderly enjoyed in a more stable rural society have been weakened, the practice of enforced retirement has spread. Increasingly employers, particularly the large industrial concerns which employ such a large share of American workers today, adopt the fixed retirement age.

To a degree, this mirrors depression demands to put older workers "out to pasture" to make room for the young. Today as well, union inflexibility at times makes it hard for the older worker to transfer to an easier job or part-time work.

And all this doesn't start the day a man turns 65. The problem of the older worker often starts at 40.

FORCED RETIRING CALLED LEVELER

Persuasive arguments have been made against forced retirement. Maybe the best comes from Dr. Walter Alvarez, himself forced to retire from the Mayo Clinic because of age, who has made a successful second career in his seventies as a writer.

Retirement, Alvarez says, should be an individual matter and geared to the health, vigor and productivity of each individual worker. Tests can be set up to measure these things, he says.

Clark Tibbitts of the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare calls the mandatory retirement age the "bulldozer which levels all men."

In many cases, he says, it needlessly deprives a man of work; it is bad for his mental and physical health, takes away his right to live in decency and self-respect and violates the concept of individual differences between men. For work today, Tibbitts notes, still is the "core around which our lives are organized."

He also points out that the fixed retirement age keeps people working who really should quit. By making retirement age flexible, he argues, those who really aren't capable of producing even a few years before reaching 65 would get out sooner.

On the other hand, H. G. Kenagy, who now teaches at Texas A. & M. college after retiring from a successful business career, argues that no board today really is competent to judge whether one man is more capable to go on working than another.

U.S. NONPRODUCTIVE RATIO HAS DROPPED

And, he asks, what happens to the self-respect of a man who is told that he must retire while a man of his age with whom he may have worked 30 years is permitted to stay on?

He challenges the belief, anyway, that most people want to go on working indefinitely. There comes a time in life, he says, when enough is enough and a person should be entitled to do what he pleases instead of going on with the drudgery of a lifetime job.

The Federal Government just recently has contributed some ammunition to backers of fixed retirement.

Opponents of fixed retirement have argued that the national economy could not remain in good health if a shrinking number of productive workers (ages 20 to 64) have to support growing nonproductive age groups (below 20 and over 65).

Recent figures by the census bureau have brought out that this proportion has dropped rather than risen. While there were 94 nonproductive persons for 100 productive ones in 1900, the figure now is 82 for 100.

This is because the average worklife of the individual, with longer life and better health, has been extended by 10 years and large numbers of middle-aged women have entered the work force.

FEWER JOBS SEEN FOR THOSE RETIRED

Various attempts are made to increase employment of the over-65. Some States, such as Massachusetts, have laws prohibiting job discrimination because of age. A similar proposal failed in the last Minnesota legislature. Numerous public and private commissions also are working in the field.

On the whole, though, it looks as if employment of the elderly will continue to go down. With retirement income becoming more adequate, the elderly may have to look for their satisfaction elsewhere than in work. Says Alvin M. David of the Social Security Administration, who has as much to do with the subject as anyone:

"A great deal has been said to the effect that work is necessary for health and that retirement, for many, leads to deterioration, unhappiness, and illness. We are not so sure as we once were that this is true.

"In a recent Cornell University study it was found that the typical correlation between retirement and health is that people in poor health tend to retire, and not that retirement adversely affects health. The conclusion of the study was that retirement does not typically have an ill effect on the individual."

MORE WORK NEEDED ON SECURITY PLANS FOR THE AGED

This will be your financial picture if you reach 65 in 1970 and become one of America's 19 million retired persons:

Nine out of ten of the retired will be getting social security, veterans benefits, or other Government pensions.

The average social security payment will be \$100 a month, almost half as high again as today's \$72 average. Maximum family benefits may be as high as \$350.

There will be health insurance for all over 65, to pay hospital, nursing home, and medical bills.

In the last 10 years America has become the first society in history where long-term, starvation poverty has been banished from the lives of most older persons.

Yet, President Eisenhower said in his 1956 economic report: "Too many families and individuals still have to get along on incomes that are inadequate by American standards. The Federal Government can do a great deal to help people who have been left behind in the onrush of progress."

Few are more likely to be left behind by that progress than the elderly, a group which has emerged in large numbers for the first time only with industrialized, urban society, and medical progress.

INCOME OF AGED SHOWS INCREASE

In 1957 half the aged living alone or with nonrelatives had an income of \$900 a year or less. Eighty percent had \$2,000 or less.

But even that is tremendous progress compared to 25 or even 10 years ago. In 1934 the elderly, forced to quit work by illness or company policy, could turn for support only to children, relatives, charity, or public relief.

The great revolution in income maintenance has come with social security which by 1950 supported 2 out of every 10 retired persons.

Today some 9,300,000 persons 65 and older are getting social security. Another 1,600,000 are entitled to it when they or their husbands quit work. This makes 7 out of 10.

Eligibility to get social security benefits at age 65 has grown from 75 percent of the work force in 1952 to 90 percent now. It still is spreading. And as coverage grows, old-age assistance and other relief programs decline.

Private pension plans have grown apace. By the end of 1957 about 17,700,000 workers were covered by private plans. A million and a quarter were getting benefits, many in addition to social security.

WITH INCOME GOES INDEPENDENCE

Thus for the first time the great majority of the retired will have an assured income which they themselves have helped build up. And for the first time they will be able to say proudly that they are dependent on no one.

Savings are not likely to play much of a role in financing retirement. Savings of the retired are skimpy, with half the social security recipients in 1957 having assets of \$600 or less, outside of the home they may own. At today's prices, especially the prices of medical care, this doesn't go far.

Now that the income floor, the avowed goal of the social security system, has been reached for a majority of the aged, thoughtful people are beginning to look beyond.

WELFARE EXPERT SEES CHALLENGE

Wilbur Cohen, of the University of Michigan, who helped set up the social security system in 1934 and is one of the Nation's leading public welfare experts, says boldly that the challenge before us now is:

How to expand social security coverage so it will cover everyone who works regularly.

How to expand the program so that every retired aged person is eligible for benefits.

How to raise the level of benefits so that every aged person will be able to live in a manner reasonably close to the standard of living of other groups in the community.

How to finance hospital and nursing home insurance coverage and other medical care protection for every aged person.

The Nation's growing productivity should make possible more generous treatment of our aged without shortchanging education, aid to the disabled, children, highways, foreign aid, and other essential programs.

A 50 percent increase in social security benefits, Cohen says, would be in line with an expected 50 percent expansion in the national product by 1970.

PRESSING NEED: MEDICAL FUNDS

The most pressing need of the aged today is how to meet medical costs. The over-65 age group is about three times as prone to illness as the younger groups. With their reduced means, the average yearly cost of medical care for retired Americans is \$125 a year now.

But only 40 percent of the aged, compared to 70 percent of the general population, have health insurance. While it can be expected to grow, coverage likely will fall far short of taking in all those needing it.

There is strong feeling now that all the aged will have health insurance one way or the other soon. If private enterprise will provide it, so much the better. But if private enterprise won't, the reasoning goes, Congress won't be able to resist the pressure for enacting the Forand bill or a similar law.

Representative ALME FORAND, Democrat, of Rhode Island, now has a bill in Congress to provide nursing home, hospital and physician's insurance to all those covered by social security. It would cost 1 added percent of payroll to finance a program of limited benefits. The key is that it would be paid for in advance, during the worker's productive years, for use after 65.

In testimony last month, the Eisenhower administration opposed the bill.

GROUPS ARE AGAINST GOVERNMENT PROGRAMS

The American Medical Association, the Blue Cross and Blue Shield organization and the private insurance industry are moving ahead to head off some of the pressures for a Government program. They are testing ways to provide cheaper medical care and cheaper insurance coverage for the aged.

The chief difficulties with commercial insurance programs are: Often those who need it the most are the poorest insurance risks and can't get it; and often an individual is covered only while he remains with the employer who took out the policy in the first place.

While there is general pressure for broadening social security benefits, few of those who know the needs best favor removal of the retirement test.

Cohen agrees with Alvin M. David, Assistant Director of the U.S. Bureau of Old Age and Survivors Insurance, that there are more important priorities. Only 20 percent of those now getting social security would benefit from the removal of the test.

Present law limits benefits which can be paid to a person earning \$1,200 a year and bars benefits to anyone earning \$2,080 or more.

BENEFITS RESTRICTED TO LOWEST INCOMES

About 300,000 persons now earn between \$900 and \$1,200 a year and presumably restrict their earnings in order to get full social security. Another 200,000 have earnings between \$1,200 and \$2,080 and get partial benefits. Then there are 1,400,000 persons over 65 who still work full time and have earnings large enough to exclude them from social security.

If the present retirement test were removed, most of the extra money would go to the latter group. A sizable increase in social security contributions would be required to finance this. And while it might be argued that these people are entitled to living as well as they can, David says, there are needier groups.

The most urgent need, he and Cohen agree, is more adequate benefits to widows. Aged women outnumber men in this country and of all women 65 and over today, 55 percent are widows.

With an average social security grant of \$72 a month, widows now get 75 percent of the primary grant, or \$54. It is felt that this should be raised to 80 or 85 percent immediately and up to 100 percent as soon as possible. There also is backing for reducing the age at which a widow can start getting benefits.

More liberal benefits will be financed partly by the scheduled increase in social security tax. Five percent of covered payroll today, it will go to 9 percent in 1969. In addition, Cohen advocates raising the portion of wages subject to social security from the present \$4,800 a year to \$9,000.

GOOD HEALTH, SELF-SUFFICIENCY BRIGHTEN FUTURE OF AGED

No longer does age mean infirmity and illness for everyone.

Men and women reaching 65 today may look forward to living in retirement half again as long as their whole working life, in many cases in reasonably good health and self-sufficiency.

The 1957 national health survey found that 43 percent of all persons over 65 had no illnesses or disabilities which interfered with their normal activities. Only one out of every six was severely enough disabled to require assistance with daily living.

While there still is too much ill health and suffering among the aging and aged, only 3.1 percent of the Nation's 15,500,000 persons over 65 live in institutions such as nursing homes, State hospitals, and tuberculosis sanatoriums.

Medical science, which first extended our average life span to 70 years by conquering infectious disease, now is not only seeking cures for the chronic, degenerative diseases of old age but finding ways to head them off.

Two big areas in giving better health to the aged now are preventive maintenance and rehabilitation.

PREVENTIVE MEDICINE CAN SAVE YOU YEARS

How preventive maintenance works was described to the University of Michigan's recent conference on aging by Dr. C. John Tupper of the university's medical faculty.

The periodic health appraisal examination for university employees which Tupper heads has turned up 848 unsuspected defects among 563 professors over the past 2 years. Age of the professors ranged from 31 to 81 and about half of the defects required immediate attention, Tupper reported.

Just as an example, the periodic exams uncovered 13 cancers in 12 of the professors. Two of these men are dead today, but 10 are well, according to all medical evidence, thanks to early treatment.

"Medicine today is not capable yet of dealing with the degenerative and neoplastic (cancerous) diseases of advancing age," Tupper said. "Hence the great need for early detection and prevention."

Nor is it enough to start thorough medical exams when a person approaches 65, he stressed. Degenerative diseases develop gradually over a person's life. And the earlier they are tracked down, the better are the chances of cure.

The need for regular medical examinations starting in early middle age cannot be over-emphasized, he concluded.

REHABILITATION CAN PROVIDE NEW OUTLOOK

Rehabilitation and physical medicine are another aspect of health maintenance, explained Dr. Max K. Newman, director of the Detroit Institute of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation.

Eighty-five percent of chronic complaints—caused by strokes, arthritis, and rheumatism, among others—can be removed by giving a person early rehabilitative treatment. Amputees, too, of whom there are sizable numbers among the aging, can benefit greatly from rehabilitation.

"If we see a stroke victim early enough," Newman said, "he will never show up in a nursing home. And oldsters who once used to die after hip fractures, we now have walking in 7 days."

Rehabilitation and physical medicine are ways of helping the patient use his physical faculties to the fullest possible extent. They include physical and occupational therapy, heat treatments and various baths, social service, speech therapy, vocational counseling and psychological help. Instruction in the use of artificial limbs also is included.

Rehabilitation should help a patient with chronic tendencies before they become a "way of life," said Newman. "Some older patients are glad to accept a disability as an excuse for 'giving up.' A good rehabilitation service can cope with that, too."

Close integration of rehabilitation with a hospital's psychiatric service is important in such cases, as well as a number of others, Newman added.

PHYSICIANS STUDY THE NATURE OF AGING

Britain, where physical medicine is part of many general hospitals, is considered the leader in this field today.

In the United States it has been pioneered by such men as Dr. Frank Krusen of the Mayo Clinic, Dr. Howard A. Rusk of New York and Dr. Frederic J. Kottke, head of physical medicine at University of Minnesota.

The American Medical Association now favors inclusion of physical medicine services in all general hospitals. Minneapolis' Fairview Hospital has been the leader among Twin Cities private hospitals in this field.

While the practical day-to-day work to make the aged healthier goes on physicians are deep in research in order to understand better the nature of aging.

One of the most ambitious projects is the regional center for the study of aging at Duke University, financed by a substantial grant from the National Institutes of Health. Under the direction of Dr. Ewald W. Busse, Duke psychiatry head, the total resources of all the university's departments are focused of fundamental research.

Much can be done to maintain the health of the aged by a proper diet, said Dr. William D. Robinson of the University of Michigan Medical School. Nor is it always true that appetite wanes with increasing years.

One study in an old-age home, he said, found that the residents ate as much bread as recruits in a navy boot camp, once they were given all the soft, attractively presented bread they wanted.

TEA-AND-TOAST DIET HAS LED TO SENILITY

The importance of a properly balanced diet to mental health also has been stressed by Dr. William F. Sheeley, head of psychiatry at Minneapolis General Hospital. While head of Hastings State Hospital he observed that many of the aged patients who had been committed as senile bounced right back once they started eating properly.

Their only trouble, he says, was that they had lived too long on a tea-and-toast diet.

Following up on this idea, the Community Welfare Council of Hennepin County and the Minneapolis Gas Co. have run nutrition clinics for the elderly which have attracted large and enthusiastic audiences.

New insights are being gained into other causes of the high rate of mental disorders among the aged. Men and women who are perfectly well while engaged in their jobs and busy daily routines collapse mentally under the strains that come with retirement, said Dr. Moses M. Frolich, University of Michigan psychiatrist.

The increasing stresses of giving up a job, losing friends and associates and having to adjust to the lower social status of idleness often lower a person's capacity to cope with the world, he said.

As America learns to accept the worth of a life of retirement, as more meaningful activity is found for such a life, we can expect the rate of mental illness among the aged to decline, Frolich concluded.

Finally, Dr. Frederick A. Collier, noted Detroit surgeon and emeritus professor at the Michigan Medical School, made the point that the lives of many aged persons are extended and made happier by surgery that never would have been considered even 20 years ago.

"We can do almost any surgery now with safety up into the seventies, eighties, and nineties," he pointed out.

Much of this, he said, is due to vastly expanded experimental medicine and the development of special surgical teams, such as the world-famous Lillehei team at University of Minnesota for heart surgery.

INADEQUATE HOUSING IS A PLAGUE TO AGED

Frank and Agnes D. are in their early seventies, with married daughters in California and Texas and a son with the Regular Army in West Germany.

They live in their southeast Minneapolis home, which they bought for \$5,400 in 1938 and have long since paid for. When Frank D. retired from his salesman's job they started taking in two to three University of Minnesota students as boarders.

"We're going to stay right here as long as we can," says Frank D. "unless I can talk the wife into buying a trailer and trying one of those Florida retirement villages."

Catherine F. is 78, widowed 7 years. Her arthritis gives her quite a bit of trouble and the steps in her two-story home near Lake Street and Bloomington Avenue sometimes are too much for her to manage.

For a few years after her husband died, Mrs. F. had an elderly cousin from Willmar, Minn., living with her. But there were disagreements over what to cook, how to clean house. And Mrs. F.'s friends didn't feel comfortable with the cousin. So she went back to Willmar.

Mrs. F. knows she can't stay alone in that house much longer. Her married daughter in Richfield wants her to come live with her, her welder husband, and their three children.

"I like them too well for that," says Mrs. F. "I'm going to sell this house—the children don't want it—and move into Ebenezer Home. Several of the women from my church live there and like it well."

John R., who is 74 and never married, is recovering in a nursing home from a broken hip. He broke it when he fell on the badly lighted stairs of his near-downtown boarding house. He's going back to the dingy, overcrowded bed-sitting room and kitchen.

But not for long. John R. has his name on the waiting list for one of the high-rise apartments in the Glenwood redevelopment area. There he'll be paying \$32 a month for an airy, modern efficiency apartment.

"It's a good chunk out of my \$71 relief check," he says. "But it's a sight better than what I have now."

HOUSING IS PRESSING NEED FOR U.S. AGED

There has been growing recognition that decent, suitable housing is one of the most pressing needs of the Nation's 15,500,000 over-65 group.

"Studies have shown that social problems, such as disease, extended illness, suicide, accidents, mental illness, and isolation occur in high proportion among populations living in deteriorated housing and disorganized neighborhoods," says E. Everett Ashley 3d, of the Federal housing and home finance agency.

"The need for a good living environment is especially important for the elderly who, because of the nature of the aging process, are especially vulnerable to the disturbing influence of unsatisfactory surroundings."

The housing conditions of the elderly were outlined thus to the McNamara subcommittee of the Senate this summer by Dr. Wilma Donahue, chairman of the University of Michigan division of gerontology:

Half of them can't afford the minimum decent housing. As many as 1,200,000 couples live in three-generation families "and most report that they regard this arrangement as undesirable."

"Middle-aged and older people," she explained, "usually capitulate to living with their children only when forced to do so because of long-term disabling illness, absence of income or devastating loneliness brought on by the loss of spouses or other social contacts."

Forty-six percent of the elderly are living as married couples in their own households; another 24 percent are not married but serve as heads of households; the other 30 percent live in homes for the aged, State hospitals, with relatives or adult children or make some other arrangements.

More than three-quarters are well enough to go on living independently, with only 1 in 5 needing specialized housing where they get help with the activities of living.

INDEPENDENCE IS DILEMMA OF AGED

Only about 3 percent live in institutions. Sixty-eight percent of persons over 65 live in their own homes, mostly paid for. This is the highest home ownership ratio among all age groups. But a larger part of the homes owned by the elderly are in unsatisfactory condition.

Industrialization, the trend to the city and greater mobility have greatly loosened the close ties that used to exist between generations in a family where the old, the middle-aged and the young had a place and useful function. More and more, the average family is made up of young-to-middle-aged parents and their children.

At the same time, people have children earlier, stop having them earlier and live longer. Today the average couple is no more than 50 when the youngest child leaves the home. At that point, the man has a life expectancy of 27 years and the woman of 31.

Thus a third of the lives of a married couple will be spent in a two-person household needing a much smaller home, Dr. Donahue concluded. And almost inevitably one spouse will spend years alone after the death of the other.

Only about 10 percent of those reaching retirement age leave their home community. But even that fraction provides a booming market in retirement villages and trailer camps for the sunshine States of Florida, California and the Southwest.

Increasingly it is becoming clear that the elderly want to continue an independent household as long as possible. And the general public expects them to do so, rather than moving in with their children.

Stiff-backed independence may not be the best thing for the older person, involving, as it must, not only material hardships but the much greater suffering of years of loneliness.

Joseph M. Britton of Pennsylvania University, whose research findings support the stress on independent living, has described the dilemma of the elderly thus:

"Present opinion hardly makes acceptance of a helping hand (i.e. living with children or relatives) a graceful thing to do, even when the hand is extended with sincerity and a genuine spirit of loving or friendly assistance.

BUILDERS SEEK TO MEET BASIC NEEDS OF AGED

"And yet, almost inevitably in old age, unless an individual dies suddenly, he becomes less self-sufficient and to a greater or lesser degree dependent upon others. This is a reality of life in these later years."

Since little can be done to change these Puritan-inspired values of our society, there is much we should do to let more of the elderly live by themselves and make it more pleasant for them, he said.

A survey of the New York State division of housing found that one in five elderly patients in New York City hospitals could go home—if they had a decent place to go home to. If they had that, the hospitals could provide home nursing care for them—at a great saving in labor, money and self-respect of the elderly patients.

One of the main stumbling blocks to their return home is this, according to Richard W. Hill, Jr., of the division:

"Almost half of the patients have limited mobility and most of them are shut in due to the lack of elevators in the buildings in which they reside. In most cases these people do not live on the ground floor level. Over 70 percent live on the second floor or higher. On the other hand, only 13 percent live in buildings with elevators.

"This block to their mobility can hardly be overstated."

Ability to get outside, home care services for temporary illness, and partial homemaker services are some of the things housing for the elderly should have.

Other desirable features are: complete dwelling unit, including bathroom, on one floor; absence of thresholds and other tripping hazards; doors wide enough to let a wheelchair pass; nonslip surfaces; hand grips by all toilets and bathtubs; a kitchen arrangement which makes stretching and stooping unnecessary.

Housing for the elderly should be located near public transportation, shopping, medical, hospital, and recreational facilities; free from major traffic hazards; in a neighborhood free from urban blight and slums; and in familiar surroundings near the occupant's usual circle of friends.

We know of some of the needs. And much is beginning to be done to meet them. There is a lively boom in construction of a variety of housing for the aged, ranging from a high-rise apartment building for retired teachers in Omaha, Neb., to the Evangelical Lutheran Church's string of old-age homes across the country, to the independent family units of Detroit's model Presbyterian village.

Following pioneers such as New York City; San Francisco, Calif.; Cleveland, Ohio, and Toronto, Canada, Minneapolis by fall will have 180 efficiency and one-bedroom apartments at low rents in the Glenwood redevelopment area. The elderly will have preference in renting them.

HOW U.S. HELPS MEET HOUSING NEED

A tremendous boost to providing more ample housing for the elderly was given by Congress in 1956 when it made possible, for the first time, for single elderly persons of low income to be admitted to low-rent public housing projects.

Congress gave authority to the Federal Housing Administration (FHA) to underwrite 90 percent of mortgage loans on projects sponsored by nonprofit groups. The

1956 law also made it easier for persons 60 and older to qualify for FHA-insured loans.

Private homebuilders also are moving into the market. One, Carl T. Mitnick, president of the National Association of Homebuilders, has built 800 units and financed many for retired persons in North Cape May, N.J.

Senior citizens, Mitnick has found, are excellent credit risks.

The scope of the continuing need has been indicated by Mitnick who says the elderly need 150,000 new housing units annually. And Herbert M. Rosenthal, a Chicago builder, says that housing for the elderly will represent a billion-dollar-a-year market over the next 10 years.

ONCE PHYSICAL NEEDS ARE EASED, BIG QUESTION BECOMES LEISURE

Reasonably good health, enough income to live in self-respect and a decent place to live—these are the foundations of life after 65 to which men and women can look forward without fear.

Although much still remains to be done before these goals are attained, we are moving toward them. But that is only the beginning. The big question now is: once the minimum of physical comfort is assured, what to do with these later years?

Shuffleboard, outings, golden age clubs, checker tournaments, gardening, reading, radio and television take up a good part of the extra time which retired persons have on their hands—at times weighing heavily on them.

A vast community effort is under way across the country to provide activities and entertainment for those who have worked in their fruitful years and now are ready to enjoy the rewards of the high standard of living they have helped create.

For many of the aged this is enough and, if the other conditions of physical comfort are present, they live out their declining years pleasantly and with satisfaction.

But with many others of the aged, Dr. Wilma Donahue of the University of Michigan feels that under their efforts to engage in recreation there is a sense of "filling an inner vacuum which has been created by the leisure time that has been thrust upon them."

The dilemma of the aged in western society, and especially in the United States, is this, says Dr. Donahue who heads her university's division of gerontology:

"Our society has been, and very largely continues to be, family and work-centered. We have assigned roles and social positions in terms of parenthood and work. Now we have created an economy in which these responsibilities are completed while many years of life remain. We invite people to retire. Adult children have little or no need for their parents in the home. But what position have we assigned to these people? How shall they use their energy, time and experience? How shall they satisfy their needs for belonging, usefulness, recognition and orientation?"

Very few are self-sufficient enough to do merely what they think is right and let the opinion of those around them go hang. Almost all of us need the approval and acceptance of those around us, the praise, the pat on the back, the knowledge that we are doing what is considered worth while.

In ancient Greece and most of the non-western civilizations almost up to the present, leisure was a respectable way to fill one's time. The old Greeks put a low value on productive work. They believed that the most worthy use of time was to deal with people through government, service, religious worship and conversation.

But in western society since the Reformation, the stress has been on productive work as the most valuable use of time. It is the

Calvinist-Puritan tradition, what the sociologists call the Protestant ethic, of hard work, self-reliance and independence which has built our technological civilization of abundance.

Ironically, it is that very devotion to productive work, which has created the highest standard of living in history and has extended our life span to 70 and more, which now strikes back at the elderly.

For, though there are beginning to be some signs of change, in our society it is hard to win public respect for a man who doesn't work any more, who has been put on the shelf.

"Work has given a man more than income," says August Hecksher, director of the 20th Century Fund which has done pioneer research in the field of aging. "In numerous ways it has provided satisfactions and answered needs, and now the real objective must be to find, not activity in general, not business for its own sake, but activities which specifically fill the void which the ending of the job has left."

MATURE LIVING MAKES DEMANDS

Other societies have accorded positions of respect and honor to their aged, have looked up to their greater experience and wisdom. America, too, with its attitudes still largely moored in a youthful pioneer society, will have to change its approach to age if it is to come to terms with a group that is becoming increasingly important as voters, consumers and setters of public tastes.

Not all the changes have to be made by the younger age groups. To be respected an older person must be more than just old. And the rocking chair-fishing routine as the end-all of retirement is not likely to make a place of honor for the aged in our communities.

Mature living, which has become possible on a large scale for the first time in our lifetime, makes demands on the middle-aged and older persons, too. Woodrow W. Hunter of the University of Michigan's division of gerontology has outlined some of the most important ones:

Selflessness or the capacity to serve one's fellow man. Too often the elderly become preoccupied with their own affairs to the exclusion of everything else. The retirement years, when the cares of earning a living and raising a family are over, present a unique opportunity to serve those less fortunate, including the sick and the institutions serving them and children and youth.

Social expansiveness or the capacity to reach out and create new and satisfying social relationships. One of the great causes of loneliness and separation from the community for the aged is their refusal to make new friends and acquaintances as the old ones, inevitably, pass away.

Other attributes making for a more satisfying retirement are mental alertness, inquisitiveness, flexibility, active citizenship, self-sufficiency in thought, initiative, and the ability to set and realize goals for the remaining years of one's life.

Not enough factual research on what the elderly themselves want to do with their retirement time has been done so far. And much valuable insight into what makes a well-adjusted retirement can be expected from some of the research projects now being carried on.

But one thing is certain: Efforts to do everything and decide everything for the elderly, however well intentioned, are off the mark.

Leonard Z. Breen, Purdue sociologist, has warned against letting the professional organizer make the elderly "public property—fair game for all those who manipulate them" and who think they know best what is good for the elderly.

"We must not take a man out of the pool hall and make a new man out of him at age 65 just because he is 65," he says. "Old people, after all, are only young people grown older. To impose a new, foreign and arbitrary set of values and standards is undemocratic and unfair in any case for no other reason than a man has reached a certain chronological age.

"Let each individual derive from his own life his own satisfactions with appropriate assistance and guidance, but with individual and personal dignity and freedom."

'MEANINGFUL MATURITY' IS PRODUCT OF PLANNING

One of the most persuasive appeals against regimentation of the aged, for consideration of each one as a separate individual was made at the University of Michigan's recent conference on aging by Mrs. Mary C. Van Tuyl.

A retired clinical psychologist who has taught and practiced in California and Michigan, raised six children and now lives at Presbyterian Village in Detroit, Mrs. Van Tuyl made these points:

"The longer I live within a group of older people, the more I am inclined to stress their differences instead of their similarities.

"The range of differences in background and present status is so variable that any generalization is more than likely to be untrustworthy. The amount of economic resources of the older individual, the extent and quality of the formal education he has had, even the character of his childhood and youth, his professional and work history, his present physical and mental health—has he been married? divorced? is his partner living? has he had children?—his church background and his present religious thinking, his personality and temperament, his tastes and appreciation resources, his adaptability to the necessities of change, his degree of independence, of tolerance of other ways of thinking and acting, even the time and the rate at which the most conspicuous physical manifestations of aging appear—all of these are important characteristics that simply pile up to make unique individuals of older men and women."

The richness of resources for meaningful satisfactions that are built up in early and middle life, she stressed, are likely to be the basic reservoir for satisfactions in later life. The whole previous life is a preparation for the later years.

In spite of what others can do for the elderly, she said, the individual's own responsibility for his life plan in the end is paramount. And she concluded her views on meaningful maturity with this story:

"Not long ago I had dinner with a woman recently retired from a successful small business. She was talking of her present activities as if they were giving her great satisfaction. When someone asked her about the difficulties of retiring, she said with some impatience, 'It seems to me that about half the country is trying to teach the other half how to retire. With me,' she said, 'I just gave up going to work 6 days a week plus some evenings and began to do some things I had always wanted to do.'

"The matter probably was not as easy as this comment would indicate, but, she continued, 'If we have handled our affairs well up to this age of 60 or 65, it's quite likely that we can plan for the later years.'"

SCOREBOARD OF AMERICAN SCIENCE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, there appeared in the Minneapolis Tribune an excellent series of articles by Victor Cohn, entitled "Scoreboard of American Science."

Eight years ago Victor Cohn wrote the first series of articles on Russian science in any American newspaper and he stated, "We are badly underrating Russian science." In 1958, Mr. Cohn spent 5 weeks in the Soviet Union and made the following grim observation:

The first year since sputnik the Russians have advanced more in science than we. At the present pace, they will lead us in most important fields of science in 10 years, in the opinion of many informed Americans.

Last year, Mr. Cohn was assigned by the Minneapolis Tribune to see how far the United States had come in science and education since Russia had launched sputnik over 2 years ago. The excellent series of articles which Mr. Cohn prepared is must reading to anyone who is concerned about our scientific status today.

I highly recommend this excellent report, and I ask unanimous consent that the series of five articles along with a chart entitled "A Scoreboard of American Science," which sums up the progress we have made in the last few years, be inserted in the RECORD.

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

(By Victor Cohn)

WASHINGTON.—How can we wake up America?

On October 4, 1957—2 years ago today—Russia launched her first sputnik.

Today many leading American scientists are still saying: "How can we wake up America?"

This is the main conclusion this reporter has reached after talking to many scientists, and working with science officials in Washington to compile the first "scoreboard of American science."

This scoreboard appears on this page. It is an attempt to show some of the things we have done and not done since the first sputnik's beep-beeps signaled a new kind of race for world leadership.

The National Science Foundation gave the Minneapolis Tribune generous help in compiling many of this scoreboard's figures and estimates. But several come from other sources, and any errors are ours.

The scoreboard and many recent interviews now show that:

Our Government—by act of the Congress that just adjourned—will increase spending on all scientific research and development in the next year by 6½ percent. An authoritative Washington estimate is that the Russians are increasing theirs by between 11 and 16 percent every year.

Two years ago we were warned that the Russians were spending 8 percent of their national income on education, while we were spending 4 percent. The U.S. Commissioner of Education now estimates that we are spending 5 percent; the Soviet Union, between 10 and 15.

Russia's moon rocket reminds us how far behind we remain in sheer rocketpower. One finds general uneasiness among scientists about our many failures on the launching pads.

There is even sharper worry among our scientists, however, about American basic research and education—for example, about the number of bright youngsters still not getting college educations in fields important to the Nation's survival. We are increasing our scientific and technical manpower supply by 3 to 4 percent a year. Russia is increasing its by 6 to 7 percent.

Our spending on basic research, which after sputnik leaped forward from shamefully low levels, has already started to level off sharply. Most scientists believe it is leveling off before even approaching the level that they believe vital to prevent future surprises like sputnik in unforeseen fields.

Congress—as one example—just put off voting either a go-ahead or starting appropriation for a crucial research tool: a 2-mile-long \$105 million Stanford University accelerator or atom smasher. The President in May personally asked approval. Congress did make available about \$1 million in AEC (Atomic Energy Commission) operating funds for preliminary design studies. Scientists and the AEC had asked a starting fund of \$3 million to \$4 million, and urged a congressional commitment to prevent destruction of team-scientists' morale, future delays and loss of keymen.

While trimming a few million here, a few million there from basic sciences, Congress voted the National Institutes of Health—the Government's medical research Institutes—\$400 million for the coming year. This is up 36 percent from 1958-59. It is \$105,700,000 more than the President asked of Congress. It is more than the Institutes themselves had asked of the President.

The Government's total basic research spending meanwhile goes up this year from \$488 to \$494 million—a little over 1 percent.

These are some of the reasons why many scientists still worry. Much, they are aware, has happened since sputnik. America's educational support and support of science have moved far ahead.

Science has begun to have a Washington voice. We are building several telescopes, atom-smashers, and laboratories.

We still lead the world in most fields of science, though the Soviet Union's upward pace is ominously faster. Our space satellites have garnered far more new facts than Russia's. Congress last year passed the National Defense Education Act to help some worthy students go to college.

The question is still raised: "Are we doing enough?"

In August 1958 Dr. Alan Waterman, Director of the National Science Foundation, wrote President Eisenhower that "only a beginning" had been made, and said "we shall rapidly lose in competition" with other nations unless we show greater effort.

Waterman said a few weeks ago:

"We've made some progress. But I still feel very strongly along these same lines. I don't know how we can bring home to people that there's still a real emergency."

He is worried about real and urgent needs for many fundamental research facilities (like the Stanford accelerator) and for millions of dollars' worth of new labs and equipment.

"I'm still very unhappy about the extent of results in education," he added. "Where I get most unhappy is the lot of the high school teacher. Who's raising his salary and status?"

"It's true, New York State has jacked up its schools. So have California and Oregon. Here and there things are happening. But it's awfully slow. We can't wait 10 or 20 years. We haven't got time."

Dr. Bowen Dees, the Science Foundation's Assistant Director for Scientific Personnel and Education, said: "We need to improve education for science at all levels."

"For example, many people in education would point to the thing that resulted in two Presidential vetoes this year—Federal aid for building college classrooms. And we're going to have increasing trouble in education because of increasing population."

On science and education, Dees said: "We still have a very long way to go, not only to catch up with the Russians but to realize

our own potential, which, after all, is the American dream."

Economists have begun to stress this point. Disregarding any competition, we are still failing to do enough research and training to increase productivity.

"By and large the Government has shown a grossly inadequate appreciation of the importance of research," said Sumner H. Slichter, Harvard economist who died last week, to a Washington conference last year.

True, he pointed out, research spending has grown, but it has been mainly military, and Government support of other research remains "only a small fraction of the amount that would yield enormous results."

Dr. George Kistiakowsky, new science adviser to President Eisenhower, said in September that we still and regrettably fail to recognize that science must grow faster than industrial production, or production will falter.

In the past year the warnings like these have piled up and up—none of them big stories at the time, some of them just a few lines in a speech, but all of them together making a powerful message.

Dr. Joseph Kaplan, U.S. International Geophysical Year chairman, said that "in spite of the impact of sputnik, no one as yet has stated the magnitude and character of the task." He believed we might have to spend twice as much on science to survive.

Lloyd V. Berkner, chairman of the new space science board of the National Academy of Sciences, asked, "Have the measures since sputnik been adequate?"—and answered: "No."

Dr. James R. Killian, Jr., the President's science adviser until a few months ago—a conservative, mild-spoken man—said in his final official speech in July:

"We still pour too much of our money into development and too little relatively in basic research."

"We face implacable, able competition * * * While recognizing our present strength, we must also recognize that we could lose the race."

"The military, economic and technological competition of the Soviet bloc"—meaning Russia and Red China—"may require us to make some hard choices between growing comfort and leisure on the one hand and self-denial and hard work on the other."

"Our vitality and sense of purpose are under test."

UNITED STATES NEEDS MORE BASIC RESEARCH

WASHINGTON.—Could the United States turn out to be the most cancer-free defeated nation in history?

This kind of question is being asked rather sadly by many fundamental scientists in this country today as the result of their nagging difficulties in getting financial support, compared with medicine's far easier lot.

Many scientists are particularly concerned this fall about the recent experience of two Government agencies: the National Science Foundation (NSF) and the National Institutes of Health (NIH).

NIH—consisting of a national cancer institute, a national heart institute and others—was established both to do research and to allot research grants. For 7 consecutive years Congress has voted it more money than the President recommended.

The Congress that just adjourned gave NIH \$400 million for 1959-60, 36 percent over 1958-59, \$105 million more than the President budgeted, and more than NIH itself sought.

A few weeks ago Science—the journal of the American Association for the Advancement of Science—said of this: "It may not be possible to spend so much money so quickly without significantly lowering present research standards."

It said many observers will praise the NIH cancer-treatment program, but will find that fundamental biological studies—the kind that medicine needs for future progress—are being short-changed.

The national science foundation was the brainchild of the scientists who gave the United States World War II radar, anti-submarine weapons and the A-bomb.

They began saying in 1945 that if we wanted future strength, we must not do research on weapons alone but must do basic research—the dreaming and thinking and searching for facts that lead both to knowledge and practical payoffs.

Dr. Vannevar Bush, wartime science chief, said in 1947 that NSF should be established immediately and that its support of American research should grow to \$125 million in 5 years.

NSF was not established until 1951, and its total research support now totals only \$76,800,000, including dollars for research facilities. In almost every year NSF requests have been cut twice, once by the Budget Bureau, then by Congress.

A year ago NSF asked the Bureau to allot it \$206 million in the President's 1959-60 budget. This was cut to \$160 million. Then Congress this summer voted \$152,700,000, having cut out \$6,617,000 in basic research funds and \$800,000 for a Southern Hemisphere astrophysics program.

This is a proposed telescope to photograph large sky areas. It was called "vital and urgently needed" by Dr. Alan Waterman, NSF director. Northern Hemisphere studies now give our astronomers only half the data they need to analyze the motions of stars and planets.

The House of Representatives unsuccessfully sought to cut even more NSF money—\$17 million in all. Of the House vote on this, Chemical and Engineering News—organ of the American Chemical Society—observed:

"There was little debate. Nobody urged the House to restore the cuts made by the Appropriations Committee. As he presented the committee recommendations, Representative JOE L. EVINS, Democrat, of Tennessee, said:

"The committee is impressed by the importance of science in the modern world, but it does not believe we should issue a blank check to the Foundation."

Most scientists think that instead of a blank check, basic science has been issued one of Washington's barest purses.

This reporter was told by NSF's Waterman a few weeks ago: "Last year we were able to support about 35 percent of the worthy research proposals we received. This next year it will be about the same, maybe a little more."

Of \$7,700 million which Washington agencies will spend on scientific research and development—to a huge extent on rocket hardware—in 1959-60, only \$494 million or 6 percent will be for basic research. This is the same percentage as 2 years ago, the year Russian science shocked us with sputnik.

Russia spends between 10 and 20 percent of its research and development money on basic research, estimates a Washington official who follows Soviet science.

The Atomic Energy Commission's basic research program is inadequate, its top science advisers found in March, at a secret meeting at Savannah River, S.C.

Navy support of basic research should be doubled to make sure of future naval and national strength, said an advisory committee to the Navy in April. The Navy has actually been by far the heaviest basic research supporter among the services.

After sputnik, Lloyd V. Berkner, then a member of the President's Science Advisory Committee, estimated that U.S. research funds ought to grow 5 to 10 times "in the

next few years." Basic research spending was indeed nearly doubled in the 2 years following October 4, 1957, when sputnik went up. But now it is leveling off.

Science has become a more routine Washington item this year, and no longer an urgent one. The NSF—for example—was just given a first \$2 million to begin to remodel and retool college graduate research laboratories (by 50-50 matching).

This is just the beginning, of course, of what should be a long-range program, but one NSF official still calls it "a pea in the dish." NIH has a 3-year-old, \$30 million-a-year program to do the same sort of job for the medical labs.

Most basic research sums are not large as Washington figures go.

"Basic research doesn't cost much," said Waterman. "In fact, doing basic research first is the most economical approach."

Where we fail to do early research and development—as in space—we wind up spending billions to much less avail on crash programs later.

Dr. Charles S. Sheldon, II, technical adviser to the still-weak House Committee on Science and Astronautics, said: "Early research is always cheap, and time is something almost impossible to buy back later, even with almost astronomical spending. Look at our rocket program."

"This House committee has been trying to point out that even a few years' delay in an important science can hurt us very badly later. But getting this across is very hard."

Dr. Wernher von Braun, Army missile scientist, was quoted to Congress by Waterman: "For years we have been talking too much about hardware and too little about filling the vat of knowledge. We have been taking from that vat for years and putting little or nothing back in. Now we are scraping the bottom."

"I think a breakthrough by us is highly unlikely because our research programs are so terribly underfunded. A breakthrough by the Russians, putting them even farther ahead, is much more probable."

Many scientists think there are still not enough scientists in high places in Washington to say: "Basic science is important."

This situation, all agree, has improved hugely since sputnik. Before sputnik, Washington's top scientific body—the President's Science Advisory Committee—was an unheeded voice. It met infrequently and did not even report to the President.

After sputnik it began frequent meetings—some of its members are still in Washington almost continuously—and it got the President's ear.

He named a personal science adviser, who became the committee's chairman. In December 1958 a new Federal Council of Science and Technology was named, representing all agencies dealing with science.

A minority of scientists—but only a minority—still think there ought to be a United States Department of Science. Most top scientists disagree.

Many, however, think it foolish that Washington still has less than a handful of scientifically trained men at any decision-making levels, with none in the Cabinet and none on the National Security Council (though Dr. George Kistiakowsky, the science adviser, often sits with it).

In Congress, science as a whole is only beginning to find any place to turn. Before sputnik, there was none. Then both Houses feverishly named special committees concerned mainly with space, though the House group had a broader outlook.

The House this year made its committee a standing Committee on Science and Astronautics (chairman, Representative OVERTON Brooks, Democrat, Louisiana).

The Senate still has what is in effect only a space committee with limited authority (chairman, Senator LYNDON JOHNSON, Democrat, Texas, the majority leader).

Many scientists would like to see a joint Senate-House committee on science with the energy and prestige of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Many Americans today think that they are supporting science because they read that we are well on the way to putting a billion dollars a year into space research and development.

"I'm going to Washington to look into the support for basic research," I told a friend, a well-informed citizen, in September.

"Oh," he said, "you mean space stuff."

A psychologist at a scientific meeting this September said: "Man is always looking for a good fairy to solve his problems, and this time the good fairy is dressed in a space suit."

But space science is not all of science, any more than atomic energy was all of science when it was the glamor field 10 years ago. Some other field could be the hot field 10 years or 5 years from now.

America's scientists do not know which field it will be, but they are saying that it's foolhardy and perhaps suicidal for us to continue to leave a large number of gaps.

RUSSIA'S SECRET WEAPON: LACK OF FUNDAMENTAL RESEARCH IN UNITED STATES

WASHINGTON.—We do not know how to make the rockets that we will be needing within a few years.

We do not know how to make future nuclear reactors.

We do not know how to make a practical atomic airplane engine.

We do not know these things, American scientists have been disclosing, because of a lack of fundamental research in what has turned out to be a crucial field: materials. This includes metallurgy, the science of metals.

"My belief is that this is an area where the Russians have more first-class people than we and are training more," Dr. Herbert F. York, Director of Defense Department Research and Engineering, told this reporter.

We have other serious weaknesses. We do not know as much as the Russians about the bottom of the ocean—the terrain of any future undersea war—because we have not done as much fundamental research as they in oceanography.

We did not have the information we needed at Geneva disarmament talks on the potential effects of underground atomic shockwaves. Our scientists had to cull Soviet scientific literature for information on conversion of energy into wave motion in the earth, because of a sharp Soviet lead today in seismology, the science of earth shocks and quakes.

In all of these areas—competent scientists have told this reporter—the Russians are either ahead of us or nearly up to us, and in all they are moving and training faster.

"We are generally lacking information in materials and the whole science of solids—in high-temperature chemistry, high-pressure phenomena, solid state physics and advanced metallurgy," reported Dr. John H. Williams, new scientist-member of the Atomic Energy Commission (and University of Minnesota professor on leave).

This is now showing up in lack of materials to do many present and future rocket and space jobs. Lack of advanced materials for an aircraft nuclear reactor was disclosed this September as one reason why we are still far from the flight of an atomic plane, though nearly \$1 billion dollars so far has been spent on this project.

"We don't have appropriately trained people; we don't have basic facts," said Dr. John Kincaid at the Pentagon's Advanced Research Projects Agency. "This is true despite the fact that the Defense Department spends at least \$500 million a year and probably a billion on materials development, as part of the contracts for many jobs. This is fantastically wasteful."

So last December a new coordinating committee was named, headed by Williams. It has charted a new program to finance university research and training. Its plans were too late for the 1959-60 budget, but the Defense Department is about to divide \$15 million immediately between 20-some universities to start some broad programs.

In oceanography, Russia is operating a fleet of big ships, where we have had mostly converted yachts. Russia also has rebuilt a Navy submarine—the *Severyanka* or Northern Maiden—into the world's first undersea research vessel. A large part of its job is to study fish movements, which made Khrushchev refer to it as "our herring catcher" during his American visit.

But it can also rest on the ocean bottom for scientists to get soil samples. A Washington official who follows Soviet progress said: "In submarine oceanography, I can tell you that they know much more about the area close to the United States than we know about the area close to Russia."

In February 1959, therefore, a committee on oceanography of the National Academy of Sciences said we must double our support of deep-sea research in 10 years or face economic, military and political penalties. It called for a \$615 million, 1960-70 research budget, and 70 new ocean-research vessels of all types.

This too came too late for the Washington machinery to crank into fiscal 1960 planning. However, the Navy has converted a submarine buoy-tender—bigger than a sailing yacht, at least—for ocean research, and another is now being converted. The Navy also has \$3½ million for a new 1,150-ton vessel, and the National Science Foundation, \$2 million.

Seismology—detection of earth shocks, natural and atomic—suddenly became a hot field when Nevada underground A-bomb tests showed we did not really know enough to detect far-away underground A-tests reliably. The President's Science Advisory Committee last December named a panel on seismic improvement headed by Lloyd V. Berkner, who grew up in Sleepy Eye, Minn.

The panel reported in March that our present activity was modest at best. The Soviet Union, however, was emphasizing seismological research and "enjoying a position superior in many respects to our own." We needed specialists and modern computing methods.

The panel urgently recommended a 2-year research and detection program costing \$10,800,000 the first year, \$7,400,000 the second, plus \$12 million a year worth of underground atomic and conventional explosions to help develop detection.

Again, most of this has been left for future action.

Seismology and oceanography are only two fields of geophysics or earth science. Here in general the Russians are moving swiftly, while support here has been meager.

In meteorology—weather—and the atmosphere, there is about to be published a new National Academy of Sciences report. It will still call this "one of the most neglected sciences of our times," and note that our average number of new Ph.D.'s is about 10 a year, where 50 or 60 are needed.

These things remain true, despite a chain of recommendations started by a National Academy of Sciences 1958 study headed by Lloyd Berkner. The new report will note with

approval that basic research support is gradually being increased in line with the Berkner report recommendations.

But more still seems to be needed. A new University Corp. for Atmospheric Research representing 14 institutions called in February for a \$1,100,000 1959-60 appropriation toward a new \$33 million National Institute of Atmospheric Research. This institute would tackle the big atmosphere-study jobs. It would maintain its own planes to send into storms and approach the kind of research job Soviet institutes are already doing.

"We must reckon with the possibility that some degree of control of the weather ultimately can be achieved," this report warned.

This institute, too, must now await 1960 action, though it will get a \$500,000 feasibility study by the National Science Foundation.

There are other weak and underfinanced areas of American science. The President's Science Advisory Committee last December also singled out biophysics, radio astronomy, inorganic chemistry, continental geology, linguistics, social psychology, and several basic life sciences like microbiology, genetics, growth, and the neurological foundations of behavior, as well as sophisticated analytical engineering to precede development billions in many fields.

Obviously several areas of science will be seeking new millions in 1960.

The Government's science agencies are now seeking backing for these from the administration and Bureau of the Budget. Then Congress will face the figures in January.

Many of the new programs, Americans will find, will require a whole new degree of support of graduate training in American colleges. There is an emergency here that has had little attention.

"It is this," said John Williams at the Atomic Energy Commission. "Today it costs on the order of \$100,000 to train a Ph. D. in high-energy physics."

It costs between \$60,000 and \$100,000—depending on the college—to train a Ph. D. in physics, metallurgy, geophysics or any advanced science.

"It's becoming harder and harder to get States to vote money to train Ph. D.'s," Williams said. "And you can understand why. These boys may get their training, then leave for parts unknown."

"I think we have to face the fact that they are national assets. Yes, \$100,000 is very expensive. But it is very cheap compared with how much it costs to train a jet pilot."

Dr. Hugh Odishaw—executive secretary of the U.S. International Geophysical Year Committee and of the National Academy of Sciences' new Space Science Board—said: "The colleges are poor. They're in trouble financially. But they've got to expand. Only the universities can bring up the next generation, and somebody's got to help them."

The leaders of science in Washington would like to see far more support of research and education by private givers and industries, so all the money does not come from Government. They have been vainly urging adoption of tax credits to encourage corporate and individual contributions.

The Government would lose some taxes by these credits, but gain more—believe the scientists—by luring some private dollars for activities it might otherwise have to finance 100 percent.

In any case, however, the leaders of science recognize that the Federal contribution is going to have to grow.

Off the record a few weeks ago, one put the situation this way:

"We have had piddling support of basic science long enough now in the United States. And 1960 will be the real test.

"You see, sputnik woke us up a bit in October 1957. But the budget requests for 1958-59 were already in, and they could only be revised piecemeal, though many were drastically changed.

"Then many scientific panels went to work on many problems. In 1959 they started making reports—but too late for appropriations for the fiscal year that started July 1. This is why the crucial tests will be what the administration does to budget requests now, then what Congress does in 1960.

"We'll find out then whether we're going to make any attempt to stay ahead of the Soviet Union in science. We'll find out then whether we're going to fish or cut bait."

RUSSIA MOVES AHEAD OF UNITED STATES IN MANY FIELDS

(By Victor Cohn, Minneapolis Tribune staff writer)

WASHINGTON.—A puzzle about the Soviet space program continues to stump many American scientists:

Why has Russia, despite its great rocket power, despite its new moon rockets, put only 3 earth satellites into orbit, compared with our 12? This has permitted us to lead in gathering scientific facts—for example, about the unexpected Van Allen radiation layers ringing the earth.

Dr. Herbert F. York—director of defense research, and engineering, top scientist in the Pentagon—gave a surprising new answer in an interview here:

"I don't think the Russians have as big a space program as we have.

"They must be putting money into other things—into missiles and other weapons. Into research and development on submarines, nuclear power, metallurgy, building steel mills, education.

"We know they have more submarines. They must have more tanks, more chemical warfare. As a matter of fact, all these things worry me much more than the sputniks.

"I believe too large a percentage of our increased support and attention has been centered on the glamorous things. When I'm questioned in Congress, everyone asks, 'How do we stand in space?' 'When are you going to have as big a rocket booster as Russia's?'

"They don't ask: 'How do all our weapons stack up against theirs—our aircraft, communications, optics?' They don't ask: 'When are you going to have a better submarine? As many cannons? Better antisubmarine warfare?'

"If the only thing we're doing is space, then we're only running a circus."

Russia, it has become increasingly apparent in the past year, has been moving ahead in many things, not just in space.

A report was produced this spring by a high level naval research advisory committee headed by Dr. C. Guy Suits, vice president and research director of General Electric.

The committee included the head of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration; the vice presidents or research directors of Douglas Aircraft, Union Carbide, American Telephone & Telegraph, and International Business Machines; the heads of Buffalo, Stanford, and Pennsylvania State Universities; and three members or recent members of the President's Science Advisory Committee.

This report has had little public circulation. It says in plain language:

"The U.S.S.R. appears to be the first nation to fully appreciate the importance of science"—as seen, for example, in its effort in education and the high share of national product spent on research and development.

"The current policy of the Soviet Government appears to be to direct the development of its science and technology toward achiev-

ing military, political, and economic supremacy over the United States.

"It appears that currently the United States leads the U.S.S.R. in most areas of physics, mathematics, medicine and chemistry." Russia seems to be "on a par" with us in aviation-space medicine, metallurgy, combustion, theoretical physics, meteorology and oceanography. Russia leads in physical chemistry and many areas of geophysics.

"The important problem, however, is the future." Russia is now training basic research scientists at a rate about 50 percent greater than ours. "Thus, the Soviet potential is increasing relative to ours at an alarming rate."

This conclusion was printed and was being circulated in Washington at about the same time that Vice President Nixon and party were returning from Russia in August.

One of the news magazines reported then that a "new assumption" was "bound to be cranked into high-level U.S. policy decision" as a result of what the Nixon tour saw. This, it was said, was the assumption that "despite sputnik, the Soviet drive to scientific advance is not as far advanced as many Americans believe."

This is far from what most competent American scientists have been saying.

It is true that Soviet achievement is still spotty. Some of her labs are good, some poor. Almost all stand in unbelievably shabby buildings, and such things can puzzle visitors.

But here are some items from recent reports and estimates of Soviet prowess:

1. American visitors have begun finding surprisingly outstanding Soviet work in electronics, which underlies computers, automation and weaponry. At a U.S. war college recently, two TV sets were placed side by side, one a good commercial American set, the other the standard set being sold to Soviet consumers.

The two were turned on. The Russian set's picture was sharper and locked into focus faster, without wavering.

"We build this quality only into our military electronics," said the scientist who told this story. "We have to concede that Russian progress in electronics in the last 10 years has been phenomenal."

2. One Soviet application may become the first successful machine translation of languages. The full scope of Russian research here appears almost incomparably greater than American research, Sonya G. Machelson, of the Library of Congress, told the American Chemical Society in September. In 1955, she said, there were two Soviet institutes active in this field. Now there are 79.

3. A report made for official eyes here covers Soviet solid-state physics, which underlies progress in electronics, materials (for rockets or nuclear reactors) and harnessing the H-bomb reaction for power. "It is difficult to avoid the conclusion," this report says, "that in another 5 or 10 years their basic research output will exceed ours."

4. Another report covers quantum field theory; the mathematical fundamentals of the atom's elementary particles. It says: (1) New understanding here could "provide a basis for the actual manipulation of these forces" exceeding man's manipulation of them to date; (2) "If, as seems likely, the study of quantum field theory continues to attract relatively more physicists in Russia than in the West, the quantity of Russian efforts will outweigh those of the West in the near future."

5. Four astrophysicists who toured Russia reported in April 1959 that Russia is now turning out twice as many astronomers as we, and might overtake us in 15 years in this field where we suffer an acute shortage of people.

Dr. Gerald F. W. Mulders, astrophysicist who is chief scientist of the office of naval research branch at Pasadena, Calif., believes we will be overtaken in astronomy in 10 years unless we make all-out effort.

6. Even on scientific data gathered by space rockets and satellites—where we have been leading—John W. Townsend of the National Aeronautics and Space Agency wrote last January: "At the next international gathering—say, a year or so from now—the Soviet result will be on a par with our results. After that, unless conditions change, the Russians will be ahead."

So go many reports.

Dr. W. A. Nash, professor of engineering mechanics, University of Florida, visited institutes in his field in Moscow, Leningrad, Tbilisi and Kiev.

Then he wrote in the journal, *Industrial Laboratories*, of decrepit buildings but excellent equipment; of many unique test machines that do not exist here; of teaching-lab equipment that far surpasses that in our best universities.

He said: "We did not find the highest level of basic research in mechanics any better in the Soviet Union than in the United States." But its quantity is now 2 to 3 times ours, and Russia is training so many students that it is almost certain that within 5 to 10 years their efforts will perhaps be of the order of 10 times our present effort.

"Unfortunately, the current indications are that our research effort during that period will increase only by a very modest amount," he added.

This professor's field—mechanics—means the behavior of matter under force. What American observers like him are saying is that the Soviet Union will forcefully manipulate matter, while we do much less.

Future Soviet achievements, then—in the manipulation of matter or the biology of life—may eclipse even moon rocketing.

We are being warned of this plainly. Soviet scientific and technical advances in many fields are likely to be coming with greater frequency, Gen. Charles P. Cabell, Deputy Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, said in August.

Dr. Edward Teller, "father" of the H-bomb, predicts:

"Ten years from now Russia's position as the world leader in science will be unquestioned. Nothing we can do will change that. All we can hope to do is regain our lost leadership at some later date."

Many scientists are not this pessimistic. But most of them are deeply concerned.

SCIENTISTS WONDER IF UNITED STATES HAS THE STUFF

WASHINGTON.—"My grand concern is for the decline and fall of the West," said Dr. Herbert F. York, Director of Defense Research and Engineering, in his office at the Pentagon.

"The rewards in America are just greater for being an advertising man than being a scientist."

"The enthusiasm and rewards in Russia are for getting ahead of the United States."

York and many other American scientists are more concerned today about the American spirit than about any of our gaps in research or schooling. They ask the basic question: "Do we have the stuff for a new kind of world?"

One of our leading space scientists was brutally frank about our attitude in a speech last week. He described what has become "a fairly typical pattern of American response" to new Soviet feats like moon rockets.

"First," said Dr. W. H. Pickering of NASA (National Aeronautics and Space Administration)—head of the jet propulsion laboratory at California Institute of Technology—

"there is a near-hysterical demand that the Government do something.

"Next, we try to buy our way out of the situation. We form new agencies, appropriate new funds, conduct congressional investigations.

"Finally, the crisis gradually fades away, the public becomes somewhat bored with the whole activity, the new agencies struggle for support, and another scientific achievement is quietly relegated to the history books."

A congressional aid agreed. "People here get excited about something the week the Russians do it," said Dr. Charles Sheldon II, technical adviser to the House Science and Astronautics Committee. "Then they forget about it—people in general and in Government."

Many practical things are worrying our scientific leaders besides spirit.

One is certainly our schooling. A panel of the President's Science Advisory Committee said (on May 23) "doubling our current annual investment in education is probably a minimal rather than an extravagant goal."

In the face of this, a prominent technical journal—*Chemical and Engineering News*—accurately reported early in the year: "Science education bills will have rougher going this year * * * 'Congress let off its steam for science education last year; it's out of fashion this year.' That's how one committee aide puts it."

Sure enough, little new educational support was voted, though critics noted that the Nation is still short 190,000 teachers, and nearly 75 percent of all high schools are considered too small to support needed courses.

The National Defense Education Act—Congress' and the administration's 1958 response to sputnik—was continued this year at about what in 1958 was called its starting level.

This act was intended to spur production of research scientists as one crucial goal. It has come to the attention of the President's Science Advisory Committee that of \$4.5 million in fellowships to some 1,000 graduate students, just 52 percent have wound up in the hands of students of science, mathematics, and engineering.

Graduate fellowships in other fields are necessary too, responsible scientists agree. Colleges must expand in all fields to teach all students broadly. But there is certain to be new argument for doing much more about training research workers than our starting, postsputnik level.

What of public education? The things most scientists now seem to be urging are: (1) continued citizens' action, school district by district, for better schools. ("We have seen how effective this can be," says the National Science Foundation's Director, Dr. Alan Waterman); (2) some move toward statewide minimum standards, to prevent the many laggard school boards from lagging forever; (3) new Federal aid.

Debate about Federal aid to schools has practically ended among scientists. *Science*—official organ of the American Association for the Advancement of Science—wrote a September 18 back-to-school editorial flatly backing Federal help for school construction.

Support for basic research worries our scientific leaders. The head of American science's big 1957-58 Antarctic program—Dr. Laurence M. Gould, president of Carleton College, Northfield, Minn.—says: "2 years have passed since sputnik, and still our basic research is terribly inadequate. We're spending billions on technology and applications—rockets and missiles—but we still haven't awakened on fundamental research."

There is also concern about many practical applications. There is a large—if

largely hushed—amount of concern still about the state of American weapons, in case of large or small wars. The President's Science Advisory Committee has been spending half its time on military matters.

Many scientists as well as military men are concerned with the fact that we have apparently accepted permanent Soviet superiority in many military branches. At this August's American Legion convention in Minneapolis, the Navy's deputy chief of operations for fleet operations and readiness said: "Our budgets have not permitted us to build sufficient new ships to replace World War II ships." He warned of the huge Soviet submarine fleet.

The Marines' deputy chief of staff for plans said: "The condition of the amphibious ships now in the fleet is deplorable." He said the marines have new "vertical assault" methods—using helicopters, aircraft carriers and amphibious vessels—but lack the vessels to use them.

The Army's Vice Chief of Staff described new weapons developed by scientists, but said there are not enough of them or enough men to use them.

At the Pentagon, Herbert York, the Chief Scientist, made it clear that he is aware both of the needs and the fact that someone has to make choices.

"We need a lot more work on weapon development," he said. "We haven't done so much."

"One problem is budgeting. People always say, 'This idea would only cost \$100 million. That's a pretty small amount for the United States.'"

"But there are 50 such ideas to examine. To do them all we would have to increase the defense budget 50 or 100 percent. I'm not sure that's a bad idea. It might be a good idea. But it's not about to be done."

The decision on how much money to spend on America—on weapons, on education, on science—is not scientists' but everyone's. Many scientists, however, are still asking: "Are we doing enough?"

York said: "We are still ahead now in most things. We are showing some signs of waking up. But whether we actually wake up enough to remain permanently ahead, or only wake up enough to put off the evil day, I don't know. Russia has more people, working harder, on more important things—and it's hard to see how that won't pay off."

So men like York plead for a reawakening of many basic American values: spirit, patriotism, sacrifice, and work.

Some of them have begun to stress a need for one more thing: thought, translated into broader national planning than we have been accustomed to so far.

One speaker along these lines has been Dr. Raymond Ewell, vice chancellor for research of the University of Buffalo, who is more worried about the Soviet Union's industrial threat—and 1965-70, "when their industrial capacity will approach 75 percent of ours"—than about Russian rockets and submarines.

He believes we need: "National purpose"—"to decide what we stand for" and get out and sell it.

"Positive, dynamic, long-range foreign policy"—to replace passive, defensive foreign policy—including greatly expanded foreign aid "even if it hurts."

Accelerated military preparedness, "even if it hurts."

More money for education and scientific research, "even if it hurts."

"We have the resources to respond to the challenge," says the Space Agency's Dr. Pickering, "We can survive," says Ewell, "with honor and freedom."

However—he and many other American scientists are now convinced—"we have only a few more years of grace."

A scoreboard of American science
[Copyright 1959 Minneapolis Star & Tribune Co.]

	1956-57 (last Government fiscal year before sputnik)	1957-58 (year of the 1st sputnik)	1958-59	1959-60 (appropriations and estimates for Government fiscal year that started July 1)	Comment	
Percent of national income spent on education.		In fall 1957, Washington estimated we spent 4 percent of our national income on education; the Soviet Union, 8 percent.		On Sept. 5, 1959, the U.S. Office of Education said the United States is now putting about 5 percent of national income into education; the Soviet Union, between 10 and 15 percent.	All U.S. education—public and private, including colleges—now costs us about \$20 billion a year.	
Number of new scientists graduated from universities:				Science and math graduates should total some 45,000 in June 1960.	Russia graduated 70,000 to 75,000 bachelors in science in 1958, and 6,400 "kandidats" (like our Ph. D's) in the 3 years, 1957-59. It graduated 94,000 engineers in 1958, 106,000 in 1959, and gave 3,300 engineering kandidats' degrees in 1957-59. This means Russia is training about 2 scientists and 3 engineers to our 1.	
B.S. degrees.....	38,967	42,453	June 1959 bachelors' degrees: about 47,000.	Engineering schools are now worried because fall 1958 enrollment was down about 8,000—13 percent—from fall 1957, though total college freshman enrollment was up 7 percent.		
Master's degrees.....	9,427	10,664				
Ph. D. degrees.....	4,168	4,193				
Number of new engineers:						
B.S. degrees.....	31,211	35,332				
Master's degrees.....	5,232	5,788				
Ph. D. degrees.....	596	647				
Number of able high school graduates still not going to college.				200,000 able high school graduates every year fail to go to college, estimates Rexford G. Moon, Jr., director of College Scholarship Service, agency of the College Entrance Examination Board; 3 in 4 come from low-income groups. Various reports agree between 100,000 and 200,000 graduates in the top quarter of their class are not showing up at college because they lack funds. It is estimated there are now "at least" a half a million college scholarships of 1 kind or another available in the United States—and that 1 million of our 3 1/4 million students get \$300 million a year in nonfamily support from jobs, loans, and scholarships.		
Total college scholarship and loan funds available.					In the Soviet Union almost all college students are subsidized.	
New Federal loan program for students.				Congress passed the National Defense Education Act a year ago as the result of President Eisenhower's post-sputnik request. It includes what started out as a scholarship fund but was changed by Congress to a loan fund. This provided \$30.5 million last year and will provide the same this year. About 100,000 students may borrow something from it this year. Graduates going into teaching for 5 years are forgiven 50 percent of their loan.	Many scientists still urge new scholarships, charging loans will encourage students to get into high-paying jobs fast, rather than to fill needed research and teaching jobs, which is the act's purpose.	
Dollars for scientific research and development (R. & D.).	\$8.86 billion worth of scientific research and development (that is, application and engineering) by Government, industry, colleges and others.		\$10 billion worth, estimated Alan Waterman, Director, National Science Foundation.		Two important points here: 1. Uncle Sam pays for more than half the country's R. & D., and even the wealthiest colleges depend on the Federal Government for about half of their research funds. 2. Spending went up sharply after sputnik made us realize our efforts in many fields were inadequate. But our extra effort has already started leveling off.	
R. & D. financed by—						
Government.....	\$5.23 billion or 59 percent of total.	\$5.54 billion	\$7.23 billion	\$7.7 billion		
Industry.....	\$3.4 billion or 38 percent of total.					
Colleges.....	146 million or 2 percent of total.					
What percent of above is basic research?				This figure has consistently been running between 6 and 7 percent, both for the Nation as a whole and the Government. This low figure appalls scientists who know that only the basic search for facts tells how to make new things: rockets, miracle drugs, weapons, or fertilizers. American industry spends only 3 percent of all its R. & D. funds on basic research.		
Federal dollars for basic research.	\$254 million	\$331 million	\$488 million	\$494 million	A marked leveling off. Dr. Vannevar Bush believed in 1947 that NSF support should grow to \$125 million a year in 5 years. NSF research dollars still have reached hardly half this level.	
Dollars for the National Science Foundation:					The Defense Department is still basic research's biggest supporter.	
Basic research.....	\$15.2 million	\$19 million	\$45.9 million	\$65.2 million		
Research facilities.....	\$5.3 million	\$6 million	\$15.5 million	\$11.6 million		
Science education.....	\$14.7 million	\$19.4 million	\$62 million	\$64.3 million		
Total.....	\$40 million (total)	\$49.7 million (total)	\$130 million (total)	\$152.7 million (total)		
Dollars for military R. & D.				\$3.8 billion, including \$113 million for basic research.		
Dollars for space R. & D. (not including military missile work).	\$55 million	\$93 million	\$730 million	\$882 million, with \$210 million of this charged to research, \$672 million to development. (These figures include both basic and applied research but not development)		
How are Federal research dollars spent?					(The physical sciences include basic physics, chemistry, astronomy, geology, geophysics, metallurgy, etc. The engineering sciences also take in many fields—as electronics and computers, just for two. This means the single field getting the most money in the U.S. is medicine. We are beginning to fall behind the Soviet Union in some physical sciences—which that country emphasizes.	
For basic biological sciences.....	\$67 million	\$70 million	\$93 million	\$103 million		
For medical sciences.....	\$156 million	\$214 million	\$276 million	\$282 million		
For agricultural sciences.....	\$56 million	\$60 million	\$63 million	\$64 million		
Total for all life sciences.....	\$138 million (total)	\$343 million (total)	\$432 million (total)	\$449 million (total)		
For physical sciences.....	\$333 million	\$333 million	\$502 million	\$533 million		
For mathematical sciences.....	\$40 million	\$48 million	\$48 million	\$56 million		
For engineering sciences.....	\$278 million	\$278 million	\$414 million	\$509 million		
Total.....	\$602 million (total)	\$651 million (total)	\$964 million (total)	\$1,096 million (total)		
Federal support of some tools of science:						
Accelerators (atomsmashers) and related atom studies.	\$26.1 million	\$36.5 million	\$59.9 million	\$80.1 million		Congress failed to vote starting funds for the mile-long Stanford accelerator that President Eisenhower asked.
University science and engineering laboratories.				\$2 million (for graduate research laboratories only).	University laboratories are starved for new and expensive modern equipment. Many Soviet laboratories are far better equipped.	

INTEREST RATES ON TREASURY ISSUES—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 294)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BYRD of West Virginia in the chair) laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Finance:

To the Congress of the United States:

As I said in my state of the Union message, the Treasury is being prevented from taking debt management actions that are fully consistent with the public interest because of the artificial interest rate ceiling on new Treasury medium-term and long-term issues.

In a special message to the Congress on June 8, 1959, I urged the removal of this archaic restriction on flexible debt management. Congressional inaction on that request has resulted in a much more rapid increase in short-term debt than would otherwise have occurred. As a result, short-term Treasury borrowing costs have risen to the highest levels in several decades and the ability of debt management to operate in a manner consistent with sound principles of sustained economic growth has been seriously undermined.

I deem it imperative, therefore that this restrictive ceiling be removed. I am asking the Secretary of the Treasury to transmit to the Congress proposed legislation designed to attain this objective.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 12, 1960.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business?

Mr. ROBERTSON obtained the floor. Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] to introduce a bill.

AMENDMENT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPRENTICESHIP ACT OF 1946

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I am very grateful for this recognition for the purpose of introducing a bill for appropriate reference to committee.

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

The bill (S. 2803) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for voluntary apprenticeship in the District of Columbia," introduced by Mr. RANDOLPH (for himself, Mr. BRIDGES, and Mr. BYRD of West Virginia), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, in sending the bill to the desk I announce that it is introduced in behalf of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], my colleague and present occupant of the chair, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD], and myself.

The bill is a proposed amendment to the Apprenticeship Act of the District of Columbia. We believe that the transfer of the program from the U.S. Department of Labor to the District of Colum-

bia government will be in the interest of economy and will further the effective administration of the act of 1946, which I was privileged to sponsor when I was a Member of the House of Representatives, and which the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] sponsored in the Senate.

When an Apprenticeship Act for the District of Columbia was first proposed, it was contemplated that the U.S. Department of Labor would be responsible for supplying the Apprenticeship Council, to be established under this law, with trained technical and administrative personnel until such time as the planned apprenticeship program under minimum standards was soundly established and able to operate on its own.

Public Law 387, 79th Congress, popularly known as the Bridges-Randolph District of Columbia Apprenticeship Act of 1946, was passed by Congress without opposition and signed by the President on May 21, 1946. The proposed act had the full endorsement of local management and labor unions.

By letter dated August 9, 1946, the Secretary of Labor advised the President of the District of Columbia Board of Commissioners that in accordance with provisions of the Apprenticeship Act, he was appointing the District of Columbia Supervisor for the Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training as "Director of Apprenticeship for the District of Columbia," with instruction that he was to "be guided in the performance of his work by the policies and program of the Apprenticeship Council to be appointed under the Apprenticeship Act by the Commissioners."

This program established a six-member labor-management Apprenticeship Council to formulate minimum standards of employment and craftsmanship and operational policies within the framework of the law.

Under the guidance of this labor-management council, within a space of 4 years, the District of Columbia planned apprenticeship program became the most outstanding in the country.

Since 1950, statistics issued by the Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training, U.S. Department of Labor, the District of Columbia has had more registered apprentices for each 1,000 journeymen craftsmen reported by the U.S. Census, than any other State or Territory.

Over the past 9 years, the District of Columbia has averaged over 60 apprentices per 1,000 journeymen each year, 20 higher than Connecticut, the second ranking State, and nearly four times the national average.

Under the circumstances, it is felt by those interested in the future of planned apprenticeship in the District of Columbia area that the program is now soundly and permanently established and that it is to the advantage of the future of the program that the Director and his staff should be transferred from the U.S. Department of Labor to the District of Columbia Government, as proposed in this amendment to Public Law 387, 79th Congress.

The proposed amendment was drafted by the Solicitor of Labor at the request

of the Secretary of Labor, and has been endorsed by local management and labor unions as being in the best interest of the District of Columbia area and its future industrial skilled labor needs.

In addition, the suggested amendment is also in accordance with the long-standing Federal policy of turning over to the States and Territories those functions and responsibilities which properly belong to local governments and can best be carried out by such governments.

This amendment will permit a fuller and closer integration of the District of Columbia Apprenticeship Council's program and operations and those of the Director and his staff with other District of Columbia government agencies and programs involving the training of skilled and other workers on the job by giving the Council more direct control over local activities. It will also permit the Director and his staff to concentrate all their interest and energy on apprenticeship and on-the-job training problems peculiar to the District of Columbia area in carrying out the Council's policies and directives, and would eliminate all possible conflict between local and national apprenticeship promotional interests.

Furthermore, as the proposed amendment merely involves the transfer of regularly appropriated funds to provide the District of Columbia Council with staff from the U.S. Department of Labor's annual appropriations to the government of the District of Columbia appropriations, it will involve no additional cost to the taxpayers and may even result in a small saving.

In a letter dated January 30, 1959, from James E. Dodson, Administrative Assistant Secretary of Labor, the budget officer of the District of Columbia was advised that the U.S. Department of Labor had appropriated \$27,700 for the District of Columbia staff for fiscal year 1959, and \$27,800 for fiscal 1960. The present staff consists of a Director, GS-12; a field representative, GS-11; a registrar, GS-5; and a secretary, GS-4.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further request for recognition during the morning hour?

THE INCOME TAX AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, last week there were many accounts in the press throughout the country of the death of former Senator Norris Brown, of Nebraska. The central theme of these accounts concerned the part played by the then Senator Brown in introducing in the U.S. Senate the income tax amendment to the Constitution.

While I do not want to take from former Senator Brown, or his memory, any of the credit for his part in this legislation, I was somewhat surprised to see little, if any, mention in press accounts of the part played in the income tax fight by the late Cordell Hull of Tennessee. He was a recognized leader in the fight to impose taxes on the basis of ability to pay. Toward this end, he waged a long and eventually successful fight for income tax legislation.

Mr. President, there appeared in the Memphis Commercial Appeal for January 11, 1960, a column on this subject by one of the feature writers for that great newspaper of the midsouth. I ask unanimous consent that this column by Mr. Paul Flowers be printed in the RECORD, at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

PAUL FLOWERS' GREENHOUSE

An almost hidden news story Thursday, under the heading "Tax Is His Monument," told of the death of Norris Brown, Republican Senator from Nebraska from 1907-13, and hailed him as the man who introduced the income-tax amendment in the U.S. Senate.

Which is all right, except that it is slightly misleading if it implies that he was more than a fellow toiler in the crusade for the income tax, or that he deserved more than a nominal part of the credit (or blame).

The story sent me back to Cordell Hull's "Memoirs," published in 1948, in which the great Tennessean, father of the good-neighbor policy and diplomat par excellence, who walked with kings nor ever lost the common touch, spelled out the record in Congress for imposition of the levy which now reaches into practically every pocket in the land.

On December 19, 1907, Cordell Hull, according to his own record, introduced into the House of Representatives a comprehensive income-tax bill. As he tells it:

"This was in the face of the fact that all statesmen acquiesced in the view that income tax was probably dead legislatively since the U.S. Supreme Court decision in 1895 declaring the income-tax law invalid. This view was based on the belief that income taxation could not be enacted except through constitutional amendment. And with special privilege in supreme control of both Houses of Congress, there appeared to be no chance to secure the submission of an amendment * * * even if ratification by the requisite number of States proved possible.

"By introducing the bill I accepted a challenge. The Republican campaign book of 1894 had stated:

"In this country an income tax of any sort is odious and will bring odium upon any party blind enough to impose it. Prepare for the funeral of the political party which imposes such a burden." I was willing to risk both the odium and the funeral."

Mr. Hull went on to tell how he had been influenced by the ideas of Benton McMillin, Member of Congress from Tennessee, who had embraced the income-tax theory and was author of the tax provision in the Wilson Tariff Act which the Supreme Court had declared unconstitutional.

When President Cleveland bypassed McMillin for chairmanship of the Ways and Means Committee, the Tennessean determined to retaliate by pushing the income tax over on the East. He was chairman of the subcommittee that drafted the income-tax provision; he forced a caucus and got his provision adopted.

Cordell Hull believed, in 1907, that wealth was shirking its share of the tax burden. He felt so strongly that he plunged in to revive the whole issue, hopeful that absence of Justice Shiras from the High Court bench had altered the situation. Mr. Hull admits that he got nowhere in the 60th Congress, but he wasn't the type to quit.

He kept talking income tax so often to some fellow members that they were no longer willing to listen. Even John Sharp Williams and Champ Clark, he recalls, although in favor of the tax, would turn and walk in another direction when they saw him coming.

When Cordell Hull made his maiden speech on the floor in March 1908, he came out for the income tax, at the risk of odium and political death.

A year later, he introduced his income tax bill on the 1st day of 61st session, in March 1909. Again in January 1910, he thundered:

"The wonderful flexibility and certain productiveness of this tax enables it to meet every requirement of peace or war emergencies." He quoted Gladstone about a similar levy, "an engine of gigantic power." He told how England had used it to conquer Napoleon; how it had been imposed for the relief of a depleted U.S. Treasury in the Civil War.

Followed years of political maneuvering; on February 3, 1913, the constitutional amendment on income tax, so long advocated by the Tennessean, was ratified, and it became effective on February 25.

Cordell Hull does not mention Senator Brown's part. In summation, he wrote:

"After I had written the final draft it went before the House practically as I wrote it. It fell to my lot to handle the income tax provision (of the Underwood Tariff Act) on the floor of the House. The measure was at no time in danger. The provision became law as part of the Underwood Tariff Act (as implementing legislation) on October 13, 1913. The United States now had a regular income tax as a permanent part of our fiscal system. No time was lost in applying it."

So now, as time nears for annual income tax returns, perhaps somebody may care to recall that a rangy, outspoken Tennessean earned whatever odium may accrue from the world's most fabulous governmental revenue producer.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I should like to take this opportunity to say that like the late, great Cordell Hull, I am a firm supporter of our income tax laws. I hope they will be strengthened and made more equitable by the closure of many of the loopholes which have crept in during recent years.

I turn now to another subject.

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

THE CONFERENCE OF DEMOCRATIC SENATORS

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I wish to take this occasion in the RECORD to thank my Democratic colleagues for the very, very courteous and considerate audience they gave me yesterday afternoon in the Democratic caucus. I could not have asked for more attention or more consideration, and I am grateful to have had the opportunity to discuss with my colleagues a problem of deep concern to me. I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a copy of the motion which I offered but which was not accepted by the Democratic conference.

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

MOTION OFFERED BY SENATOR GORE AT THE CONFERENCE OF DEMOCRATIC SENATORS

I move, Mr. Chairman—

That all vacancies occurring hereafter on the Democratic policy committee be filled by election by a conference of Democratic Senators,

That the membership of the policy committee be increased so as to be more truly representative of the Democratic Senators, the major geographic areas of the United

States and of the national character and interest of the Democratic Party.

That the Democratic policy committee undertake the development and formulation of legislative policies of the Democratic Party in the Senate to be submitted to the conference of Democratic Senators for its consideration and action.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President—

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I believe I have the floor. If the Senator from Tennessee has a brief statement to offer I shall be glad to yield to him for that purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair wishes to state that we are still in the morning hour. The Chair had recognized the Senator from Virginia, but the Chair did not understand that the Senator from Virginia wished to make a statement of more than 3 minutes.

Mr. GORE. I certainly do not wish to impose upon my good and distinguished friend from Virginia. I have only one additional statement to make. Will the Senator from Virginia yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee is recognized in the morning hour.

THE INTEREST RATE CEILING

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, the President of the United States has sent to Congress another message in which he demands the removal of the interest-rate ceiling on Government bonds.

Mr. President, I opposed the removal of this ceiling last year. I continue to oppose it.

The bond interest rate question is not one which can be considered in isolation. It is part and parcel of the much larger question of overall economic policy. Unfortunately, the Eisenhower administration has tended to center all economic policy around the central theme of tight money and high interest rates.

We have seen repeated failures to keep our economy in balance by raising interest rates and tightening up on the supply of money. This will be the result again and again. Already the housing industry is in a precarious position, and other segments of our economy are sorely pressed with high interest rates and tight money.

I shall soon address the Senate at greater length on the broad economic issues which confront us. I shall show how the interest rate on Government bonds is related to other economic issues. For the time being, let me say that my studies to date have convinced me that it would be a great disservice to the American people for the Congress to remove the interest rate ceiling on Government bonds.

Last year the Congress adopted Senate Concurrent Resolution 13 and thereby authorized the Joint Economic Committee, headed by the foremost economist in the Congress, the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] to make a study of employment, growth, and price levels. The interest rate on Government bonds, along with related economic issues, has been considered by that committee. The report of the committee will be submitted

prior to the end of this month, and I await it with considerable interest.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, has morning business been concluded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It has not been concluded. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

THE IMPORTANCE OF SPACE PROGRAMS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I believe editorials published in the New York Herald Tribune of January 6, 1960, and the Washington Post and Times Herald of January 7, 1960, speak for themselves in indicating why this country cannot ignore the importance of our space programs.

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

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

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Jan. 6, 1960]

THE GREAT ISSUES OF 1960—SPACE: A RACE WE MUST WIN

Suppose the Soviets landed an expedition on the moon, then declared that the arrival there of any other expedition would be regarded by the missile-armed Soviet Government as an unfriendly act—what would we do?

The new Congress should be asking itself this sort of question as it reviews the scope, organization and priority of the Nation's space program.

Present indications are that unless we quickly and markedly accelerate our own efforts, the Soviets will be first on the moon—and also, despite our dramatic Mercury astronaut program, that the first man in orbit is quite likely to be Russian.

Whether we like it or not, we are in a race—a race we cannot afford to lose.

Conventional military minds may argue that we have our ICBM; that the much greater power represented by, say, the 1.5 million-pound-thrust Saturn project has no immediate military application, and that therefore its development is not of crucial importance in terms of national survival.

But the potential military significance of reconnaissance satellites, space platforms, even moon bases, is only beginning to be explored. Power of the Saturn magnitude, and greater, is needed to hurl aloft the quantity of hardware needed for real space exploration. And operating as it does on the frontiers of knowledge, concerned with the massing and control of vast energies, the venture into space holds the possibility of discoveries the significance of which we can only guess at—and even our guesses will probably fall short of reality.

The space lag could hold a far greater threat to national survival than even the missile lag. We at least have the comfort of alternate deterrents, such as SAC, to set off against Soviet missile power. But against the still unknown threat from future Soviet firsts in space we might have no defense, and not even a good counter offense.

More than the direct military significance of space, however, is involved in our race to get there.

We live in an age in which diplomacy and propaganda, military, scientific, and economic strength all are bound up inextricably together, and in which an anxious world is looking both to us and to the Soviets for leadership.

At the heart of the Soviet Union's drive toward supremacy is its effort to establish an image of the Soviet system as the wave of the future. Spectacular triumphs in space have played a key role—and a highly effective one—in this effort.

If anyone doubts the effect of such triumphs, let him reflect on how the popular image of the Soviet Union has changed in this country since Sputnik I shot aloft, shattering our ill-founded complacency, forcing us at last to recognize the dynamics of Soviet growth.

Our national space agency this year has a budget equal to only one-tenth of 1 percent of the gross national product, while vital space programs have been deliberately delayed for lack of funds. The U.S. space effort is still hamstrung by inadequate financing, by divided authority, by lack of a clear affirmation of national purpose.

From a late start, we have made impressive gains which should not be minimized. But they have still not been enough. We are second, and not even second among equals; we still are getting there—into space—latest with the leastest.

We can't win unless we start running. The free world has a right to demand more vigorous leadership than it has gotten from the United States in the competitive conquest of man's ultimate frontier.

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 7, 1960]

CHEAPSKATE

The richest country in the world thinks that it cannot afford to compete with the Soviet Union in space exploration. That is the flat implication of the series of articles this newspaper has published recently about the space and missile lag, and it would be an appropriate takeoff point for the new Senate investigation.

Of course the problems of space exploration can be vastly oversimplified, and doubtless there are many factors in the American deficiency beyond mere lack of money. But it is really shocking that the reason given for the failure to use more large-thrust Atlas missiles in the lunar aspect of the space program is cost. Seemingly the administration has not yet fully emerged philosophically from the attitude it exhibited at the time of Sputnik I, which it attempted to pass off as an interesting trick but nothing to get excited about and certainly nothing to warrant greater effort or expenditure.

Very much the same approach has characterized the attitude toward the defense program ever since 1953. The new look, massive retaliation, the bigger bang for a buck all have been essentially rationalizations for getting by on the cheap—with the result that today the United States has relatively little except the big bang. The placid, passive resignation to the missile gap represents a new phenomenon in American history—something bordering upon defeatism which is sometimes candied up with explanations to make it look like one of Hitler's victorious advances to the rear.

The plain, simple, elementary, and obvious fact is that the United States is going to have to spend more money—a lot more of it—in order to assert parity, let alone primacy, in defense and space programs. Better organization and more efficiency no doubt would accomplish something, but there is no use looking for panaceas or regarding waste and duplication as scapegoats. More money for defense space and other national needs is going to require tax adjustments and very possibly higher rates.

Perhaps we can continue to skimp and drift for another year, at which time the efforts to catch up will be more painful. But we are in great danger meanwhile of giving the world, and particularly the Russians, the impression that we are indeed soft and flabby and that we value our luxuries over our sinews.

It will do no good, however, for Congress merely to bemoan the dilemma and use it as a political club against the administration. Congress has the power of the purse and can do something about the problem if it wishes.

THE NEED FOR ADDITIONAL HOUSING LEGISLATION

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, during the 2d session of the 86th Congress much consideration will be given to the question of housing. We already have had statements from the chairman of the Senate and House Housing Subcommittees in which they have set forth their views on this subject. Both of them have taken the position that there is need for additional legislation to promote housing during the sixties.

Until legislation is introduced, the discussion on the subject of housing must be on general lines. But even though my comments are general, I think it is appropriate to set forth some simple facts which we should keep in mind in considering housing legislation this year and in succeeding years.

In the first place, the number of housing starts is high and gives every indication of continuing high, though probably not as high as in 1959. The prewar peak of new housing starts, 937,000 in 1925, was about equaled in 1948, and beginning in 1949 the number of new dwelling units started in every year exceeded 1 million, as shown in the following table:

Estimated total nonfarm new dwelling units
[Thousands of starts]

1949.....	1,025.1
1950.....	1,396.0
1951.....	1,091.3
1952.....	1,127.0
1953.....	1,103.8
1954.....	1,220.4
1955.....	1,328.9
1956.....	1,118.1
1957.....	1,041.9
1958.....	1,209.4
1959 (preliminary estimate).....	1,375.0

It is not easy to make any flat statements about whether this volume of housing is adequate to meet the need for new housing. Many factors enter into the question of need.

The most specific, of course, is the need arising from increases in population and new family formation. The Census Bureau reports that between March 1950 and March 1958 the average annual increase in the number of households was about 850,000.

During the 5 years from July 1960, to July 1965, the Census Bureau's estimates of the average annual increase in the number of households ranges from 643,000 to 1,018,000, varying with different assumptions for population growth and the establishment of households. Apparently, we are more than keeping up with the need from this point of view.

New housing also is desirable in order to upgrade the level of housing and particularly to eliminate substandard housing. It has been pointed out that in 1950, there were about 16.5 million substandard homes, while in 1959 there were about 12 million of these substandard

units. This is not satisfactory progress in meeting the need for adequate housing.

However, new construction is, in many cases, neither the quickest nor the cheapest way to eliminate substandard housing. If a dwelling unit is substandard because it needs repairs or because it needs running hot water, it may be far quicker, cheaper, and more efficient to install a hot water heater or to put on a new roof than it would be to build a new building.

Between 1950 and 1956 about 3.4 million substandard dwellings were upgraded. Unfortunately, about 1.3 million dwellings which were satisfactory in 1950 had become substandard by the end of 1956. Greater attention to upkeep would have prevented much of this deterioration. The problem of substandard housing will not be most effectively or

completely solved just by more new construction; perhaps as much as 9 percent of the 10 million new units built between 1950 and 1956 were classified as substandard in 1956, due in part at least to lack of proper maintenance.

The need for housing, of course, is related to the public's desire for new housing and its willingness to spend its money to get the new housing, instead of spending it for other purposes. A family may prefer a second automobile to a recreation room; some may even prefer an automobile to a third bedroom.

In any discussion of housing, we must keep clearly in mind that money has been made available in huge and almost constantly increasing quantities for home mortgages. The following table shows the amounts of mortgages recorded in the last 10 years, and the net increases in mortgages outstanding.

[In billions of dollars]

Calendar year	Nonfarm mortgage recordings of \$20,000 or less				Increase in mortgage debt outstanding on 1- to 4-family properties			
	Total	FHA	VA	Conv.	Total	FHA	VA	Conv.
1950.....	16.2	2.5	3.1	10.6	7.6	1.7	2.2	3.7
1951.....	16.4	1.9	3.0	10.9	6.5	1.1	2.9	2.5
1952.....	18.0	1.9	2.7	13.4	6.8	1.1	1.4	4.3
1953.....	19.7	2.3	3.1	14.4	7.6	1.2	1.5	4.9
1954.....	23.0	1.9	4.3	16.8	9.6	1.5	3.2	5.6
1955.....	28.5	3.1	7.2	18.2	12.6	1.5	5.3	5.7
1956.....	27.1	2.6	5.9	18.6	10.8	1.2	3.3	5.8
1957.....	24.2	2.3	3.8	18.2	8.6	1.0	2.3	5.3
1958.....	27.4	4.6	1.9	21.0	10.1	3.2	—	7.2
1959.....	132.0	16.0	13.0	123.0	113.0	14.2	1.3	9.1

¹ Estimate.

Source: Various issues of the Federal Reserve Bulletin, as revised. Figures for 1950 are estimates supplied by the Federal Reserve.

Total nonfarm mortgage recordings of \$20,000 or less have grown from \$16.2 billion in 1950 to an estimated figure of \$32 billion in 1959. The increase in mortgage debt outstanding on 1- to 4-family properties went from \$7.6 billion in 1950 to an estimated \$13 billion in 1959. And even in 1957, when there was a decline in housing starts and mortgages, there still was a figure of over \$24 billion for nonfarm mortgage recordings—\$3 billion more than the figure in 1950—and there still was a net increase in mortgage debt outstanding on 1- to 4-family properties of \$3.6 billion, \$1 billion more than the net increase in 1950.

Throughout the postwar years, net flows of funds into mortgages have represented an extremely large share of the total net flow of funds into capital markets.

Net flow of funds into capital markets
[Amounts in billions]

Year	Net capital market flows ¹	Residential mortgage flows	
		Amount	Percent of total net capital market flows
1948.....	\$15.6	\$5.9	37.8
1949.....	15.9	5.3	33.3
1950.....	17.4	8.7	50.0
1951.....	18.7	7.8	41.7
1952.....	24.7	7.5	30.4

¹ Includes flows of funds into corporate securities, State and municipal, and Federal obligations, and mortgages.

Net flow of funds into capital markets—
Continued
[Amounts in billions]

Year	Net capital market flows	Residential mortgage flows	
		Amount	Percent of total net capital market flows
1953.....	\$26.1	\$8.2	31.4
1954.....	25.3	10.2	40.3
1955.....	28.2	13.4	47.5
1956.....	26.9	11.4	42.4
1957.....	28.6	9.2	31.8
1958.....	40.5	11.6	28.6
1959 (estimate).....	43.5	14.7	33.8

Source: "Study of Mortgage Credit," Senate Banking and Currency Committee, 86th Cong., 1st sess., p. 190; 1958 figures and 1959 estimates from Federal Reserve System.

This table compares only the net flow of funds into corporate securities and State, municipal, and Federal obligations with the flow of funds into mortgages. It does not, for example, take into account the flow of funds into consumer credit, which rose from \$21 billion in 1950 to almost \$50 billion in October 1959.

Those proposing an increase of funds into the mortgage field, over and above the large amount and the large proportion now going into mortgages, should think carefully where it is to come from. Funds going into corporate securities are the source of our long-term growth

in productivity. New factories, to produce additional raw materials and manufactured goods, are expensive, and money to finance them must be raised somehow if we are to have increasing production. Funds going into local, State, and Federal securities provide roads, dams, airports, schools, hospitals, and meet the deficits in Federal budgets which so frequently follow the adoption of lavish spending programs. And while funds flowing into consumer credit do not directly increase future productivity, they provide an incentive for manufacturers to increase their plants, and they represent a choice by the consumer in favor of automobiles, television sets, washing machines, and the like, as compared with housing or anything else they could spend their money on.

The increased demands for funds for consumer credit, for mortgages and for corporate and governmental purposes had the result of increasing interest rates. These increases in interest rates were not confined to the mortgage field. Interest rates, and yields in the case of securities whose interest rates are fixed, have risen to the highest point in about 25 years. It would indeed be surprising if interest on mortgages had not followed suit.

The general rise in interest rates hit especially hard FHA and VA mortgages, where the rates were fixed by law. The table showing mortgage recordings and increases in outstanding mortgage debt illustrates this. The amount of conventional mortgages recorded has increased gradually but steadily, the only decline being from \$18.6 billion in 1956 to \$18.2 billion in 1957. In contrast to this, FHA mortgage recordings rose and fell repeatedly. VA mortgages rose and fell even more violently. The same contrast between conventional mortgages and FHA and VA mortgages is shown in the table giving increases in mortgage debt outstanding.

The Joint Economic Committee's recent staff report on employment, growth, and price levels at page 365 takes the position that the fixed interest rates on FHA and VA mortgages is the cause of the pronounced fluctuations in mortgage funds available for these programs:

Due to ceilings on the interest rates that may be charged on mortgages insured by the Federal Housing Administration and guaranteed by the Veterans' Administration, a rise in yields on other competitive types of investments, such as corporate and Government securities, has tended to attract the supply of investment funds away from these mortgages. On the other hand, when credit conditions have eased and yields on competitive investments have fallen, the supply of investment funds has tended to flow back into the Government-supported mortgage programs.

The report takes the position that "a continuing high degree of sensitivity seems likely as long as the ceilings on FHA and VA interest rates remain in effect." An occasional increase in the statutory interest rates for VA and FHA mortgages, invariably too little and too late, does not eliminate the problems caused by the statutory fixed rate.

However, even if the statutory interest rates for VA and FHA mortgages were

eliminated, the housing industry would still be so dependent upon credit that changes in the credit situation—changes in the supply of credit and changes in the cost of credit—would necessarily have a substantial effect upon the industry. The housing industry would still have to compete with other uses for money.

One method of helping housing in this competition would be for the Government to subsidize housing directly or indirectly. This means that the taxpayer sooner or later must reduce his expenditures, on things he wants to buy for himself, in order to supply housing to the beneficiaries of the subsidy. This is what is done in the public housing program and what would be done in any program involving direct loans at a lower rate of interest than what the Government must pay to get the money. I have opposed these programs, and I expect to continue to oppose them.

Another method of making money available for housing is to impose selective controls or direct controls on other activities which compete with housing. On paper, it would be easy to reduce consumer credit by direct controls on it so as to make the money now flowing into consumer credit available for housing credit. In 1958 more than \$40 billion of installment credit was extended. Only a fraction of this would serve to even out the flow of money into the mortgage field. But I would not favor this. Important as housing is, I would not favor the use of selective credit controls in order to protect housing against fluctuations in the supply of credit.

The most effective way, I think, for the Congress to reduce the ups and downs in housing, aside from the elimination of the statutory interest rates on FHA and VA mortgages, would be to balance the Federal budget. An unbalanced Federal budget means that the Treasury must go into the capital market and borrow billions of dollars, in competition with other users of money. The \$12 billion deficit of the fiscal year 1959 imposed on capital markets a drain which could not help but push interest rates up substantially.

If the Congress will eliminate the inflationary drain on capital markets of an unbalanced Federal budget, I am convinced that the housing industry can compete on equal terms with other users of credit. There still will be occasions when it will be necessary to tighten up on credit generally, in the interest of a sound and stable economy; and there still will be occasions when it will be necessary to relax credit, in the interest of a sound and stable economy. As a user of credit, the housing industry should be subject to the general policies applicable to the use of credit.

In closing, I want to make it clear, as I did at the beginning, that these comments on the subject of housing are general. No housing legislation is before us at the moment. When such proposed legislation is introduced and is under consideration, it will, of course, be necessary to have each proposal made considered on its merits and in the light of the general economic background.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield to me?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I am pleased to yield to the chairman of the Housing Subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I wish to compliment the distinguished chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee on his presentation, which contained a great deal of helpful information. I thank him and commend him for it.

In this connection, let me say that the Senator from Virginia, as chairman of the full Banking and Currency Committee, has always been most helpful in connection with the enactment of good, strong, dependable housing legislation. I thank him for his outstandingly fine work.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Alabama very sincerely for his kind words.

I yield the floor.

JUVENILE DELINQUENCY CONTROL PROBLEMS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BYRD of West Virginia in the chair). The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be read by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 694) to provide Federal assistance for projects which will demonstrate or develop techniques and practices leading to a solution of the Nation's juvenile delinquency control problems.

FEDERAL ELECTIONS ACT OF 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 571, Senate bill 2436.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2436) to revise the Federal election laws, to prevent corrupt practices in Federal elections, and for other purposes.

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

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2436) to revise the Federal election laws, to prevent corrupt practices in Federal elections, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 5421) to provide a program of assistance to correct inequities in the construction of fishing vessels and to enable the fishing industry of the United States to regain a favorable economic status, and for other purposes; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two

Houses thereon, and that Mr. BONNER, Mr. BOYKIN, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. TOLLEFSON, and Mr. VAN PELT were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

THE STEEL STRIKE SETTLEMENT

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, the settlement of the steel strike was the answer to the prayers of millions of Americans—not only steelworkers and their families, but the entire population. It was generally admitted that the steel strike was a threat to our entire economy. At its peak, over 1,200,000 workers were out of jobs. Many industries and the workers in nearly all industries were threatened. For weeks, there was an impasse. Then, light came through the clouds. A settlement was reached. Millions of Americans took a sigh of relief, and felt gratitude in their hearts.

The Vice President of the United States was given credit for playing a principal role in the settlement; and, at first, no one seemed to begrudge him this honor.

Then, when the first flush of victory passed, politics raised its ugly head. Members of one party said: "Hey, wait a minute. Our opponent in the next presidential campaign is getting too much credit. We have been stymied by President Eisenhower's popularity; we have not been able to attack him. And now comes his successor, getting general acclaim. How can we head that off, in this election year? Why, in only one way: by saying that the settlement was not such a great one, after all. We can say that the settlement was unfair to the steel companies, even though they are satisfied. We can say the settlement is inflationary, even though it is not."

But the opposition got its wires crossed. Before word was passed along to criticize the settlement, instead of praising it, one member of the opposition proclaimed that the father of one of their candidates deserved credit for the settlement.

Political opponents of Vice President Nixon say that the steel strike settlement is inflationary. Let us look at that statement. Under the settlement, the average earnings per year will rise less than 3¼ percent. Compare this with the 3.82 percent increase under the separate Kaiser Steel Co. settlement, 4.5 percent for the can industry, and 5.2 percent for the aluminum industry. These other increases average nearly 30 percent more than the steel settlement increase. Mr. Roger Blough, chairman of the board of United States Steel, has verified the fact that the average annual increase in hourly employment costs resulting from the steel strike settlement will be 3.5 to 3.75 percent. This is in contrast to the increases under other steel settlements during the postwar period, during which hourly employment costs have been rising at an average of 8 percent a year. Thus, by means of the steel strike settlement, the postwar trend has been cut in half. The steel wage increase of 7 cents which goes into effect December 1960, is less than the

average increase. As a matter of fact, 65 percent of the wage increases in 1959 exceed that figure.

What this means is that the steel strike settlement is in line with—or, I should say, below the line of—others negotiated. It cannot be any excuse for setting off an inflationary wage pattern.

Newspaper reports of the settlement were misleading. There was no 40-cent-per-hour wage increase. That is an exaggerated gross figure related to total overall costs. A table which I shall insert in the RECORD shows the breakdown of the overall figure. The 40-cent figure would represent more than a 10-percent increase, while, as a matter of fact, the average increase under the settlement is less than 3.75 percent per year—much less than the average increase covering all industry.

One of the main issues in the steel strike settlement had to do with the work rules aspect. The settlement set up a union-management committee, to be headed by an impartial third party representing the public, to set work rules. Steel company executives tell us that this is what they wanted and what they insisted upon, that it is a victory for management, and that it will, without doubt, improve work rules, to the end that there will be more efficiency and more productivity. Labor and management thus combine to increase the pace of productivity gains.

The figures I have used in this statement are taken from statements by R. Conrad Cooper, chairman of the steel companies coordinating committee, and Roger Blough, chairman of the board of U.S. Steel, one of the companies for which "the bleeding hearts" are bleeding.

I would like to ask those who have criticized the steel settlement: Would you have preferred no settlement? What kind of settlement did you propose? Or, if you did not propose anything, what kind of settlement would you have proposed?

Mr. President, I feel rather sorry for the opposition. For a long time they have been overawed by President Eisenhower's tremendous popularity; and now they have had a taste of Vice President Nixon's outstanding ability and the public recognition of that ability. I suppose we can expect more of the sort of unjust criticism and distraction which we have witnessed the past few days, but I do not believe that the people will be so easily fooled. They know that there was a steel strike; and they know that it was settled in a manner satisfactory to the parties concerned, including the public; and they know that Secretary of Labor Mitchell and Vice President Nixon played leading roles in the popular settlement.

My thanks and the thanks of millions of other Americans go to Secretary of Labor Mitchell and to the President of the Senate, Vice President Nixon, for their part in the steel strike settlement.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD, immediately following my remarks, two tables which show the steel strike settlement terms, as compared with the terms

of other settlements. The tables were prepared for me by the Department of Labor.

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

TABLE A.—Steel strike settlement terms, compared with those of other settlements

	Unit of quantity	Steel	Can	Aluminum	Kaiser Steel
Value of package on comparable wage and benefit areas (including cost of living)	Cent.....	32.8	34.2	35.08	20.4
Length of settlement.....	Month.....	30	34	32	20
Number of retroactive months.....	do.....	1 (-2)	2	4	0
Average annual increase in hourly earnings resulting from these packages.....	Percent.....	3.75	4.5	5.2	3.82
Average annual increase in employment cost of settlement package if applied to steel industry.....	do.....	3.5-3.75	4.7	4.7	5.0

¹ There were approximately 2 months' production under prior contract terms.

TABLE B.—Supporting data

Increase in	Steel	Can	Aluminum	Kaiser
Wages plus increment.....	{ 7 plus 1.2 7 plus 1.2 7 plus .6	{ 7 plus 1.2 7 plus 1.2 7 plus 1.2	{ 4.8 7.15 8.86	{ 7 plus 1.2
Cost of living (maximum).....	.6	6.0	6.0	3.0
Insurance.....	13.44	1.5	5.64	6.9
Pensions.....	3.0	2.0	2.63	2.3
Holiday pay.....		.1		
Total.....	32.8	34.2	35.08	20.4
Newspaper estimates.....	40.0	128.2	128.5-130.0	\$22.5

¹ Excludes 6 cent cost-of-living allowance.

² Includes incentive effects and SUB.

NOTE.—Estimates in table, aside from newspaper estimates, all exclude effect on incentive earnings, indirect effects on overtime, etc., and SUB.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE GOV. CLINTON A. CLAUSON, OF MAINE

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I am moved to share with the Senate the profound sorrow and the deep sense of loss with which all Maine citizens reacted to the untimely death of Gov. Clinton A. Clauson in the early morning hours of December 30, 1959.

The dimensions of our loss are spelled out, not simply in political terms, nor in terms of the abruptness with which his dedicated service to Maine was terminated—but, more broadly and meaningfully, by the warm, human qualities which established a close, personal relationship between him and the people he served so well.

"Doc," as he was known to all of us, was a kindly man. He was a genial man. He was a sympathetic, understanding, and compassionate man. The problems of others, whatever their station in life, were his problems. He gave unstintingly of his time, his energies, his attention, and his heart to those who sought his counsel and assistance. He was available to all. He denied himself to none.

It was these qualities which prompted one of our Maine newspapers to say editorially, with a voice which spoke for all of us, "losing him hurts a great deal."

In the memorial service to Governor Clauson, the Reverend Kenneth Lloyd Garrison spoke in these words movingly and eloquently of this man who was so beloved of his people:

Clinton Clauson was a man of the soil who never did and never wanted to shake from his soul the color of the farm that gave him birth. Yet he combined with this rural warmth, an urban sagacity.

It was not in his nature to pretend to be anything but what he was. He was above corruption. He could look any man in the face without seeing a ballot box in one eye and a dollar sign in the other. This made people trust him. This made the rank and file of the citizens of Maine want him to be their chief executive. He was honest.

He was a public servant who could never separate his vocation from his avocation. Blessed is the man who is able to say that his work is his fun. He shook hands with people the first time because it was his job; the second time because it was his wish yet he loved them on both occasions. No journey was too far, no group too small, no occasion too insignificant—but that he went to share his convictions of good government. He was dedicated to his work.

Clinton Clauson never thought too highly of himself. His companions knew both more and less than he. From the former he learned; with the latter he never felt superior. He walked the tight rope of constant self-analysis. He was a humble man.

Of his friendliness one need not speak. It was once said of this public servant: "Show me a man who dislikes Doc and I will show you a man who hates himself."

He had so little chance, so governed was he by circumstances and time, to write his name boldly upon the business records of the State, yet, of where he stood, and what he wished to do there seems to have been no doubt. Men differed with him but they were his friends. He battled issues, yet in all his fellow men he saw the spark of God that made him love them.

The Governor was born on a farm in Mitchell, Iowa, 64 years ago. After receiving chiropractic training in his home State, he moved to the State of Maine while still a young man, settling in the city of Waterville. In his new city, he found the lovely bride, Ellen Kelleher, who was to be his partner in a lifetime of public service. Their family life was both devoted and tightly knit as their

son and daughter grew up and, in later years, as grandchildren joined the affectionate family circle.

Governor Clauson was interested in Democratic politics, at first as a hobby, ever since he was old enough to cast his first presidential ballot for Woodrow Wilson. After military service in the First World War, he returned to Waterville and developed a lifelong, serious interest in the activities of his political party. He served at all levels of party organization, first as ward chairman, then as chairman of his party's city committee, and from 1928 to 1932 as a member of the Democratic State committee at a time when his party was victorious at the State level. He resigned from active participation in politics when he was appointed collector of internal revenue for the State of Maine in 1933. He served conscientiously and ably in that capacity until 1952, earning statewide approval of the quality of his work.

Once again Dr. Clauson had an opportunity to serve the people of his community through the avenues of active political participation. He served as mayor of Waterville, Maine, in 1956 and 1957, and was elected Governor of Maine in 1958, the first Governor in the history of Maine elected to a 4-year term, and the first Democrat to be elected following another Democrat in more than a hundred years.

His qualities as a man were reflected in Governor Clauson's approach to his duties as chief executive of Maine.

He believed he should know his people and that they should know him—intimately and personally. He believed that only in this way could government be responsive to their needs, and so he moved among them constantly, meeting them, talking to them, listening to their views. And they responded to him, and trusted him, and believed him when he said that his one objective was to contribute to the building of a State which would serve their needs better.

There is no doubt that he was dedicated to that task. His work, his programs, his words, and his actions were pointed to it.

It is a tragedy that he was cut down at the threshold of greater accomplishments in the interests of his beloved adopted State, and that the people of Maine were thus deprived of the full measure of that service which he gave so unstintingly and well.

His loss is deeply mourned by all citizens of Maine, regardless of party. His humility, his human warmth, his love of life, family, and fellow man, his years of devoted public service, have left a lasting imprint on the State of Maine.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point a resolution adopted by the Maine congressional delegation.

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

RESOLUTION BY THE MAINE CONGRESSIONAL DELEGATION ON THE LATE GOV. CLINTON A. CLAUSON

Whereas the State of Maine has been saddened by the death of its Governor, the late Clinton A. Clauson; and

Whereas the members of the Maine congressional delegation held the highest respect and affection for Governor Clauson, both as an individual and as a dedicated public servant; and

Whereas the members of the Maine delegation have the deepest sympathy for the bereaved family of Governor Clauson: Be it therefore

Resolved, That the Maine congressional delegation hereby note its profound sorrow over the passing of Clinton A. Clauson; and that copies of this resolution be sent, with the delegation's deepest sympathy, to the widow and family of the late Governor.

MARGARET CHASE SMITH,
U.S. Senator.

EDMUND S. MUSKIE,
U.S. Senator.

CLIFFORD G. MCINTIRE,
Member of Congress.

FRANK M. COFFIN,
Member of Congress.

JAMES C. OLIVER,
Member of Congress.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I feel inadequate in undertaking to describe for my colleagues who did not have the privilege of knowing Governor Clauson the qualities of this man, and so I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the RECORD various items which will speak more eloquently than I can: The full text of the memorial service by the Reverend Kenneth Lloyd Garrison; the text of the funeral prayer by the Reverend John I. Daniel, of Waterville, Maine; and various editorials and newspaper comments upon the passing of this devoted servant and adopted son of my great State.

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

MEMORIAL SERVICE FOR THE HONORABLE CLINTON A. CLAUSON, GOVERNOR OF MAINE, JANUARY 2, 1960

(By Rev. Kenneth Lloyd Garrison)

On the Ides of March in 44 B.C. an assassin cut short the life of Julius Caesar, the ruler of Rome. William Shakespeare, in romanticizing it in his play, puts the following funeral oration upon the lips of Mark Antony.

"Friends, Romans, countrymen, lend me your ears;

I come to bury Caesar, not to praise him. The evil that men do lives after them; The good is oft interred with their bones; So let it be with Caesar. The noble Brutus Hath told you Caesar was ambitious; If it were so, it was a grievous fault, And grievously hath Caesar answered it. Here, under leave of Brutus and the rest—For Brutus is an honorable man; So are they all, all honorable men—Come I to speak in Caesar's funeral. He was my friend, faithful and just to me: But Brutus says he was ambitious; And Brutus is an honorable man. He hath brought many captives home to Rome

Whose ransoms did the general coffers fill: Did this in Caesar seem ambitious? When that the poor have cried, Caesar hath wept:

Ambition should be made of sterner stuff: Yet Brutus says he was ambitious; And Brutus is an honorable man. You all did see that on the Lupercal I thrice presented him a kingly crown, Which he did thrice refuse: was this ambition?

Yet Brutus says he was ambitious; And, sure, he is an honorable man. I speak not to disprove what Brutus spoke, But here I am to speak what I do know.

You all did love him once, not without cause;

What cause withholds you then, to mourn for him?

O judgment! thou art fled to brutish beasts, And men have lost their reason. Bear with me;

My heart is in the coffin there with Caesar, And I must pause till it come back to me."

On the 30th day of December 1959, another assassin cut short the life of Clinton Amos Clauson, the Governor of Maine. Now we have come to bury him because we must. But we have come to praise him because we wish.

The task is fraught with high emotion because he was our friend and we did love him, and our hearts are in the coffin with him. It would be best to await another day to set a value upon such a man; a day when reason returns and tributes carry not the scent of flowers.

Yet here he lies within our midst and honor, duty, and desire command our tethered minds. How flimsy a vehicle of true expression is a funeral eulogy. If a man is evil, in such an hour, we would not take advantage of the sorrow of his loved ones to cast aspersions on his name. But if a man is good, as this man was, how powerless we are to add one cubit to his stature.

What, therefore, we say today is not to be construed alone as praise of this, our friend, the servant of the State, but rather it is to call to our remembrance those attributes—which, though a man may differ strongly with others by conviction—will make them sadder and poorer when like the proverbial Arab he folds his earthly tent and steals away into the night of eternity.

It is not required that a public servant be the most politically astute of men—but it is required that he be honest.

It is not necessary that he possess the wisdom of Solomon—but it is to be expected that he will be dedicated to his task.

It is not essential that he be puffed up with tinted arrogance—but it is beneficial to the State if he is humble.

It is not dictated that he give a glad hand to every potential voter—but it is wholesome if he is warm and friendly.

Clinton Clauson was a man of the soil who never did and never wanted to shake from his soul the color of the farm that gave him birth. Yet he combined with this rural warmth an urban sagacity.

It was not in his nature to pretend to be anything but what he was. He was above corruption. He could look any man in the face without seeing a ballot box in one eye and a dollar sign in the other. This made people trust him. This made the rank and file of the citizens of Maine want him to be their chief executive. He was honest.

He was a public servant who could never separate his vocation from his avocation. Blessed is the man who is able to say that his work is his fun. He shook hands with people the first time because it was his job; the second time because it was his wish, yet he loved them on both occasions. No journey was too far, no group too small, no occasion too insignificant—but that he went to share his convictions of good government. He was dedicated to his work.

Clinton Clauson never thought too highly of himself. His companions knew both more and less than he. From the former he learned; with the latter he never felt superior. He walked the tight rope of constant self-analysis. He was a humble man.

Of his friendliness one need not speak. It was once said of this public servant: "Show me a man who dislikes Doc and I will show you a man who hates himself."

The reflections of posterity will more properly evaluate the contributions made by this kindly man. We attest that, virtuously speaking, he was a good Governor.

History will assign him the place that he merits among the leaders of men.

There was so much that he wanted to do. So much left undone. A homely American poet has summed it up well:

"Oh, never we reach to our fullest height,
And never we do our all;
We must turn away at the close of day
When the tools from our fingers fall.
But it isn't a failure to hold a dream
That never on earth comes true,
For the tasks of worth that we miss on earth
Are reserved for our souls to do."

He had so little chance, so governed was he by circumstances and time, to write his name boldly upon the business records of the State, yet, of where he stood, and what he wished to do there seems to have been no doubt. Men differed with him but they were his friends. He battled issues, yet in all his fellow men he saw the spark of God that made him love them.

I know of no more fitting final testimony to this first citizen of Maine than those words supplied by Frederick J. Gillman shortly after the Civil War:

"God send us men whose aim 'twill be,
Not to defend some ancient creed,
But to live out the laws of Christ
In every thought and word and deed.
God send us men with hearts ablaze
All truth to love, all wrong to hate;
These are the patriots nations need,
These are the bulwarks of the State."

(Selections read from Holy Scripture: Psalm 1: 27, 121; Romans 8: 13-39; Matthew 25: 34-40; Psalm 23.)

CLAUSON FUNERAL PRAYER TEXT

The following is the text of the prayer prepared by the Reverend John I. Daniel, of Waterville, for delivery at Gov. Clinton A. Clauson's funeral this afternoon:

"Father in Heaven, we thank You for the privilege of having known in this life, Clinton A. Clauson. Some of us have known him many years, as a private citizen; others only more recently amid his responsibilities as mayor of Waterville, or as Governor of our great State; but all of us who have experienced his warmth and friendliness, have felt a spark of the Divine shining from his human eyes.

"Once more, O Lord, we raise the cry of 'Why?'—Why must there be heartache and frustration, sickness, anguish, separation—death? And while our eyes cannot penetrate the cloud of mystery, or our ears detect an auditory answer, we thank You for the knowledge that You sent Your son into our world to suffer with us; accepting all that man knows of heartache, anguish, misunderstanding, violence, death.

"We thank You for his words, 'Because I live, you shall live also;' and for the wonder of divine forgiveness expressed in Christ's promise to the criminal crucified beside Him on the cross, 'Today shalt thou with Me be in paradise.' Grant us that honest penitence for our sins, O God, we pray, whereby we too may lay hold upon our Master's promise of forgiveness.

"We thank You that love is that which is common to this world and eternity. Grant that we may surrender our fears, anxieties, resentments—every negative thought which blocks the flow of love through the channels of our hearts. O God, may we become more sensitive to others. May we become more understandingly aware of those whom we encounter on life's journey, even as Governor Clauson was so humbly aware. Grant us the largeness of heart and sufficient holy imagination to realize that probably everyone does the best he can under the circumstances, if only we can be understanding enough to realize his circumstances.

"Bless, we beseech Thee, the loved ones of Governor Clauson. Bless his wife, his children, grandchildren, and his many grieving friends.

"Grant that all of us may keep the candles of memory lighted on the altars of our hearts for those dear ones whose voices are now silent. Forbid that we should think of them as merely resting—but rather that they have been called from out our midst to greater responsibilities, more dynamic and creative labors than while they were with us; purged of their infirmities, and working amid the vital presence of Jesus.

"Even as our faith makes known to us that love is immortal, O God, so would we be mindful that death is only a horizon, the limit of our sight. Lift us, that we may see farther, illuminate our eyes that we may see more clearly. Draw us closer to Thyself, that we may know ourselves nearer to our beloved who are with Thee.

"And now in these years, or months, or days which remain to us, may we lay hold upon that love which is eternal. Grant, O God, that when a voice speaks to us, as it has so recently spoken to Clinton Clauson, it may say to us, as to him: 'Well done, thou good and faithful servant, thou hast been faithful in a few things, I will make thee ruler over many things. Enter, thou, into the joy of thy Lord. Amen.'

CLAUSON TRIBUTES POUR IN FROM STATE, NATION

Tributes to Governor Clauson's warmth, kindness, and devotion to public service keyed the comments on his unexpected death Wednesday.

Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY, of Massachusetts, a 1960 Democratic presidential nomination hopeful, spoke of Clauson's ability and human qualities and deplored the loss of his wise counsel.

The Democrats' national chairman, Paul Butler, said the news "is a source of great sorrow to Democrats everywhere."

Republican National Committee member Bradford H. Hutchins, of Waterville, said Clauson was "a friend of everybody who knew him."

The man whom Clauson defeated for the governorship—ex-Governor Horace Hildreth, Republican—said he was "an exceedingly kindly man" whose untimely death is "a tragic event which saddens all the citizenry of Maine."

Clauson's predecessor in Blaine House—Senator EDMUND S. MUSKIE, Democrat—said it was tragic Clauson couldn't give the people "a full measure of the service he gave so unstintingly and so well."

Excerpts from other comment:

State Senate President John H. Reed, now the Governor: "I considered him a true friend and join with thousands of others who mourn his passing."

Maynard C. Dolloff, who lost to Clauson in the 1958 Democratic primary: "Maine has lost a tremendously dedicated and sincere citizen."

Ex-Gov. Percival P. Baxter, Republican: "Governor Clauson was a fine, honest, able Governor."

Congressman FRANK M. COFFIN, Democrat: "His 1 year as Governor was distinguished by two words which to him were always a keynote—responsible progress."

Connecticut's Gov. Abraham Ribicoff, Democrat: "A grievous loss. I found him to be a warm individual and a man of great integrity."

Mayor Albert Bernier, Democrat, of Waterville: "I feel that he represented more thoroughly than possibly any Governor all the people of all walks of life."

Frederick N. Allen, of Portland, chairman of the public utilities commission: "I have known the Governor for many years and have always found him willing and eager to lend

his hand in any way in which he was needed. During the past year he has shown a real interest in the working of all governmental departments * * * always striving to keep abreast of any problem and offering constructive advice and full cooperation."

Said Gov. and Mrs. Wesley Powell of New Hampshire: "Mrs. Powell and I express to you our heartfelt personal sympathy in the passing of your good husband and fine public servant. I extend also, the sympathy of the people of New Hampshire to you personally and through you to the people of Maine."

Vermont Gov. Robert T. Stafford said he was "deeply shocked to learn of the sudden passing of Gov. Clinton Clauson, of Maine."

Stafford said, "In the past year, Governor Clauson has worked closely with the other New England Governors to promote the social and economic growth of the region."

He said Vermont Personnel Director Frederick Downing, former director of the Maine State Employees Association, will represent him at the funeral of Clauson.

Gov. Foster Furcolo, Democrat, of Massachusetts, said that the death of Gov. Clinton Clauson, Democrat, of Maine, "will be felt severely by his friends everywhere."

"He was one of the most friendly, capable, and dedicated men I have ever known and a credit in every respect to his great State and to his country.

"Mrs. Furcolo joins me in extending our sympathy to his family," Furcolo added.

Richard J. Dubord, of Waterville, Democratic national committeeman: "His brief year in office gained him many new friends and prophesied a brilliant career. Our State has lost a beloved leader."

Mrs. Ellen Thomas, of Anson, vice chairman of the Republican State Committee: "Governor Clauson's death brings sadness to all the people of Maine regardless of partisan belief. He was a kindly man with the interest of his State foremost in his heart."

GOVERNOR CLAUSON—HE WAS A MOST HAPPY FELLOW

(By Peter M. Damborg)

"He was a most happy fellow."

Those are the words of Gov. Clinton A. Clauson's administrative assistant, Maurice Williams, describing how the late chief executive appeared as he ended his state-house day Tuesday—8 hours before his unexpected death in the Blaine House.

Perhaps Williams' description best summarizes the spirit, the contagious affability of the man who came to head his State, despite the predictions of all but the most devoted of his many friends.

It certainly fits the personality of a Governor who, possibly more than any other man in modern times, appeared to be beloved by all who met and knew him—perhaps by all the people of Maine.

He was not a great politician. He personally knew and acknowledged that he was not a dynamic leader. He was far from being a spellbinding orator. And he had a lot to learn about State government.

But "Doc" Clauson—the nickname he liked best—knew people. And the people liked his way of getting across to them that he recognized his limitations. It has been said that it's doubtful that he made a single enemy while Governor.

"Doc" Clauson thought about running for Governor in 1954, the year that Edmund S. Muskie—another Waterville political success—threw his lot against Gov. Burton M. Cross (Republican of Augusta) and won.

I interviewed him early that year and his attitude was something like this:

"I'd like to be Governor, I think any man would who feels he could contribute something and who loves his State as you and I do.

"But I like to think I am a practical man and I just don't think this is the year for it. My party has little organization strength. The odds would be pretty heavy—and besides, Mrs. Clauson isn't too well right now and my son (Neil) and I are getting a good start in the oil business.

"I won't give up the idea, though, and you can be sure I'll let you know whenever I make up my mind to run, if I do."

Four years later, "Doc" Clauson called to remind this writer of his promise "to let you know."

His philosophy then—less than 2 years ago—was in this vein:

"I think the time is right now, I guess I should have run before, but I didn't and we've had a wonderful Governor since and the party has grown tremendously.

"I don't know whether or not I can make it, but I'm going to try. There's no harm in that. If I lose, I'll make a lot of new friends and have fun seeing old ones along the way."

This same "I hope I can, but I won't be mad if I don't" Clauson spirit prevailed through the 1958 campaign. It was a rough one—two, in fact, because he had to defeat a well known State grange master, Maynard C. Dolloff who had the public blessings of a big majority of the "new" Democrats.

Time after time, he would call me aside, after a campaign speech, and ask: "How am I doing?" And when the answer was "pretty good but why not try speaking off-the-cuff? You're better at that than reading a script," he would smile and reply: "I'm not a public speaker. All I'm trying to do is get my message across and meet the people and hope I'm accepted."

That he was accepted now is a matter of record. He defeated former Governor, ex-U.S. Ambassador to Pakistan Horace A. Hildreth, by 10,000 votes.

He enjoyed those campaign days which often began at 6 a.m.—like the mornings he met with the Lewiston Public Works Department employees, going to work.

Following U.S. Senate Candidate Muskie through industrial plants, he looked as though he was trying to tie onto the lanky Governor's coat-tails. But as the drive for votes for the two came close to an end, it was apparent that "Doc" was keeping up with Muskie, that folks were sensing his down-to-earth, almost nonpolitical approach.

Sunday night, the eve of the September election, "Doc" and Mrs. Clauson dropped in to the Portland Press Herald office, along with the Muskies and the Oliviers and the Coffins. They had finished their last television appearance. Mostly, the office crew look to Muskie. But, Clauson too "did the handshake rounds."

Mrs. Clauson came over to my desk. She smiled, and said: "Well, it's all over now. I'm glad because you know, I think Doc is awfully tired. He doesn't believe it, though. What do you think will happen tomorrow or don't you think you should say?"

The reply was as soft as possible: "I honestly don't think it looks too good but you shouldn't give up hope." She smiled, sweetly, and answered: "I don't think so, either, but that's all right. It's been fun and he's really enjoyed it."

When it was all over, both Clausons wore the same smile they showed the night before the election that appeared so doubtful. And it was these smiles that continued to earn them more and more friends.

Clauson went into office knowing he had a lot to learn—but happy. He learned, he surrounded himself with top men in their fields.

But—he appeared continually to disprove his wife's contention that he tired from constant activity. He accepted almost all invitations to speak, to appear at both public and private functions. And before his first

legislative session was over, he was talking about stumping the State again.

"I want to show my friends who supported me that I meant it when I said I was coming back," he told me in private one day. "I'd like to revisit every plant and shop that I covered during the campaign.

"And, besides," he chuckled, "it would be good politics, now wouldn't it?"

He did go back over some of the same ground of the 1958 campaign but his State duties prevented complete coverage, coupled with his combined business-social calendar.

A youngster met the Governor not too long ago and said, with child-like simplicity: "You don't look like a Governor; you look like a grandfather."

A State house janitor yesterday paused and said: "It is a shock. He was a fine gentleman."

"Doc," "Clint," Governor Clauson—a grandfatherly gentleman who earned the love of the people of his State because he was honest, humble, friendly, and their kind of man.

[From the Lewiston Evening Journal, Dec. 30, 1959]

GOVERNOR CLAUSON'S UNTIMELY DEATH

The death of Gov. Clinton A. Clauson this morning came as a great shock to the people of Maine. The Governor seemingly enjoyed the best of health and only last night was a guest of honor in Lewiston at a dinner given by Paragon Glass Co. to express its thanks to those who helped in the firm's relocation in Maine.

Words always are and always will be inadequate when it comes to expressing sympathy. All we can do is to extend sincere expressions of regret, knowing full well that similar sentiments pouring in from all over Maine in no way will ease the sense of loss felt by the late Governor's family.

Clint Clauson, as he was known to his friends, attained the governorship against considerable odds. He was not expected to win the Democratic Party nomination in the primary election, and there was much doubt over his ability to defeat former Republican Governor Horace Hildreth.

The Clauson personality had much to do with his political achievements. The Governor had a warm, kindly personality that won him a host of friends. He was a man virtually everyone "took to." Political opponents and opposition party members found it impossible to dislike him, even when in disagreement with him.

Governor Clauson did not live to complete a full year of his 4-year term of office. During his first year he had the satisfaction of seeing the Republican-controlled legislature enact a budget closely corresponding to the one advocated by him for the biennium. This same period found him doing a workmanlike job as chief of state.

Once again we wish to extend our deepest sympathy to Governor Clauson's family.

[From the Portland (Maine) Evening Express, Dec. 30, 1959]

GOV. CLINTON A. CLAUSON

Death early this morning robbed Gov. Clinton A. Clauson of the chance to display as the State's chief executive the outstanding administrative ability which had marked his performance in every public office he has held.

Governor Clauson had nearly completed the first year of the first 4-year term in Maine history. It was a year of study, for he had to overcome the handicap of no legislative experience. It was a year of getting his feet placed in the giant footprints of his predecessor, U.S. Senator EDMUND S. MUSKIE, certainly the greatest Democratic votegetter in Maine history and one of the State's most popular Governors.

It was a year marked by inevitable differences with the executive council, and by the longest legislative session in the State's history, and by unusual budget difficulties.

It was a year, too, in which he emerged from the shadows of those who had been politically more prominent to gain full partnership with the State's other Democratic leaders, Senator MUSKIE and U.S. Representatives FRANK M. COFFIN and JAMES C. OLIVER.

Governor Clauson considered politics only a hobby when he first became interested more than 40 years ago in Waterville. Twelve years later he sold his chiropractic practice to enter public service and he never returned to his profession. He was Maine collector of internal revenue for 19 years and was mayor of Waterville the 2 years prior to his election as Governor.

Governor Clauson was widely known as a man who had the courage of his convictions and those who have watched executive councils assume what seemed to be many of the Governor's powers, particularly in the appointive area, were willing to wager that he would have tamed the council within the 4 years. If he hadn't succeeded, council personnel at least would have known they'd been involved in a battle to the bitter end, said those close to the Governor.

For Governor Clauson was a humble man, as all his friends will attest, but he was determined and independent and he had a fierce pride in his office and in its prerogatives. He had a serene confidence, too, and this never was displayed to better advantage than in his decision to become a gubernatorial candidate in defiance of the wishes of the State's new Democrats, who wanted a younger man.

It is a matter of record now, of course, that Governor Clauson defeated their candidate in a hotly-contested primary election; and then went on to become Governor in an amazing Democratic landslide in the State elections. Then he set about healing the party wounds, for with Muskie and Oliver and Coffin in Washington, it was apparent that the welfare of the Maine Democratic Party would be Governor Clauson's responsibility.

This task of reunifying the party wasn't too difficult for Governor Clauson, who cast his first vote for President Wilson in 1916 and had been active in Maine Democratic councils ever since. His reputation for sincerity and integrity never was questioned. He was remembered, too, as one of those who helped to fashion the surprising Democratic victories of the early 1930's, when Louis J. Brann became Governor. And so this long and uninterrupted service to his party, which provided a link between the old Democrats of Brann and Harold Dubord, and the current new Democrats, added weight and dignity to his peacemaking efforts.

Governor Clauson never indulged in personalities in any political contest. His advisers time after time urged him to take off the gloves in his recent gubernatorial campaign against his Republican opponent, but he adamantly refused. Even in the heat of the primary battle, when he was the target for some bitter criticisms, he stuck to issues and problems.

He refused 5 years ago to run for major political office for a reason any father can understand. His son, Cornelius K., in 1954 had purchased an oil distribution business in Waterville and the Governor decided to pass up the political invitations to help his son get started in the business. Two years later, with young Clauson well established, Governor Clauson was his party's champion in the Waterville mayoralty race. He won easily.

Governor Clauson's loyalty to the national Democratic Party remained unshaken though

he was an innocent victim of the reorganization of the Internal Revenue Service. Nineteen years of faithful service went by the board, though it might have been expected that he would remain in the position until retirement, when directors were chosen by civil service examinations and he was replaced by a career man. These changes were made during the Truman administration and so it was Governor Clauson's searing experience to be jettisoned by his own party.

The reorganization appeared to be a necessity in the national interest, the Governor told friends who didn't hesitate to voice their bitterness. His loyalty never wavered.

The State lost a competent and dedicated servant when death so suddenly took Governor Clauson, and his party lost a great leader.

[From the Augusta (Maine) Kennebec Journal, Dec. 31, 1959]

CLINTON A. CLAUSON

The State of Maine has lost a good Governor, the capital city has lost a good friend and neighbor, in the sudden passing of the Honorable Clinton A. Clauson.

He was really one of us, a man who entered wholeheartedly into the life of the community. During his years of service as chief of the Internal Revenue Service here he had been closely associated with Augusta people. He was a former president of the Augusta Rotary Club. Augusta knew him in those years and during his more than 11 months of residence in the Blaine House, as a good neighbor—as one of the best.

He liked people—liked them so genuinely, so sincerely, that people could not help liking him. And their politics had nothing to do with it.

Governor Clauson did his level best to be a good Governor of this State—and he succeeded in that determination. The conservatism with which he approached problems of State finance and government at first surprised and soon delighted those who, being in the opposing political camp, had looked with foreboding on the accession of another Democratic chief executive.

Taxpayers found themselves applauding the firm restraint Governor Clauson brought to State fiscal planning. His budget message to the legislature last January demonstrated a realistic awareness of Maine's economic needs—and of the ability of Maine taxpayers to meet those needs. And that message won applause from one end of the State to the other, from Republicans and Democrats alike. People who, until then, had not been well acquainted with this man, breathed sighs of relief. The State, it appeared, was in capable hands.

And so it was. Governor Clauson was enthusiastic about his position as chief executive. He liked people and wanted to help them. He loved this old State, and he served it to the best of his ability. An intensely loyal party man, he nevertheless put State above party, when it came to that. No words are adequate to express the statewide sense of loss and of grief at his passing.

[From the Portland (Maine) Thursday Morning, Dec. 31, 1959]

FOR GOVERNOR CLAUSON

As a man Clinton A. Clauson possessed humility, dignity, humanity, integrity, and morality. To the governorship of Maine he brought all these traits of character and, what is truly the measure of this dedicated public servant, kept them whole. It would not have occurred to him to do anything else.

Candor compels recording that Dr. Clauson fought for the office of Governor as an underdog. He won. Once elected many of the troubles of the underdog beset him still. Yet, endowed as he was with high character

and a deep concern for Maine that sprang from simple affection, he set about governing with the best there was in him. When he died he had grown familiar with a milieu that had at first been strange to him. In short he was repeating the history of his election. He was winning again.

It was always pleasant to meet Governor Clauson—and always easy, for he had no love of remoteness. Maine people knew it because he went among them as often as he could. Newsmen knew it particularly well because their work put them in frequent contact with him and the experience was consistently gracious. People in government and politics knew it too, and more than once their personal fondness for him was enhanced, if anything, by their official opposition.

Politically Maine has lost a Governor whose administration was still evolving and therefore could not yet be judged for the final record although the evolution was distinctly upward. But there is no doubt whatever concerning Clinton A. Clauson the man.

Losing him hurts a great deal.

[From the Portland (Maine) Sunday Telegram, Jan. 3, 1960]

CLINTON A. CLAUSON—A GENTLEMAN

"Isn't he a nice man?" This was the reaction of so many persons on meeting Clinton A. Clauson.

"A most happy fella." His closest associates borrowed this phrase with which to describe him.

"You don't look like a governor. You look like a grandfather." This was the opinion of a 5-year-old who, like all small children, knew perfectly well that all grandfathers are nice men.

To those who knew him briefly as "Governor," and those who knew him for many years as Doc, Clinton Clauson was a kind, warm, friendly man—a gentleman. But the genial Governor was not one to let his desire to like and to be liked override his judgment. He would stand firm for a cause he believed to be just.

It was not given to Clinton Clauson to serve his State long as chief executive. Indeed, so few were the days of his stewardship that his mark as Governor is not clearly defined. But standing plain for all to see is the mark of a man. A nice man. One does well to live out his allotted span and leave behind so many to share in such a eulogy.

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, I wish to join my colleague in the tribute to the late Clinton A. Clauson, who served as Governor of the State of Maine. He was a personal friend of mine for nearly 20 years.

At this point, I read for the RECORD my telegram to Mrs. Clauson and my statement to the newspapers about his untimely passing:

Mrs. CLINTON A. CLAUSON,
Blaine House,
Augusta, Maine:

My heartfelt sympathies to you and the members of your family on the untimely passing of a great American and one of Maine's most beloved citizens. Your grief is shared by all people of Maine. I am grateful for the 20 years of friendship we had.

MARGARET CHASE SMITH.

Following is my statement to the press at the time of the Governor's death:

The death of Governor Clauson is a great loss to the people of Maine. It is a personal loss to me because we have been good friends for 20 years.

In his one year as Governor he not only demonstrated ability and fairness, but he

truly became a chief executive beloved by the people of Maine.

I extend my heartfelt sympathies to our gracious first lady of Maine, Mrs. Clauson, and the members of the family.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I rise to pay my respects to a good man and a good Governor, who has passed on in the service of his people.

Gov. Clinton A. Clauson of Maine loved people, and was loved in turn. He made friends throughout the State because he was willing to listen to their problems, and because he was willing to walk an extra mile to help them find a solution. The men and women Clinton Clauson had befriended responded in 1958 by electing him Governor, to succeed the distinguished junior Senator from Maine, Mr. MUSKIE. And now death has cut short his career of public service.

I know that I express the sentiment of all my colleagues when I extend to his family and to the people of Maine my most sincere condolences.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I join the people of Maine in mourning the loss of an outstanding public servant and a great gentleman. The recent death of Gov. Clint Clauson ended a career of able service to the people of his State. Those who knew him as Governor will miss the vision and the integrity which he brought to his work. Those of us who knew him as a friend will miss his warmth and kindness.

I was with Clint Clauson for the first time last Spring during a trip to his State. It did not take long to see why he was such a leader, and why he was so highly respected by his colleagues of both parties. Mrs. Symington and I could never forget the gracious hospitality extended to us by the Governor and his wife.

It was an honor to know Governor Clauson and to be among his friends, and it is with deep sadness and a sense of loss that my wife and I join in paying tribute to Governor Clauson, and in expressing our deepest sympathy to his wife and family.

INCREASE IN RATES BY ALASKA RAILROAD

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, it is not my desire to come before the Senate every other day to call attention to actions by administration officials and agencies affecting my State which run directly counter to policies proclaimed by the President of the United States. Unhappily, I feel it is my duty again to call such a development to the attention of the Congress.

On Monday my able colleague and I reported that the Federal Maritime Board, all of whose members were appointed by the President of the United States, had just allowed a new 10-percent freight rate increase on shipments to Alaska to go into effect without even hearing the evidence. This followed by but a few hours the appearance of the President of the United States before Congress to tell us in his state of the Union message of the dangers of in-

flation and to urge us that "we must fight inflation as we would a fire that imperils our home."

I regret that with only 1 day intervening it is now my sad duty to report another departure by administration officials from the anti-inflationary policies so repeatedly proclaimed by the President himself. This departure is even more shocking than that which preceded it. In the case of the water freight rate increase, the interests of private carriers were involved. The regulatory agency—so called—went along with them. The new event is more shocking, and less excusable, because it is perpetrated by an administration agency, for an administration agency alone and unaided.

The Alaska Railroad, owned by the Federal Government and administered by the Interior Department, is also raising its rates. No private interests are involved. The railroad has no stockholders. It has no competitors. It is subject to no regulatory agency. It is a part of the administration. Ironically it is part and parcel of the same administration which keeps telling us that we must fight inflation.

The story of this most recent and most unconscionable inflationary action is told in a telegram which I have today dispatched to the Secretary of the Interior. The telegram is as follows:

JANUARY 13, 1960.

HON. FRED A. SEATON,
Secretary of the Interior,
Department of the Interior,
Washington, D.C.:

I have just learned with dismay that the Alaska Railroad apparently either has or is proposing to put into effect an increase in rates which will cost shippers an estimated \$100,000 a year. I learned this from a newspaper account which did not say when the described increase would go into effect. Because of the complete absence of information, or even notification, I am unable even to speculate on whether the reported rate increase is necessary or just.

I think this is the first time that an action by a Federal Government agency seriously affecting a large number of my constituents has been taken since I have been in Congress without the Government officials involved even having the courtesy to notify me. As you know, things would be quite different if the Alaska Railroad were, like all other railroads, subject to Interstate Commerce Commission jurisdiction, which some are urging. It would then, at least, be required that the railroad would have to file public notice in advance when changes in its tariffs were planned.

To me it seems incongruous and shocking that at the very time President Eisenhower is addressing the Congress urging that "we must fight inflation as we would a fire that imperils our home" an agency of his administration is, without consultation of any kind, taking an action which is highly inflationary and doing it presumably with the consent of the Secretary of the Interior appointed by him.

I ask that you move immediately to stop this further attack on the living standards of Alaskans, coming as it does on top of a 10 percent increase in water freight rates to Alaska which the Federal Maritime Board has just permitted to go into effect following a 15 percent increase less than 2 years ago. I urge action by you not only on behalf of the people of Alaska, but also in accordance

with the repeatedly proclaimed policies of the Eisenhower administration against inflation which I assume you embrace and would desire to carry beyond words into action which is meaningful for our fellow-citizens.

ERNEST GRUENING,
U.S. Senator.

Mr. President, I assure you I get no pleasure or satisfaction out of appearing here for the second time in 3 days to call attention to actions by Federal Government agencies which undeniably are inflationary and against the public interest. In discussing just 2 days ago the freight rate increase allowed by the Federal Maritime Board in ocean freight rates I felt compelled to refer to the action as "seaway robbery." Now we have a case of "railway robbery" perpetrated by an executive agency of the very administration which inveighs against everything inflationary.

It is difficult, Mr. President, for the Congress to fight inflation as we would a fire that imperils our home when these executive agencies are so busy piling on more fuel.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AND BALANCED BUDGETS

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, from time to time some persons have been heard to say that those in and out of the administration who are concerned with balancing the budget ought to recognize that national defense is more important than balancing the budget.

If that were the choice, one would be disposed to agree with them, but the choice is not so simple. Our concern must be not only with an adequate national defense but also with a balanced budget, which, in my judgment, can be obtained within the range of the budget statement referred to by the President in his state of the Union address.

We have for this point of view a high precedent, which I should like to quote:

As a very important source of strength and security, cherish public credit. One method of preserving it is to use it as sparingly as possible, avoiding occasions of expense by cultivating peace, but remembering, also, that timely disbursements, to prepare for danger, frequently prevent much greater disbursements to repel it; avoiding likewise the accumulation of debt, not only by shunning occasions of expense, but by vigorous exertions, in time of peace, to discharge the debts which unavoidable wars may have occasioned, not ungenerously throwing upon posterity the burden which we ourselves ought to bear. The execution of these maxims belongs to your representatives, but it is necessary that public opinion should cooperate. To facilitate to them the performance of their duty, it is essential that you should practically bear in mind, that toward the payment of debts there must be revenue; that to have revenue there must be taxes, that no taxes can be devised which are not more or less inconvenient and unpleasant; that the intrinsic embarrassment inseparable from the selection of the proper object (which is always a choice of difficulties), ought to be a decisive motive for a candid construction of the conduct of the government in making it, and for a spirit of acquiescence in the measures for obtaining revenue, which the public exigencies may at any time dictate.

That is an excerpt from the Farewell Address of President Washington. It is still a good standard—paraphrasing President Washington—to which the lovers of liberty may repair. It is well to remember that national defense will indeed crumble under a continuous and too-long-extended unbalanced budget, because a stable and secure nation is one of the pillars of national defense.

Mr. President, I desire to address myself to another subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Moss in the chair). The Senator from Pennsylvania has the floor.

ANTIRELIGIOUS OUTBREAKS EMPHASIZE IMPORTANCE OF CIVIL RIGHTS AND ANTIBOMBING LEGISLATION

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, it is with dismay and revulsion that I read of the current outbreak of anti-Semitic and anti-Catholic agitation. The situation has all the overtones of an international nightmare. The things people normally hold dear are no longer sacred and apparently sane men, women and children are behaving as if they were demented.

These developments call up the ugly memories of the 1930's and 1940's when the specter of Adolf Hitler stalked through Europe, slaughtering, defiling, and destroying. Although the situation today is not nearly so critical as it was 25 years ago, we cannot help but think that if mankind had acted more emphatically in the 1930's, perhaps some of the horrible bloodletting would not have occurred later.

The current outbreak of antireligious activity apparently began with the desecration of a synagogue in Cologne on Christmas Eve and has since spread to many places in Germany and from there to other countries.

This vandalism against religious buildings, both Jewish and Catholic, points up the concern many world leaders have expressed for the past 2 years about other trends in West Germany.

There have been an unprecedented outcropping of anti-Semitic literature, a series of cemetery and synagogue desecrations, smuggling of convicted Nazi offenders to Egypt, and a general softening toward former Nazi officials and toward neo-Nazi youth organizations.

Recently a survey was taken of West German students between the ages of 15 and 17. According to the study, 9 out of every 10 students either knew nothing about nazism or believed that, on the whole, Hitler was good for Germany.

I know that the West German Government is concerned about the recent outbreaks and that it is acting promptly to prosecute the offenders. But I urge that it go even further and undertake an educational campaign. The young people of Germany must understand that the rights of all persons are sacred, that any attack against a minority is an attack against the entire system of free government, and that antireligious and antiracial activity eats away at the very foundation of civilization.

But we who deplore antireligious activity abroad must accept full responsibility for the things which are happening within our own borders.

We must make it clear that our people, our Government, and our courts are on the side of human liberty. There is civil rights legislation before the Congress today which should be enacted.

The administration's seven civil rights proposals, of which I am one of the co-sponsors, should be enacted promptly. I urge the Congress further to enact the bills which would restore title III to the Civil Rights Act and which would make bombings of houses of worship a Federal crime—both of which I have also co-sponsored.

Mr. President, I call attention particularly to the antibombing measure. The vandalism committed against churches is just a step removed from bombings. I venture to say that it is in large part done by the same type of people, but those who might not have ready access to explosives.

We are dealing with people poisoned by hate. Each time they commit one act of violence they are encouraged to try another. We must protect our houses of worship from those demented persons.

Finally, I urge the Postmaster General to examine carefully the material which is being sent through the mails. These hate sheets are stimulating the vandals and the bombers. If we can prevent pornographic material from passing through the mails, we should be able to take similar action against other kinds of filth.

Mr. President, we in the United States have no past history by which we can explain away the things which have happened in the United States in the past 2 weeks. We have no unreconstructed elements which we believe some day will die off. We can make no excuses for swastikas smeared on synagogues, smashed windows in churches, and violent literature which urges our citizens to hate and defile.

We are a people who hold human rights to be sacred. We have a history of advancing the dignity of the individual. We must act promptly and thoroughly under the law to assure all peoples, including ourselves, that we are worthy of the traditions of our forefathers.

SPECIAL PRAYER SERVICES UPON CONVENING OF CONGRESS

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, upon the convening of Congress a number of churches in Washington held special prayer services. In times such as those in which we are living, it is apparent that the eyes of the God-fearing men and women of America are upon the Government of the United States, and frequently on the Congress.

We are also reminded that "unless the Lord build the house he labors in vain who builds it."

I have received a very fine letter from the pastor and assistant pastor of the Bethany Lutheran Church of Omaha, Nebr., concerning a special prayer service upon the opening of Congress. This service was held in Omaha. I ask unani-

mous consent that the letter, together with a copy of the prayer thereto attached, be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

BETHANY LUTHERAN CHURCH,
Omaha, Nebr., January 5, 1960.

The Honorable CARL CURTIS,
Senator, Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR CURTIS: Back here in our good State of Nebraska we are thinking of you this week as a new session of the Congress convenes, and our thoughts are directed as prayers to the throne of God, asking His blessings upon you and your work of representing our good people in the Senate of the United States.

We recognize the tremendous problems that face our country, and thus face you as a Member of our highest legislative body. These many and varied problems in the economic field, in social relationships, and in foreign relations with other countries just cannot be solved by human ingenuity alone. Nor can human wisdom see a way out of the many dilemmas in which our beloved country finds itself. God's help and blessing is needed, and His wisdom must guide and direct us through these difficult days.

We are sure that in these busy and decisive days, you will be helped to know that the prayers of many of your constituents go to God's throne in your behalf. Therefore, we are enclosing a copy of the prayer which we used in our worship services last Sunday, January 3d, remembering particularly also, the beginning of the new Congress in Washington this week.

God bless you in your work and give you strength, health, and courage for your tasks.

Yours in Him,

LLLOYD BEHNKEN,
Pastor.
DAVID LUDWIG,
Assistant Pastor.

Faithful God, Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, humbly we acknowledge our sins and shortcomings of the year now past and ask You to forgive them, for the sake of our Savior who died for them on the cross of Calvary. Be with us to bless and guide us in the year that is ahead. Grant us renewed faith, greater trust, and more abundant love for You and Your work, that this new year may truly be a year of grace in which, through worship and study and service, we draw ever closer to the fires of your love and grow day by day into better Christians, and more devoted disciples. On the pastors and teachers of Your word throughout the world give wisdom and understanding that they may preach Your word with power and teach it in its truth and purity. Bless the missionaries throughout the world who take Your word for us to others, and cheer them in their difficulties and moments of danger. Bestow Your special blessing also upon the students and servicemen of our congregation who have been home for the holiday season, and are now returning to their places of study and duty. Guide them all, absent from us in the service and away at colleges and universities, that they may recognize that the fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom, and that they may feel Your presence always to sustain and bless them. Bless our country and guide our President and his advisers in these trying and difficult days, that we may be led in paths of peace with all nations, and live in the respect and good will of others, through the righteous and upright conduct of our affairs. Give wisdom to Senators CURTIS and HEUSKA and Congressman CUNNINGHAM who represent us in the Congress soon to convene in our Nation's Capitol. Guide their consider-

ation of the economic problems before our land, the social problems that beset us, and the domestic and foreign relationships of our Government. We ask not, O Lord, only for superiority in arms and armor, in scientific advancement, in atomic research, and in space exploration, but for the humility and trust and responsibility to use the wisdom and power which You give in a way that will benefit mankind and honor You and Your will, and help us to live at peace and in security with freedom among all men. Let us all be Christ's men from head to foot in this new year before us, that recognizing the necessity and opportunity of the days in which we live, we may wake up to our call into your service and to the realities of life as You have given it to us. This we ask, O Lord, in the name and for the sake of our Lord and Savior, whom You named Jesus to remind us that He would save us from our sins. Amen.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

FEDERAL ELECTIONS ACT OF 1959

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2436) to revise the Federal election laws, to prevent corrupt practices in Federal elections, and for other purposes.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, on July 23, 1959, as chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, I reported to the Senate from that committee an original bill which was entitled "The Federal Elections Act of 1959." There is a long history behind the culminating fact of the reporting of the bill and its appearance before the Senate for consideration today. I shall not burden the RECORD with too many particulars with respect to the history of the bill, but I wish to emphasize at the outset that what is before the Senate today, together with several amendments which will be offered, is the product of extensive hearings on several bills which have been reported, this being the third since 1955.

I think I can speak with some particular feeling, if not with a great measure of expertness, upon election matters, in view of the fact that I probably have served more time on the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections than any other Member of the Senate, with the possible exception of the distinguished senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], to whom we are paying tribute today. I do not know how long the Senator from Rhode Island served on that subcommittee. I served almost 6 years and then resigned because of my candidacy for reelection in 1956. But I served on that subcommittee from the time I came to the Senate to 1956, a part of the time as chairman of the subcommittee.

During that time we were engaged in many inquiries with respect to Federal elections and, indeed, several contests,

complaints, examinations, and hearings. It was a very busy committee for a number of years, and our work really forced some of us, I feel certain, to the views and conclusions which are embodied in the proposed legislation and the several amendments which are expected to be offered.

The distinguished junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], who succeeded me as chairman of this subcommittee, did yeoman work in connection with the investigations relating to the campaign of 1956, to which I shall refer more specifically later. I wish to compliment him, too, upon his earnest devotion to this work, which is more or less a thankless and certainly not a spectacular job among the many jobs assigned to us who serve on many committees in the Senate.

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

Mr. HENNINGS. I am very happy to yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. I am deeply grateful for the very generous compliment of my able and distinguished friend, the senior Senator from Missouri. The subject matter of the proposed legislation which he has brought before the Senate is a vexatious one, indeed; but it constitutes an area in which the right of the people to control the fate of their government, to give mandate and direction, must be safeguarded, else the power of the pocketbook may exercise an undue influence.

I have serious doubt that the bill as presented by the able Senator's committee is as strong as it should be. During the course of the debate, I shall offer amendments which will seek to strengthen the bill, as indeed, I understand, the chairman of the committee also proposes to do.

Mr. HENNINGS. I propose to offer several amendments. The Senator from Tennessee and I have discussed these matters several times, so many of the amendments will be the result of our composite thought and efforts.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator from Missouri. I shall be laboring by his side, I am sure, in behalf of most of the amendments which he will present, although that may not be true in all cases.

I congratulate the Senator from Missouri upon the long, diligent, sustained study, interest, and effort which he has devoted to this subject. I hope his efforts will be crowned by the enactment of satisfactory legislation.

Mr. HENNINGS. I thank the distinguished Senator from Tennessee for his contribution to the discussion.

It might be observed, as an inevitable corollary, that no one as an individual really takes too kindly or too enthusiastically to regulating himself; and the same thing is true of legislative bodies. The same thing may also be said in regard to bureaus and agencies of the Federal Government and in regard to private and other organizations.

But, Mr. President, at the outset I wish to point out that in the year 1960, in many respects the bill constitutes a great liberalization of the so-called, and certainly misnamed, Corrupt Practices

Act of 1925, because here we are, 35 years later, undertaking to operate and invoke the same rules, procedures, and limitations which were in force back in the year 1925. The bill before us increases by five times the amount which a Senator may spend in connection with his election; and likewise increases by five times the amount which the 1925 act permitted to be spent in connection with the election of Members of the House of Representatives.

Let us bear in mind, too, Mr. President, the change in the value of the dollar. Obviously the amounts provided in the bill were not arbitrarily selected. We had to arrive at some ceiling, some point beyond which we thought election expenses should not go.

But presently the Corrupt Practices Act of 1925 is as obsolete as the brass-bound Ford, and is as unworkable, as unmanageable, and as out of date as most of the other products of that period. Certainly the fiscal limitations which could properly be applied to such elections in 1925 are not at all adequate for application to the elections in the year 1960.

Mr. President, I believe I would be remiss if I did not extend and present my thanks to the distinguished majority leader [Mr. JOHNSON] of Texas and the other members of the policy committee of the majority party for unanimously clearing this bill for Senate floor consideration.

I may say in all candor that on yesterday I indicated to the members of that committee that certain amendments would be offered; and I undertook to suggest what those amendments would be. Nonetheless, the bill was unanimously cleared by the majority policy committee for consideration on the floor.

Mr. President, I also believe it appropriate to thank the ranking minority member of the Committee on Rules and Administration, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], who joined with all the other minority members of the Committee on Rules and Administration in the effort to bring the bill to the floor, for Senate consideration.

So the bill was reported unanimously by the Committee on Rules and Administration, and it has received a unanimous vote by the majority policy committee, for Senate consideration.

Many of us think that it is, indeed, good for the bill to be made the first order of business in this very important election year.

Certainly the bill is not, by its terms, in any respect that I can conceive, partisan in nature; and certainly it is not intended to be such.

The new clean elections bill—as it might be referred to—was adopted by the Committee on Rules and Administration after an exhaustive study in a series of executive sessions. This new legislative project is thus the outcome of thorough examination; and, as I have suggested, it bears the imprint of the spirit of compromise which brought together divergent, and often contrary, views.

In the course of my remarks, Mr. President, I shall point out parts of the bill with which I do not agree, and

which I would like to see amended by the Senate. At this point, however, I wish to emphasize that this unanimously reported bill is a testimonial and an expression of bipartisan recognition that the basic Federal elections statute—the so-called Corrupt Practices Act of 1925—is hopelessly out of date in some of its important aspects, and that in many, many instances, it has been contemptuously and flagrantly avoided, evaded, and disregarded.

As all of us know, under the Constitution, Congress is given extensive powers to regulate Federal elections. The Constitution grants to the States the power to determine the qualifications of electors who vote for congressional candidates, and the manner of appointing presidential and vice-presidential electors. However, Congress is granted the power to regulate the time and manner of electing Senators and Representatives. Congress can also change the places of choosing Representatives. Moreover, Congress is given the exclusive power to judge election returns and the qualifications of its Members. In addition, the "necessary and proper" clause places at the disposal of Congress adequate legislative means to make effective the specific grants in the field of elections.

The Supreme Court of the United States has fully recognized the power of Congress to regulate Federal elections, and especially to pass laws for the control of campaign financing, so as to prevent the corrupt use of money to affect elections. In *Burroughs and Cannon v. U.S.* (290 U.S. 534, 1934), the Court said:

The importance of his [the President's] election and the vital character of its relation to and effect upon the welfare and safety of the whole people cannot be too strongly stated. To say that Congress is without power to pass appropriate legislation to safeguard such an election from the improper use of money to influence the result is to deny to the Nation in a vital particular the power of self-protection. Congress, undoubtedly, possesses that power, as it possesses every other power essential to preserve the departments and institutions of the general government from impairment or destruction, whether threatened by force or by corruption.

In that decision, the Supreme Court of the United States affirmed its earlier pronouncements sustaining the constitutionality of the first comprehensive Federal statute—the Enforcement Act (16 Stat. 44)—so far as it relates to congressional elections. (Ex parte Siebold, 100 U.S. 371 (1880).)

When, in 1894, Congress repealed almost all of the provisions of the Enforcement Act (28 Stat. 36), it was a matter of political decision, not a matter of determining the right or the authority of the Congress so to legislate.

A new period in the history of Federal regulation of national elections began in 1907 when Congress passed the Tillman Act prohibiting national banks and corporations from making contributions in connection with Federal elections (34 Stat. 814). In an amended form which includes labor organizations within the prohibition, as well as expenditures along with contributions, the Tillman

Act appears today as a provision of the Taft-Hartley Act.

I mention this in order to remind Senators that the present bill does not deal with this provision of Taft-Hartley. I know full well that this statute and even the soundness of its underlying principles have been questioned and debated. Nevertheless, the issues raised have not been sufficiently investigated, and it is certainly my confirmed conviction that any legislation touching section 610 would be at this point premature. The administration of this statute by the courts has, up to now, satisfactorily resolved the controversies involved.

In 1910, Congress enacted a comprehensive statute which was the model of the existing Corrupt Practices Act. In subsequent years, the statute of 1910 was amended, and in 1925, the existing law, the so-called Corrupt Practices Act, was passed.

Many years ago when I served in the House of Representatives, it became clear to me, as it certainly did to many others, that the existing election law was completely inadequate and that a thorough revision was absolutely necessary.

As I said, when I first came to the Senate in 1950, we embarked on the so-called Maryland investigation in the first week of my term of office; and from then on the committee of which I was a member was exceedingly active in matters relating to Federal elections.

For several years, I was chairman of this subcommittee which deals with our election laws. My experience in investigations of elections and complaints, as well as in election contests, confirmed my views that we needed a much stronger statute.

Mr. President, with the thought that we need a much stronger and a much more realistic elections law, on January 21, 1955, together with other Senators, I introduced the first of a series of so-called elections bills. At that time the urgency of the need for a new Federal elections act was not widely recognized.

However, hearings were held from April 12 to May 18, 1955, on that bill by the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections. The hearings were lengthy, and, I may say, among other witnesses, the then chairman of the Republican National Committee and the then chairman of the Democratic National Committee appeared and testified. After these hearings, it seemed fully demonstrated that there were great deficiencies in the existing law. Those hearings included virtually anyone who had anything to say upon this subject.

It was a matter of great satisfaction to me when, subsequently, on June 22, 1955, the full Committee on Rules and Administration acted on the recommendations of the subcommittee to report the bill to the Senate. It was disappointing, however, that in its action, the committee split along party lines.

I think many of us have now come to believe that questions of revising Federal election laws should lie outside the area of partisan politics, as that phrase is generally understood.

Yet my disappointment did not end there. It was disheartening that the Senate, as a body, never acted on the bill. The sense of urgency was obviously lacking. There was no keen realization of the dangers inherent in election laws inadequate for the existence and development of democratic institutions in this country.

Gradually things have changed for the better. The press has done a great deal to call attention to the various weaknesses of our election laws, as have political scientists, leaders of various groups, and others who have taken the interest citizens should take in their Government, and especially in this vital, and indeed critical area, of regulation, in order that democracy may be fulfilled at the very fount from which springs the power of the people in this country, and that is in the elections of those who are to represent them and who occupy places of trust and confidence in our system of government.

There were also two special investigations by the Senate. I refer to the hearings held by the Special Committee To Investigate Political Activities, Lobbying and Campaign Contributions in the fall of 1956; and to the hearings and statistical study conducted by the Senate Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections at the same time. The findings and recommendations of those committees were contained in the final report of the special committee and the report of the subcommittee, entitled "1956 General Election Campaigns."

These reports supplied valuable, though to some extent cumulative, information, but they certainly helped to alert and to form public opinion and to advise Congress on the desirability of a revision—and a speedy revision—of our antiquated, outmoded, archaic Federal election laws.

It was in this atmosphere of public interest that on May 23, 1957, I introduced another clean elections bill. The Committee on Rules and Administration, under my chairmanship, spent several weeks considering that bill.

The final action of the committee indicated that times had changed. Unlike the 1955 bill, the bill of 1957 was reported by a large bipartisan majority of seven against an equally bipartisan vote of two. It was thus demonstrated that, whatever our philosophy of government and legislative position, in matters of election law we were beginning to reach a common understanding as to the desirable shape of the new statute. The preponderant bipartisan support certainly indicated that the flagrant inadequacies of the existing law had become a matter of general recognition. The progress we made was indeed remarkable. I think we may all take satisfaction in the progress which was made.

However, in 1957 the first result was no different. Some of us believed that we should stay with this problem and that it should not be allowed to continue to gather dust and have nothing done about it. So we have before us today this new bill, reported with such unanimity by two agencies of this body.

Mr. President, the existing law rests upon the idea that the integrity of the election process can be safeguarded by keeping political contributions and expenditures within certain prescribed limitations, and, further, by requiring a disclosure of data involving the financing of political campaigns.

These are the basic principles of elections legislation. The new bill has imbedded in it, certainly, these tenets as its basic philosophy.

But the limitations imposed by the Corrupt Practices Act are hopelessly out of step with the rise in prices and cost of services, especially if we consider the cost of broadcasting and the ever-increasing importance of radio and television in political campaigns. Those instrumentalities were not factors in 1925, when the law under which we are now supposed to be operating was enacted. Certainly, the economic changes of the last decades have unhinged the entire scheme of limitations prescribed by existing law enacted 35 years ago, in 1925. It is indeed almost impossible to wage an adequate political campaign within the ceilings permissible under the existing law.

The present system, in view of the factors I have undertaken to outline, is hypocritical in the extreme, from beginning to end.

In pointing out some inadequacies, I do not wish to convey the idea that I consider money used in political campaigns a wicked and undesirable thing in itself.

We all know that the figures with regard to funds used in the elections have reached astronomical proportions in the great elections of today. These do not especially concern or disturb us. As elsewhere in public affairs, our concern is with secrecy and inadequacy of disclosure. When the light of publicity fails to illuminate all these happenings, about which the public has a right to know, there will always be some suspicion of corruption, even though there may be in fact none. There is always the danger that even an unjustified suspicion may tend to corrode the trust of the people in their representatives in government.

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

Mr. HENNINGS. I am glad to yield to my able friend the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. I concur in the sentiments expressed by the able Senator from Missouri. Does the Senator not think there is also a danger that by an undue weight of the pocketbook, an undue influence of money—particularly in regard to the use of mass media—the true will of the people, if truly ascertained, would be thwarted.

Mr. HENNINGS. Not only do I agree with that statement, but I also wish to say that there have been several elections cases, as the Senator well knows, in regard to which the Senate itself has determined excessive expenditures did influence the elections.

I know the Senator is a student of the precedents in regard to elections and recalls the cases to which I refer, without

mentioning the names of the men who were elected to the Senate, who are now gone. We know that in at least one campaign it was found by the Senate that the excessive use of money did influence the election and that in fact the election was bought. That person was not seated as a result of the finding by the Senate.

Mr. GORE. The junior Senator from Tennessee is aware of those cases.

Is the situation not more dangerous now, with the greater facility for influencing public opinion? Is there not greater danger that money may unduly influence elections and thereby thwart a genuine popular will?

Mr. HENNINGS. In reply to my friend, the Senator from Tennessee, I wish to say, briefly, we know that science has made great progress in the media by which the messages of the parties and the candidates may be conveyed to the public. I speak, of course, of television and radio. I do not intend to exclude the ingenious devices of advertising for promulgating the sale of products by the clever and adroit use of words and pictures, by the creation of desires in people who perhaps have not thought they needed some of the things advertised, and probably do not know what to do with them when they get them, except to have a hard time meeting the payments on them.

We know there has developed in this country since 1925 a very large group of ladies and gentlemen who are known as members of the profession of advertising, which is, indeed, a legitimate American enterprise. They have had to be controlled and stepped upon occasionally by the FTC and other regulatory bodies, because of the manner in which they have represented the advertised products or ideas to the public.

We know there have been many who have devoted considerable time since 1925, and theretofore, perhaps, to various techniques of persuasion and influence.

On the other hand, I would not like to suggest that I believe there is any diminution in the ability of the American citizen to think for himself. I do not despair of the elective process simply because of the invocation of the techniques which have been suggested by the Senator from Tennessee. I think it does raise, seriously, the question of one candidate having adequate money and the other candidate having relatively little, and the question to what extent the latter candidate is able to project himself, his principles and his views, to the people to whom he is offering himself as a candidate, as compared to the man of unlimited means.

We know from history that in the old days in this country there were no restrictions whatsoever upon campaign expenditures. It was not until 1870 that some legislation on this subject was enacted. That legislation dealt with bribery, among other things. There was no registration of voters in the old days. There were very primitive practices at polling places. Somehow or other the Republic has survived and burgeoned in spite of these many things. I attribute that fact to the essential strength of the

great republican form of government which we have in this democracy.

Sometimes we do pay a price for freedom. We believe in freedom of speech. We believe that the press should be able to print the advertisements of candidates. We believe that billboards should display their messages, and that television and radio should carry them. Within the limitations of fair comment, provided a candidate does not transgress the injunctions against libel, we allow very free and frank and candid discussion. I am all for that; and I do not for one minute wish to suggest that in the presentation of a candidate's case, either by himself or by others, any candidate should be any more severely restricted than he has been in the past, except to say that the weight of the moneybags should not be preponderant in determining the course of elections, especially when disclosure of the sources of the funds is not made.

From time to time there have been suggestions that there be no limitations at all upon campaign expenditures, but that full publicity be given to them. I would not say that my mind is closed to such a suggestion. However, some of us thought, at the beginning of a revision of the Corrupt Practices Act of 1925, that we should try to arrive at some reasonably realistic basis for campaign expenditures, within which a candidate could campaign, within which he could be honest when he reports, within which there would not be under-the-table, undercover money, within which, as one of the amendments I propose to offer will suggest, there could not be 100, 200, or 300 committees set up in a given State in order to avoid and evade what I think is one of the primary purposes of the act. The purpose is to avoid a proliferation or multiplicity of committees set up for the purpose of receiving funds to avoid the limitation upon campaign contributions.

When we get down to the essential basis, what we are trying to do is to help everyone be a little more forthright, considerably more realistic, and certainly less hypocritical when it comes to the business of campaigning. In my own experience, if I may be forgiven one illustration, I have run in six primaries. I have been nominated six times and elected six times, three times to the House, once as a district attorney of my State, and twice to the Senate. I know a little about what goes on in campaigns in a State of almost 5 million people. I have served on campaign finance committees, as have many other Senators. We have served on campaign committees for our friends. We have spent a great deal of our time in being reelected, and we have given of our time and efforts to others in the course of our lives.

We know that, by and large, the 1925 provisions in practice are not observed in spirit, even if they are in letter. There is no use in our trying to indulge in any pretension that people are living within the 1925 dollar value, in the light of 1960 campaign costs, any more than we live within the 1925 dollar in terms of anything else. But that is only one point I should like to mention at this

stage of the preliminary discussion of the bill.

I do not know whether I have answered the question of the distinguished Senator from Tennessee. I took a long time to do it. I did not intend to take so long.

Mr. GORE. The Senator has answered fully.

Mr. HENNINGS. As the Senator knows, this is one of those things which do not lend themselves especially to simplicity, unless great effort is made to be simple. That is what I am trying to do.

Many sections of the bill require reading, rereading, and close study. However, I have undertaken to outline the broad and basic philosophy of the bill.

As I have said before against the background of existing law, the new elections bill represents vast improvement. It puts an end to the pretense that election campaigns can be run within the ceilings of permissible expenditures established 35 years ago in a vastly different economic situation.

The existing law permits a candidate for Senator to spend \$10,000 and a candidate for Representative \$2,500.

Imagine that. I do not know what the population of the State of Maine is. I should say that the State of the distinguished occupant of the chair has a population of approximately 600,000. Some of us come from States with little larger populations. My State happens to have a population of nearly 5 million. A candidate could not begin to campaign in the city of St. Louis for that amount if he had one committee and spent only \$10,000 in a campaign for the Senate, much less a candidate for the House of Representatives campaigning for \$2,500.

We have seen some of the statements filed under the present Corrupt Practices Act, showing that candidate A or candidate B says he spent \$22 to be nominated and \$85 to be elected. That is the sort of thing that the proposed legislation is designed to stop, by making contributions public, putting people on notice as to who makes the campaign contributions, when they are made, and in what amounts.

I suppose there are some very good citizens who might contribute \$5,000 to a candidate and expect nothing whatsoever in return for it. There are a number of citizens who have contributed \$5,000, more or less, and who have been exceedingly disappointed when they found they were not getting anything in return for it.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator yield to me?

Mr. HENNINGS. I am very glad to yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. KEATING. Is not the distinguished Senator from Missouri aware of the fact that frequently an equal amount is contributed to both candidates for the same office, in order—

Mr. HENNINGS. Indeed.

Mr. KEATING. In order that there may be, particularly in a close election, no doubt afterward?

Mr. HENNINGS. The Senator is exactly right. He has been in many campaigns. Some of us know from experience that the president of a company

might make a contribution to a candidate—for example, perhaps to my opponent—and the vice president would make a contribution to me. What some of them expect, we do not know, but I believe it is only consistent with human nature to face the fact that not a great many people give enormous amounts to individual candidates without expecting some personal benefit from making such a contribution, or, indeed, expecting some benefit from having given to the party in the majority in the Senate or in the House, or, indeed, in the White House. By that I do not mean merely for the promotion of good government. I mean other and sometimes sinister things.

The Senator from New York was not in the Chamber earlier when I undertook to compliment him as one of those who had worked with us on the bill and had helped us to submit a unanimous report on it, and who has associated himself with me, or I with him, in the offering of at least one amendment.

Mr. KEATING. I appreciate those remarks. If the Senator will yield further, his view is somewhat similar to mine, that it is very necessary to legislate in this field. I am happy that the bill has been brought before the Senate, and I shall support it. In certain respects, however, I believe it could be improved, as does the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. HENNINGS. I appreciate my friend's remarks. I think we agree that, in the ultimate, it is better to have this bill than no bill at all, and to bring us at least somewhere past the mid-20th century. Some of us hope for considerable and substantial improvement in the bill, and will offer amendments representative of our views.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield once again?

Mr. HENNINGS. I am very glad to yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. The able Senator from Missouri has referred to the investigation which a subcommittee under my chairmanship conducted into campaign expenditures and contributions in the 1956 election. The findings which that investigation disclosed dramatically demonstrated that some of the influences which the late Senator Taft in his statement made public recently said brought about his defeat for the presidential nomination, materially brought about the election of President Eisenhower in 1952.

I shall, in the course of the debate on the pending bill give some details which I believe will prove interesting in that regard.

Mr. HENNINGS. I might say that the Senator from Tennessee sent out a number of questionnaires during the 1956 campaign to all the candidates in that election. The replies buttressed and supported us in our belief as to what really goes on behind the scenes when an important Federal election is taking place.

Mr. GORE. The Senator will recall that for the first time in the history of the country we cataloged in black and

white \$33 million—who contributed it, who received it, and what was done with it.

Mr. HENNINGS. The Senator is exactly correct. We have those records, and the figure of \$33 million was cataloged, as the Senator says, and, under his supervision, was illuminated in all particulars.

Along with these \$10,000 and \$2,500 limitations the existing law provides also a formula under which congressional candidates may spend an amount obtained by multiplying 3 cents by the total number of votes cast in the last general election for all candidates for office which the candidate seeks. This formula, however, is subject to an overriding overall ceiling which limits a candidate for Senator to \$25,000 and a candidate for Representative to \$5,000.

Under the new bill, the ceiling is raised to \$50,000 for a candidate for Senator and to \$12,500 for a candidate for Representative. Under the alternative formula of the bill, the ceilings are ascertained by multiplying 20 cents by the first million of votes cast in the last election, or persons registered to vote in the present election for that particular office, and by multiplying 10 cents by such votes or registered voters in excess of 1 million. Furthermore, the ceilings of the existing law are subject to the ceiling provisions of State statutes, whereas, under the new bill, the Federal ceilings are controlling.

Similarly, the new bill provides for an increase of maximum contributions to, and expenditures by, interstate political committees. Under the existing law, political committees are not permitted to receive contributions in excess of \$3 million, and the same ceiling applies to expenditures. As against this, the bill under consideration, the elections bill of 1959, establishes ceilings limited by the amount obtained by multiplying 20 cents by the highest number of voters casting votes for all candidates for the office of presidential elector in any one of the last three elections for that office. Judging by the available figures, the amount of political contributions and expenditures under the bill would be about \$12,500,000.

As I have said, the reporting provisions, dealing with the publicity to be given to contributions and expenditures, are exceedingly important.

Under the existing law, political committees and candidates for Representative file a report with the Clerk of the House, and senatorial candidates with the Secretary of the Senate. Under the new bill, the originals of all reports are to be filed with the Clerk of the House and copies of reports of senatorial candidates and political committees supporting candidates for President, Vice President, and Senator are to be filed with the Secretary of the Senate. Furthermore, under the new bill, copies of all reports are to be filed with the clerks of the U.S. district courts or authorized State officials.

The reason for the latter provision cannot be overemphasized. We all agreed on it.

Under the existing law, the reports are not readily available to the people of the States and congressional districts. By contrast, there is being established, under the new bill, the dissemination of reports on the local level where the election is being held, which would lead to a wide dissemination of information on the financial transactions of candidates and political committees, so that people locally may have access to these reports in the clerk's office or from State officials authorized by State law to keep such records.

Another provision of the new elections bill requires that every candidate must make—and I quote from the bill—

Every reasonable effort to ascertain what political committees, or other committees, associations, or organizations of the State or district are supporting him by publication of advertisements in newspapers or other periodicals, by publication of pamphlets or circulars, by providing printed material, by radio or television broadcasting or by providing billboards or posters.

The bill further requires the candidate list such committees or organizations with the names and addresses of their officers. It provides that such listing shall not be construed as a ratification on the part of the reporting candidate. It gives him the opportunity to repudiate in his report any of the committees or organizations listed.

He does not have to say that he approves of the support of any organization, but he is given the opportunity to repudiate, in his report, any of the committees or organizations listed. He may candidly say, "I do not want the support of this, that, or the other group," even though he may be getting it. That would largely happen, of course, if he felt either that the support was from a source of which he did not approve or that the support was more of a burden than an aid.

The disclosure value of these provisions speaks for itself. I wish only to point out that these listing requirements cover intrastate as well as interstate committees.

Equally important for safeguarding the public knowledge in matters of campaign financing is the increase of time during which reports should be preserved. The existing law requires that recipients of reports should preserve them for a period of 2 years, and political committees should preserve the supporting data of their reports for a period of at least 2 years.

Under the new bill, those who receive reports—that is, U.S. district courts and other such public officials—will preserve them for a period of 6 years, and those who file reports are charged with the duty to preserve them for a period of 1 year.

Also helpful is the reduction in the number of reports by political committees. The existing law requires four reports annually in off-election years. Two additional pre-election reports are required in election years. By contrast, the new elections bill requires only semi-annual reports in off-election years which are due on June 30 and December 31. In election years, the bill requires

one pre-election report as of the 10th day next preceding the date of election and one post election report due on the 30th day following the election.

Mr. President, the importance of election law cannot be sufficiently emphasized. The elective process is the very source of our national life, the controlling force of our society. It is my strong conviction that we cannot afford to be negligent in matters which go to the foundations of our American democracy. Election reform is urgently needed and it will have to come. Therefore, I urge that the Senate approve the Elections Act of 1959, with certain amendments to be offered later.

The amendments which I intend to offer cover primaries, intrastate committees, an overall limitation on contributions, and the reporting of direct expenditures.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, is the Senator from Missouri finished?

Mr. HENNINGS. I was about to begin to offer amendments. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. No. When the Senator from Missouri is through with his presentation, I desire to make a brief general statement on the bill. Since the Senator wishes to proceed, I shall wait.

Mr. HENNINGS. I do not want to preclude the Senator from Nebraska, who has been so cooperative in the Committee on Rules and Administration, from making any statement he wishes to present.

Mr. CURTIS. Was the Senator about to offer amendments?

Mr. HENNINGS. I have amendments which I had hoped might be taken up at this time. Has the Senator from Nebraska any amendments to offer?

Mr. CURTIS. No; I have no amendments.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, at this time I yield to the distinguished Senator from Nebraska, with the understanding that, by unanimous consent, I do not lose the floor.

Mr. CURTIS. I thank the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration for his courtesy, not only today, but also throughout the consideration of this measure in committee.

I wish to preface my remarks by paying tribute to another member of the committee, the distinguished senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], about whom many kind words have been spoken today. It has been my pleasure to serve with him on the committee. I hope he will have many fine days ahead. It will be a pleasure to have him here for the remainder of this year.

Mr. President, clean and honest elections are an objective of all. There is no dispute concerning the desirability of improving our elections and obtaining the widest possible citizen participation.

There is a difference of opinion on the methods and procedures for obtaining the desired objective. There is a difference of opinion wherein the responsibility should be lodged for the policing of political campaigns, including the financing thereof.

Problems are not necessarily solved by placing them in the hands of the Federal Government and, thus, removing them farther from the electorate. An addition to the Federal bureaucracy for any laudable purpose is not, per se, a solution to a problem. Individual citizens, local communities, and the sovereign States have a basic responsibility. There is no State in the Union which cannot have honest elections, including the complete and honest reporting of campaign expenditures, if a majority of the citizens of that State so desire.

Candidates for the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives are required, under existing law, to file a statement of their contributions and expenditures. That requirement is continued in S. 2436. Under existing law, only those committees which operate in two or more States, or are a branch or subsidiary of a national committee, are required to file a Federal report. S. 2436 continues with the same definition of a committee.

The Committee on Rules and Administration was faced with a considerable divergence of opinion about extending the Federal reporting requirement to intrastate committees. I think it would be a great mistake to do this. As a compromise, in the committee we agreed on the following language:

It shall be the duty of every candidate to make every reasonable effort to ascertain what political committees or other committees, associations, or organizations in his State or district are supporting his candidacy by means of (1) publication of advertisements in newspapers or other periodicals, (2) publication of pamphlets or circulars, (3) providing printed material, (4) radio or television broadcasting, or (5) providing billboards or posters.

The candidate shall enclose with the reports required to be filed a list of names of all such committees, associations, or organizations, together with the names and addresses of their chairmen and treasurers. Such lists shall be cumulative.

The listing of committees, associations, and other organizations and their officers shall not be construed as a ratification by the candidate of any action by them and the candidate may, at his option, note in any such report a repudiation of the support of any such committee, association, or other organization.

This section should not add any undue burden to the candidate, because it refers to committees engaged in activities in connection with which the present law provides that someone must take responsibility for such acts.

The committee was in disagreement as to whether the Federal reporting requirements should be extended to primary elections. The committee decided not to include primaries, and I concur in that decision.

The law prohibits political expenditures on the part of corporations, national banks, and labor unions. There are widespread abuses, particularly in reference to enforcement of this provision as it relates to labor unions. It suffers from poor administration and poor enforcement.

These provisions of law should be enforced, not as antilabor or anticorporation activities, but because we favor in-

dividual rights. No stockholder should have his money spent without his consent in a political cause in which he does not believe. No laboring man or woman should be compelled to give financial aid directly or indirectly to candidates or to a political party not of his or her choice. But this is happening today. Some of our wage earners are compelled to support candidates and parties in order to hold their jobs even though they may be in total disagreement with the political principles which they must support. Some courts, as well as enforcing officers, have bowed to the great power of unions and have turned their backs on individual rights in this field. They should take a new look at the existing statute, and should interpret it in the light of the principle that an individual's right to choose whom he shall support politically is a basic American right, and should be totally free from coercion or compulsion.

In many of the States of the Union, compulsory union membership is permitted under the law. This means that an individual must stay in the union and must pay his dues or else he will lose his job. Most certainly in those cases, such an organization, with its power of compulsory membership, should not be engaged in politics. To do so is to trespass upon one of the most sacred rights that an individual has—namely, the right of choice in political matters.

If this bill is to be opened up for amendment, this problem should be dealt with. Among other things, the definition of "contribution" and the definition of "expenditure" should include "provision of paid manpower and paid personal services other than bona fide volunteers." We should also provide that if any union hereafter obtains a contract which calls for compulsory membership, the union shall take no part, directly or indirectly, in politics, because it is no longer a voluntary association.

Senate bill 2436 does raise the limit on the amount of money which can lawfully be spent by a candidate or a political party. This is commendable. Existing laws is antiquated in this regard. Present day campaigning, with the addition of television, is very expensive; and the limits on spending set forth in existing law are far too low. They are conducive to the use of a multiplicity of committees and a lack of centralization and responsibility in election spending.

Mr. President, the measure now before us is a compromise. It contains some good provisions, principally those in regard to raising the limits to practical amounts.

I suggest that the bill be passed without amendment.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MUSKIE in the chair). Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. I wish to commend the ranking minority member of the Committee on Rules and Administration for the statement he has made. He has

stated what I understand to be the provisions of the pending bill. It is not a bill which suits everyone; but it is a compromise—the best we could work out.

I am sure the Senator from Nebraska feels as I do, namely, that the antiquated statute now on the books should at this time be brought up to date to the extent that we can do so by means of agreement here in the Senate.

If attempts are now made to add to the bill provisions not now in the existing law, perhaps a bill on this subject will be passed, but perhaps it will not be passed. Therefore, I shall oppose any such attempts; and I assume that the distinguished Senator from Nebraska feels the same way that I do about that matter.

Mr. CURTIS. I do; and I thank the distinguished Senator from Arizona for his statement.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, again I wish to extend my thanks and my appreciation to the ranking minority member of the Committee on Rules and Administration, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], not only for his cooperation throughout the course of the committee's work on this measure, but also for the statement he has just concluded in this Chamber.

I have already paid my tribute to the distinguished President pro tempore of the Senate, the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], who has been a very great help in enabling us to get this measure out of committee.

However, Mr. President, I am constrained to say that I believe some strengthening amendments should be adopted.

I am advised by the junior Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] that he proposes to join me in regard to one amendment—that relating to political activities in primary elections; and I believe that there may be other amendments on which other Senators may reach agreement.

But I am thoroughly in agreement with my friend, the President pro tempore of the Senate [Mr. HAYDEN], who has worked so diligently on this committee, of which he has been chairman, and also on the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections, when he says that the passage of some bill on this subject is certainly better than the failure to pass any such bill.

However, Mr. President, I do not believe we are faced with the prospect of failure to pass such a bill, or else I would not undertake to hazard the offering of amendments. I believe that some amendments at least will improve the measure as reported. It was reported because of the desire of all of us to bring to the floor of the Senate a measure for consideration and for ultimate passage.

At this time I am very glad to yield to the distinguished junior Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING].

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, today we are presented with a historic opportunity to bring up to date the clearly outmoded provisions of the Federal election law. Enactment of Senate bill 2436, with appropriate amendment, will go a long way toward making fairer and

more effective the election of Federal officeholders. I hope we do not let this chance escape us.

Anyone who has studied the provisions and the practical application of the Corrupt Practices Act recognizes that it has serious shortcomings. Many are attributable to the simple fact that the statute was enacted in 1925, and has not been amended since then.

In the interim the value of the dollar has declined sharply; the national population has increased greatly; and the use of television, air travel, and other developments has mushroomed the cost of political campaigning. It is high time that we modernized these obsolete provisions of the act.

My basic philosophy with regard to measures regulating the election of Federal officials can be rather simply stated. It is my conviction that public disclosure of activities connected with the nomination and election of Federal officeholders is a basic part of the public's right to know about the operations of their Government. Such reporting will help prevent improper use of funds to influence elections and will raise the national level of campaigning. I believe that there are dangers inherent in the undisclosed and unregulated use of money in political campaigns, which may lead to temptations for corruption and chicanery.

I am sure we all agree that realistic limitations on campaign spending and contributions are necessary. None of us wants elections controlled by large expenditures from a few individuals or organizations. Such domination is clearly contrary to the basic concepts of our democratic system.

Starting from these basic premises, it is my position that limitations on campaign contributions and expenditures, combined with public disclosure of such matters—public disclosure is so important—offers the best antidote to possible misuse of such funds and to spoliation of the electoral process.

S. 2436 reflects this philosophy in large part and is therefore, in my judgment, a commendable step in the right direction. I do not believe for an instant that this measure, or any other measure, even if we amend it as I feel we ought to, contains all the answers. Unscrupulous people will still seek out loopholes and will exploit weaknesses in the law, and we must be ever vigilant to correct those shortcomings as they appear.

Nevertheless, passage of this bill will make the task of the dishonest a great deal harder and can improve substantially the Federal election process. I therefore support it strongly and urge its adoption, with at least one amendment which I shall discuss in a moment.

I am mindful of the fact that the passage of any legislation in this field is extremely difficult. As I have noted, no changes have been made in the Corrupt Practices Act since it became law in 1925. It is true that language was included in the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947 relating to elections, but that was, as we all know, in a rather limited field.

It is therefore significant that the bill before us was reported unanimously by the Senate Rules and Administration Committee, and I join the Chairman's commendation of the members of this committee, on both sides, for that action. As a member of that committee, I supported this proposal because I felt it was headed in the right direction and because I felt confident to a considerable degree that improving amendments could be added on the floor of the Senate. I shall deal with these changes later on.

Whenever legislation in this field is discussed, the question of the constitutionality of such actions is brought up—and perfectly properly so. My study of this aspect convinces me that there are firm constitutional foundations for congressional statutes relating to Federal elections.

The principle of checks and balances restricts both the States and the Federal Government in this field. Broadly speaking, the States exercise jurisdiction over the qualifications of voters, the manner of appointing presidential and vice-presidential electors, and the times, places, and method of elections for Members of the House and Senate.

The Federal Government, under the Constitution, is given the power to change such laws, with the exception that Congress does not have the power to change the places of choosing Senators. Congress clearly has the responsibility to judge elections, returns, and qualifications of Members of both bodies, and McCulloch against Maryland establishes the principle that the "necessary and proper" clause of the Constitution permits Congress to utilize its legislative function to put into effect specifically granted powers.

Congress thus has a rather wide field in which to legislate with regard to Federal elections, and while I am sympathetic to those who are concerned about the rights of States in this matter, I do feel it is incumbent upon Congress to lay down certain regulations and guidelines.

The specific provisions of the bill before us today will go a long way toward eliminating many of the bad practices which have arisen under the outmoded Corrupt Practices Act of 1925.

First, the bill significantly broadens the scope of the reports required of candidates and political committees. The number of off-election year reports is reduced from four to two, annually. In election years, instead of the two additional pre-election reports, S. 2346 requires one before the election and one after. There are also various streamlining changes with regard to who must file reports, and a 3-day period of grace is provided for the filing date.

The bill, secondly, expands the dissemination of data on campaign spending with the requirement that copies of reports be filed on the local level. Under the existing law, political committees and candidates file with the Clerk of the House or with the Secretary of the Senate, as the case may be. Under provisions of this bill, the originals of all reports are filed with the Clerk of the

House and copies of reports by candidates for the Senate and political committees supporting nominees for President, Vice President, and Senator are to be filed with the Secretary of the Senate. In addition, copies of all reports are to be filed with the clerks of the appropriate U.S. district courts—in other words, in the district of residence of the candidate or the district where the principal office of a political committee is located, if it is a political committee that is doing the filing. In States where some State official is authorized to perform such duties, the bill requires that the copy be filed with that State officer.

The net effect of this aspect of the bill is to increase the opportunities for the public to know the facts about local campaigns in the areas where the campaigns took place.

The third major part of this bill raises the ceilings on contributions and expenditures to more realistic levels. These provisions will permit more effective campaigning and presentation of issues without the need to resort to devious means of financing.

S. 2436 raises substantially the ceiling on expenditures for congressional candidates. Under the present law the limit is \$10,000 for the Senate and \$2,500 for the House. This bill raises the ceiling to \$50,000 for a Senator and \$12,500 for a Representative.

S. 2436 also changes the alternate formula for campaign spending. The existing law permits an amount to be determined by multiplying 3 cents by the total number of votes cast at the last general election for the office which the particular candidate seeks. This sum is not to exceed \$25,000 for candidates for the Senate and \$5,000 for candidates for Representative or Resident Commissioner under the present law.

Under the alternate formula of the bill before us, a candidate may spend an amount equal to the higher of two formulas. One is found by multiplying 20 cents by the total number—not in excess of one million—votes cast in the last general election for that office, plus the amount obtained by multiplying 10 cents by the total number of such votes in excess of one million. That is one of the alternatives. The second amount is determined by multiplying 20 cents by the total number—not in excess of one million—of persons registered to vote in the general election for the office the candidate seeks, plus the amount obtained by multiplying 10 cents by the total number of persons in excess of one million. One has a choice as to which formula one wishes to employ in arriving at the ceiling for his campaign. There is no maximum set by this method in the bill.

I might also point out that this bill does not cancel out, and does not exempt, any candidate from complying with pertinent State laws, unless those laws are directly inconsistent with the Federal statute. This measure also clarifies the relation between Federal and State ceilings and makes clear that the Federal limitation is paramount.

S. 2436 also deals with the problem of maximum contributions to and expend-

itures by interstate political committees. The present law provides a flat ceiling of \$3 million for expenditures by a political committee in any calendar year. Such a limit is no longer realistic, as I have previously pointed out.

This bill substitutes for a definite ceiling a formula for political committees operating in two or more States. Under this formula, the ceiling is determined by multiplying 20 cents "by the highest number of voters casting votes for all candidates for the office of presidential elector in any one of the last three elections for that office."

Mr. President, in broad outline these are the major provisions of the pending bill. I realize they are not perfect and that they do not provide answers to all the problems in this extremely complex field. I do contend they are far more realistic than the provisions of the present law and that they deserve our wholehearted support as steps in the right direction.

Enactment of this measure will mark, it seems to me, significant progress along the road to a modern and workable elections statute which will be fair to all concerned and which will make possible the fullest and frankest presentation of the issues to the American electorate by candidates for Federal office. I trust it will gain the wide support in this Chamber it so richly deserves.

Mr. President, in commending the bill to the favorable consideration of my colleagues, as I said before, I feel that at least one amendment is distinctly necessary. It is an amendment which I offered last August. It is printed and is on the desks of the various Members of the Senate.

Mr. President, the bill as a whole is laudable and is worthy of support. I shall support it, whatever may happen in the amendment stage, but it does seem to me that the bill is seriously deficient in that it expressly excludes from its purview primary elections and conventions and caucuses where political candidates are nominated. This is not a fatal flaw, but it is a near-fatal flaw which should be eliminated by amendment.

It is a well-known fact that in roughly one-third of our States today success in a primary is tantamount to election. In these States, obviously, the choosing of candidates is the only thing that counts, and to permit such selections to proceed without the same Federal regulations which govern elections in other States is both unjust and unfair.

If we are going to pass limitations on the conduct of Federal elections, let us not do a halfway job. In my view, it would be folly to pass this bill without including within its coverage general, special, or primary elections, including preferential primaries, and conventions or caucuses of political parties which are held to nominate candidates. That is just what this amendment would do.

Mr. President, I understand the amendment is about to be offered by my distinguished chairman, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNING]. I join him in offering it, if his amendment is the one we shall act upon.

Mr. HENNING. Mr. President, will the Senator allow me to intervene at that point?

Mr. KEATING. I should be happy to.

Mr. HENNING. I simply wanted to reassure the Senator, as I did in the committee. The Senator will recall that I offered such an amendment in the committee, and it was voted down.

Mr. KEATING. By a very close vote.

Mr. HENNING. The Senator from New York supported the amendment. The amendment was voted down, I think, by a margin of one. At any rate, I expect to have a few words to say upon the amendment.

When the Senator from New York concludes, I propose to offer the amendment. As I understand the situation, it is proposed that before we have further debate, and certainly before we have a vote on the amendment—and we expect to ask for the yeas and nays—there may be some other subject matters dealt with by other Senators who desire to speak this evening, so that tomorrow the amendment will be the pending business, and we hope we can proceed with consideration of it.

Mr. KEATING. I will say to my chairman, the distinguished Senator from Missouri, I hope we shall be able to convince the Members of the Senate of the merit of the amendment. I am happy to join with my colleague in offering the amendment.

Mr. HENNING. I am very glad to have the strong right arm of the distinguished Senator from New York, who is one who advocates the amendment. I would not undertake to describe the amendment as being absolutely essential to the bettering of conditions by the bill of 1959, compared to that of 1925, but certainly, as the Senator suggested, this is most eminently desirable. We should face up to the entire elective process, which some of us believe includes primaries as well as general elections. We know that the selection of a candidate in a primary precedes the election of a candidate in the general election. All of this is part of the broad and general process of election.

Mr. KEATING. Yes.

Mr. HENNING. For that reason some of us feel very strongly that to fail to acquire a provision relating to primaries would be a grievous mistake, and one which the Senate would have occasion to regret in the future. We know opportunities do not come to us very often to deal with proposed legislation affecting the manner and means by which Members of this body and other collateral and related bodies are elected. This may be the last chance for a long time to do anything about this matter. I hope we can embrace it and face up to it and recognize the ultimate and pervasive importance of it, as the Senator so well suggested.

Mr. KEATING. I appreciate those remarks, Mr. President. I wish to make it very clear, lest it be misunderstood, that my position with respect to this is no way intended to impute that there are irregularities in those areas where nomination means election. It is simply

based on a deep belief that our democratic system of elections functions best when the people are privy to all the facts and on the idea that when information is unnecessarily kept from the electorate there is cause for concern. Our system functions best when the vigilance of the people is based on full information.

The proposed amendment which would rectify this shortcoming is extremely simple. It merely includes within the definition of "election" in the bill primaries and nominating conventions or caucuses, and inserts at the proper places in the bill language to insure that such activities are included in its purview.

Mr. President, only by adopting this amendment can the Senate fully carry out the purpose of this bill to eliminate corruption and dishonesty at all levels in the selection of Federal elected officials, and give the American people full information about the electoral process from beginning to end. I hope it will win wide support.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEATING. I do not have the floor.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. If no point of order is made, the Senator may yield for a question.

Mr. KEATING. I am happy to yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I should like to ask the Senator if he would object to modifying the amendment to require the States to have primary elections. I can think of no more undemocratic process than that followed in States like New York, where there are no primary elections, where politicians may get together in smoke-filled rooms and select a candidate. The people have no real opportunity to say who the candidate of the party shall be. I should like to submit a proposed modification of the amendment, to require that the States have primary elections, so that the public can say who the candidate shall be. It is idle to talk about honest elections when bigwigs get together and the public at large has no real opportunity to say who the candidate shall be.

Mr. KEATING. My friend from Louisiana makes an interesting suggestion. He comes from a great State. I can understand his complete knowledge about the electoral process. In that State, as we all know, unusual events happen from time to time. We consider that in our great State of New York we have fully as democratic a system as has the Senator's State. Candidates in New York are selected by a State convention, and the delegates to that State convention are elected by the electorate.

Speaking for the junior Senator from New York, he was not chosen in any smoke-filled room. The only other person in the room with him at the time was the distinguished Governor of New York; and the Governor of New York does not smoke. So there was no selection in a smoke-filled room. The Governor of New York made the request that the junior Senator from New York join him on the ticket, and it was left to the convention to make the decision. If the

convention had not agreed with the Governor of New York, the present junior Senator from New York would not be here. In my judgment, it is just as democratic to select candidates through delegates who are elected by the people as it is to have the candidates elected in a primary election.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Why not let the people vote?

Mr. KEATING. Are there no Republican primaries in Louisiana?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. No. They select a candidate and place his name on the ballot. The point is that candidates should be required to fight for their offices, and be approved by the public. The Senator wishes to regulate our primaries. Would he be willing to submit himself to a primary? If so, I should like to prepare an amendment—

Mr. HENNING. Mr. President, I believe I have the floor.

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

Mr. HENNING. I should like to ask the Senator if all these races and runoffs are not somewhat exhausting, both physically and financially, to a candidate, who then must confront a strong, vigorous Republican organization, standing in immutable opposition to the Democratic Party.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. We do not complain about it.

Mr. HENNING. Then he is required to go through a grueling ordeal, a trial by fire, a contest with the strong semblance of the Republican Party in the State of Louisiana. It is very trying.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. It is a difficult thing, indeed.

Consider our situation in Louisiana. Eleven men ran for Governor. Then there was a runoff between the top two. One man who ran for the Democratic nomination for Governor 4 years previously could not get into the runoff in the Democratic primary election. He joined the Republican Party. Now the Democrat who was nominated must fight all over again. The candidate to whom I refer, who has joined the Republican Party, has a sidetrack to go into the final race, without ever having to submit himself to the public for approval.

If we are to have all these regulations providing for honest elections, why not provide for a primary election? The Senator from New York will not even submit himself to the kind of election we have in Louisiana.

Mr. HENNING. I believe we are to make the expenses of the caucus, which the distinguished Senator from New York has discussed, one of the elements of this amendment. The expenses of conventions and caucuses are also to be limited and to be reported. So whether there are smoke-filled rooms, or rooms otherwise filled, for whatever purpose, all those expenses will be reported, under the terms of the amendment I am about to submit.

Mr. KEATING. Including the cost of cigarettes and all other smoke-producing materials.

I believe this is the most heartening thing I have heard about the Republican Party in recent weeks. I had not real-

ized how much the distinguished Senator from Louisiana fears the forthcoming campaign against the Republican candidate in Louisiana. I had no idea of the seriousness of the threat to the present Democratic nominee for Governor, who has gone through so many campaigns and is so exhausted. It is heartening to hear that the distinguished Senator from Louisiana supports us. I am sure the Senator from Missouri is as happy as I am that he supports us, and that we shall have his strength behind the amendment. If he wishes to offer an amendment to it, we shall have to pass upon it when the time comes. But to hear him say that he will support our amendment is very heartening.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. If the distinguished Senator from New York believes we should have an honest election, the first thing to do is to get the election. Here is a Senator who wishes to regulate elections, but he does not wish to submit himself to a primary election such as we have in our State. He would like to dictate how someone else is to be elected. I am for that, provided he subjects himself to the same type of contest which we face.

I am willing to run, Mr. President. That is the way I got here, and I expect that that is the way it will have to be. However, while I am willing to run against Republicans and Democrats, I believe it is not fair that my friends from the Republican side should come into my State and require Democrats to run in our campaigns in accordance with all these details and by going through all these machinations. I believe it would be fair if the Senator from New York would submit himself to the same problems that we have in my State, which he would like to regulate, and have him first run against Republicans and get the majority vote before he runs against a Democratic opponent. Of course, I have no doubt that the distinguished Senator from New York would be elected without any opposition, but why not prove it? He could do it if he would agree to accept an amendment I propose to offer to his amendment, to the effect that it would not be possible to have caucuses to nominate a candidate, or provide for a convention to nominate a candidate, but that it would be necessary in the parties for candidates to submit themselves to a primary, subject to the regulations that he could recommend. He should be willing to run under the rules he would recommend.

Mr. KEATING. I fear the Senator from Louisiana has not carefully read the amendment which the Senator from Missouri and the junior Senator from New York are offering. The amendment applies to both political parties. It is not directed against any one party. It requires for both parties that if there be a primary contest they would have to report what they spend in the primary election, just the same as they are required to report what they spend in the general election.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I am not quarreling with the reporting provision. The Senator from New York was not

named in caucus. He said that Governor Rockefeller called him into his office and told him he was the nominee for the Senate on the Republican ticket, because Governor Rockefeller thought he should be elected. Why not have a Republican vote on it? It seems to me that it is much more undemocratic for the Governor of a great State to put a man on the ballot than it is to hold an election, even though the election may have some imperfections.

Mr. HENNINGS. I will interrupt the colloquy, although I do not wish in any way to limit the discussion.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, may I be permitted—

Mr. HENNINGS. I should like at this time to offer an amendment on behalf of the junior Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] and myself, to revise the Federal election laws. I send the amendment to the desk and ask that it be read. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendments.

Mr. HENNINGS. I should like to have the amendments reported now so that they will be the pending business before the Senate tomorrow. I have no desire to interrupt any further colloquy.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. Page 2, strike out lines 4 and 6, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

(1) The term "election" includes a general, special, or primary election, including a preferential primary, and a caucus or a caucus of a political party held for the purpose of nominating candidates.

Page 2, line 8, after the word "for" insert the words "nomination for, or".

Page 2, line 8, after the word "as" insert a comma.

Page 3, line 2, after the word "is" insert the words "nominated or".

Page 13, line 1, at the beginning of the line insert the following: "primaries, nominating conventions, caucuses, and".

Page 13, line 7, after "(2)" insert the following: "in the case of an election other than a caucus or nominating convention".

Page 15, strike out lines 20 to 22, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

(1) The term "election" includes a general, special, or primary election, including a preferential primary, and a caucus or a caucus of a political party held for the purpose of nominating candidates.

Page 15, line 24, after the word "for" insert the following: "nomination for, or".

Page 15, line 24, after the word "as" insert a comma.

Page 16, line 2, after the word "is" insert the words "nominated or".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair wishes to inquire of the Senator from Missouri whether he desires the amendments to be considered en bloc or separately.

Mr. HENNINGS. I ask that they be considered separately. The Chair is referring to the amendments I am offering, I assume. There are two amendments at the desk, I believe.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment read by the clerk is in several parts.

Mr. HENNINGS. There are other amendments at the desk. I am asking that the ones just read be considered en bloc.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is referring to the amendments which the clerk has just read.

Mr. CURTIS, Mr. KEATING, and Mr. CHURCH addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I object.

Mr. HENNINGS. Before I—

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

Mr. HENNINGS. I do not wish to detain my colleagues, but I should like to ask for the yeas and nays on the amendments which have just now been offered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Did the distinguished Senator from Louisiana reserve his right to object?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I shall not object if—

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana will state it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. So as to keep the record straight, I believe the Senator from Louisiana objected to the request of the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I reserve my right to object, because I should like to protect myself regarding these amendments. I shall offer amendments to the amendments just offered. In other words, I will offer amendments to require that there be primary elections, which the Senators would seek to regulate.

That is why I entered an objection to the consideration of the amendments en bloc. Perhaps I shall withdraw that objection if I find that I have protected my rights. Under the circumstances, I would like to protect my rights. I will object unless it is agreed that amendments may be offered to the pending amendments. If that is agreed to, I shall not object to the consideration of the amendments en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard at this time.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I believe objection was made on the basis that it would be withdrawn if the rights of the Senator from Louisiana were protected and with the understanding that he could offer an amendment to the pending amendments.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. MANSFIELD. May I have a ruling by the Chair?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I must object, unless I have an understanding that any amendments I might offer to the amendments at the desk would be in order.

Mr. HENNINGS. I do not know whether under the parliamentary rules I have the right to make such an agreement.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that any amendments I might wish to propose

to these amendments may be in order. That is all I have in mind.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to that request? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. Without objection, the amendments will be considered en bloc.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, at this time I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendments.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

Mr. HENNINGS. Before proceeding with a discussion, tomorrow, of the so-called primary election-convention-caucus amendment, I shall undertake to yield to all Senators who desire to have the floor for various purposes. I first yield to the distinguished Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I have been asked by the distinguished assistant majority leader to announce to the Senate that there will be no votes during the remainder of the session today.

Mr. HENNINGS. 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. CHURCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

INTEREST RATES ON TREASURY ISSUES

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, today the President has sent us a message on debt management. At this time I should like to read the message to the Senate:

To the Congress of the United States:

As I said in my state of the Union message, the Treasury is being prevented from taking debt management actions that are fully consistent with the public interest because of the artificial interest rate ceiling on new Treasury medium-term and long-term issues.

In a special message to the Congress on June 8, 1959, I urged the removal of this archaic restriction on flexible debt management. Congressional inaction on that request has resulted in a much more rapid increase in short-term debt than would otherwise have occurred. As a result, short-term Treasury borrowing costs have risen to the highest levels in several decades and the ability of debt management to operate in a manner consistent with sound principles of sustained economic growth has been seriously undermined.

I deem it imperative, therefore, that this restrictive ceiling be removed. I am asking the Secretary of the Treasury to transmit to the Congress proposed legislation designed to attain this objective.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 12, 1960.

Mr. President, it is my understanding that such action by the Congress at this

time would be contrary to the understanding we had at the close of the last session with the leadership, namely, that the Congress would not take up the matter of an increase in the interest rate on the public debt or other matters relating to suspension of the historic interest-rate ceiling on the debt until we had received a report following a long study by the committee, headed by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], of the Banking and Currency Committee. I am advised that the report is nearing completion.

So it would seem inappropriate for the Finance Committee—which has jurisdiction of the proposed legislation which the President is now demanding and insisting upon—now to begin the hearings without having the advice of the Senate committee which has specialized in this field and has spent considerable time in studying it. Then we can consider whether it is necessary to take action contrary to a principle which has been observed since the days of George Washington, namely, that the Congress has the right to set a statutory ceiling on the interest rates on long-term Government debt.

I think this matter should be understood by the country, as the President casually calls this an "archaic restriction on flexible debt management." Let me say that I believe we are already being "flexed" to death by the constant escalation—by means of administration-inspired moves, which have broken all records in recent history—of the cost of money on the short-term market. I, for one, am unable to understand how the action now requested would lower the interest charges on the money Uncle Sam borrows, which already is running in excess of \$9 billion a year, on what Calvin Coolidge used to call "the rent on the money."

Such expenditures really produce nothing for Uncle Sam. Today our interest cost is more than \$4 billion a year above our interest costs in 1953, and increased by \$1 billion during the last year.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield to me?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I think the Senator from Oklahoma inadvertently referred to the study being made by the committee headed by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] as a study being made by the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, whereas, as a matter of fact, the study is being made by the Joint Economic Committee, which includes among its members distinguished Members of the other body, as well as distinguished Members of the Senate.

A staff report on this whole subject has already been printed and distributed. I am happy to note that the staff report takes the same general position as the one the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma is taking, although in the press the report has been widely misquoted.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania for that clarification.

Mr. President, certainly the step proposed by the President would be one of the most dangerous steps which the Congress could take, and I believe the issue involved is one of the most important to come before the Congress this year.

I do not know how much more strain in connection with the administration's high-interest-rate policy it will be possible to bear. The administration complains about the cost of borrowing the necessary funds. Yet the administration, through its various agencies, has done everything within its power to create the situation we now face and yet it now requests unlimited authority—authority never before enjoyed by any President in the history of our country. President Eisenhower asks for authority to wipe out all control over the interest rate on the long-term Government debt. Thus, in the dying days of this administration, we could be faced with Eisenhower bonds totaling hundreds of millions or billions, bearing a 5½ percent or 5¾ percent interest rate and running over 25 to 30 years.

If such a development were permitted to be made, if the Congress were foolish enough to yield to the request which now has been made of it, then, Mr. President, for the next 30 years the people of the country would have to pay the cost of that kind of mismanagement.

I do not think the Congress will buy that kind of a pig in a poke. I do not think the Congress intends to permit this administration—which claimed it wanted to inject business methods into Government operations—to do exactly the reverse of what every corporate manager would do. No corporate manager ever would attempt to finance long-term obligations at a time when interest rates were at their highest. Private business finances such long-term obligations when interest rates are low. At times when interest rates are at their peak—and at the present time they are virtually jumping over the moon—private business refinances its obligations on a short-term basis, and proceeds to use short-term financing until such time as the interest rates become lower.

Yet, Mr. President, today the administration is literally trying to drive the Congress—and let me say that I know of some of the pressures which have been put on the leaders of both congressional bodies—to pass the bill the President this year insists he needs.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield again to me?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. Will the Senator from Oklahoma agree that if this effort by the President, on behalf of the bankers and money lenders of the country, is successful, it will inevitably result in mortgaging the future of our children and our grandchildren, by loading on the country an entirely unnecessary burden of high-interest-rate debt?

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator from Pennsylvania is absolutely right. It is asked these bonds be issued, without limit. The President does not suggest

any limitation. He says, "Just trust me. Just trust our advisers"—these wonderful men who have made the interest rate jump over the moon, the very ones who have brought about the high interest rate crisis. We are asked to trust in them and told they will be able to manage the debt, which has been so grossly mismanaged until it is reaching a point almost of disaster.

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

Mr. MONRONEY. I am happy to yield.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator from Oklahoma will recall, will he not, that during a number of years of the Eisenhower administration, and in particular shortly after Mr. Robert Anderson became Secretary of the Treasury, interest rates were held down and that at that point it would have been entirely possible to refinance the long-term debt at interest rates hardly more than half of what they are now; and yet the Eisenhower administration never moved once to refinance the long-term debt? It waited until the interest rate was at the highest point before it asked for this move. I congratulate the Senator from Oklahoma for the speech he is making in opposition to it.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank my distinguished colleague.

The reason given by the administration at that time was that we were in a sort of Eisenhower recession—which was not a recession in the eyes of the Republicans—and that we should not withdraw money from the market because the credit was necessary for business expansion. I know what the market was then. Money was free, loose, and ready to be loaned; but the administration did not take advantage of it, and we are now paying the price in terms of the very interest rate about which the President is screaming.

The President is now asking us to invade the long-term market at a time when money is tighter than ever, when the Federal Reserve Board should have tried to relieve the demand for money. Meanwhile, twiddling their thumbs in their ivory tower, the Federal Reserve Board has been going blissfully along, tightening up credit, making it more difficult for the smaller businesses to borrow at reasonable rates. Because the interest rate is much higher than the rediscount rate which exists in the prime money market, small business is suffering; and each rise in the discount rate by the Federal Reserve Board tells all the money lenders, who always wish to receive the maximum possible interest that can be charged, that they should demand higher and higher interest for the offerings Uncle Sam makes.

So we have a chain reaction because the men who are running the fiscal policies and financing the Government, which already has a debt of about \$280 billion, are allowing interest rates to escalate upward; and the end is not in sight.

Now the administration asks us to put ourselves into a 20- or 30-year debt so that we may be able to pay off, in 20 or 30 years, the folly and stupidity of a policy which we hope after January 20

next year will not be carried over into the new administration. I feel the history of the Democratic policy has shown that it has always tried to prevent exorbitant interest rates both for the Government and other borrowers.

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

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. McGEE. Will not the Senator agree that if the increases are made in bond rates now to be paid for the next 20 or 30 years, they will create security and stability for the Wall Street group?

Mr. MONRONEY. They will create security and stability and also windfall profits for them, because Wall Street is not dumb when it comes to making money for themselves; but a policy which means money for them means the outpouring of tax dollars by the public. If Wall Street investors can get their hands on new offerings of bonds that pay 5 percent or more, they will be able to sell them at a great premium once the new administration takes office and reverses the escalation of interest rates.

Wall Street does not have to keep the investments for 20 or 30 years. It can sell the bonds at premium rates and get windfall profits, in the amount of hundreds of millions of dollars, for taking advantage of the present tight money market—tight because this administration planned it that way—and at the same time it is nailing us to the cross of \$4 billion in additional interest cost.

The administration's policy is resulting in higher interest rates to private business all over the country, because it is the Government rate that fixes the cost of borrowing money. No individual can hope to borrow, no matter how good his project nor how good his security, at a lower rate than the Government pays. This is the prime rate, because it represents the security and faith of the United States.

Mr. McGEE. Will the Senator agree that Wall Street can get more security out of such a policy by allowing that security to trickle down to those who have less security?

Mr. MONRONEY. I have never found that to be the case. It seems to me the trickle always ends when it leaves Wall Street.

Mr. McGEE. Is not this the philosophy that is offered in providing such an approach?

Mr. MONRONEY. We have always had tight money in Republican administrations. That kind of policy goes back through the history of our country, to the days of Andrew Jackson, when he had to move in and compete with the Bank of the United States, under the Biddle regime.

It always has been the policy of the Democratic Party to see that that trickle-down theory—which has always been discredited—is reversed. The Democrats have always followed the policy that prosperity must come from the ground level, and that from small business and wage earners comes a genuinely healthy prosperity, as nature nourishes the trees, foliage, flowers, and grain from the ground.

Mr. McGEE. Would not such a policy pursued for the benefit of Wall Street tend to save the people from inflation?

Mr. MONRONEY. That way of saving people from inflation is rather difficult for me to understand, because we have been told countless times that if we dared appropriate \$50 million above the budget for a public health project or for cancer research or for the development of our natural resources, the expenditure of \$50 million or \$100 million would be inflationary.

We have been told we must not spend such additional amounts of money because they would increase the strain on the budget and create inflation—but at the same time we have been getting these lectures, every hour on the hour, because of our banker friends who run this administration, we have been increasing the budget—\$1 billion even—during the last session of Congress by added interest costs. The cost of interest increased the budget \$1 billion during the last session of Congress. That added to the cost \$4 billion over the total sum for which the Democrats were handling practically the same amount of public debt.

So if it is appropriations that create inflation, as we have been told, then how do we escape inflation by an additional \$4 billion cost for interest resulting from an erroneous and discredited policy? Yet the very men who have engineered that policy are asking us to give them power which no President since George Washington has ever had, and that is the power to issue long-term bonds without limitation as to interest, which they say is in the national interest.

We have found that some of the things which have been proclaimed by this administration to be in the national interest have been against the public interest. An additional interest cost of \$4 billion to the taxpayers in the form of additional taxes certainly does not seem to me to be in the public interest.

Mr. McGEE. I wish to commend my distinguished colleague from Oklahoma for singling out what I think is the central question for the people to face in this very critical year. We can talk about peace. We can do wishful thinking about many other things. However, I think there is no greater issue at stake for the public to decide forthrightly than that of the whole economy of the country, which in effect has been strangled, as stated so well by the Senator from Oklahoma, by a tight money policy which is more concerned with the future security of a few in a very narrow area of the United States than with the productive capacity and the general welfare of the many.

I want to commend the Senator for his courage in bringing this subject before our people.

Interest rates also mean something to the people of Oklahoma and of Wyoming. These rates mean \$200, \$300 or \$400 extra on the purchase of an automobile. They mean several thousand extra dollars on the purchase of a house. I think houses and automobiles and human necessities are far more important

in bringing about increased productive capacity for the Nation than the securing of the highest possible interest rates for the bankers of Wall Street.

Again I commend the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank my distinguished friend for his valuable contribution, because, as he says, the added \$4 billion which we must spend annually now, because of the excessive cost of interest under this administration, could be used to improve the productivity of our country, the condition of our small businesses and of our farmers. It could be available so that money could be lent at a reasonable rate. However, since it is being used for interest alone it is denied use for any other purpose.

If the Congress did not exceed the President's budget estimates and the interest costs could be reduced to the levels which the Democrats maintained before the Republican administration took over—I hope the Senators will understand this, because it is important—the very same \$4 billion of excessive added interest rates we are paying today would be available to us to reduce the public debt. We therefore would drive down the interest rates, because we would be liquidating \$4 billion of public debt each year.

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

Mr. MONRONEY. But the Republican administration, by getting the interest rate higher instead of liquidating the debt, compel the Government to keep spending more and more and more for the rent of the money, instead of retiring the debt itself.

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

Mr. MONRONEY. I am happy to yield.

Mr. CLARK. Would not the action which the Senator advocates have retarded the inflationary forces and given us an opportunity to put the brakes on inflation, about which the President is so interested?

Mr. MONRONEY. It would have been the greatest single contribution which could have been made toward retarding inflation in a way which would not have been destructive. It would have meant taking out of circulation \$4 billion in bonds—taking it out of the monetary base, for which the banks can issue credit of about 6 to 1 of their holdings of these bonds. Consequently, we would have been acting in a wise way and we would have been reducing the strain on the taxpayer. We would have eliminated not only \$4 billion of outstanding debt, but the interest that must be paid each year on the additional \$4 billion.

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

Mr. MONRONEY. I am happy to yield.

Mr. GORE. Does not the spiraling interest rate, conversely, have a very inflationary effect?

Mr. MONRONEY. I should say it does, because if the interest rate goes up, as it has gone up, for small business, for

industry, for automobile manufacturers, for automobile buyers, and for all the various others who are affected by spiraling interest rates, there is an addition to the cost of living, to the cost of the product the customer buys, to the cost of equipment the small businessman buys, to the cost of the home the GI buys, and on through the chain. All of this must be reflected, because the wages of money, the same as the wages of the people, have to be accounted for in the ultimate price.

Despite this, the administration, which rails at the idea of increasing the minimum wage to a bare living existence amount, claiming it to be inflationary, thinks nothing about the added steps of inflationary cost for the interest component, for the wages of money, which business is paying, or which the finance companies are exacting as they finance the automobile so necessary for the workman's transit to and from work, or the home a man needs to live in, or many other factors which go into the cost of living.

Mr. McGEER and Mr. GORE addressed the Chair.

Mr. MONRONEY. I shall yield first to the distinguished Senator from Wyoming, who was previously questioning me.

Mr. McGEER. Mr. President, nothing more eloquently attests to the truth of the Senator's observation or to the point of the question of the distinguished Senator from Tennessee than the fact that the present administration is deploring inflation at a time of tight money. What better illustrates the fact that tight money does not obviate the fears of inflation?

I think this is a process involving considerably more than the inflating of the cost of a GI home. This process also inflates the cost of a Senator's home. Senators are people, too.

Mr. MONRONEY. And Senators buy their homes on time, I will say.

Mr. McGEER. I should like to give the Senator some figures which I think may be interesting at this point.

When I came to Washington a year ago I had to buy a house at what I suppose one would say was an inflated Washington, D.C., real estate price. It was a very simple house, but its cost, nonetheless, \$27,000. Had I been able to finance my house in Washington, D.C., at the rate of interest which was the rate under the Truman administration instead of the rate of interest we are talking about now, which is being required by and requested by this administration, I would have been able to finance my house for approximately \$9,000 less. I am not referring to eliminating interest charges; I simply refer to \$9,000 less of interest charges. This is the result of the spiraling of interest rates.

This is why it seems to me the time has come to call a halt. Instead of being concerned, as the White House has been, about increasing maximum interest rates, I think the time has come to fight for maximum production rates, in contrast.

Mr. MONRONEY. I quite agree with the distinguished Senator from Wyo-

ming. He is absolutely correct. This interest bite goes from the very lowest to the very highest, for living expenses, for payments on homes, and everything else.

I think the figures show that in the case of the average GI home the cost of interest has gone so high that the GI must at least sacrifice one room, and possibly one and a half rooms, if he is to have a house for the same money and for the same monthly payments; or, if he wishes to carry the loan longer, he can make payments for an additional 10 years, and finally own the same home.

This is the present, this is the gift, this is the legacy of a discredited policy which is being imposed upon the Government and which has been imposed upon the people of the country. Now we are being asked to compound the error. We are being asked to remove the historic ceiling which has existed through two world wars, through the war in Korea, through the great major depression, and through a whole series of minor Eisenhower recessions.

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

Mr. MONRONEY. I am happy to yield to my distinguished colleague from Idaho.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, would the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma regard it as an accurate statement that the President expressed dismay in his state of the Union message about the fact that in this year the total interest charges on our national debt will exceed \$9 billion, and then went on to prescribe as his solution still higher interest rates?

Mr. MONRONEY. That is correct. The higher interest rates are to be paid to lower the Government's interest costs. This is the neatest trick of the week, or of the year.

Mr. CHURCH. Is it not also an accurate statement that in 1953, when this administration took power, one of its first official acts was deliberately to increase the interest rate on the national debt?

Mr. MONRONEY. That is correct.

Mr. CHURCH. Does the Senator have available the figures to show what the total added cost has been to the taxpayers of the United States resulting from the increase in interest rates which has occurred since 1953, when this administration made that deliberate decision?

Mr. MONRONEY. I could get that information. I do not have it at this time because there was a quorum call, and I was not able to obtain it.

The figure now is \$4 billion plus, perhaps \$4½ billion added cost for the current year. It was about \$3.5 billion last year. The cost has progressed upward with accelerating speed.

The more accustomed the bankers become to the friendly environment, shall we say, of big business in this administration, the greater has been the greed, the greater has been the insistence, and the greater has been the management of Government finances in behalf of these people, with a very valued assist downtown from every single

agency of Government which has anything to do with the issuance of Government securities or of Government-guaranteed securities.

These are the Siamese twins. The nearest thing to a Government bond is a Government-guaranteed security; yet the distinguished Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEER], the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIER], the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], and many other Democratic Senators have consistently called attention to the escalation of the Government guaranteed home mortgages, the GI home loans, and the FHA mortgages.

They started at about 4 percent. Gradually, with each session with the excuse that they wished to end the vicious discounting system, administration officials succeeded in persuading the homebuilders and building and loan people, and others, that the way to loosen up money, the way to avoid a vicious discount system, was to raise the interest rates on these GI loans. They had statutory authority to raise the rates on FHA loans. But as the interest rates on the GI loans were raised, it was necessary to raise the interest rates on FHA loans because they are so closely connected. But with each raise in the case of Government-guaranteed mortgages, which are most nearly comparable to Government bonds, they acted as an escalator to pull higher and ever higher the interest rates on Government bonds.

So the housing loans, which run into billions of dollars a year, find themselves again after the raise in competition with an escalating interest rate because of Government policies. So the administration comes back to the Congress and recommends a higher interest rate, an increase of one-half of 1 percent, or three-quarters of 1 percent, on guaranteed housing loans. That request is granted, and the Government bonds move up to their proper ratio with the legislated increase in the housing loans, which are guaranteed almost as though they were genuine Government securities.

So we have had the merriest song of escalation, to the great delight of Wall Street, those who control the limited amount of long-term investment capital.

No one has shown, in the Treasury's presentation, that anything done in raising the interest rate will bring a greater flow of long-term investment capital. The nearest we can come to relating long-term investment capital to Government bonds is that U.S. bonds draw from the same pool of long-term money from which Government guaranteed home mortgages, under the FHA and GI loans also are financed.

After being taken for a buggy ride four or five times, on the theory that raising interest rates would cause money to flow in, we find that they must be increased again and again. That theory should be discredited by now; yet we are asked to do it again.

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

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. CHURCH. I think the Senator from Oklahoma is rendering a great service today in bringing this subject to our attention on the floor of the Senate. It seems to me that his service is in closest conformity with what has been the traditional role of the Democratic Party, as a party of the working people, of the farmers, of the small independent businessmen, who have opposed high interest rates.

By the same token, it seems to me that if Rip Van Winkle were to go to sleep at any given period in the history of this country, when he woke up all he would need to do would be to ask, "How high are the interest rates?" If they were up near the ceiling, he would know that the Republicans had taken over the national administration.

True to that kind of behavior, the present Republican administration undertook, as one of its first official acts, a deliberate move to increase the interest rate on the Federal debt.

As the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma has so well pointed out, both with respect to the Government debt and with respect to the VA and FHA loans, each year the administration has come back to the Congress and said, "Do not be alarmed about the present interest rate. The real problem is to channel money in, to refinance the debts, to obtain the necessary capital for the FHA and Veterans' Administration loans. The solution to the problem is to increase the interest rate still further."

Here we are, 7 years later. None of these problems is solved, and the President of the United States expresses his dismay when he observes that the interest on the Federal debt in the present year exceeds \$9 billion. His prescription is to raise interest rates still further. This seems to me to prove that these gentlemen cannot learn by experience. Let us hope that the Congress can. If our experience demonstrates that raising interest rates will solve none of these problems, but will merely aggravate them still further, let us profit by that experience.

Mr. MONRONEY. I could not agree more thoroughly with what my distinguished colleague from Idaho has said. He has been in the forefront of the fight against the great policy of error which is creating a crisis. We must understand that under this administration the things which happen in the administration are not necessarily known to the President.

Although his administration has been in power for 7 years, and is nearing the end of its term, he has only now become acutely aware of the fact that he has been able, through his policies and those of his administration, to double the interest cost, on approximately the same amount of public debt.

Then he says that the way to remedy the situation is to be able to pay more for interest, and to cement the high interest rate as a legacy, so that we shall never forget President Eisenhower as we pay off the 6, 7, 8, or 10 percent Government bonds which, over 30 years, is the answer to the Wall Street dream. This is better than "The Night Before Christ-

mas." This is actually "The Night Before Christmas" throughout the year, or throughout the remainder of the present year, and up until January 20, 1961, when we hope an administration with fiscal sanity will take over and readjust.

We should put the Federal Reserve Board and the bank, as an agency of stabilization of this Government, at least on speaking terms with the facts of life. Today the Federal Reserve Bank holds practically no bonds which mature in less than 1 year, and this in a period of time when there is the greatest pressure on the long-term market, and when the Treasury is urging long-term investments and is willing to break the historic ceiling on the interest rate in order to get more money. But the Federal Reserve Board, an arm of the Government, is withdrawing from this element of investment.

I was amazed to read, on the New York Times financial page, the record-breaking interest rates, and the bargains which were available. The Federal Reserve could go into the open market and buy, at tremendous discounts, these very same Government bonds.

According to the New York Times of January 5, at the close 13 issues of Treasury debt were selling at prices to yield more than 5 percent. Eight issues were discount bills due from next June to October. The others were as follows: 2½s of November 1961, 5.2 percent; 3¾s of November 1962, 5.03 percent; 2¼s of August 1963, 5.09 percent; 2½s of February 1963, at 5.10 percent.

It would seem to me—and I do not have the total amount of this outstanding debt—that, if these issues are pending on the market, perhaps it might depress the interest rates demanded if the Federal Reserve were to make a few investments in the greatest and most stable credit in the world, the U.S. bonds, which are kicking around at this great discount. However, I suppose that would not be quite sporting in Republican circles, or that it might be called unfair, because it would be evidentiary material for the Wall Street bankers to advise, "We must bid above 5 percent so long as these terms are pending in these various issues."

They have been doing everything within their power to force up the interest rates. Consequently, we are in the dilemma of being asked to violate a course of action which has been in existence since George Washington's time and to give to President Eisenhower authority to put us deeper into debt.

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

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Is it not true that the Constitution is very explicit in giving Congress the right to regulate our money?

Mr. MONRONEY. That is true. That is one of the prime duties of Congress.

Mr. PROXMIRE. As a matter of fact, the Constitution specifies that power in article I, section 8, subparagraphs 2 and 5, I believe. Is it not a fact that the President is asking us to relinquish the only remaining power we

have over interest rates, when he asks us to raise the 4¼-percent interest limit.

Mr. MONRONEY. That is correct. Until 1918 Congresses held the power with respect to the rate of interest and the power to set the amount of the debt issue. Under Carter Glass, in order to speed the financing of World War I Congress yielded its power to fix the debt issue amount and never got it back. Very few people know that Congress had that power or that it was traditional. Carter Glass was permitted by Congress to handle the financing of the war as to bond issue amounts but Congress fixed the long-term interest ceiling at 4¼ percent.

Mr. PROXMIRE. We talk about the erosion of legislative power. Would this proposal not be a surrender by Congress of a very important power which it still retains and which the Constitution explicitly and directly gives to Congress? Would it not be a surrender of that power to the Executive?

Mr. MONRONEY. That is true. Beyond that, it would be putting this power into the hands of whoever the President's designee was. I am sure it would not be the President himself, because I am confident he is even less familiar with this subject than he is with others. He would designate someone to exercise these powers. It would not be the Secretary of the Treasury, because he is busy with other things. It would be delegated to an old-fashioned, orthodox banker. There has been a quarantine in Government on new ideas which have been suggested even by Republican Members. The ideas which have been suggested to modernize savings bonds have been quarantined. As a matter of fact, in the case of savings bonds, we are still issuing a 1939 package in the year 1960. That has been the case with respect to the suggestion made by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], to revise the interest rate payments, so that they would carry a level rate, instead of the present payments.

Instead, they are following the orthodoxy of a past time, and thus we find ourselves without any new ideas on that subject. It is strange indeed that in a job of such magnitude so little marketing advice has been called in from the outside, other than from the moneylenders themselves. The rates that are suggested for these bonds come from the moneylenders themselves from the big Wall Street financiers. I do not believe that is in the best interest of the country.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Senator has referred, as have several of our other colleagues, to Wall Street. I am sure that when the Republicans hear us refer to Wall Street they think that the Democrats are reverting to it as a political symbol. We do not mean that at all.

I know that the Senator from Oklahoma and our other colleagues are conscientious and sincere, and certainly I could not be more serious in that regard. During the last congressional recess, while I was in my home State of Wisconsin, I made it a point to visit the small bankers. As a matter of fact, the

Wall Street Journal and the New York Times said that President Eisenhower was calling on the bankers and others to talk to Senators and Representatives, to persuade them that the 4¼ percent limit should be eliminated.

I made it a point, while I was in Wisconsin, to talk to every smalltown banker in the towns I visited during the recess. As a result of my talking with these smalltown bankers I found that either they had no interest in the subject or they supported our position and were opposed to the position of the President of the United States.

They said, "If these interest rates continue to rise, we will be damaged, and we will lose money. Of course, it is true that we will receive more money on our loans, but we will be damaged."

The smalltown bankers have 50 or from 65 to 75 percent of their deposits in time deposits, against which they have to pay interest. The Wall Street bankers have only 3 or 4 or at most 6 percent of their deposits in time deposits. Their deposits are overwhelmingly in demand deposits.

Naturally the interest proposal is wonderful for Wall Street, but it does not help the small bankers at all. It does not help the local country bankers at all.

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator is absolutely right. Just as my colleague said earlier in the debate, "They have planned it that way." It was done by the "Humphrey-Dumphries," and has resulted in the present dilemma. If a small banker held \$100,000 of these bonds at par, and they go down to 85—as has happened—they lose \$15,000 by Mr. Humphrey's act. A burnt child hates fire. At the same time the Treasury cannot understand why small bankers, having been burnt by the bear raid by Wall Street on the "Humphrey-Dumphrey" issues, are not willing to buy more Government bonds.

They cannot understand why so many small bankers, at the very prospect that Congress might be willing to give what the President is asking for, should say, "Don't try to talk to us about any more bonds. We have had our bath. We have taken our licking. We do not want any more manipulations of this kind in Government bonds. We do not want any further decrease in the value of our bondholdings. We cannot afford to hold them." They are not prepared to take that kind of loss.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The small bankers are deeply concerned with the action of the Treasury inflating the 10-month 5-percent issue. I found in many cases they were deeply concerned. I do not wish to detain the Senator any longer or to interrupt him further, but I should like to address a few more remarks to him.

I should like to point out that the effect on the independent businessman and the home buyer and the car buyer is a kind of selective inflation. It is true that some economists believe that there may be some effect with respect to diminishing inflation if interest rates are increased. That theory has been advanced. However, the best that can be said for it is that it is channeling inflation into areas where it is necessary

to borrow money to pay for money in order to make purchases.

It channels inflation into home buying and automobile buying, as the Senator from Oklahoma has said so well, and also, and particularly, into school construction and hospital construction. There is no question in my mind that the cost of the present hard-money policy to school construction has been greater than the benefit which would be received by the most generous proposal that has been made on the floor of the Senate to benefit school construction.

The increased cost to localities for building schools has simply been devastating because of the hard-money policy. The cost has increased 20, 30, or 40 percent, as the interest rate has increased since 1952.

Mr. MONRONEY. And the communities will be paying that debt for 20 or 30 years, because they are issuing long-term bonds at recordbreaking interest rates. It is a travesty on the future educational policies of the country to tie the smallest and least able communities to these bonds for 20 or more years because they are retireable only serially; they cannot be picked up and refinanced, as many of the blue ribbon or blue chip debentures can be.

Mr. PROXMIRE. It means also that many schools which should be built are not being built. Many hospitals which should be built are not being built. We talk about the importance of growth in our economy. All of us want it. Republicans and Democrats alike. But it is perfectly obvious that when 4, 5, or 6 percent of the working force of the Nation is unemployed, and a large part of our resources are unemployed, high interest rates are preventing us from getting the kind of production growth we need.

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator from Wisconsin is correct. Has it occurred to him—I am sure it has—that this policy is also doing a great disservice to our country, because it is becoming increasingly possible to accelerate the combinations of huge businesses by the liquidation of small business?

During the depression, I ran a small business. During times of tight money, the ability of small businessmen to borrow for their inventories, to carry their accounts, or perhaps to provide for expansion, is meager indeed. The banker is tougher and more grim looking. He wants a greater degree of security. With tighter money, he can be more selective. He can favor the rich, those more able to pay, those having the largest reserves. So it is often a psychological thing.

I have heard from many of my small-business friends, who say to me, "I am simply throwing in the sponge. I know the bank does not wish to carry me, because every time I renew my note, I am told I must reduce the amount materially, since money is tight, and interest rates are going up."

Many fine banks do not put the squeeze on their customers, particularly country banks and smaller banks, where the personal relationship has existed from father to son, and so on. But they are compelled to ask for an earlier liquidation of the loans. So after a few trips

back and forth to the bank, and having the favor of renewal, and hearing a lecture from the banker of how tight money is, the borrower is told, "I do not think we will be able to renew the note the next time."

So the vision of what he can throw overboard in a liquidation sale makes that man's mind up that there is no place in this administration for small business. Bankruptcies are bad enough; but the voluntary liquidations which are taking place because of the tight money policy, and because of the cruel attrition in the financing, which was available under Democratic administrations to carry small business, are numerous.

Has the Senator noticed the increased number of appeals to see if anything can be done to help get a loan from the Small Business Administration? My mail has increased 10 times over what it was 10 years ago in this respect, because the normal sources of credit have been drying up, and in a last gasp of desperation borrowers are seeking to keep their small businesses alive.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I have, indeed, noticed that. I am the chairman of the Subcommittee on Small Business of the Committee on Banking and Currency, so I am very conscious of the fact that the demands on the Small Business Administration have, as the Senator from Oklahoma has pointed out, increased greatly. It is a serious question as to how this problem can be solved. Obviously, the Small Business Administration cannot do it. This is but a tiny fraction of the number of businesses which need help. The great majority of small businesses may feel that no agency in Washington can help them. There are only a few which are active and aggressive and can do the job. The number of small businesses which need help, as the Senator has pointed out, constitute many hundreds.

Mr. MONRONEY. Has it occurred to the Senator from Wisconsin that the tight money policy can help create inflation? Let us say that all interest payments are deductible from the income tax. An interest payment of \$1,000 by a person who is in the 25-percent bracket has small value as an income tax deduction. He gets some credit for it. But the people who are borrowing large sums today, and are willing to pay all the interest which is necessary to get the money—and suppose it runs 8 percent or 10 percent—and happen to be, as I am not, in the \$200,000-a-year income bracket.

They can afford to pay 8 or 10 percent for the money. If they are in a high income tax bracket, such as the 90-percent bracket, they can deduct most of interest cost. So their net cost if they paid interest on a 10-percent basis, and were in the 90-percent bracket, would be only 1 percent. The Government would be subsidizing them for 9 percent. Yet these are the very sources of inflationary investment and expansion which exists today.

Mr. PROXMIRE. And there is discrimination. It is an advantage to the man who has an enormous income, and a disadvantage to the man who does not have it.

Mr. MONRONEY. The greater the income, the larger the tax subsidy, we might say, through the ductibility of the interest rate he pays. If he is in a high bracket, he can certainly do well. No wonder those who deal in big money are pushing the interest rates up, because they are freezing out the ribbon clerks. They are making it easy for those of wealth, particularly if Uncle Sam is footing nine-tenths of the bill for the interest rate they pay.

Small, hard-pressed corporations, like United States Steel, Bethlehem Steel, and Aluminum Corp. of America, with their huge earnings and their correspondingly large profits, are, through interest deductibility, letting Uncle Sam pick up 51 percent of the cost of all the interest they pay. So if they are borrowing money at 6 percent, the going, net rate to them is less than 3 percent. But the Government is "Uncle Sap." When he pays 5 percent, he is paying a real 5 percent. He cannot deduct as a business expense his own interest rate. He cannot deduct it from the budget or anywhere else. United States Steel, Aluminum Corp. of America, General Electric, and any other of the large corporations, and many of the medium-sized corporations, because of the deductibility feature with respect to interest, are actually borrowing money cheaper than Uncle Sam can borrow it.

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

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. CHURCH. The Senator from Oklahoma is aware, of course, that we Democrats are often branded by our colleagues across the aisle as reckless spenders. Is it not fair to say that most of those who so brand us are avowed backers of the Republican tight-money policy?

Mr. MONRONEY. I think all the test votes have shown that there are very few deviations from the Republican school of higher interest rates and tight money.

Mr. CHURCH. Does the Senator suppose that if those very gentlemen were given carte blanche authority to proceed to cut waste and to trim the fat from all the activities of the Government in every feasible way open to them, they could possibly effect a saving which would be so great as what their tight-money policy has cost the taxpayers of the country?

Mr. MONRONEY. I am very glad the Senator from Idaho mentioned that. There is no means by which they could save in appropriations the \$4 billion of extra added interest cost to Uncle Sam, let alone save the \$20 billion or \$30 billion it is costing the taxpayers, because of the higher interest rates they too must pay.

Perhaps it has occurred to the distinguished Senator from Idaho, who has been very much interested in this subject, as well as in others, that the earned income from interest is of a peculiar type. Perhaps the internal revenue laws were planned in that way; I do not know.

But if there is an \$18 billion or \$20 billion income from agriculture, as it increases, the tax is paid on the relative

increase in the profits made. On the other hand, in the case of interest, there is somewhat of a difference. I think the Federal Reserve Board is estimating the amount of income from interest now at nearly \$20 billion a year. The cost of \$50 billion of our debt is relatively small, because the Government pays a low-interest rate to the American citizens who buy the defense bonds. Incidentally, they are the ones who have the greatest faith in the Government; they demonstrate that by their purchases of those bonds with their small savings. But they are receiving the lowest rate of interest. At a time when Wall Street is charging 5.1 percent or 5.9 percent or more, the American citizens who buy the defense bonds are accepting the low interest rate which those savings bonds bear. They have faith in Uncle Sam. The interest they collect usually is taxed as personal income, often in the 25- or 30-percent bracket.

On the other hand, the large amounts of short-term Government high interest obligations are held by insurance companies, savings institutions, and other large concerns; and the interest they receive on the Government obligations they purchase rarely gets back into the tax stream which results from the ordinary interest income. So the Government not only loses as a result of the tax deductibility of personal or corporate interest expense available to such large personal incomes, but the Government also fails to collect a full measure of taxes on the interest earned by those who can claim special privileges such as mutual insurance companies, mutual savings banks, and so forth, who have special tax privileges.

So we find that it all adds up to the establishment of a very favored position or a very nice, cozy little club, let us say.

However, there are some good signs. For instance, yesterday I was delighted to read in the New York Times that finally the great mystery of where one goes to buy a Government bond other than a defense bond is being solved by the small investors. I think that is important, because those who usually have controlled the strategy in connection with the merchandising and the marketing of such Government bonds have been rather secretive about the practice followed, and very few persons who had \$1,000 or \$2,000 or \$5,000 to invest in other Government bonds seemed to know how to go about buying such securities.

So I was indeed delighted to read in yesterday's edition of the New York Times the following:

PUBLIC DISCOVERS U.S. BILL MARKET—INSTITUTIONS ARE SWAMPED BY INQUIRIES FOR THE NEW TREASURY ISSUE

(By Albert L. Kraus)

The public discovered the Treasury bill market yesterday and sent bankers scurrying to textbooks to help explain how it operates.

Mr. President, the dispatch came from New York—not from Oshkosh or Kalamazoo or Okmulgee, Okla.—and was published in the New York Times. From

the article we learn that when the people demanded an opportunity to purchase the 5-percent Government bonds, in many cases it was necessary for the bankers to consult the textbooks, in order to determine how to explain just how the procedure operated.

I read further from the article, which was published in the New York Times on January 12:

Lured by predictions that the Treasury's special offering today of \$1,500 million of 1-year bills might be sold at prices to bring investors 5 percent and possibly 5½ percent, investors flooded banks, savings banks, and investment houses with inquiries about the issue.

The Federal Reserve Bank of New York, where bids will be accepted until 1:30 p.m. today, reported hundreds of telephone calls and a lineup of investors, cash in hand, ready to buy.

Mr. President, certainly that beats Macy's bargain basement. The public has found out what is going on in Wall Street, and they want in on the new, high yield, 5-percent Government bonds, which have so long been such a great mystery to the small investors who wanted to buy them.

I read further from the article:

By way of contrast, the regular weekly bill auctions yesterday occasioned only the routine interest of Government securities dealers and other professionals.

Mr. President, I have heard about professional wrestling being fixed; and now we are hearing about these professionals, according to the New York Times.

I read further:

Bankers, in many cases, were forced to confess to depositors who wanted to shift funds from savings accounts into the new bills that they weren't entirely sure how the auction worked. After a bit of quick research, however, a number were able to explain that—

Unlike other Government securities, which are usually sold at \$1,000 and bear interest in regular installments, Treasury bills are sold at a discount from their redemption price. An investor realizes his return by appreciation of the bill to \$1,000 at maturity.

Bills are sold at auction, with prices and return to investors determined by the strength of the bidding, in contrast to other Government securities which are offered at fixed interest rates. Thus, in contrast to the Treasury's offering last October of its "magic 5"—5-percent, 4-year, 10-month notes—the return to investors on today's bill offering won't be known until all the bids are in and tallied. This may not be until a late hour tonight.

Small investors may buy \$1,000 to \$400,000 in bills (\$200,000 in the regular weekly auctions) without naming a price merely by indicating on their bids how many they want. This indicates their willingness to accept the average price determined in the competitive bidding.

These noncompetitive bids are then awarded in full. Competitive bidders, usually professional, have to take their chances with what is left.

Because of the considerable interest in today's issue, Government securities dealers estimated that the noncompetitive bidding might total \$500 million, compared with their earlier estimates of \$300 million. They guessed that this might cut the rate discount on the new issue to 5.05 to 5.10 percent.

Bankers said that while investors were flooding them with inquiries, withdrawals

were smaller than those in October to purchase the "magic 5s." The Bowery Savings Banks, for instance, reported 60 withdrawals totaling \$327,000. On the first day after announcement of the "magic 5s," it lost \$3,400,000.

The article shows that if the public are let "in" on how to buy such Government bonds, they will not exact the last ounce of blood, by trying to reach the very top of the interest rate available.

In connection with this matter, about which even many of the New York bankers are uncertain at a time of crisis in obtaining funds to finance the Government.

Why has not our great Government, explained its fiscal facts of life? It has propaganda agencies by the score. In every department and agency in Washington they have writers who could get this information into the newspapers, and on the radio, and the television. This way they could show the people of the country how they, too, can enjoy a 5-percent return on a Government bond for 5 years or slightly less.

So, Mr. President, I think it high time for the Congress, after the report of the committee headed by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], to hear from the Treasury. I am sure they will ask some very searching questions about why someone has not been "tending the store," why someone has not been taking affirmative action to reverse the ever-accelerating trend to stratospheric interest rates.

Two men could do that very easily. I venture to say that two speeches, if made in earnest, and if they demonstrated a determination to do something about this matter, could reverse this ever-accelerating trend that is leading to higher and higher interest rates. If President Eisenhower would state, in a speech, that this process has gone on long enough, and that the Government intends to move to break the bottleneck on the Government's financing and the ever-increasing exaction of interest; and, second, if Mr. Martin, the head of the Federal Reserve Board, would state in a speech that the Board is ready to go back into open market operations, which served the Government so well during the gigantic financial operations necessary in World War II—such action would lower the interest rates; and once they started to go down hill, I think they would continue to go down hill, because the operation that is keeping the interest rates at these high levels is more or less an artificial "bear" raid.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield to me?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. Did I correctly understand the Senator from Oklahoma to say that the Federal Reserve Board and the Treasury, by changing their present policies, could lower the interest rates, without any substantial inflationary effect, by supporting the Government bond market?

Mr. MONRONEY. I certainly say so; and I would say that they themselves have the power, with the degree to which they go into open market operations where these bonds are placed, to limit in

any way they wish the inflationary impact by their very operations.

Mr. CLARK. Would the Senator not agree with me that it would be most unwise for the Senate of the United States to consent to an increase in the interest debt ceiling unless and until the present monetary and fiscal policies of the Federal Reserve Board and the Treasury were drastically changed?

Mr. MONRONEY. I would certainly say that is true; and I would say that putting this unlimited power in the hands of the men who have gotten us into this position would be foolish in the extreme. They have not demonstrated the competence to manage the public debt; and to give them the power to saddle us with such a recordbreaking interest rate for another 20 or 30 years would be the most tragic disservice to this Nation and to our children and children's children, who would have to pay for this folly, that the Congress could do.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator has long been an expert on the subject of residential housing and construction. Does not the Senator agree that these high interest rates operate adversely on the construction of housing which is badly needed by the families of America?

Mr. MONRONEY. I agree; and I have the testimony and communications from almost all the homebuilders in my State, who now say the interest-rate cost and the shortage of money and the continued discounting of Government guaranteed mortgages are literally wrecking the homebuilding industry and denying the man with an average income the opportunity to buy and to provide for his family a home of minimum standards.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is familiar with the fact that there is a special subcommittee to investigate the subject of unemployment, the chairman of which is the Senator from Minnesota. I have the honor to serve on that committee. Will not the Senator from Oklahoma agree with me that reemployment and employment are being actively deterred by tight money and high interest rates?

Mr. MONRONEY. I certainly do, because the larger the percentage of the cost of buying or building that flows into interest, the lesser the amount that can flow into construction of housing or purchase of goods. It is obvious that the greater the diversion of money which must be made to pay "rent" on the money, as I have stated, the lesser the amount that can be paid for construction of houses or purchase of goods.

Mr. CLARK. Does the Senator agree that tight money and higher interest rates are inhibiting desirable increased national economic growth?

Mr. MONRONEY. I would say that, and agree to it, and also say that policy has added to the inflationary impact. There has never been during this period, while we have continued to have inflationary increases in our living costs, a shortage in supply of any single basic item I know of.

Mr. CLARK. So we do not have a situation of too much money chasing too few goods?

Mr. MONRONEY. There is no "classic inflation." Yet the administration, while every sign or scrap of evidence indicates this is not a "classic inflation," is giving us the remedy that is prescribed in the books on economics to treat "classic inflations." That is the same as giving a person a vaccination for smallpox when he has mumps.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator from Oklahoma has made reference to banks, with relation to the high interest policy. I wonder if he will join me in a unanimous-consent request that there may be printed in the Record at this point an article from the January 3, 1960, issue of the New York Times, entitled "Banks Will Show Record Earnings," from which it appears that 1959 was the most prosperous year in history for banks, and that was due largely to the interest rates?

Mr. MONRONEY. That must have been the segment of our economy to which the President referred when he spoke about the prosperity of the economy. He was not looking beyond Wall Street.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, 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:

BANKS WILL SHOW RECORD EARNINGS—A HIGHER RETURN ON LOANS IS THE RESULT OF RISING RATES OF INTEREST—GAIN HERE PUT AT 13.8 PERCENT—1959 PROFIT INCREASE OF 9 PERCENT FOR BIG INSTITUTIONS IN OTHER AREAS SIGHTED

(By Albert L. Kraus)

Banks across the Nation will begin this week to report record operating earnings for 1959.

Unlike 1958, when the Federal Reserve permitted an increase of \$15 billion in bank loans and investments, the improvement will reflect chiefly the banks' ability to clear a higher return on their portfolios.

For, although earnings assets rose less than \$6 billion in 1959, rising interest rates permitted the banks to improve substantially their return on loans. From an average of 4.17 percent, the 1958 low point, interest rates on short-term business loans in 19 large cities had risen to 5.27 percent by September. In New York City, the rise was from 3.88 percent to 5.15 percent.

Not only have rising interest rates benefited banks' incomes, but the banks have continued to shift out of lower yielding Government securities into higher yielding business and consumer loans. In 1958, the banks added \$8,200 million to their holdings of Government securities and those of Federal agencies. Last year, they sold \$7,200 million. At the same time, they increased their loans to business \$5,600 million, their mortgage loans and their consumer loans \$2,700 million each.

SOME FEEL SQUEEZE

All banks, however, have not shared equally in the improvement in operating earnings. For "retail banks"—those dependent on the business of small savers and borrowers—the rising cost of savings deposits, of branch system operations and of promotion have kept expenses cheek-to-jowl behind climbing gross income.

For the "wholesale banks"—those dependent on large business customers—the tendency of corporations over recent years to hold their deposits to a minimum, to shop competitively for bank services, and to turn

over their funds more rapidly has produced a similar squeeze on earnings.

On balance, however, the banks in the major money centers—and among these the "wholesale" banks—should show the greatest improvement for 1959. For one thing, although their return on loans tends to fall more rapidly than that of retail banks in a period of declining interest rates, it tends to rise more rapidly in a recovery. For another, their break-even points are lower.

BANKS HERE FARE WELL

M. A. Schapiro & Co., bank stock dealer, estimates that the 8 New York City banks among the 25 largest in the Nation should show a 13.8 percent increase in net operating earnings for 1959 over the level of 1958. In contrast, the other 17 banks—among them the big retail branch system banks on the Pacific coast—are expected to show a gain of only 9 percent.

The New York banks report capital funds equal to 11.8 percent of their deposits, the other 17, to 8.9 percent. Because of this relatively greater capitalization, the New York banks continue to show an operating return on capital funds smaller than other banks in the top 25, 9.38 percent against 10.73 percent. M. A. Schapiro & Co. notes, however, that the New York banks' return on capital has risen from 5.77 percent over the last 10 years.

Operating earnings do not tell the whole story of how the banks are doing. By definition, they exclude profits and losses on securities. And most banks will show sizable losses in their bond accounts for 1959.

But this is an entirely normal occurrence. As interest rates rise, the market value of securities in a bank's portfolio declines. Because the bulk of these securities are U.S. Government obligations, there is no question about their ultimately being redeemed at full value.

A bank may hold its bonds to maturity and avoid losses, but to do so will mean some sacrifice of return. Or it may realize its bond losses, obtain a tax benefit, and switch into higher yielding securities. The banks that show the largest bond losses, thus, often show the sharpest rise in operating earnings.

The choice between holding bonds to maturity and switching often is not simple. For some banks, realization of bond account losses may require dipping into undivided profits, part of the bank's capital funds.

For institutions unable or unwilling to raise additional capital, this means that acceptance of a lower rate of earnings growth sometimes is preferable to going outside the organization for funds.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I have a request from the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] to have printed in the RECORD a statement in which he expresses his regret at being unable to be on the Senate floor at this time, and which is a commendation of the Senator from Oklahoma for the splendid address he has been making in the Senate this afternoon.

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

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MORSE

I regret that I am unable to be on the Senate floor at this time to commend the Senator from Oklahoma for the presentation he is making today.

The request of the President for higher interest rates on long-term Government bonds and on savings bonds is but another

step in the direction of the tight-money, economic restriction policy his administration has continuously pursued. It was in February of 1953 that I became one of the first Senators to rise in the Senate to protest the interest rate boost announced by the newly inaugurated administration. Since then, its tight money policy has hampered the economic development of the entire Nation. Its adverse effect upon housing and consequently upon the lumber industry with which we are so concerned in Oregon has been documented time and again. Yet we are again being served up more of the same.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] has led the fight in the Senate for an interest rate policy on the financial transactions of the Federal Government which would encourage the steady economic growth of the Nation. He has been a wise and valiant leader in the interest of the American people on this matter, and I wish to associate myself with the views he is expressing.

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

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I wish to commend the distinguished junior Senator from Oklahoma for the fine address he is making and for the thorough manner in which he is calling the attention of the people to the deleterious effect on our general economy of the unconscionable increase in interest rates.

I desire to say to the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma that the homebuilders of Texas have stated to me that the effect on homebuilding in my State is exactly the same as that which the Senator stated it was in Oklahoma. It is interfering with housing construction. It is depriving many families of the opportunity to acquire homes. That is one phase of the problem.

I express my appreciation for the excellent and thorough manner in which the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma is bringing this matter to the attention of the Nation.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the distinguished Senator from Texas. Mr. President, finally, in closing, I would merely like to say that, in addition to all the other things I have said about the lack of wisdom of giving this unlimited authority to the administration to pay higher interest rates in order to reduce the Government interest rate, another very cogent reason exists for not giving the President this authority. It is that the administration has never tried to use the 4¼-percent interest rate for which authority has been granted since 1918. How does the administration know it cannot sell bonds at 4¼ percent interest?

We know that in a rather tight market, on a short term slightly under 5 years, the "magic 5s" were tremendously oversubscribed.

Certainly without finding out what we should pay, in ways other than accepting the unverified word or perhaps the guess of those who manage the money market in New York, it might be wise to try out the 4¼-percent figure before we give President Eisenhower and the people who have put us in this fix authority no other President of the United States has ever had.

RECESS

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess until tomorrow at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 24 minutes p.m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, January 14, 1960, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 13, 1960:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The following-named persons, who were appointed during the last recess of the Senate, to the offices indicated:

Now Foreign Service officers of class 2 and secretaries in the diplomatic service, to be also consuls general of the United States of America:

Ward P. Allen, of Virginia.
Harlan B. Clark, of Ohio.
George W. Renchard, of Michigan.
William D. Wright, of the District of Columbia.

For appointment as a Foreign Service officer of class 2, a consul, and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Joseph Mintzes, of Pennsylvania.
Now a Foreign Service officer of class 3 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul general of the United States of America:

Merritt N. Cootes, of Oregon.
For appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 3, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Harold E. Howland, of Virginia.
Norman F. Johnson, of Maryland.
Barney B. Taylor, of Michigan.

For appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 4, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

George A. Landry, of New Hampshire.
T. Howard Peters, of Washington.

For appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 5, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Henry W. Kemp, of Pennsylvania.
Harry Kushner, of California.
Thomas E. Summers, of California.

Now Foreign Service officers of class 6 and secretaries in the diplomatic service, to be also consuls of the United States of America:

Chris C. Pappas, Jr., of New Hampshire.
Edward M. Rowell, of California.

For appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 6, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Spiros A. Siafacas, of Florida.
Miss Anita R. Wharton, of Florida.

For appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 7, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Miss Frances L. Adams, of Arizona.
Mrs. Ethel Balashova, of California.
Roger A. Provencher, of Colorado.

For appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 8, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

David Anderson, of New York.
Rodney E. Armstrong, of California.
Donald P. Black, of California.

Richard L. Bowen, of South Dakota.
Thomas Gordon Brown, Jr., of New Mexico.
John Allen Buche, of Indiana.
John B. Connelly, of California.
John P. Crawford, of Ohio.
Douglas James Harwood, of Connecticut.
Marvin W. Humphreys, of the District of Columbia.

Robert E. Kaufman, of the District of Columbia.

Kenneth A. Kurze, of Rhode Island.

Paul L. Laase, of Nebraska.

Stephen J. Ledogar, of New York.

Jon S. Lodeesen, of Tennessee.

Edward V. Nef, of the District of Columbia.

Jack R. Perry, of Georgia.

Paul B. Remmey, Jr., of Pennsylvania.

Charles W. Schaller, of Wisconsin.

Lincoln F. Steik, of Illinois.

Charles H. Thomas II, of New Hampshire.

Joseph W. Twinam, of Tennessee.

Thomas H. Walsh, of Texas.

E. Allan Wendt, of Illinois.

A. Norman Williams, of Michigan.

A Foreign Service Reserve officer to be a consul general of the United States of America:

William Howard Taft III, of Connecticut.

Foreign Service Reserve officers to be consuls of the United States of America:

Valentin E. Blacque, of Minnesota.

Seymour Chalfin, of New York.

Ross L. Collins, of Missouri.

Daren J. Filtercroft, of Virginia.

Albert W. Hennig, of Massachusetts.

Phillip G. Hodge, of Connecticut.

Eric Neff, of the District of Columbia.

Michael Pavlyak, of Virginia.

John B. Perkey, Jr., of West Virginia.

Phillip B. K. Potter, of Connecticut.

William H. Strong, of Virginia.

Rutherford T. Walsh, of California.

A Foreign Service Reserve officer to be a consul and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Alex A. Cohen, of California.

Foreign Service Reserve officers to be vice consuls of the United States of America:

Charles J. Baker, of Virginia.

Christopher H. Ballou, of Vermont.

Robert B. Clark, of Massachusetts.

George L. Coale, Jr., of California.

James R. Connelly, of California.

Richard K. Cooke, of Texas.

John W. Hennessy, of Connecticut.

John A. Holzna, of Pennsylvania.

Starr M. King, Jr., of Massachusetts.

James F. Shea, of Maryland.

Joseph P. Sherman, of Michigan.

Jack Stewart, of Illinois.

Robert L. Taylor, of New York.

Foreign Service Reserve officers to be vice consuls and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

William T. Brown, of New Jersey.

Ralph W. Stephan, Jr., of Ohio.

Foreign Service Reserve officers to be secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Edgar J. Applewhite, of the District of Columbia.

Howard W. Bovee, of Wisconsin.

Edward P. Brown, of Virginia.

Dudley R. Burris, of Texas.

Robert G. Caldwell, Jr., of Virginia.

Laughlin A. Campbell, of the District of Columbia.

Arthur C. Close, of Virginia.

Raymond H. Close, of New Jersey.

Richard J. Cornish, of Kansas.

Aldo D'Alessandro, of New York.

Philo Dibble, of Utah.

Edward A. Dow, Jr., of New York.

Charles L. Duthie, of Colorado.

Mrs. Virginia H. Emmons, of Michigan.

John F. Fay, of Virginia.

John S. Foster, of Virginia.

Joseph C. Goodwin, of Utah.

Tucker P. E. Gougelmann, of New York.

Charles C. Hall, Jr., of Virginia.

John J. Hicks, of Virginia.

Leo J. Horvath, of Pennsylvania.

Boris Ilyin, of Virginia.

George A. Ives, Jr., of North Carolina.

Hans J. Jensen, of California.

Thane A. Kuhlman, of Michigan.

George V. Lauder, of Connecticut.

Lawrence G. Leiserson, of the District of Columbia.

Richard M. Long, of Colorado.

Edward S. Lynch, of Maryland.

Joseph A. Minott, Jr., of Oregon.

Nicholas A. Montesano, of New York.

Duncan Purcell, of Pennsylvania.

Ralph H. Redford, of Utah.

Carl J. Schoepe, of Ohio.

Edward H. Splain, of Virginia.

Richard F. Stolz, Jr., of Vermont.

Clifton R. Strathern, of Massachusetts.

John M. Turner, of Georgia.

Frederick D. Vreeland, of New York.

Frederick U. Wells, of the District of Columbia.

Foreign Service staff officers to be consuls of the United States of America:

K. Marshall Berg, of Iowa.

Edmund R. Johnson, of Massachusetts.

Max W. Kraus, of Maryland.

Miss Ellen I. McCullough, of New Jersey.

Stephen N. Sestanovich, of California.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 13, 1960

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.
The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Proverbs 9: 10: *The fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom.*

Almighty God, may we now approach Thy throne of grace not only with our own individual needs and longings but with those of all mankind.

In penitence we confess that our prayers, so often in days gone by, have seemed to have been unanswered.

Inspire us to wait before Thee in deeper reverence and humility.

Purge our minds and hearts from doubts and misgivings and lift them by Thy spirit to the heights of courage and hope.

Help us to believe that nothing we ask and do in accordance with Thy divine and holy will shall pass away unheeded and unnoticed.

In Christ's name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read by the Clerk:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., January 12, 1960.

Mr. SPEAKER: I hereby tender my resignation as a member of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee effective immediately.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE E. SHIPLEY,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 417) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That GEORGE E. SHIPLEY, of Illinois, be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the standing Committee of the House of Representatives on Appropriations.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ASSISTANT SUPERINTENDENT OF THE PRESS GALLERY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 418) and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That effective January 1, 1960, there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House, until otherwise provided by law, compensation at the basic rate of \$5,300 per annum for the services of a special assistant superintendent of the House Press Gallery: *Provided, however*, That the authorization and appropriation herein contained shall terminate whenever a vacancy occurs in the position herein created.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CUBA—PATIENCE?

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, Americans should not be surprised that the Castro government has for the present rejected the formal protest by the U.S. Government of the seizure of American properties in Cuba without normal, legal processes and without any clear understanding as to reimbursement of the owners. We have previously given Cuba two notes on property confiscation and this third and last protest was delivered in the hope that the Castro government would discuss the situation. Instead, the Castro revolutionary government has promised to study the protest in due time.

No one can deny the sovereign right of the Castro government to establish a land reform program and to take properties to accomplish these purposes. In fact, the United States has long fostered and encouraged land reforms. However, law and justice dictate that the taking be equitable and that the property owners shall be fairly reimbursed for their investments.

Even the Cuban constitution declares that expropriated property should be paid for in cash at amounts fixed by the courts, and paid for in advance of expropriation.

Until now, the Castro government has claimed it cannot pay in cash and that